

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION (CRC)

In the matter of:

CRC PUBLIC MEETING - LIVE LINE DRAWING

Southern California

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2021

9:30 a.m.

Reported by:

Jacqueline Denlinger



APPEARANCESCOMMISSIONERS

J. Kennedy, Chair
Alicia Fernández, Vice-Chair
Isra Ahmad, Commissioner
Linda Akutagawa, Commissioner
Jane Andersen, Commissioner
Neal Fornaciari, Commissioner
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, Director of Outreach
Kimberly Briggs, Southern California, L.A., Field Lead
Ashleigh Howick, Northern California, Field Lead
Jose Eduardo Chavez, Central California, Field Lead
Sulma Hernandez, Outreach Coordinator

TECHNICAL CONTRACTORS

Kristian Manoff, AV Technical Director/Comment Moderator

LINE DRAWING TEAM

Kennedy Wilson, Q2 Data & Research, LLC
Karin MacDonald, Q2 Data & Research, LLC
Tamina Ramos Alon, Q2 Data & Research, LLC
Andrew Drechsler, Haystaq DNA

VRA COUNSEL STRUMWASSER & WOOCHEER

David Becker
Frederic Woocher

Also Present:Public Comment

Renee Westa-Lusk
Claire Sterling
Sue
Amy Wong

Tina Mun
Robyn Cole
Samuel Sukatan
Rami
Matt
Janine Arica
David
Felicia Castillo
Vincent Tran
Courtney Taylor
Elizabeth Rumetto
Metaborach Mathias
Vince Sanchez
Trevor Eckov
Vivian
Nancy
Haleigh
Ben Manore
Sam Liccardo
Joseph Lima
Tanae
David Donaldson
Brian Halloway
Paul
Kris Rowe
John Cassandra
Joseph Roth
Karen Soule
James
Angel Ruiz
Tony Maldonado
Magda Menendez
Karima Abdul Kadir
Barbara
Pedro
Vanessa
Michael Soto
Deborah
Patricia Ramos Anderson
Mr. Ramos
Mike nail
Majesh Portala
John Wong
Cassandra
Samantha
Vanesh
Samantha Valdez
Ginger
Dora Perez

Linda Sal
Arman
Manson
Unidentified Speakers

INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
Call to Order and Roll Call	4
Public Input Review	6
Public comment - motion on the floor	26
Congressional Districts	31
Public comment	274

P R O C E E D I N G S

9:30 a.m.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Good morning, California. Welcome
2 to today's meeting of the California Citizens
3 Redistricting Commission. I'm Ray Kennedy, the current
4 rotating chair.
5

6 Ravi, would you please call roll?
7

8 MR. SINGH: Yes, sir. Thank you. Commissioner Le
9 Mons?

10 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.

11 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sadhwani.

12 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

13 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sinay.

14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

15 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor.

16 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I am here.

17 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Toledo.

18 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Present.

19 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Turner.

20 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

21 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Vazquez.

22 Commissioner Yee.

23 COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

24 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Ahmad.

25 Commissioner Akutagawa.

1 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

2 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Andersen.

3 Commissioner Fernandez.

4 VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Presente.

5 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari.

6 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

7 MR. SINGH: And Commissioner Kennedy.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: I am here. Thank you so much, Ravi.

9 MR. SINGH: You're welcome.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Today's run of show: We're
11 looking approximately a twelve-hour day today. There
12 will be an opportunity for announcements. We will have a
13 brief business meeting. There's at least one business
14 item to bring up. After the business meeting segment
15 concludes, we will jump back to Congressional districts,
16 I have spoken with the mappers, we will start with the
17 Central Valley, followed by San Jose, and then any other
18 iterations that we might have time for.

19 I'm not counting on having anymore at this point,
20 and we do plan to do the same, jump back to Congressional
21 districts tomorrow morning as well. So if we do not
22 finish going through Congressional district iterations
23 that are ready this morning, we will get back to them
24 tomorrow morning.

25 After the 11:00 break, we will go back to Senate

1 districts, starting with Central Valley, looking at our
2 explorations there, then hopefully moving to Sacramento,
3 then this afternoon getting to the San Francisco Bay
4 region, and hopefully making it to Northern California
5 later in the day, during the last mapping session. We'll
6 then have a 6:30 break, followed by public comment
7 starting at 6:45.

8 So that is the run of the show. Hope to be
9 concluding by 9:15 at the latest. So are there any
10 announcements from Commissioners or staff?

11 No announcements. Okay. So we have a business
12 meeting matter. As I understand it, there is a policy
13 ready that has been posted for approximately thirty-six
14 hours for public review. Is that with Legal or is that
15 with Admin and Finance?

16 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: It's actually with the Public
17 Input Subcommittee.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Public Input Subcommittee. Okay.
19 So Public Input Subcommittee, please step forward.

20 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I'm stepping forward, Chair.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

22 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: So just a brief background.
23 Commissioner Fornaciari and I met with Chief Counsel Pane
24 to review our Public Input Policy. We already had one in
25 the handbook that we had approved previously. However,

1 we wanted to revise it to make sure that it encompassed
2 everything that we've been doing with public input, and
3 the practices that we've been following, particularly
4 during this increased amount of public input we've been
5 receiving. So the policy has been posted. I hope
6 everyone has had a chance to review it. Nothing in there
7 should be a surprise. It is how we've been conducting
8 our input process throughout.

9 And I guess I will turn it over to Commissioner
10 Fornaciari, and then Chief Counsel Pane for any
11 additional items. And then questions if folks have them.

12 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well said. I have nothing
13 to add. Thanks Commissioner Ahmad.

14 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: So to that point, if the -- if
15 the subcommittee wants -- would like this, we could
16 schedule it for a vote, and we would meet our motion, and
17 go through our process. Thanks.

18 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I move that we approve the
19 Public Input Policy as reflected on our website.

20 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I second. Pedro Toledo.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Discussion. Commissioner Fernandez?

22 VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

23 First of all, if it is an amendment or a revision, we
24 should probably note that somewhere in here that it's an
25 addendum, or revision, or whatever you want to call it.

1 And just wondering if it's a typo, 1-A, where it says,
2 "At each", should it be "agendized meeting"? Is it a
3 typo?

4 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner
5 Fernandez. Yeah, we can certainly make that -- change
6 that typo. And to your earlier point, because the
7 contents are different, I think -- believe this is
8 probably more of a revision, only because the topics that
9 were covered in the proposed handout are additional to,
10 and slightly change one aspect of the previous policy.
11 So I'd recommend having one policy and this would be the
12 new revised policy.

13 VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. And then just my
14 other, on 1-A-I, I guess, second line, I believe you left
15 out the word during, and at least once during each
16 agendized meeting. Thanks.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.
18 Commissioner Yee?

19 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I'm just
20 curious about the two-minute -- up to two-minute limit.
21 It just caught my eye because I -- you know, there were
22 times in the past where we did have longer comment
23 periods, depending on, you know, the stage of the work we
24 were in. I just wanted to hear that this is actually a
25 decision to entirely limit all comments in all periods to

1 no more than two minutes.

2 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Yeah. To your point,
3 Commissioner Yee, there have been usually what public
4 bodies do, is given the usually the -- very voluminous
5 public comments that can occur, it's very common for
6 public bodies to say, you know, we need one minute for
7 each speaker, or one and a half minutes, or two minutes.
8 This would be putting a cap that it wouldn't be longer
9 than two minutes, but it does provide the chair with
10 flexibility to do less than that, if need be, given how
11 many people are in the queue.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: But never more than that.

13 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: But not more than that. It's a
14 ceiling of two.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez?

16 VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes. Sorry about that, and
17 just one more thing. In here you put a two-hour limit on
18 public comment. And we have been going past two hours.
19 So I'm just wondering, is this two hours going forward?
20 Or what the process is here, because I'd really like to
21 hear all comment. Thank you.

22 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Yeah. I don't know if the
23 subcommittee wants to weigh in as well. But I'll leave
24 it to them.

25 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Commissioner Fornaciari?

1 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So we -- yeah, we
2 haven't had a specific -- I'm going to address two
3 things, right? Commissioner Yee's comment about longer
4 time for the public to speak. I think, you know, for
5 public comment, I don't believe we've gone over -- over
6 two minutes. In other contexts, you know, for specific
7 public input we've gone longer, but for public comment I
8 don't -- I don't think we've gone longer than two
9 minutes. And so this just codifies, you know, what we're
10 actually doing.

11 So the two-hour time limit, we were just trying
12 to -- you know, there's where we have the option to
13 create a time, what's the term, time --

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Time, place, and manner.

15 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- time, place, and manner
16 restriction. So we just wanted to be able to sort of,
17 you know, manage public input, you know, in a way that we
18 can balance the time, time for us to do the work we need
19 to do, but also time for the public to provide input. So
20 that was the thinking behind that.

21 I don't know if Anthony or Isra has anything that
22 they'd like to add.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Ahmad?

24 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Nothing more to add.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And --

1 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Just the one thing I'll add to
2 that is, Marcy did a -- our Outreach Director did a sort
3 of a preliminary analysis, and it was on average, around
4 an hour and a half in some -- a lot of the time, less
5 than that, but certainly taking into consideration the
6 increased public comment where we're doing -- and now
7 we're talking an hour and a half of actual public
8 comment. You take away the break part, you take away --
9 you know, once you actually start, an average, about an
10 hour and a half of public comment.

11 And this would be two hours. So it would be a
12 little bit longer than that. So trying to balance that,
13 and that's just a little bit more of a policy call, but
14 certainly taking into consideration what's happened in
15 the past that's -- the two-hour mark is more -- certainly
16 more generous than what has happened in the past,
17 generally, on average.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chief Counsel Pane.

19 Commissioner Toledo?

20 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I think, given that on
21 average, we are able to see and hear for everyone that
22 has called in, I mean two hours seems like a reasonable
23 amount of time, and perhaps there might be language added
24 to two hours, and give the Chair some discretion as well
25 to -- for those circumstances where we may need to

1 continue just seeing -- to continue to where we may still
2 have hands raised. And it's important not to cut off
3 where the Chair determines it's important not to cut off
4 the discussion or the input.

5 So maybe giving the Chair a little bit more
6 discretion to be able to go beyond the two hours, as
7 necessary, would be acceptable? Thank you.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.
9 Commissioner Sinay?

10 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair.

11 Thank you for revising our public comment policy.
12 And we have used the words public input and public
13 comment to mean different things. And I'm curious --
14 well, I think for this Public Comment Policy, we should
15 then define what we mean by public comment, because we do
16 have both.

17 And then, you know, because we want that flexibility
18 for public input -- yeah, I mean, as we said some -- a
19 lot of our public input sessions were very different than
20 our public comment. And so I just want us to make sure
21 that we are being consistent, because even when earlier
22 we said, well, yes, we've done that differently for
23 public input, and then -- and then we started talking
24 about public comments, and someone said public input,
25 when I think they meant public comment, which is okay,

1 but I think for a policy, we do want to be clear if
2 we're -- if we have -- since we have differentiated it
3 throughout.

4 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: So to your point, Commissioner
5 Sinay, yeah, they are different terms. Public comment is
6 specifically referenced in the Government Code. Public
7 input is a term that is somewhat defined in our
8 Commission statutes. And the Commission has previously
9 differentiated those terms.

10 You'll recall that the Commission has -- took a
11 previous policy of three minutes for public input, and
12 that's when they were -- when you were doing a different
13 phase of the Commission process. The Government Code
14 allows public bodies to regulate time, place, manner
15 restrictions for public comment. And so this policy is
16 in line with the Government Code referring to public
17 comment.

18 So you would be regulating public comment. As I
19 understand it, as applied to this part, or what's
20 remaining for the Commission, what's at this point is
21 public comment for the rest -- for the remainder. But
22 generally, yes, you have previously defined public input
23 and allocated a time, place, manner restriction for that
24 to be three minutes. This policy does not address public
25 input, it addresses public comment.

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right. My comment was just --
2 we might just want to put a sentence in the very
3 beginning just -- saying exactly that and defining what
4 public comment is.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.
6 Commissioner Yee?

7 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, I just
8 wanted to echo Commissioner Toledo's thought about adding
9 some discretion for the Chair, maybe under 1-A, perhaps
10 saying, will ordinarily occupy up to two hours. I mean,
11 I think if we're coming up on two hours, and only two
12 more people in the queue, most chairs would just take
13 those, you know.

14 But by the language here is like we couldn't, you
15 know, at least by the letter of the law, letter of the
16 policy. So some discretion for the Chair to go longer as
17 circumstances dictate.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.
19 Commissioner Ahmad.

20 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. Given the
21 discussion around this, I would like to revise my motion
22 to say approve -- I move to approve the revised Public
23 Comment Policy with amendments, as noted, for the
24 remainder of our Commission meetings. I can send you
25 that in writing, Alvaro. Thanks.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.
2 Commissioner, Akutagawa?

3 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I think on
4 Commissioner Yee's point, I wonder if there also needs to
5 be just a brief sentence, or some language that also says
6 that at the -- either the Chair's discretion that if
7 there is quite a bit more public testimony waiting to be
8 given, that another date and time will be rescheduled. I
9 think we've talked about that, that after a certain time,
10 if we just need to, you know, extend it into the next
11 day, or reschedule for another day, we'll just capture
12 everybody's contact information so that they can, you
13 know, give their testimony. And I didn't see that. And
14 I'm just wondering if that should also be included in
15 there, with the Chair's discretion. Thank you.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.
17 Chief Counsel Pane.

18 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: So I -- just a quick point
19 about the discretion. Can certainly work with that, but
20 I would, frankly, want to get a clearer understanding of
21 what that discretion looks like. Sort of an open-ended
22 discretion of the chair isn't really a time, place,
23 manner restriction.

24 So you know, certainly we have a motion on the -- on
25 the floor and it's been seconded, but if we would want to

1 go back and substantively alter what -- to include
2 discretion, and sort of the limits of that discretion, I
3 would want to go back and rework that policy, if that's
4 the Commission's will.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chief Counsel Pane.
6 Commissioner Toledo?

7 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I'm wondering what
8 might be some options to rework, to allow us to hear --
9 to go beyond the two-hour time frame, should we want to
10 do that. Is it something like giving the chair an
11 additional -- the flexibility of an additional -- an
12 additional fifteen minutes, or fifteen-minute increments,
13 or something like that, or something else.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo. I
15 could also imagine in those situations requiring a vote
16 of the Commission to extend the public comment period
17 beyond the two hours.

18 One issue that came to my mind is if we -- you know,
19 this is just theoretical, but if we had a large number of
20 speakers requiring, and/or requesting interpretation, and
21 we needed to give them twice as much time, then we would
22 effectively be reducing the number of people we could
23 hear from.

24 So I'm wondering if we might want to include a
25 provision saying, the two hours would be calculated on

1 the amount of original input, excluding any time required
2 for interpretation. Chief Counsel Pane?

3 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: I think we -- I think we could
4 certainly add that. I would -- even if the Commission
5 didn't or chose not to include that, I believe that would
6 be the application of the law as current -- as currently
7 under the law would require that anyway. We would,
8 effectively, go beyond the two hours for that specific
9 limited purpose that's already in the law for that.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: All right. Okay. Thank you.

11 Commissioner Turner?

12 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I would like counsel to
13 reconsider that response with the thought process that
14 the two hours that we determined would be above and
15 beyond what we've already done, would have already
16 included in any interpretation, or translation. And all
17 of our public comment has already had that baked in.

18 And we've set a limit based on that total. And so
19 now it looks like we're taking that total and giving
20 additional time, and has nothing to do with whether or
21 not people need the translation. I just feel like the
22 calculations that were used already had that included in
23 as part of it.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

25 Commissioner Akutagawa, is your hand still up, or up

1 again? Okay. Please go ahead.

2 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So on the point about
3 discretion. Is it better to then say that should there
4 be X number of people, or the expectation is that the --
5 based on the number of people in the queue, it will go
6 beyond a fifteen-minute time frame. A new -- you know, a
7 new -- the remainder of the people in queue to make
8 comment will be rescheduled for, you know, the following
9 day or something like that.

10 And if, instead of using that discretion language,
11 you know, being very specific about how many people in
12 queue has to be -- you know, has to be there to trigger,
13 you know, just the idea that we cannot go beyond the two
14 hours, and that we just need to schedule. Versus like,
15 okay, if there's two or three people, I think we would --
16 we'll know that that will take less than fifteen minutes.

17 I just want to ask about that. Maybe that -- being
18 that specific may be helpful to what Chief Counsel Pane
19 spoke about, where it doesn't require a complete
20 reworking of it, but just inserting, you know, language
21 that adds that specificity of when additional time needs
22 to be triggered for -- to take that public comment.
23 Thank you.

24 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: So to that point, I can give
25 you at least a few examples. But one example that comes

1 up with another state entity, they've allocated up --
2 it's an up-to a certain amount for public comment. And
3 the theory behind that is they average what they
4 typically have, and usually you'd increase that a little
5 bit more to gauge what would, otherwise, be appropriate.

6 But in that case there is usually that hard -- that
7 hard stop, so in -- so if we talk about discretion, it
8 gets difficult to say, well, it's two more callers, if
9 it's four more callers, if it's -- so it may be worth
10 figuring out what the Commission thinks would be the
11 right amount of time for public comment. The Government
12 Code does allow public bodies to limit the total amount
13 of time for public comment.

14 So it's a question of what is that total amount of
15 public time for public comment. And as on an average
16 you've done about an hour and a half, maybe a little less
17 than that, the theory then was, well then we'll add it --
18 we'll add an additional thirty minutes for a total of two
19 hours. But we're never going to know if it's two more
20 people, or four, you know, it's always going to -- it
21 could always be different.

22 So that's sort of the theory behind having the total
23 amount behind it is to kind of capture the situations as
24 best you can, what we think public comment has been, what
25 we think it will be, and that's what we would go by.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chief Counsel Pane.

2 Commissioner Toledo?

3 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I mean, given, you
4 know, the thought that has gone behind this, and also our
5 limited amount of time over the next, I think -- I think
6 Commissioner or Chair Kennedy referenced hours, right, we
7 have hours to complete our work over the next couple of
8 weeks, I do think a cap would be -- is probably -- would
9 probably be something that would be prudent, given that
10 we have so many ways for the public to give us input, not
11 just through -- through our -- through coming on to
12 giving public testimony over our live sessions, but also
13 through the various means of doing so.

14 So given that, I'd be like -- I started off being a
15 little bit uncomfortable with the -- with the ceiling.
16 But the more -- the more that I think about it, the more
17 that I understand all the thought process that went into
18 coming up with a two-hour time frame. I'm more and more
19 okay with it. Thank you.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

21 Commissioner Fernandez?

22 VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. In terms
23 of -- I don't know what the outreach director used in
24 terms of averaging, if she went all the way back to when
25 we 1st started our meetings, but obviously, in the last

1 few weeks, it's been more than two hours. So that's my
2 concern is, it has been more than two hours, sometimes
3 three hours, so I mean, it has to be at least three
4 hours. Two hours, I mean, even in our run of shows we're
5 allocating two one-and-a-half-hour blocks. So that's
6 three hours in my opinion. So I'm saying a minimum of
7 three. Thanks.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.
9 I will join Commissioner Toledo in this. We have very
10 few hours remaining. And I think, you know, we have to
11 look at the balance between getting our work done, and
12 taking public comment. I think that, you know, we
13 have -- we have successfully managed to balance that.
14 But as the hours tick down, and we have fewer and fewer
15 hours remaining, saying three hours is taking up a
16 rapidly increasing percentage of the time available to us
17 to complete our work.

18 And I believe that two hours is reasonable in that
19 context. We are we are not trying to cut off anyone in
20 particular, any views in particular, we want to continue
21 to take public comment, but we must focus on the amount
22 of time remaining to get the actual work done.

23 That said, I'm not comfortable with the chair being
24 the only one with discretion on this. I think that, you
25 know, part of the purpose of establishing a policy is to

1 limit any sort of discretion. And to the extent that
2 there might be occasions where some amount of discretion
3 might be useful or important, I would -- I would again
4 propose that it require a vote of the full Commission.
5 Thank you. Commissioner Taylor?

6 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you, Chair. I agree. I
7 hear what -- I hear what you're saying. Hours are
8 precious, time is precious. But I think I would have to
9 lean towards Commissioner Fernandez's line of thinking.
10 I think we have to go minimum, the two-hour or ninety-
11 minute blocks, that's what we've sort of have it set up
12 for, and work from there. Yeah. I think two ninety-
13 minute blocks is reasonable.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.
15 Commissioner Ahmad?

16 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. This
17 conversation was not as fast as I was hoping. I want to
18 remind myself that we have until December 27th to get our
19 maps in. We don't have a meeting scheduled for beyond
20 December 27th at this point, so just wanted to remind
21 myself of that first.

22 I am ready to vote. If there is a strong opinion to
23 increase the two hours to two ninety-minute blocks, fine,
24 let's do that and move on. I want to get to mapping.
25 Thanks.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

2 Commissioner Toledo?

3 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I'm fine with two
4 ninety-minute blocks of that -- that would come out to
5 three -- or I wouldn't say two -- I would just say three
6 hours max, I mean a three-hour cap. Although I thought
7 the two-hour was reasonable, but if more -- if the three
8 hours seem -- are more aligned with our practice at this
9 point, I'm comfortable with that. I can fully support
10 that.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

12 Commissioner Andersen?

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I suggest an amendment of,
14 as such, two ninety-minute time block, time limits -- two
15 ninety-minute combined time limits -- you know, would be
16 our limit, yeah. I propose in there, instead of where it
17 says two hours, I propose the amendment of making that
18 two ninety-minute block -- ninety-minute blocks as our
19 maximum.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

21 Commissioner Fornaciari?

22 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Let's see. So here is
23 what I -- I just want to make sure we're clear. There
24 are a couple of typos that we need to fix. And I would
25 propose we don't say two ninety-minute blocks, because we

1 may start in the middle of one of our ninety-minute
2 blocks. So I would just offer three hours. And other --
3 and those would be the two amendments that we would
4 capture here is what I'm hearing. Is that correct?

5 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: That's what I'm taking note of
6 so far. Yes.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.
8 Commissioner Andersen?

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I withdraw mine, and
10 accept -- ninety minute -- and accept Commissioner
11 Fornaciari's.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: So the original motion was made, I
13 believe, by Commissioner Ahmad.

14 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: So do you accept the amendment?

16 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes. The three hours.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Second --

18 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Let's go.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Second was by whom?

20 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Toledo.

21 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: That was myself. And I accept
22 the amendment, the friendly amendment.

23 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Okay. So we've

1 discussed it. We now must take public comment before we
2 vote.

3 So Kristian, could you please issue the
4 instructions, and begin taking public comment on this
5 item?

6 MR. MANOFF: Yes, Chair.

7 In order to maximize transparency and public
8 participation in our process, the Commissioners will be
9 taking public comment by phone for the motion on the
10 floor.

11 To call in, dial the telephone number provided on
12 the live stream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted
13 enter the meeting ID number provided on the live stream
14 feed, it is, 85932989398 for this meeting. When prompted
15 to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound. Once
16 you've dialed in, you'll be placed in a queue. To
17 indicate you wish to comment, please press star nine,
18 this will raise your hand for the moderator.

19 When it's your turn to speak, you'll hear a message
20 that says, the host would like you to talk, press star
21 six to speak. If you'd like to give your name, please
22 state and spell it for the record. You are not required
23 to provide your name to give public comment.

24 Please make sure to mute your computer or live
25 stream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during

1 your call. Once you're waiting in the queue, be alert
2 for when it is your turn to speak. And again, please
3 turn down the live stream volume.

4 Chair, would you like me to enforce a two-minute
5 time limit on comments?

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

7 MR. MANOFF: Very good. For those in the queue, we
8 do have a couple of people who have called in -- just a
9 moment. We are going to lower your hands. If you would
10 like to give comment on the motion on the floor, you will
11 be invited to raise your hand again. All hands are
12 lowered now. If you'd like to give comment on the motion
13 on the floor, please, press star nine.

14 We're going to allow some time for people to
15 consider if they want to give comment on the motion on
16 the floor. Again, if you want to give comment on the
17 motion on the floor, please press star nine. And we do
18 see those hands. Thank you very much.

19 As the Chair said, we will be enforcing a two-minute
20 time limit on comments on the motion on the floor.

21 First up, we have caller 3995. And after that will
22 be caller 2829. Caller 3995, please follow the prompts.
23 The floor is yours.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hey, good morning,
25 Commissioners. I just want to say that I hope that you

1 do embrace a longer public comment period. There is a
2 lot of people who do have to wait on these for a really
3 long time. Some people wait up to like four hours,
4 having to -- especially like last week, before there was
5 a solid procedure in place. So I really do hope that you
6 embrace public comment and leaving, whether it be two
7 ninety blocks -- two ninety-minute blocks, or just three
8 hours of public comment. I do hope that you embrace that
9 motion. Thank you.

10 MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

11 Up next, we've got caller 2829. Please follow the
12 prompts.

13 MS. WESTA-LUSK: Hello, Commissioners.

14 MR. MANOFF: The floor is yours.

15 MS. WESTA-LUSK: Hello, Commissioners. This is
16 Renee Westa-Lusk. I guess I need some clarification.
17 I'm rather confused about this discussion, because I
18 think there needs to be a distinction between public
19 comment, I guess, that you would give at a business
20 meeting, versus, I don't know what you call the comment
21 that you're getting when you have the line drawing
22 sessions, because like all yesterday was line drawing, it
23 wasn't a business meeting.

24 And you had this segment of three hours -- almost
25 three hours from 6:30 to 9 last night. Is that public

1 comment, or public input? So I'm confused about limiting
2 this. If you could, please clarify. Thank you.

3 MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much for your comment.

4 One more time, for those who have called in, if you
5 would like to give comment for the motion on the floor,
6 please press star nine.

7 There are no more hands at this time, Chair.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Kristian. Chief Counsel
9 Pane, would you like to respond to the last caller?

10 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Yes. This, what we're doing
11 here is public comment. Public input was a specific
12 designated time in the phase, as I mentioned briefly.
13 Right at this point we are not -- to my understanding,
14 the Commission has not asked for public input, they've
15 asked -- they've been asking for public comment. So I
16 wanted to just clarify that point. Thank you.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: But this would reply -- this would
18 refer to or cover public comment on business items during
19 business meetings as well as public comment on the maps.

20 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: So I would argue, and you can
21 look at the agenda, but every agendized meeting is -- I
22 would argue is a business meeting, in a sense. Even line
23 drawing is part of this Commission's mandate. And so --
24 and as you can refer to on the agenda, it is one line --
25 line drawing is certainly one of the items on the agenda

1 for the Commission meetings.

2 So it's -- and we -- as noted, Bagley-Keene requires
3 public comment for every agendized item. And so this
4 would be one of those items where you would all take
5 public comment from.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.
7 Executive Director Hernandez, are you ready to handle
8 this vote?

9 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes. We are ready.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Please proceed.

11 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Commissioner Le
12 Mons?

13 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

14 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani.

15 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

16 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay.

17 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

18 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Taylor.

19 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

20 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Toledo.

21 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

22 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner.

23 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I was hoping to have the
24 motion read one more time for understanding of where we
25 ended.

1 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Sure. The motion -- as noted,
2 the motion to approve revised public comment, referring
3 to the 12/16/21 handout policy, with discussed amendment
4 as noted for the remainder of the Commission meetings.

5 COMMISSIONER TURNER: And the discussed amendment
6 was three hours instead of two.

7 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: And as well as fixing a couple
8 of the spelling typos as well.

9 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Yes.

10 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fernandez caught a
11 little typo there.

12 VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: (Indiscernible)

13 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Very well. I'll continue with
14 the call. Commissioner Turner?

15 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

16 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Vazquez?
17 Commissioner Yee?

18 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

19 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad?

20 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

21 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa?

22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

23 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen?

24 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

25 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fernandez?

1 VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Just for clarification, so
2 there's no option to go beyond the three on current
3 policy, correct?

4 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Commissioner Fernandez, to your
5 point. If this policy were adopted, there would be a cap
6 of three hours devoted to public comment for each agenda
7 item.

8 VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: No.

9 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fornaciari.

10 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

11 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Abstain.

13 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: The motion passes. Thank you.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Executive Director
15 Hernandez.

16 Are there any other business items that need to come
17 before the Commission at this point?

18 I'm not seeing any. We are now turning our
19 attention to iterations that have been prepared and
20 posted for our Congressional maps. So Kennedy, it is
21 over to you. And you were working with Commissioners
22 Fornaciari --

23 MS. WILSON: Sadhwani --

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- and Turner on this? Or this is
25 Sadhwani and Toledo?

1 MS. WILSON: Correct. There's a lot of iterations
2 going around. This one is Sadhwani and Toledo.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

4 MS. WILSON: So where we left off yesterday was we
5 went through the three iterations, we had the one where
6 we split the -- in Fresno and swapping 5,000 between each
7 other, and then we had the next two, which have the arm
8 in Fresno/Kern, and a big difference between them was
9 just how we put out the extra 17,000 (sic) people.

10 And so one way was splitting through Clovis and
11 North Fresno, and we left off on the -- just taking parts
12 of Fresno. And I can zoom in a bit closer for you to see
13 that. And this would be the iteration for us -- STCD4
14 (ph.).

15 (Pause)

16 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So are we just thinking
17 about this right now? Is that where we are?

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry. Commissioner Andersen?

19 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. So I'm sorry.
20 The population that got moved is 17,000? Oh, okay,
21 because I thought it was yesterday --

22 MS. WILSON: Sorry.

23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- one hundred --

24 MS. WILSON: It was 117-, my apologies, 117,000.

25 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. And because we're

1 moving 5,000, the 117- came from where?

2 MS. WILSON: So before it was 5,000 just because we
3 kept the same configuration of all three districts, and
4 only took out Old Fig Garden. Here, we took out Visalia,
5 parts of Tulare, Lemoore, Lemoore Station, the
6 northwestern part of Hanford, and that was a lot more
7 people, and put that into Fresno/Kern to get the
8 deviations to where they are.

9 So before, when we didn't have this arm, King,
10 Tulare, Kern was at -- I believe it was around fifty-
11 eight percent. However, Fresno/Tulare was around fifty-
12 one. And so to get this back up to fifty-three we had to
13 take out more parts. And that is why it's a bigger shift
14 in population.

15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you. And the
16 only difference between version 3 and version 4 is what
17 part, how the 117,000 was taken out.

18 MS. WILSON: Correct.

19 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. And 3, it's part
20 of Fresno and part of Clovis, and 4, it's all part of
21 Fresno?

22 MS. WILSON: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Could you please tell
24 us, you know, for each -- for version 3, you know,
25 where's the downtown in each of these cities? And you

1 know, what percentage of the city has been moved to ECA?
2 Like, say, do we know where the downtown is in Fresno, or
3 the --

4 MS. WILSON: And I'm turning on the terrain map so
5 we can take a look at where the splits were. And so
6 again, one thing we were able to bring in that we didn't
7 have in other iterations was Fig Garden Loop, and in with
8 Old Fig we have a cut here at North/Shaw Avenue. Here is
9 going across Blackstone, up to Bullard Avenue, North
10 First Street, and then the 99 is right here, so it's a
11 little bit more west. And this road here is the North
12 Santa Fe Avenue, and it kind of goes around to Fig Garden
13 Drive, and up to Herndon Avenue, and down to Shaw.

14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you. And
15 could -- just on this one, can we see the difference in
16 Fresno, please, from 3 to 4? Or I'm sorry, which, this
17 is 4. And in 3 what are -- when it's close like this,
18 what does 3 and 4 look like?

19 MS. WILSON: Yes. One moment, and I will turn it
20 on, and you can see them together. Or so this is 4. And
21 let's turn on 3. So they take the border, from the
22 Fresno/Tulare stays the same, it's just how we take out
23 the 117,000.

24 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you, yeah. I'd
25 like to know, you know, sort of what -- what parts of the

1 city are -- like particularly in this version, so what
2 portion of -- what's the population in Fresno? And
3 what's the population in Clovis that goes to ECA?

4 MS. WILSON: Clovis, let's check that right now. I
5 know Clovis entirely has around 120,000, but I can see
6 the exact number of people that were taken out from each
7 in one moment.

8 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you very much.

9 (Pause)

10 MS. WILSON: Sorry, I had both lines on, and that
11 was confusing me, so now I'll just put these lines on.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Well, while we're waiting.
13 Commissioner Turner?

14 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. Yes. And
15 so I wanted to just support the STCV4 iteration that
16 went -- that was displayed on yesterday. Thanking
17 Commissioners Sadhwani, Toledo, and Kennedy for showing
18 them. We got a lot of good feedback on that through our
19 public comment on last night. I like the non-pairing of
20 Clovis, and I think this version honors most of the COIs
21 that we've received. Thank you.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

23 MS. WILSON: So this is slightly a few blocks off,
24 but it's around 104,000 people here. Oh, and you asked
25 for --

1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. Yeah.

2 MS. WILSON: -- for each one. Okay, sorry. Hold
3 on.

4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez?

6 VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Yes. I
7 also prefer version 4. However, my concern is with the
8 STANISFRESNO, that's the only district where the Latino
9 CVAP actually went down. So I just want to make sure. I
10 think this was brought up yesterday that it has been
11 reviewed by our VRA counsel, but I just want to confirm.
12 It just seems really low to me. Thank you.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. We will be asking
14 counsel for their thoughts on this, momentarily.

15 Commissioner Toledo?

16 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. And so with that, I
17 wanted to just frame this a little bit more. So if we go
18 back to our draft maps. Is there a way to go to our
19 draft maps, Kennedy, the ones from back in November? I'm
20 sorry. I'm having a technical glitch so -- with my
21 laptop in the Commission Office.

22 So if we go back to our original draft maps, you'll
23 see that -- because that really was the -- while we were
24 drafting these maps back in November, we did our best to
25 get CVAPs while honoring all of the COIs, and all of the

1 criteria. And our CVAPs in the southern region were --
2 and Kennedy can show us what they were. I believe the
3 Latino CVAP in the Kern district was -- Kennedy, can
4 you -- I can't see them on my screen, so if you could
5 just --

6 MS. WILSON: Yes. I am pulling it up right this
7 moment. And also for Commissioner Andersen, we took
8 around 70,000 from Clovis, and around 37,000 from Fresno.
9 It's not an exact number, but around there.

10 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. Yeah. Thank you very
11 much, Kennedy.

12 MS. WILSON: And then to Commissioner Toledo. In
13 STANISFRESNO, we had 51.66 percent Latino CVAP,
14 Fresno/Tulare was at 53.16 percent, and KINGTULAKERN was
15 at 55.5 percent.

16 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And if you could also
17 highlight the African-American or the Black -- the Black
18 CVAPs as well, just because that also colors our thinking
19 around all of this. So when we -- when we were working
20 through these back in November, and putting these
21 together, we actually, during public meeting, during that
22 session where we developed this, we asked the public for
23 feedback on the CVAPs.

24 I mean, actually, it was Mr. Becker who went on
25 record, and wanted the public to comment on whether these

1 CVAPs were -- were at the range that would allow for
2 the -- the communities to elect candidates of choice.
3 And we did receive quite a bit of feedback from the
4 community saying, no, the Kern -- the Kern/Tulare
5 District was not sufficient, and that the Fresno --
6 Fresno/Tulare District could be -- if we could -- an
7 increase in that CVAP would be preferable.

8 We went back in iterations to try to maintain the
9 compactness, maintain the COIs, maintain everything that
10 we had talked through, and while also trying to increase
11 the CVAPs for Latino and African-American communities in
12 this area. And it was a challenge, we would -- and
13 Kennedy, and Commissioner Turner, and Commissioner
14 Sadhwani, and myself, we all, in different iterations,
15 with different versions, and different times, tried very
16 hard to do that. And we'd raise it in one area, and it
17 decreases another.

18 So the two areas that came -- that the community
19 has -- the community groups have consistently said are
20 the challenges, the Fresno/Tulare District, and the --
21 and the King/Tulare District, but particularly the
22 King/Tulare District. And after looking at different
23 versions, and essentially putting the first two criteria
24 first, equal population of VRA, which is our obligation,
25 less concern on the COIs.

1 We started venturing on saying, whether we could
2 increase the CVAPs by reworking this a little bit more.
3 And that did mean creating the -- what is being called an
4 arm into the Lemoore area through Visalia. And so that
5 does raise some compactness issues. Of course,
6 compactness is way below in priority to equal population,
7 and also to VRA.

8 But what this did allow us to do, and what you'll
9 see is it allowed us to get to the CVAP in King/Tulare,
10 at a level that is more aligned with what the community
11 groups are telling us that they would like to see. In
12 the Fresno/Tulare, while the Latino remained the same.
13 And that was a big win for us because just keeping it at
14 that level while also raising the Kern/Tulare was very,
15 very difficult, and almost impossible while maintaining
16 the shape that we had prior. Actually it was impossible.

17 We were able to maintain the Latino CVAP, but
18 increase the African-American CVAPs. So the Black CVAPs
19 actually goes up by bringing in some of the Black --
20 additional Black COIs, and putting them into that
21 district.

22 Yes, to Commissioner Fernandez's point. The
23 district to -- STANFRESNO did go down slightly, but it is
24 slightly, and there's still comfort with that level from
25 the community groups. And that's what we're hearing.

1 And even within our own analysis.

2 And so this, what we have now, and in your iteration
3 3 and 4, are pathways forward to getting to the CVAPs
4 that would -- that would likely give Latinos an
5 opportunity to elect the candidates of their choice. And
6 also meet our obligations under the VRA, equal
7 population, and all of the other factors, because we did
8 follow them in a manner that was compliant, and so -- and
9 with legal advice throughout this whole process.

10 Certainly, I mean, there's always risks, and there's
11 risks to not doing this, there's risks to doing this.
12 And I think what we -- we as a Commission have to do, is
13 we have to do the right thing for the people of the
14 Central Valley, for the people of California, and to have
15 fair maps, and do it in a process that is -- that is
16 compliant.

17 And I believe that's what we have done here. We
18 have done this in a compliant manner, and we're doing it
19 and with the -- with the view that we want fair maps for
20 all of California, and that these maps would meet our VRA
21 obligations for the region. And how we do the -- how we
22 shift populations up, or east, that's really up to the
23 Commission. And we have some options and certainly --
24 and some preferences across the group.

25 I think Commissioner Sadhwani and I, I don't want to

1 speak for her, but I really don't have a preference
2 between 3 and 4. We just wanted to make sure that the
3 group had the opportunity, as a Commission, to speak
4 through, through those issues, because really our charge
5 was to try to see if we could raise the CVAPs in
6 alignment with what we had heard from both the community
7 groups and our legal -- through Legal.

8 So we believe we have achieved that, and now it's --
9 we have to figure out how to -- how to contour the
10 districts. And so that would be, you know, that's the
11 discussion that we're having today. Thank you.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

13 I get the sense, Commissioner Sadhwani, as the other
14 part of the team on this, would like to add a few words
15 to that.

16 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No. I was just going to
17 say, I second everything that he -- that Commissioner
18 Toledo so eloquently laid out. And I actually don't have
19 a strong preference between 3 or 4. I see them as
20 accomplishing the same goals of building stronger VRA
21 districts, which was the goal that we had in doing this.

22 And we just simply wanted to provide two different
23 options for the Commission, as well as for the public to
24 provide feedback on. So thank you.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much.

1 Commissioner Turner?

2 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Uh-huh. Thank you. Yes. I
3 do have a strong preference for 4. I also have personal
4 experience in the area, and happen to know for a fact
5 that African-American Coalition Partners work tightly
6 with the Latino Coalition Partners in the area. And so I
7 don't have any concerns that that would be the right
8 thing to do, and that there would be the work together.

9 But I also wanted to say that -- oh, and from the
10 long session last night of hunting and pecking in this
11 area, trying to find census blocks that will increase it,
12 I would be extremely shocked and surprised if you can
13 find anything different or higher in the area that would
14 serve all of the needs.

15 But I also wanted to say, Commissioner Andersen
16 asked a question about Downtown Fresno, and she wanted to
17 know where that was. And of course that would be, you
18 know, responded differently depending on who you ask.
19 But it's loosely and roughly Highway 99 to the west,
20 Divisadero to the north. It's First Street to the east,
21 and then Ventura. So it's through that area is downtown,
22 roughly, for Fresno. Thank you.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.
24 Commissioner Andersen?

25 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you, Chair.

1 Actually, I was -- I liked Commissioner Turner's, about
2 the hunting and pecking idea. The STANIS -- the FRES
3 (ph.) also dropped, did concern me, but I don't want to
4 have to send anyone back to hunting and pecking. But I
5 was kind of surprised going up into Tracy, if that would
6 help at all. And I -- but again, I did not look at this.

7 But I'm just wondering around, in Madera, you know,
8 where sort of tend to be looking around, you know, in
9 this area, around in Stanislaus, but I'm wondering, you
10 know, around Chowchilla, or you know in that border, if
11 we couldn't have -- that was an area that we could have
12 increased the CVAP in that area.

13 Again, I didn't do the hunting and pecking, but I
14 didn't know if we were looking in the CVAP in this area,
15 because I know we all -- we've tended to focus north, but
16 I don't know if that was worth -- worth doing.

17 In fact, with the version 3 and 4, I was really kind
18 of hoping Clovis, you know, would possibly go up with --
19 instead of Fresno. But I see you can't do that, because
20 you'd leave Fresno isolated. And then looking, you know,
21 this is our current version -- well, it wouldn't have --
22 it wouldn't have done too much.

23 You know, I don't want to cut up cities like, poor
24 San Jose, had to be cut for VRA, in a funny, funny way,
25 which separated the city. But I see that this does not

1 actually do that for Fresno. Um-hum.

2 Yeah, my concern is that, you know, yes, I think
3 most people are going with 4, and I just want to be on
4 record to say, you know -- I'm the voice for the Sierras,
5 and they'd really, really like to have a voice in the
6 Sierras. And that could be, you know, up by Lake Tahoe,
7 it could be in the suburbs from Sacramento. But here,
8 you know, there'd be about 117 people -- about 117,000
9 from Fresno. And I don't know what the number is that's
10 also in the Central Valley from Stanislaus, you know, the
11 Modesto, et cetera.

12 If it's -- if it's over 500,000 I'm very concerned,
13 still. But I'll support whichever of these options. And
14 you know, I'll probably go with 4 as well. Thank you.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.
16 Commissioner Sinay.

17 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair.

18 Commissioner Andersen, the two areas that you
19 mentioned that might be helpful for increasing the Latino
20 CVAP are already in the -- in that district. Unless I'm
21 not seeing the maps correctly, but my understanding -- my
22 eyes are saying that they're in there.

23 My question is, Commissioner Turner, you've worked
24 really closely with all this area, and you've been on the
25 ground for a long time, and you said you strongly support

1 number 4. And we keep hearing 3 or 4 might be good. But
2 you didn't tell us why you strongly support number 4, so
3 I was hoping I could learn a little bit more from you.

4 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Actually, I did. I
5 said 4 separates Clovis out from the Old Fig Garden
6 areas. And that was just from COI testimony that we've
7 asked -- that has been asked for in every draft, of every
8 type map that we've put out. And so to me, the
9 distinction there just made it easy to be able to
10 accommodate that, as opposed to going the other
11 direction, because short of that, there's not a lot of
12 difference.

13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. I had heard that, but I
14 didn't know if there was more than that. So thank you so
15 much.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay, and
17 Commissioner Turner.

18 Commissioner Toledo?

19 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. And just to
20 piggyback on Commissioner Andersen. Our hope had been
21 to -- to try to include more of Clovis, but it did get us
22 into contiguity issues, as you pointed out, with Fresno.
23 And so this, this cut in Fresno would be very minor, I
24 believe, if I remember correctly, Kennedy, it was only
25 17,000 (sic) people going up, if I remember correctly, to

1 ECA, if I remember correctly. Please advise.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Kennedy?

3 MS. WILSON: 117.

4 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: 117, a little bit off, a
5 little bit off. So it is not as minor as I thought it
6 was.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
8 Toledo.

9 Commissioner Fernandez?

10 VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I
11 just want to confirm all the districts are balanced now,
12 right?

13 MS. WILSON: (Nods yes).

14 VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, great. Thank you so
15 much. And thank you, thank you both, I don't know -- all
16 three of you for doing this. I appreciated having
17 different options, which is great. And I know a lot of
18 time went into it. So thank you so much.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you, everyone. We have
20 another iteration to consider that is the iteration that
21 Commissioner Yee and Commissioner Ahmad have worked on
22 for San Jose.

23 Before we do that, I would like to go into a brief
24 closed session. So we are -- we are due for a break at
25 11:00. I don't think the closed session will incur into

1 that. Worst-case scenario is we should be seeing public
2 again by 11:15. We might be back earlier, but 11:15 is
3 the most likely at this point, I would say, after our
4 fifteen-minute break.

5 This would be a closed session under the pending
6 litigation exception. And we will report any action
7 taken after we return from our break. So thank you,
8 everyone.

9 (Whereupon, a closed session discussion was
10 held, and a recess also taken from 10:34 a.m.
11 until 11:33 a.m.)

12 MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much, Chair. We are in
13 closed session on the live stream. For Commissioners and
14 Legal, if you could please follow that link, I include
15 the mappers also just in case. And for the rest of the
16 staff, you're on break, and we'll keep you posted on the
17 return time. Thanks everybody.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you everyone for your patience
19 during our closed session and our break. We did not take
20 any action in closed session. And in keeping with our
21 run of show for the day it is now 11:30, and we will
22 resume our work on the Senate Districts.

23 And for that we are going to Kennedy for a review of
24 where we are in the Central Valley and any iterations
25 that are posted and ready to present.

1 MS. WILSON: So hello, everyone. Now we are looking
2 at Senate Districts. There was an iteration TFCV, which
3 is Turner-Fornaciari Central Valley iteration, and we
4 made some changes here. I don't know if they want to go
5 over it. I can go over some of the changes that we made.
6 And I'm not seeing either of them. So I'll go ahead and
7 start talking about the changes.

8 First, I'll show you what we began with. We began
9 with a Kings-Kern that carves out Visalia, goes a bit
10 into Fresno, Fowler, Reedley, Parlier are a part of this
11 iteration. And I'm going to switch to the changes. Some
12 changes that they've made were to cut out Shafter. We
13 followed the same assembly lines and congressional lines
14 from groups about where to take in population in
15 Bakersfield. Then moving north, we actually -- following
16 some of Congressional, we took out parts of Tulare, the
17 same parts that we took out for Congressional, and then
18 we also took out a little bit from Visalia as well.

19 And then going into the former San Benito-Fresno,
20 again, big change that we were working with was that we
21 no longer have San Benito and Salinas Valley included.
22 And so going into what they changed it to, we did bring
23 in Selma and Parlier. And this is following some of our
24 Assembly lines. Going into the City of Fresno, we follow
25 Shaw across and up the 99. And then we move into Madera.

1 We take in a bit further than previous lines. And we
2 have Chowchilla, Fairmead, almost the entirety of Merced,
3 again, following our Assembly lines where we go up to
4 Livingston and Winton.

5 And we had the CVAP, the Latino CVAP levels that we
6 were trying to get to fifty-three here because we had
7 looked at MALDEF's lines and Black Redistricting Hub
8 about how they've drawn this. And while they've had
9 similar configurations, MALDEF's area here was around
10 fifty-three, Black Redistricting Hub was around fifty-
11 two. And so we were able to get that to fifty-three
12 percent.

13 And I see Commissioner Fornaciari's hand is up, so
14 you can take it from here. If that's okay with the
15 Chair, sorry.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: That's okay with the Chair.
17 Commissioner Fornaciari?

18 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: You're doing such a
19 wonderful job. I hate to interrupt. You were basically
20 saying what I was going to say. Just the goals here were
21 to keep Kings-Kern at fifty-eight and bring SBENFRESNO up
22 to fifty-three. And as Commissioner Turner described it
23 earlier, it was an awful lot of hunting and pecking to
24 move little bits here and there to get there. But I
25 can't imagine we could do better. But I think we're --

1 both Commissioner Turner and I felt we had gotten to a
2 really good place.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.
4 Kennedy, do you have anything further for us?

5 MS. WILSON: I was just going to mention -- yeah,
6 just the CVAPs, we were able to get that up, and while
7 it's not 58, it is a 57.98. Previously it was 58.06. So
8 it dropped by .06. So it is still at a very high level.
9 And it's just -- it says seven, but it's really close to
10 the eight, so just wanted to note that.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much.
12 Commissioner Fernandez?

13 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And so
14 if we adopt this, we're not done because we still have an
15 under in ECA and an over in MIDCOAST that is then going
16 to impact the rest of the districts, right?

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.
18 Commissioner Andersen?

19 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you very much
20 for all the work that's been involved in this. I really
21 appreciate it. I do have a question, though. Because I
22 was looking at, you know, the idea that we're -- where
23 we're getting our population for our San Ben-Fres. I'm
24 kind of surprised we're going up into Stanislaus when,
25 you know, there was a section of Madera that was formerly

1 in Stanis-Fres, that by -- you know, above -- in Lament,
2 that area. I'm just sort of surprised. Oh, I'm sorry.
3 We are not doing that. Ah, okay. Okay, so I'm just --
4 all right. Okay. I take that back. Thank you very
5 much, Kennedy.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you all.

7 So for this area, for the VRA districts in the
8 Central Valley, do we have any objections to these
9 districts? Are we able to support these districts, these
10 VRA districts in the Central Valley?

11 Commissioner Toledo?

12 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I just want to
13 thank the group that's working on this, Commissioner
14 Turner and I believe it's Fornaciari, and the line
15 drawers. These look like very strong VRA districts, and
16 I appreciate that. It certainly will give an opportunity
17 for protected class to elect candidates of their choice.
18 And I see that as much of the protected class was put in
19 as was possible. And it just -- and so I just want to
20 appreciate them for their efforts and will support this
21 iteration. Thank you.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

23 Commissioner Sadhwani?

24 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Same. I -- same as
25 Commissioner Toledo. Well done to Commissioner Turner

1 and Fornaciari. I really like this iteration and
2 definitely would be willing to support it. I so
3 appreciate being able to keep together folks in the
4 Central Valley, who have asked to be together, who are
5 all a part of those protected classes and being able to
6 keep them in a strong district where they can elect
7 candidates of their choice. So I really appreciate the
8 work that's been done here. Thank you.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

10 I'd like to ask Karin MacDonald -- thank you for
11 spending a moment with us now. I just wanted to get your
12 sense of where we could best focus our attention at this
13 point. Are we free to proceed to Sacramento, or are we
14 better off resuming any outstanding work in the south?

15 MS. MACDONALD: Hello. Thank you so much for that
16 question. And this is going to be up to you. I think
17 either one would work for us.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

19 Commissioner Akutagawa?

20 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I did want to just
21 note, reading through some of the additional COI
22 testimony that has come in to the Airtable. There -- I
23 just wanted to know in terms of the Senate Districts,
24 there's some things that have come up that I wanted to
25 just raise. Whether or not this is something that the

1 Commission wants to revisit, I guess, that's a different
2 question, but I wanted to just raise these up.

3 One, there was some testimony about separating the
4 Conejo Valley that is Calabasas, Agoura Hills,
5 Woodland -- I think it's, like, Malibu, Hidden Hills, I
6 forgot what the -- it's, like, the West Valley. I forgot
7 exactly what -- I wrote a "WV". Anyways, I wanted to
8 just lift that up because they did say that they've been
9 separated, and they are together in, I think, both the
10 Congressional and the Assembly District maps.

11 So I'm not sure if that's something that is --
12 there's an appetite to revisit. Also, I know I had said
13 this before. I had also noted that in terms of the
14 Congressional District, the district is very much the
15 same in the San Gabriel Valley and the pairing with the
16 Inland Empire.

17 I'm a little, I guess, I'm just going to just say
18 it. Both -- I've seen testimony both on the San Gabriel
19 Valley side as well as on the Inland Empire side, a
20 desire not to be put together. I'm not sure what the
21 opinions are on that particular one. And then there's
22 also a concern about -- from the -- from an Armenian
23 community COI, about the separation of Burbank and
24 Sunland in the Senate District from their community in
25 Glendale, La Canada Flintridge, and La Crescenta, which

1 is part of that San Gabriel Valley district right now.

2 So those are -- oh, and then last one. And this
3 one, I think, is a fairly significant one because we've
4 been hearing quite a bit from Equality California. But
5 there's pretty serious concern about the separation,
6 three-way split of the LGBTQ community in the Coachella
7 Valley. And in particular, there being vulnerable
8 seniors and other members of the community there, and
9 with that three-way split, it just really disenfranchises
10 them even more so.

11 I just wanted to lift those particular ones up that
12 I noticed several different testimonies on. Thank you.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.
14 Commissioner Fernandez?

15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.
16 Depending on what we do, obviously, if we go north, we're
17 going to have to take care of that ECA. So I don't know
18 if we want to do that live, or I'm willing to work, you
19 know, with Kennedy offline on that as well, because we --
20 it's going to affect it. Actually, both MIDCOAST and ECA
21 are going to affect it going up north. So I'm not
22 sure -- it's going to be time consuming if we do live
23 line drawing. So I'm wondering if maybe we can do that
24 offline. And then if you want to go back to southern
25 California or central, wherever the case may be. So just

1 offering an option. Thanks.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.
3 Ms. MacDonald?

4 MS. MACDONALD: Yes. Thank you so much. I just
5 wanted to clarify when I said that it was up to you. I
6 meant in northern California. In southern California,
7 I'm assuming that we're going to do that tomorrow. So
8 just didn't want to confuse the populate -- the
9 conversation, not the population. The population of
10 either.

11 And regarding the ECA district and live mapping
12 versus working offline, we feel that that is a pretty
13 significant potentially shift that needs to be done
14 there. So we would appreciate it if we could at least
15 start with live mapping so that you can make some
16 decisions on that, please. Thank you.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. Thank you very much for that.
18 Commissioner Sinay?

19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Ms. Mac Donald took all my
20 points.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.
22 Commissioner Akutagawa?

23 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just going to offer
24 to volunteer to work with the line drawers on some of
25 these questions to see if there is a solution to it. And

1 if we're going to be covering southern California
2 tomorrow again, then perhaps we could come with some
3 potential solutions if the Commission -- if the Chair and
4 the Commission is amenable to it.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I'm eventually amenable, but
6 I do agree with Ms. Mac Donald that this -- we have some
7 major decisions to make even, I think, to get to the
8 point of being able to give direction to a mapper and
9 Commissioners to further refine the conceptual framework.

10 So I do agree that we need to get started on
11 addressing the -- how we shift the excess population from
12 MIDCOAST up and around to ECA. So I would like to go
13 there at this point. Let me just make one change here.

14 Commissioner Andersen?

15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, I
16 was going to say that -- you kind of said exactly it.
17 I'm concerned about this MIDCOAST area taking that
18 population up and how we get it over to ECA, and, you
19 know, I -- thank you, Ms. Mac Donald for suggesting that
20 we really should do this bit now because there's multiple
21 ways of doing this.

22 And then I would certainly volunteer to help work
23 out any also -- and, just the whole northern and how it
24 fits through as well. We get a bit of direction. Thank
25 you.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

2 Okay. So Kennedy, if you could pull the map back
3 for us, please? Zoom out. Okay, that's enough. So we
4 need it in just a little bit so that we can see the
5 statistics box for the MIDCOAST region. Okay, there we
6 go.

7 So we've got over thirty percent overpopulation in
8 MIDCOAST, that we need to get most of that around to ECA.
9 So I'm looking for thoughts on how to get that done.

10 Commissioner Fornaciari?

11 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yesterday, you know, we
12 took a quick look, and, you know, if we grab all of Santa
13 Clara County, that's in the MIDCOAST district and move it
14 north, that would solve the MIDCOAST district. Then I
15 think that, you know, there was some suggestion to maybe
16 move some of that population to the west a little bit.
17 But I would suggest we make that move first, fix
18 MIDCOAST, and then decide, you know, where we're going
19 from there. Because we have -- I mean, we have to go
20 north with it. I guess, we could immediately turn east,
21 but we still have to move it north. And that honors the
22 county split. It keeps Santa Cruz, San Benito, Monterey,
23 together, which is what those counties want. So I think
24 that's a good first step.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: I would agree, but let's hear from

1 Commissioner Andersen.

2 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I do agree. But first, I
3 would take the little bit that we can and move it south.
4 The -- you know, what we can add to Ventura and San
5 Luis -- you know, that SCOAST in that area. That little
6 bit there. Because I think it's, you know, it doesn't
7 balance. We've got a negative twenty-three, and we've
8 got positive thirty.

9 I think we -- if we make it a little bit more equal,
10 it won't be quite as traumatic as we take it all north.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So your suggestion then would
12 be to add approximately one percent --

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Exactly.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- so that's --

15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Exactly. Not a lot. You
16 know, 7,600. A little bit. But I think when it -- you
17 know, get them all under five, I think it might help.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay.

19 Commissioner Ahmad?

20 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I think I'm
21 leaning towards the suggestion by Commissioner
22 Fornaciari, although I do agree, Commissioner Andersen,
23 that evening out a population would be helpful, but there
24 are some negative districts up north that can help take
25 in that over population between ECA and MIDCOAST.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. The biggest negative that I'm
2 seeing is the south SACSTANIS district. Sacramento is
3 just barely under populated. I don't know that we need
4 to go as far north as the NORCA district. The -- let's
5 see -- SD80 Corridor is -- it looks like next after south
6 SACSTANIS.

7 I mean, I'm amenable to 10,000 people moving south,
8 but are we doing that for -- is that going to help us
9 address any communities of interest south of Monterey
10 County.

11 Commissioner Fornaciari?

12 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. A couple things. I
13 thought I saw a seven percent district in the Bay Area;
14 is that correct? Or was I --

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: It doesn't look like it.

16 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. I was
17 hallucinating. Okay. But is the map in the south, the
18 latest version? Because we got -- we have, like, sixteen
19 percent off, or we have two negative eights here also. I
20 thought I saw --

21 COMMISSIONER SINAY: MCV is negative eight
22 something.

23 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And then what about --

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: SECA is as well. Okay.

25 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh, and we still got all

1 this population to worry about in the south. So yeah,
2 okay. I guess, we can probably manage the thirty percent
3 in the north. I just wanted to check what else is
4 happening in the state. Thanks.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.
6 Commissioner Toledo?

7 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I'm leaning toward
8 Commissioner Fornaciari's initial thought to shift
9 population up. I mean, it is 300,000 people that would
10 have to be shifted through the state. But I do see that
11 there's an opportunity to shift some of this population,
12 although I think it will -- it's not something that we
13 can do in live line drawing. I think we can give
14 direction and perhaps work with -- have Commissioners
15 work with Kennedy or others, Tamina, on this. Thank you.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.
17 Commissioner Andersen?

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I see the merit
19 given -- I thought we'd actually done more on the south,
20 and I didn't think that was quite as bad. The one little
21 thing though, as we move this north, we do know, and
22 it's -- it might be important as we shift through the
23 Central Valley. That one area of the Humboldt, if we
24 could fix that area, so that way, we know we're working
25 with correct numbers.

1 That was -- I was going to leave that completely to
2 the end. But we're going to be dragging population up
3 and around. So I would really like us to do that, you
4 know, ask Tamina to, you know, take care of that if
5 possible. If you go up a little bit further north that
6 corner. No, north. Bringing the map down, please.
7 Yeah, I think we've all -- the consensus was that now the
8 Humboldt should be whole so that population would go back
9 into the north coast and out of NORCA, which I think as
10 we're moving this population around, we need those
11 numbers to be correct.

12 It's just as Commissioner Fornaciari said, you know,
13 didn't we have negative eights and stuff we need to be --
14 these are the real numbers. We can't have, oh, oops.
15 Now we have to do it again. So I would like us to do
16 that, please.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

18 I would point out that the numbers involved in that
19 small square in relation to a million person district are
20 quite small.

21 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, except --

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: I'm willing to do it. So Tamina,
23 please do it.

24 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. But it might -- it'll
25 change that NORCA.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen, thank you.

2 We're doing this.

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Tamina, please make that change.

5 MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, Chair.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari, did you
7 have anything further?

8 Thank you, Tamina. Okay. So let's go back down.
9 And Commissioner Fornaciari's suggestion was that we
10 remove any remaining parts of Santa Clara County from the
11 MIDCOAST district. Is that correct Commissioner
12 Fornaciari?

13 Okay, so let's proceed with that. Can we get the
14 statistics box? Okay, we've got MIDCOAST to within one
15 percent. So we now have SANJOSE overpopulated by thirty-
16 three, almost thirty-four percent.

17 Are there suggestions to move any of this to the
18 PENINSULA?

19 Commissioner Andersen?

20 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Gilroy, could we leave
21 Gilroy because that is the triangle. It's Gilroy,
22 Hollister, Watsonville. I know that it's around 60,000.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

24 Commissioner Toledo?

25 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I would support leaving Gilroy

1 as part of the -- as part of the San Benito. And we have
2 room, so it does help with population as well. Thank
3 you.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: I would as well. Any objection to
5 leaving Gilroy in the MIDCOAST district? It --

6 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, no, I'm sorry. I was
7 saying that it might take you over the five percent.
8 That's what I meant, in terms of with MIDCOAST.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

10 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm just like -- in my head I'm
11 trying to figure out the --

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Tamina, could we look at the impact
13 of that?

14 MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, Chair. The change is 60,887
15 people. Resulting deviation to MIDCOAST is 6.77 percent.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So then if we go down to the
17 southern end of MIDCOAST. So are there recommendations
18 based on community of interest input to where we could
19 shrink MIDCOAST slightly on the south? Do we want to put
20 San Louis Obispo in the district with the southern part
21 of the county and Santa Barbara County?

22 Commissioner Fornaciari and followed by Commissioner
23 Fernandez.

24 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Tamina, can you let us
25 know how many people are in the rest of -- in the

1 northern part of San Luis Obispo County there?

2 MS. RAMOS ALON: Sure. Just one moment. The
3 population of San Luis Obispo in MIDCOAST is 223,698.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So that's way too many.
5 So --

6 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, where would we be if
7 we moved it in? What percentage would we be if we moved
8 in? We'd be at --

9 MS. RAMOS ALON: If you moved this whole area into
10 SCOAST, then SCOAST deviation would be 26.32 percent.

11 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. All right. And I
12 don't really have any suggestions, I guess. If we were
13 going to move, we'd start at the cities in the bottom.
14 But I don't have any specific suggestions.

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

17 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Tamina,
18 can you zoom in? Is Arroyo Grande in or not? And if
19 they're in, Pismo Beach is right next to them so that
20 might be a place to -- okay. So what's the population of
21 Arroyo Grande, please, Tamina?

22 MS. RAMOS ALON: The population of Arroyo Grande is
23 18,469. Resulting deviation to SCOAST is 5.55 percent.

24 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, so that's too much.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: And what is to the south of South

1 Coast, that's Ventura? None of that goes all the way.

2 Okay. Well, would we be looking or wanting to put

3 Camarillo in with Thousand Oaks and those other cities in

4 Ventura County?

5 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Chair --

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: -- can I ask a clarifying
8 question?

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Ahmad?

10 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Are we now moving population
11 down? Or are we still working on --

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: At this point, we are looking at
13 moving a little bit of population down in order to bring
14 Gilroy into the district.

15 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Got it. Thank you.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

17 Commissioner Fernandez, did you have anything else?

18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. Camarillo is 70,000,
19 so I think that's going to take us over. If you can go

20 back up to the San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara border

21 that'd be great. Can you zoom in just one more time?

22 Sorry about that. Okay, let me -- oh, man. Okay, let me
23 think about that.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. While you're thinking about
25 that, Commissioner Andersen?

1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Can we go look at the Los
2 Ranchos? Instead of --

3 MS. RAMOS ALON: Up here?

4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Tamina, if you could tell us
6 what moving --

7 MS. RAMOS ALON: Los Ranchos is 1,516 people. And
8 the resulting deviation to SCOAST is 3.84 percent.

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Tamina, what is the little
10 area to the west -- east of it? That little other --

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Edna.

12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Edna. Edna, instead.

13 MS. RAMOS ALON: Selecting Edna as well or Edna
14 instead?

15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No. Instead.

16 MS. RAMOS ALON: Oh, instead. Edna is 184 people.
17 Resulting deviation is 3.7 percent.

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: 100 people?

19 MS. RAMOS ALON: 184.

20 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Okay, we need
21 something in between those.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, but if we took both Los
23 Ranchos and Edna --

24 MS. RAMOS ALON: The population of Los Ranchos and
25 Edna is 1,700. Resulting deviation for SCOAST is 3.85

1 percent.

2 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. Yeah,
3 I thought you said 100,000. Thank you. Yes, let's --
4 that would help.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: It would help. I'm not sure it
6 resolves our problem, but it would help.

7 Commissioner Akutagawa?

8 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I was just going to
9 make a comment that I've seen -- I'm looking through the
10 COI testimony real quick, and I'm seeing that Los Ranchos
11 is not included. But at least Pismo Beach, Avila Beach,
12 and Arroyo Grande are all part of a, I guess, a five-
13 city, I guess connect -- I don't know. Whatever they
14 call themselves. There is a word for it. I'm not
15 thinking of a cog. Yes, thank you. And they asked not
16 to be separated. So looking for more information.

17 What about some of those unincorporated areas either
18 to the very north, like, maybe bringing down that
19 northern border of it? And is there enough population
20 there to, you know, kind of chip away at it, hunt and
21 peck, as I think somebody said. Thank you.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Right. I'm also looking at
23 the possibility of a swap. If we're looking to unite
24 Avila Beach, Pismo Beach, Arroyo Grande, Oceano, and
25 whatever the other one is, we could either look at

1 bringing the two that are currently in SCOAST into
2 MIDCOAST, or we could look at bringing Avila Beach, Pismo
3 Beach, and Arroyo Grande from MIDCOAST to South Coast and
4 then finding other trades.

5 Commissioner Akutagawa, did you have anything
6 further?

7 Commissioner Turner?

8 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. When we were looking at
9 trying to bring population down so that we can bring
10 in --

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Gilroy.

12 COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- Gilroy. What about Peru
13 and Fillmore that was down towards this -- at the
14 bottom -- at the southernmost portion. I know Fillmore
15 is 16,462. I don't know what Peru is.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: But I mean, my understanding is
17 those are in the district that they should be in.

18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: We received significant COI
19 testimony at -- during public input session that Peru,
20 Fillmore, Santa Paula wanted, you know, all the way down
21 that whole valley to Puerto -- thank you -- Port Hueneme
22 wanted to all stay together. It's an agricultural worker
23 COI.

24 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. And is the
25 unincorporated -- I guess, that's not going to be enough

1 population there to make a difference.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

3 Commissioner Andersen?

4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I liked your -- the idea
5 of -- that Commissioner Akutagawa said. Going up and
6 taking portions of eastern San Luis Obispo. Further
7 north. And going up the -- a little further north. You
8 know, trying to get -- again, further north. Trying to
9 get -- you know, we can't take a nice area. We don't
10 want to take San Luis Obispo itself. And looking
11 something -- yeah -- through -- in that area, something
12 like that. I don't know. Commissioner Fornaciari was
13 more familiar with this area. And I'm just wondering if
14 that -- something like that would make sense in this, you
15 know -- in this part of the San Luis Obispo.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: So we would look to move the South
17 Coast district line north towards the San Luis Obispo
18 Monterey line. Is that correct?

19 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct. Yes.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: On the -- to the east.

21 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So yes, roughly that area.
23 Tamina, could you get us a rough estimate of the
24 population in that area?

25 MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, Chair. Are folks able --

1 these might be very small to see the numbers here.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: We don't need to see the number. We
3 just need a rough estimate for that area.

4 MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay, probably about 300 people in
5 that entire area, but I will get you a number.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

7 MS. RAMOS ALON: I took the little cities there to
8 give it a little bit more. So we are now at 6,140.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So I'm starting to lose track
10 of the impacts of all of these small changes. If we were
11 to incorporate that into SCOAST, what would the SCOAST
12 deviation be?

13 MS. RAMOS ALON: The resulting deviation to SCOAST
14 would be 4.3 percent.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And then that's starting to
16 get us close enough in MIDCOAST to bring Gilroy in; is
17 that correct?

18 MS. RAMOS ALON: It's a start.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: And then and then we could just give
20 instructions to balance the population.

21 Commission Fornaciari?

22 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I'm wondering if we
23 just want to kind of leave Gilroy where it is for the
24 time being and leave an overpopulation in the SANJOSE
25 district and kind of figure out the details of this

1 later. I kind of feel like we're chopping the -- in San
2 Luis Obispo County were chopping all the wine growing
3 region right down the middle. And so we're going to
4 split that, you know, in a way that might not -- that if
5 we had a little bit more time to think about it, we could
6 make a change that makes more sense, I guess.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Just a thought.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

10 Commissioner Akutagawa?

11 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. What -- can you go
12 all the way back up to the northern part of this
13 district, this MIDCOAST district, back up to around where
14 we were looking at Gilroy, and then do you see, you know,
15 where it intersects -- oh, okay. I get it now. I was
16 just thinking we could just try to give up some of that
17 area up at the border of PENINSULA and MIDCOAST, but it
18 defeats the purpose. So sorry. Forget about it.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Okay.

20 Commissioner Fernandez and then Commissioner Sinay,
21 Commissioner Sadhwani. So Commissioner Fernandez?

22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I -- I'm
23 with Commissioner Fornaciari. I actually just drove to
24 San Luis Obispo this past weekend twice. And Shandon and
25 those small communities, I mean, one, they are vineyards.

1 Two, they're on the, I believe, it's Highway 41 or
2 something. I drove it and probably -- I drive it by
3 memory now. But I don't like splitting off those small
4 communities from the bigger communities in terms of,
5 like, Pao Robles and all of the other cities that are on
6 the 101. So I would -- yeah, I'd prefer to just leave
7 this San Luis Obispo for now, and we can deal with that
8 later. Thank you. And bless you Commissioner Taylor.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

10 Commissioner Sinay?

11 COMMISSIONER SINAY: We have received COI testimony
12 in the past from this region, from the winegrowers,
13 asking for, you know, to be kept together. So we may
14 want to look at that testimony, which cities they've put
15 together, and that might be a way to take that COI out
16 and -- but -- and keep them together.

17 Also, Arroyo Grande has written in, way in the
18 beginning, asking to stay with San Luis Obispo, so we
19 don't want to divide them from San Luis Obispo if
20 possible. We are at the -- we are at deadlines.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And what I was saying there
22 was there were two more communities between Arroyo Grande
23 and the coast, basically, that would be part of that
24 five-community grouping that we were talking about
25 earlier, and whether it might make sense to go ahead and

1 bring them into MIDCOAST with Arroyo Grande, Pismo Beach,
2 Avila Beach and make the necessary compensatory shifts
3 later.

4 Commissioner Sadhwani?

5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. As we're looking at
6 this, could we actually just turn on the CVAPs
7 particularly for MIDCOAST and San Benito is in there?
8 Thank you.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Did you want the statistics or the
10 heatmap?

11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No, I think the statistics
12 are helpful. Thank you.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

14 Commissioner Toledo?

15 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I was just -- you
16 know, I think these CVAPs are helpful. Thank you,
17 Commissioner Sadhwani. And just looking at some of the
18 public input that we've been receiving, there is public
19 input from the community that came in earlier today
20 showing maps that are aligned with these CVAPs, but that
21 actually create three VRA districts with CVAPs at this
22 level. And that public testimony is 41010 in our
23 Airtable. It's available for us to look at. The -- I
24 believe the shapefiles were submitted as well, in
25 addition to the JPEG, but just thought that might be

1 helpful in our thinking as they do have a slightly
2 different orientation. It's similar but different in the
3 alignment, but does actually raise the question of
4 whether we can -- given that San Benito is in a protected
5 area, whether we can protect all three areas and maintain
6 those CVAPs, which was what we were looking at yesterday.
7 So just wanted to raise that.

8 Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani for -- as I looked
9 at those CVAPs and compared the public testimony, there
10 is that. And I just wanted to bring it back to the
11 Commission to -- so that we're all aware that that
12 testimony has come in. Thank you.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

14 And I would propose that we adapt Commissioner
15 Fornaciari's proposal slightly by leaving the
16 overpopulation in MIDCOAST in the form of let's go ahead
17 and move Gilroy in because it seems that there's good bit
18 of support for keeping Gilroy with that area.

19 And then we can keep in mind that we have that
20 overpopulation, and we'd be looking potentially at
21 spreading that out towards the south. But we may be able
22 to give direction to the mappers to be able to work that
23 out on their own and come back to us with another
24 iteration. Is that acceptable? We go ahead and move
25 Gilroy in as an indication of our intent to proceed in

1 that direction?

2 Okay. Tamina, if we could just go ahead and move
3 Gilroy into MIDCOAST. We understand that we'll be
4 somewhat overpopulated, but we will provide instructions
5 at a later point on spreading population southward.

6 Commissioner Akutagawa, Commissioner Toledo, your
7 hands are up. Did you have anything further?

8 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I just would --

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa, first.

10 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm sorry. Good.

11 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Just real quick. I
12 just wanted clarification from Commissioner Toledo. He
13 mentioned three VRA districts, and I think there's been
14 so much conversation, I'm getting a little confused as to
15 where we are.

16 And then separately, I'm looking at, you know, some
17 of those communities that are along that SANJOSE border.
18 Can any of those be brought in, or will it break up COIs
19 or not do any, you know, not bring in enough population
20 to accommodate, you know, bringing in Gilroy? Thank you.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

22 Commissioner Toledo?

23 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I think, I just would
24 want legal to weigh in on the question of the two VRA
25 district versus three, given that we do have public

1 testimony that three can be created in the CVAP ranges
2 about this -- the level that we have at this point. And
3 I have forwarded on the documents we received from the
4 public to legal for review, but it might be too early,
5 but maybe it's something we can get in the next hour or
6 so.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: In terms of opinion from
9 legal.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.
11 Commissioner Fernandez?

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I
13 would recommend if we're going to bring Gilroy in that we
14 also bring in the unincorporated area to the west.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: To the west? Okay.

16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Is that right? Yeah.

17 But --

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Tamina, could you -- yes. Okay.

19 MS. RAMOS ALON: This is 120 people.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect.

21 MS. RAMOS ALON: Resulting deviation to MIDCOAST is
22 6.73.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

24 Okay, so we currently have 27.8 percent
25 overpopulation in SANJOSE. Again, did we -- was there

1 any concern about or any interest in moving any of that
2 to PENINSULA for any reason, or we continue our march
3 northward?

4 Commissioner Andersen?

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: You know, a no of accept
6 because I'm thinking -- I don't know if Tamina can give
7 us the population if we actually move the PENINSULA,
8 MIDCOAST line in San -- yeah, exactly. What's the
9 population on that? Would that help us at all in this
10 distance be -- you know, before we hit Boulder Creek?
11 That sort of unincorporated. You probably already know
12 if there are any people in that area or not.

13 MS. RAMOS ALON: Not very many. This is the county
14 line. I can -- let me see how many people are in here.

15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And could you also put
16 Highway 17 on here?

17 MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It's not a lot of people. I
19 don't know how much that would --

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. No. I would say that this --

21 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- is something that we could give
23 the mappers the option of further exploring. But I
24 think --

25 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- we're at line drawing. We don't
2 need to pursue this --

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- right now.

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And I don't see a nice easy
6 thing we could do to add to -- up to the PENINSULA.
7 Because again, that's already a two, you know --

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- in -- unless someone else
10 sees it. So thank you.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It says 4,200.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, let me rephrase the question.
14 Is it -- is there any reason to move any population
15 between PENINSULA and SANJOSE in either direction before
16 we continue moving north if we want to get PENINSULA
17 closer to zero to give us greater flexibility elsewhere?
18 I just wanted to get a sense of that before we move on.

19 Commissioner Sadhwani?

20 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, Chair. I'm -- I don't
21 have an answer for your question, in large part because,
22 you know, as Commissioner Toledo raised, if there's -- if
23 it's feasible to draw a third VRA district, I think that
24 that would determine our course of action in this area.
25 You know, so I know that he's sending the submission that

1 we received onto legal for review and for feedback, but
2 I'm cautious to continue working in this area until we
3 have a more clear response in terms of the direction to
4 take.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you Commissioner
6 Sadhwani.

7 Commissioner Ahmad?

8 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I was just
9 going to ask if we can move north a little bit, so we can
10 see all of PENINSULA and SANJOSE? Thank you.

11 But I also agree with Commissioner Sadhwani on legal
12 guidance.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay.

14 Commissioner Yee?

15 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I mean, just, obviously,
16 if you want to shift some of that population, you can
17 make the cut in SANJOSE farther to the west.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we would potentially want
19 to know the population, Tamina, of that area of SANJOSE
20 including Burbank and Fruitdale.

21 MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving it into the -- so further
22 overpopulating the SANJOSE district?

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct.

24 MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Just looking at keeping SANJOSE more

1 whole as an option. So if you could just let us know
2 what the impact of that would be. We don't have to
3 proceed with it right now. We just need to understand
4 it.

5 Commissioner Fernandez?

6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I'm just -- after we
7 do this, if we can just zoom out a little bit because
8 obviously we have various roads we can take. We can just
9 make a -- you know, go east. Or we can go north and
10 east, or north-north and east. So I'm just -- there's
11 various --

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

13 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- iterations you could
14 have with this.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Yeah. And that's basically
16 what we're trying to figure out so that we can get to a
17 point where we can give the mappers instructions and not
18 occupy all of this valuable live line drawing time.

19 MS. RAMOS ALON: The population of this part of
20 SANJOSE is 141,288 people.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And can you make the typeface
22 larger and expand the box so that we can see the impact
23 on deviation and other statistics? Okay. So that would
24 be -- okay. And based on COI testimony is there any
25 reason that we would want to trade, for example, that

1 highlighted segment for Saratoga -- or no, those are both
2 in the same district, so we would -- the trading it for
3 Cupertino, for example. If that came into SANJOSE, and
4 Cupertino moved west.

5 Commissioner Andersen?

6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: To make the -- we can only
7 put like 20,000 people or so in the PENINSULA. Right, to
8 keep it less than 5 percent? So I think we should be
9 kind of thinking of terms of how population -- because
10 Campbell is 44,000 -- you know, kind of looking at -- you
11 know, what we could do.

12 I can see the idea of trying to switch, but, you
13 know, this -- the Cupertino, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, they
14 really all wanted to stay -- oh, actually they're not
15 with Milpitas or -- okay, I take that back. But I think
16 we should be looking for more like just a small amount,
17 kind of to balance it.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, now my idea is just inquiring
19 whether there are any swaps that we want to make in this
20 area that would make better sense than what we currently
21 have.

22 So Commissioner Ahmad?

23 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. There is COI
24 testimony asking for Campbell, Los Gatos, Saratoga,
25 Cupertino, Sunnyvale area to be together. I know all of

1 that is not possible based off of the numbers, but there
2 is some flexibility in terms of the different COIs we've
3 received about this area.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you. Okay, we're
5 fifteen minutes from our meal break. Okay, let's pull
6 the map back, as Commissioner Fernandez suggested and see
7 if we can figure out in what direction we would like to
8 go with this population.

9 Commissioner Yee?

10 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, I was just going to suggest
11 we make -- not take all of that area but take just part
12 of it, you know, to get as much of it as would make
13 PENINSULA have the deviation we wanted, but, you know, we
14 could take this larger look as well.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen?

16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Following Commissioner
17 Ahmad's lead, though, that's -- could be kind of close.
18 I -- I'm just -- I could only have the population --
19 that's 70,000 that would want to go back in, you know,
20 with the switch, as you were talking about. I don't have
21 the actual full population in there.

22 We might be able to not quite take as much of
23 SANJOSE and -- actually, to make that switch, to
24 balance -- put in a little bit in PENINSULA and put the
25 COI together, but that's something I think -- you know,

1 we could tell Tamina to do offline too, and then continue
2 on.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, very good.

4 So Commissioner Fernandez, is the map pulled back
5 far enough?

6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you. Yeah, I --
7 I'm just thinking go east, because we've got the negative
8 4.92 and then it can meet up with ECA, instead of going
9 all the way up and around --

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I don't know, that's just
12 my thinking right now.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Any thoughts on the most
14 direct route here?

15 Commissioner Turner?

16 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I was just going to say
17 we would just want to continue to watch the CVAP number,
18 because all of that hunting, unpacking, everything we did
19 impacted -- it changed the number, it lowered it, so that
20 would be the only caution going that direction.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: That it lowered it --

22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, we wouldn't touch
23 that district.

24 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay, I thought she was saying
25 going through that --

1 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, no, no.

2 COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- district.

3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, not at all.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: No, we're looking --

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: We're not to touch that
6 one.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- at going through the south SAC-
8 STANIS. So we would be looking at going through South
9 SAC-STANIS.

10 Commissioner Andersen?

11 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I would throw it all
12 into South SAC-STANIS and then work with it from there.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

14 Commissioner Ahmad?

15 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I think we can take a two-
16 pronged approach to this, with direction to the line
17 drawers about kind of eliminating some -- not
18 eliminating -- adjusting the line between PENINSULA and
19 SANJOSE as well as adjusting the lines between SANJOSE
20 and South SAC-STANIS because we are so heavily
21 overpopulated in this area, and we don't want to have
22 that ripple effect in some of the other districts that
23 are neighboring.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so do you have specific
25 suggestions for -- first of all, adjusting the line

1 between PENINSULA and Santa Clara?

2 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes, I do. If we could go to
3 that area?

4 So based off of COI testimony, I'm seeing that
5 communities are asking for Cupertino, Los Gatos,
6 Campbell, Saratoga, Monte Sereno, AKA the West Valley
7 cities in that area to be together.

8 I see Saratoga is already in PENINSULA, but if we
9 start by adding in population from Los Gatos and
10 Campbell -- I don't know if Cupertino has too many
11 people -- but somewhere around that region, to push
12 population into PENINSULA while it stays under 5 percent
13 and then move in the other direction with the rest of the
14 population. Does that make sense?

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, I think the numbers are going
16 to be way out of range.

17 I mean, Tamina, you can -- you can help us, but
18 I'm -- if the idea is Cupertino, Saratoga, Campbell, Los
19 Gatos, that basically mean -- because Cupertino,
20 Campbell, Monte Sereno, Los Gatos are all currently in
21 SANJOSE. If we're moving all of that to PENINSULA,
22 that's huge.

23 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Are we not going with the
24 change Commissioner Yee recommended with SANJOSE?
25 Burbank, Fruitdale, that blue area?

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, okay. We can -- we can
2 explore that. So Tamina, let's explore. Let's move this
3 to PENINSULA.

4 MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, Chair.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: And then let's take Burbank,
6 Fruitdale and that portion of San Jose and put it in
7 SANJOSE.

8 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Chair, could you start at
9 the other side, at the east side and -- 'cause we might
10 end up needing to leave a little bit of the SANJOSE in
11 there, to have PENINSULA come to -- right just under 5
12 percent.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Tamina, could you start --
14 sorry, could you start over towards Burbank and Fruitdale
15 in case we need to leave some of SANJOSE in PENINSULA?

16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: We don't need to take
17 anymore (indiscernible) 3 percent.

18 MS. RAMOS ALON: Chair -- Chair, did you want me to
19 balance PENINSULA, or just get it under an acceptable
20 number? I can stop here.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Let's go ahead and accept this and
22 see where we are. We may go further.

23 Okay, so if we were to continue removing parts of
24 San Jose, then we would -- I've lost. Okay, there it is,
25 okay. We would be further reducing PENINSULA, and we

1 have about 7 percentage points that we could continue to
2 move portions of San Jose. So my inclination would be to
3 continue.

4 Commissioner Ahmad?

5 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah, I was just going to say
6 that since we have to move population up and around, we
7 can continue to do that by moving that line that runs
8 through east foothills, Alum Rock neighborhood down and
9 around Santa Clara, Cupertino, Sunnyvale to make a
10 district that encompasses the majority of San Jose in one
11 district. And then move the rest of the population up
12 through EDENTECH and out to the east.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, I'm --

14 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Or we can continue to dip into
15 the rest of the blue area in San Jose.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, I'm --

17 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: I'm --

19 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I see testimony speaking both
20 ways.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

22 Commissioner Fernandez?

23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I guess I got confused. I
24 thought the point of this was to get PENINSULA higher to
25 offset some of the overage in San Jose, and maybe I

1 misunderstood. So I thought we were trying to get
2 PENINSULA like close to 5 or something like that, but I
3 might have misunderstood.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: No, as I look at it, we're looking
5 more at getting it closer to negative 5 so that we could
6 have as much of San Jose as possible in a single
7 district. We've also succeeded in having Saratoga,
8 Campbell, Los Gatos, Monte Sereno together.

9 The other option would be instead of this portion of
10 San Jose, looking at moving Cupertino -- well, actually
11 that goes in the other direction. So -- okay, so if we
12 continue -- if we take the rest of San Jose that is
13 currently in PENINSULA and we reunite it with the rest of
14 San Jose, then PENINSULA is at a negative 3.69, which is
15 an acceptable population deviation and we have achieved
16 bringing together more of San Jose.

17 So is that -- is that something we would like to
18 proceed with?

19 Commissioner Yee says yes.

20 Commissioner Fernandez?

21 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It's just more that we have
22 to move across now.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

24 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And that's my frustration,
25 is that we were trying to minimize it, but now we're --

1 we've actually made it worse than it was when we started.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Ahmad?

3 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I'm fine with this change.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I would -- I would ask Tamina
5 to go ahead and make this, and then pull the map back.

6 Okay, so then we're looking at -- we have
7 negative -- almost negative 5 percent in South SACSTANIS
8 already. We have almost negative 25 percent in ECA, so
9 that's -- we're looking at negative 30 percent, roughly,
10 between those two.

11 So between these three districts, we should -- as
12 far as numbers, we should easily be able to do this. The
13 question is where the lines get drawn. Where are we
14 going to pull population from, from SANJOSE? So, what is
15 the -- what is -- and we still have open to us, options.
16 Going through COCO, you know, we do have options. So
17 what makes the most sense as far as actually moving the
18 population?

19 Tamina, if you could -- yeah, thank you. So do
20 we -- do we move it, do we lower than line from EDENTECH
21 farther south, do we -- I don't know. Do we -- do we try
22 to put portions of SANJOSE directly into South SACSTANIS?
23 To me that doesn't seem to be the best option.

24 Commissioner Andersen?

25 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just so we have an idea,

1 could we see what the population is in the unincorporated
2 areas east -- yeah, of Santa Clara County? And also the
3 unincorporated areas -- you know, that one. And then,
4 what's the unincorporated areas of COCO? This -- the
5 unincorporated of this first, and the unincorporated of
6 that one second, 'cause that'll give us an idea of what
7 population centers we would actually have to move so that
8 we could play with that.

9 And then I think we probably will have to drop a
10 little bit of EDENTECH, which might give more of the Tri-
11 Valley together, but I don't think there's population --
12 you know, taking Livermore over or something like that.

13 MS. RAMOS ALON: This whole area is 925 people.

14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. And what is the
15 same in -- you know, if you take out that central -- I
16 think we sort of tried that before, because that's only
17 like 6,000, if you do that whole central unincorporated
18 area.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, while we're waiting.

20 Commissioner Toledo?

21 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I just -- Chair, the
22 last change -- I didn't see -- I couldn't tell if we had
23 general consensus on the last change before it was made,
24 and I'm just wondering -- I mean, I just want to make
25 sure that as we move forward we're still operating on

1 general consensus, given -- you know, I know we have a
2 lot to do, but I wouldn't want to get to a place where we
3 couldn't get support for things.

4 So we'll just -- so just making sure that we're
5 still operating under general consensus and just as we
6 move forward, thank you.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, we're exploring right
8 now. We're not looking at adopting anything, but I do
9 appreciate that.

10 Commissioner Ahmad?

11 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. Looking at
12 the population and where we're trying to move, I don't
13 know if I see a way to go directly to -- now the box is
14 covering it -- SACSTANISLAUS?

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

16 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: SAC --

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: South SACSTANIS.

18 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: South SACSTANIS directly --

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

20 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: As Commissioner Andersen says,
21 I feel like it has to move through EDENTECH, through
22 COCO, then to South SACSTANIS and then to ECA.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

24 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: No direction with that comment.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay.

1 MS. RAMOS ALON: Chair, the highlighted population
2 is 3,532 people.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

4 Commissioner Sinay?

5 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just exploration, but if we
6 look at Sunnyvale, Santa Clara -- you know, move that --
7 I mean, I'm just looking at how to move population and
8 also end up in COCO, ending up putting the three -- the
9 Tri-Valley back together, since it is a Senate -- it's
10 Senate, so it's a larger district.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I was -- unless I'm wrong --
13 are they together in that line --

14 MS. RAMOS ALON: They are currently together.

15 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay, sorry, that county line
16 confused me. All right, so my brilliant idea is dead,
17 so.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just -- I did want to bring
20 up Santa Clara and Sunnyvale, 'cause we have heard at
21 different times, different places.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. We are incurring into our
23 meal break. We came back a bit late from our last break,
24 so we can continue for thirteen more minutes, but that
25 would be cutting into our lunch, so let me take

1 Commissioner Yee's, and then we can determine whether we
2 want to go ahead and break for lunch.

3 Commissioner Yee?

4 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, we have to move a lot of
5 people. I think North San Jose is really the only
6 option, so I would like to see that go north with
7 Fremont -- that part, yes. Not -- yeah, just the
8 northernmost, if that would do it.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Yee, could
10 you -- could you guide a selection of population here?

11 COMMISSIONER YEE: Sure, the part that's directly in
12 under Fremont, adjacent to Milpitas.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: No, we're moving it to EDENTECH.
14 Yes. Okay, Tamina, we need the statistics box in the
15 corner to help us. Thank you.

16 Okay, so that's not actually a very densely
17 populated area.

18 COMMISSIONER YEE: So we continue to the portion
19 adjacent to Milpitas, to the west.

20 MS. RAMOS ALON: This area is already in EDENTECH.

21 COMMISSIONER YEE: Oh, I'm sorry, yeah --

22 MS. WILSON: (Indiscernible) Berryessa.

23 COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. Meanwhile, I would not
24 split up Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Cupertino, that's -- you
25 know, those always get mentioned together.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: And what is the population of those
2 three?

3 MS. RAMOS ALON: One moment, Chair. 344,334 people.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Which is roughly what we're looking
5 to move, right? That seems to be roughly what we want to
6 move into EDENTECH. Do I have any objection to moving
7 that?

8 Commissioner Sinay?

9 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry, my hand is still up. I
10 was excited 'cause that was what I was eyeing.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

12 Commissioner Akutagawa?

13 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think I'm just trying to
14 get clarification. I think that would be a good move if
15 it's going to stay because I know that reading through
16 the COI testimony, there's been requests to put
17 Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara with Fremont, but are
18 we -- but I know because we're trying to move population
19 onward -- is that what's going to happen? Is that --
20 some of that pop -- which -- where's that population
21 moving onward from? The top part?

22 Okay, thank you. Thanks for the clarification.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

24 Commissioner Andersen?

25 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Without knowing what is

1 coming out of the other COI, which fits very well, that's
2 a great big chunk.

3 I was just going to propose a much smaller amount.
4 You know Castro Valley, I guess -- because, you know,
5 Dublin is already out. If we put the terrain layer on,
6 and then you're chalking up parts of Hayward, you know,
7 this -- that gets -- you know, you could maybe take, you
8 know, kind of the north -- you know, the mountain, you
9 know, the hill area.

10 300,000 people? That's a great deal. I -- before
11 I'd say yes on this -- and the idea that Santa Clara and
12 Cupertino is with Hayward and San Leandro, they are not
13 going to like whatsoever.

14 The parts of Fremont, I can see. The rest of that
15 area is not high-tech. That's not -- you know -- and to
16 have them separated from San Jose as well -- I mean, I'd
17 like to see the exchange before I think that's a good
18 idea.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

20 Commissioner Turner?

21 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I was going to say,
22 we're just doing the exploration right now. I think we
23 can do it, and then based on -- I am in agreement with
24 Commissioner Andersen. Based on what comes out the other
25 end, I'm just more willing to see it first. So yes,

1 let's do it.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
3 Turner.

4 Commissioner Ahmad?

5 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Keeping in mind that this is an
6 exploration, I would propose a potential different area
7 to swap in, would be that area right along the Santa
8 Clara border to -- yes, that -- exactly where your mouse
9 was, that area, to see if there's enough population
10 there, along with North San Jose, that's already
11 highlighted in red. But I'm curious to see what comes
12 out the other end, for both of these.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we would, for the time
14 being, remove Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, and Cupertino and
15 take in the areas that Commissioner Ahmad mentioned in
16 SANJOSE.

17 MS. RAMOS ALON: I'm just -- this area is 83,976
18 people.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Ahmad, do you want
20 to --

21 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Is that putting EDENTECH at
22 7.25?

23 MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, EDENTECH will be at 7.25,
24 SANJOSE will be at 25.14.

25 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay, and right now we're

1 trying to get SANJOSE down to 5?

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: 5 or less.

3 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay, I will step back for now.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

5 Commissioner Fernandez?

6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Those from the area, I was
7 just thinking -- making up the difference with the rest
8 of San Jose, but I'm not from San Jose, so -- if you
9 don't want to, you know, interrupt this Sunnyvale, Santa
10 Clara, that's kind of your only -- the only option I see
11 right now.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: The last part, instead of -- you
13 said Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Cupertino --

14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, if they're not -- if
15 it's not going to be Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, then it
16 looks like the other area would be San Jose, taking the
17 population --

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- from San Jose and taking
20 it up to EDENTECH.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay. So at this point --

22 Commissioner Akutagawa, did you have something else?

23 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I think I just wanted
24 to perhaps just have us be clear about additional goals.
25 So one goal I'm hearing, and it's the main goal, is to

1 move that population up.

2 The question then I have next is -- as we have
3 multiple -- at least two routes that we could go, what
4 would then be a secondary goal? Is it -- you know, at --
5 when we were considering bringing in Sunnyvale, Santa
6 Clara, and Cupertino, there was some, you know,
7 discomfort with what cities then would go out on the
8 other end if -- and that would be the same question if
9 you bring in San Jose.

10 And then, you know, are you going to move from
11 the -- I guess, going eastwardly, are you going to go
12 north? I think we better get comfortable with what
13 that's going to be, before we just decide which ones
14 we're going to move because I think that will determine
15 which cities make sense to move as well, too. Thank you.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

17 So -- okay, Commissioner Fornaciari, followed by
18 Commissioner Sinay.

19 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes, just looking at it,
20 you know, 300,000 people, it's Cupertino, Sunnyvale,
21 Santa Clara. Moving up, then Hayward, San Leandro, all
22 the unincorporated parts, maybe Union City too, going
23 east.

24 Then if you scroll down -- yeah, then it's like the
25 entire Tri-Valley and more going into SACSTAN, and then

1 it's Stockdon and Manteca, going into ECA or something
2 like that, right? I mean, if we just make big steps like
3 that. I mean, that's the road we're on.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, thank you, Commissioner
5 Fornaciari.

6 Commissioner Sinay?

7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just a reminder, these are
8 million -- almost a million people, and sometimes --
9 yeah, when we were working in the south, we kept being
10 reminded, you may have to group two or three unlikely
11 partners because it's a million people.

12 And so, I'm okay with the different steps
13 Commissioner Fornaciari was speaking about, and so I just
14 wanted just to remind us that we do want to move forward,
15 and it's -- and it's a million people.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.
17 Commissioner Akutagawa?

18 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I think I'm going to
19 follow on what Commissioner Fornaciari was talking about,
20 and I -- let me just, you know, kind of propose this and
21 tell me if -- you know, maybe this doesn't work.

22 We did a lot of work around -- you know, like around
23 Hercules and Vallejo, you know, Benicia, Martinez. If
24 you move Hayward up into -- with Oakland, you could
25 possible cut somewhere below -- maybe, I don't know --

1 San Pablo, or somewhere -- maybe just below that, and
2 then you could put those cities with Vallejo, bring it
3 across the Benicia Bridge and into, like, Martinez,
4 Clyde, Pittsburg -- Antioch could possibly be one entire
5 district, which would match a lot of what -- the work was
6 being done around the Assembly district.

7 Then move those Delta communities into South
8 SACSTANIS and then -- and keep moving the march that way.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you. You know, I wanted
10 to give the mappers some instruction before we went to
11 break, but you know, I can't get a break to give them
12 instruction. You know, Commissioner Andersen, this is
13 going to have to wait.

14 Tamina, could you please -- after the break we'd
15 like to see an option with Cupertino, Sunnyvale, and
16 Santa Clara; another option with San Jose instead of
17 those, and then the input in the air table that is --
18 that Commissioner Toledo mentioned, 41010, if you could
19 help us see that and just let us know when all that is
20 ready. I can talk to Ms. MacDonald, and we can figure
21 out where else we can go in the meantime.

22 Thank you so much. We are on lunch until --

23 MS. RAMOS ALON: Can I get some direction on where
24 to split San Jose?

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Wherever it goes to get to our

1 population target.

2 MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, Chair.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. So lunch until 1:30.

4 Thank you.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Chair. Enjoy your
6 lunch, everybody. See you all at 1:30.

7 AUTOMATED MESSAGE: Recording stopped.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you everyone for your patience
9 during our meal break. We are back.

10 We are working on shifting some population around
11 from the MIDCOAST district eventually over to the ECA
12 district.

13 Before we broke for lunch, we asked our mapper to
14 work on three visualizations that we could take a look at
15 when we came back from lunch. She has done miraculous
16 work and finished all of that in time -- in essentially
17 half an hour, so kudos to Tamina, and we are yours to
18 show us what you have been able to come up with.

19 Thank you so much.

20 MS. RAMOS ALON: Thank you, Chair, gladly. So I'll
21 start with where we left off, with the SANJOSE district
22 being overpopulated by 33.64 percent. I was asked to
23 take a look at two different iterations of moving the
24 population up into EDENTECH, so I will bring those up
25 now.

1 The first of these iterations looks at bringing more
2 of SANJOSE in. You'll remember that we began looking at
3 north San Jose and parts of mid San Jose to bring into
4 EDENTECH , and I received instruction to just continue
5 down until I met the population requirement.

6 So this new configuration for SANJOSE,, which does
7 not include this green section here of San -- of the San
8 Jose city. It brings the deviation of the district to
9 3.12 percent. I'll zoom out so you can see what this
10 district looks like.

11 So the SANJOSE district is here, I'm tracing in
12 black. So that is one option.

13 And I'll open the second. And apologies for all the
14 little pop-up windows.

15 The second view moves Sunnyvale, Cupertino, Santa
16 Clara, and the northern part of San Jose into EDENTECH.
17 This creates a population deviation in the SANJOSE
18 district of -1.61 percent. The shape of the resulting
19 SANJOSE district comes along the western part of SANJOSE
20 down here, and then follows the county lines, resulting
21 in a similar overpopulation in EDENTECH.

22 And Chair, would you like to discuss these two
23 before I move onto the third?

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: No, go ahead and show us the third
25 as well. Thank you.

1 MS. RAMOS ALON: The third that I'm about to put up,
2 and I just asked Kennedy to join me, is a submission that
3 we received through public comment, and so it is more
4 than just this particular district, but does give us a
5 kind of unique look to what to -- what we're dealing with
6 currently.

7 So we'll start here in the San Benito area. And
8 what they did is they created a district which includes
9 San Benito and the 1.25 corner of Monterey and then
10 reaches over into Fresno, Madera, Merced, and I'll let
11 Kennedy describe the rest.

12 MS. WILSON: And it's able to do that because it's
13 taking less from Fresno versus how we had it before, and
14 so it takes very similar portions of Merced and
15 Stanislaus; however, it includes San Benito and Salinas
16 Valley because it doesn't take any of the City of Fresno
17 really, and however, they take none of Tulare, so none --
18 no cities, no part of Tulare is taken into the VRA
19 consideration for Kings-Kern, and so that's why they're
20 able to do that swap of population.

21 You also see that Fresno is being paired with Mono
22 and Inyo, which is something that we -- that you've
23 worked hard to prevent during your time here up in the
24 Stanislaus area; however, Modesto is going north and
25 Turlock is going outward, and that's what the public

1 comment looks like.

2 We have their Latino CVAP numbers in Kings-Kern
3 without Tulare, they have it at 57.6 percent, and then
4 the San Benito, Fresno with San Benito, Salinas Valley,
5 into Merced area is at 54.49 percent.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Tamina. Thank you,
7 Kennedy. Onto comments from Commissioners.

8 Commissioner Fornaciari?

9 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, there was some
10 thought that this might get us three Senate VRA
11 districts, but I believe Fresno-Kern is going to be
12 thirty -- mid-thirties --

13 MS. WILSON: 36 point --

14 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- in LCVAP.

15 MS. WILSON: 36.9 is where It's at.

16 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh, this is the -- oh,
17 these are the CVAP numbers, right, so it doesn't give us
18 a third VRA district. It does keep the counties, the
19 northern counties in the San Joaquin valley together.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

21 Any other comment?

22 Can I get Commissioner Yee, thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, I mean, it's an interested
24 exploration, but it goes in a direction that discussion
25 this morning -- definitely pulling us away from,

1 especially, comments about Central Valley and not
2 reaching over to San Benito despite the CVAP
3 possibilities there.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.
5 Commissioner Sinay?

6 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Of the three that we've seen,
7 I'd like to continue to see number 2 and see where that
8 was getting -- where she went from there.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, I'm not sure that -- yeah,
10 the -- but that was -- this was just to take the next
11 step. So that was the one that focused on Sunnyvale --

12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- Santa Clara, and Cupertino?

14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Instead of splitting up San
15 Jose city as much.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Andersen?

17 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I agree with what
18 Commissioner Fornaciari was saying. This gives us two
19 districts, not three, so I don't think that's a viable
20 option.

21 So looking back at the previous scenarios, I
22 appreciate the work that Tamina did, thank you very much.
23 But that's a huge amount of population, so at this point
24 what I would really prefer doing is putting as much --
25 not taking the -- the PENINSULA one, do not lower it to a

1 the negative.

2 I would need to come up to 5, which would be
3 grabbing what we were previously doing, taking that
4 section of Cuper -- of San Jose and putting it with the
5 PENINSULA, so we don't have quite as much population to
6 move north. Thank you.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.
8 Tamina, could we zoom in a bit then and look at that
9 area? Okay, so let's go back to the working draft before
10 these visualizations, if we could.

11 MS. WILSON: This is the working draft before the
12 visualization, before we went to lunch.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, but we don't have a way of
14 getting that -- Fruitdale, Burbank, San Jose area back
15 out into PENINSULA, so how did we have that before? We
16 had Campbell, (indiscernible) Park.

17 MS. WILSON: I can grab the -- so before the draft,
18 excuse these big fuzzy lines -- it looked more like this.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Can we go back to that point?

20 MS. WILSON: Yes, just one moment please.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen? We're not
22 hearing you.

23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry, thank you. I think
24 we were doing this, but now taking a section of the
25 PENINUSLA, essentially, from Saratoga going up into San

1 Jose and expanding that out until we reached the positive
2 5. So taking that section of -- oops. Well -- let me
3 get back there -- I think that was -- was that clear?
4 Going up through Saratoga and taking that population from
5 SANJOSE and putting it into the PENINSULA. To keep the
6 tech corridor from Saratoga through Santa Clara, that
7 whole thing -- yeah.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so --

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, go -- Saratoga and
10 then taking portions of SANJOSE, correct, that area until
11 we have 5.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, but also theoretically moving
13 Campbell, Cambrian Park, and Los Gatos back into
14 PENINSULA?

15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That too, we could do that
16 again.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay. So let's look at
18 reversing that change. Let's put Campbell, Cambrian
19 Park, Los Gatos back into PENINSULA.

20 Or Campbell, Monte Sereno, and Los Gatos for now.
21 We don't need to move Cambrian Park, because that would
22 pull part of San Jose with it.

23 MS. WILSON: This would add 83,690 people to the
24 PENINSULA district. Resulting deviation to the PENINSULA
25 district is 10.62 percent.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Andersen,
2 suggestions? Or any other --

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, then start at the --
4 put -- take that -- accept that in, and then start in
5 SANJOSE,, at that -- you know, Burbank, Fruitvale --
6 Fruitdale and walk that eastern line west until PENINSULA
7 is around 5 -- just a little bit below 5, 499, something
8 like that. Essentially, putting --

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead, Tamina.

10 MS. WILSON: May I do that, is that --

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

12 MS. WILSON: -- follow the direction?

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please. Okay, Tamina, we
14 probably need to remove some of the westernmost portion
15 of that and have a more solid north, south line there.
16 But we're at a population that we're happy with.

17 We can leave this for a cleanup later. Go ahead and
18 accept that.

19 Okay, so the PENINSULA population is at almost 5
20 percent. Our excess population is still in MIDCOAST
21 here, so we would need to bring the rest of the Santa
22 Clara County except for the Gilroy area and the area
23 south that would need to connect it to San Benito.

24 MS. WILSON: Chair, because we did go back, Gilroy
25 is back with Santa Clara. If you'd like, I can move it

1 back out with this area.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, what I was saying was if we
3 can move into SANJOSE, the remainder of Santa Clara,
4 except for Gilroy and the area necessary to connect it to
5 San Benito County.

6 MS. WILSON: Very good, Chair.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Okay, so we know that we
8 have a slight overpopulation in MIDCOAST that we will
9 deal with later, moving some of that population south.
10 So now we have 25 percent over in SANJOSE. We can leave
11 as much as 5 percent deviation there, so essentially
12 we're looking at now 200,000 people plus or minus.

13 Commissioner Andersen?

14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I'm just wondering --
15 oh, I'm sorry, I -- nothing, nothing.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, do I have a proposal for next
17 step? Commissioner Yee?

18 COMMISSIONER YEE: That would be to redo the North
19 San Jose, Sunnyvale, Cupertino, Santa Clara, move north.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, and if we -- so we had two
21 options looking at that in a slightly different context,
22 but Tamina, can you remind us how many people are in
23 Sunnyvale, Cupertino, and Santa Clara?

24 MS. WILSON: Yes, Chair. The population of
25 Sunnyvale, Cupertino, and Santa Clara is 344,334 people.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so that's a lot more than we
2 need to move. Okay, so let's leave them where they are
3 for now.

4 Commissioner Andersen?

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry, could we see how much
6 population is in the Alum Rock portion of San Jose?
7 Essentially, we have to -- essentially, what I would
8 propose is we take -- I think it's 190,000 is what we
9 need to make SANJOSE down to 5 percent, so I would -- I
10 would like the idea of taking a portion of San -- enough
11 San -- isn't that going the other way?

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Tamina, could we see the pending
13 changes box, please?

14 MS. WILSON: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay, I'm sorry. It -- I
16 know. The area between -- not that area. The area
17 between Santa Clara, is it -- moving that line south.
18 Correct, moving the line going above --

19 MS. WILSON: North?

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, starting -- starting at the
21 north portion of San Jose City there, that crook -- that
22 jagged line, and moving that line south to sort of,
23 matching what's on its east side until we have more of
24 San Jose, about 190,000, and so our San Jose is at 5.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

1 Commissioner Yee?

2 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, you know, that's possible.
3 But I was thinking if we go back to that western portion
4 and expand it, then perhaps that gives us -- let's see,
5 does that work with PENINSULA though?

6 I was thinking that could offset the over -- the too
7 large population, if we move Sunnyvale, Cupertino, San
8 Jose, but that's -- that's the wrong district, I think.
9 Because that would make more of San Jose whole rather
10 than splitting it further, which is what this change
11 does.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

13 COMMISSIONER YEE: And moving to the downtown area.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, we also have that northern
15 area above Sunnyvale and Santa Clara, so --

16 Commissioner Ahmad?

17 COMMISSIONER YEE: But that's lightly populated, it
18 was like 6,000 people.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay.

20 Commissioner Andersen?

21 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Chair, I like what you were
22 saying because it would -- it would take less of -- not
23 much, but every little less bit of the southern part of
24 San Jose that we're taking would be better.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so we now have SANJOSE at

1 2.71. We could even retain some of that.

2 Commissioner Ahmad, would you like to help steer
3 while we're in San Jose?

4 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Well, I'm sure anyone can steer
5 any part of the state, but it would be helpful to see the
6 freeways.

7 Yeah, I'm just curious to this dip into the heart of
8 San Jose. What is the -- the supporting evidence to make
9 this change?

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: That doesn't -- yeah.

11 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Is this population-based?

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: We're just looking at population
13 right now.

14 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: COIs? Okay.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Happy to adjust the contours to take
16 into account the communities of interest.

17 Commissioner Andersen?

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I would think, rather
19 than doing this dip into the center, I would keep the
20 line as close to -- parallel, like that Alum Rock area, I
21 would move that diagonal line that presently from -- you
22 know, the -- right where it says east foothills and Santa
23 Clara, I would take that section and move in a line,
24 south. I would not just delve into the heart of San
25 Jose.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Commissioner Yee?

2 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, you know, I know we're
3 trying -- just trying to balance the population, but I'm
4 feeling uncomfortable about doing this on the fly, 'cause
5 there's a lot of COIs in this area that we need to
6 recheck and -- I know we're trying to get an even march
7 of population around, but I would really rather do this
8 offline and check those COIs, you know, be much more
9 careful around downtown San Jose, look into some
10 possibilities there with Saratoga and West San Jose and
11 swapping around there. You know, just some better
12 options than doing this on the fly, although I know we
13 need to move along here to keep our population going.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

15 COMMISSIONER YEE: Could we just set a target for
16 this area and move on? I'm really -- I would like to do
17 this better than we're doing it right now.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: And that's what I was going to ask.
19 If we are okay with a 2.71 positive deviation for SANJOSE
20 at this point, we can leave it here and have some
21 additional work done offline to show us, you know, what
22 adjusting the contours to accommodate communities of
23 interest would look like, but keeping in that, you know,
24 range of less than a positive 5 percent and moving on.

25 Commissioner Andersen?

1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, but I'd like it to
2 be -- not at 2.7, I'd like to be around, you know, 4 --
3 4, 5 at least. But I totally agree that it should be
4 done offline. And then knowing that we have -- if you
5 take 4 -- you know, 4.5 percent out -- or like, it would
6 be, you know, 20.5 percent, to move on.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you. Commissioner
8 Ahmad?

9 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah, I agree with this
10 suggestion, Chair. Because eventually the changes would
11 need to be made in this general area, so we can localize
12 those changes and move with the population up in
13 EDENTECH, forward.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect, thank you.
15 Commissioner Yee?

16 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, Commissioner Andersen, can
17 I hear your rationale on the 4.5 target and -- just, you
18 know -- just so we know why that's the number to shoot
19 for?

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen?

21 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It's to try to keep as much
22 of the population still within San Jose and minimize the
23 disruption of all the COIs we've worked on throughout the
24 whole East Bay, where we're trying to now move this.

25 COMMISSIONER YEE: So just that we could reduce the

1 bubble -- the population that we still have to move?

2 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.

3 COMMISSIONER YEE: Over to ECA?

4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.

5 COMMISSIONER YEE: And do we know -- is that -- I
6 mean, our target at ECA, is that going to get us there?

7 I don't want to run out of people either, but

8 (indiscernible) ECA.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: When we looked at it earlier, it was
10 clear that at least the three counties that we were
11 looking at -- or the three districts we were looking at,
12 we would easily be able to.

13 We've made some changes since then, so Tamina, could
14 you -- okay, so we're over 25 in SANJOSE, we're under,
15 essentially, 25, in ECA. So if we left 5 percent in
16 SANJOSE, then the best we could do in ECA was 5 percent
17 under.

18 So yeah, I think we're better having that population
19 left in SANJOSE closer to a zero deviation, which would
20 mean we'd be closer to a zero deviation by the time we
21 got over to ECA.

22 COMMISSIONER YEE: I agree, even though it's going
23 to be more work, of course, because it's still moving
24 more people through more places.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, but as you say, we don't want

1 to get over to ECA and find we're short population.

2 Commissioner Andersen?

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'm noticing that there
4 are -- there's a positive 5 percent, there's negative --
5 there are positive sections elsewhere. I don't think it
6 at all has to come directly from here because -- we
7 aren't -- we're going to have trouble moving that
8 through, so -- you know, I'd like us to be able to play a
9 little bit with that and not -- you know, see what it's
10 going to do to Eden-Tech, to 80CORRIDOR, to the COCO, to
11 the entire -- all those four districts, or five districts
12 that are about to change.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, if we -- if we go ahead and
14 accept the pending changes, that leaves 2.71 percent in
15 San Jose. And I would be comfortable with that, so not
16 necessarily shaving it to zero, but not leaving as close
17 to 5 percent.

18 Okay, seeing some agreement there. Can we go ahead
19 and accept this and move forward?

20 Commissioner Turner?

21 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. Yes, I
22 think -- we certainly can accept this and move forward.
23 Since we're going to continue down this path in the next
24 couple of hours or so, we may know if we can adjust that
25 a different way, higher or lower as well.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

2 Commissioner Andersen?

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, I
4 would say let's take a snapshot here and then have this
5 be exploration, so we don't have to try to undo all the
6 steps to make a change if we find out, oh, oops, if it
7 was a different number, then all these other scenarios
8 that we talked about could've worked.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Tamina could you take a
10 snapshot and then go ahead and accept these pending
11 changes?

12 And again, the intent is to have Tamina and a
13 Commissioner go back and revisit the actual contours of
14 this district in SANJOSE to make sure that we are
15 respecting as many communities of interest as possible.

16 Okay, we now have 21.12 percent excess population in
17 EDENTECH. Do we want to take it all in one direction or
18 do we want to divide it?

19 We could put some more population into SD80 Corridor
20 before we head to move population east. Or do we want to
21 go all the way up to the top of Contra Costa County and
22 bring it east?

23 Commissioner Fernandez?

24 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, I would recommend
25 taking some of it into the SD80. I think San Leandro

1 might be a little bit too much, though, for the
2 population. I forgot to check it.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Tamina, could we look at the
4 line in San Leandro or around San Leandro?

5 MS. WILSON: Yeah, San Leandro is currently not
6 split in this district.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, and we only have the ability
8 to bring in about 70,000 into SD80 Corridor before we
9 would overpopulate it?

10 Commissioner Ahmad?

11 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: What is the population of San
12 Leandro?

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: 91,103.

14 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: So if we are considering moving
15 that, we would have to split it, right? Okay.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Either that or if we looked at the
17 other end of the district, is there a possibility, do we
18 have any flexibility at the other end of the district?

19 So we have CONTRACOSTA district is 2.18 over. We
20 could conceivably -- if we took San Leandro in, then we
21 would need to push something out at the other end, so
22 that would put us in Hercules, Rodeo, Pinole; potentially
23 grouping those with Martinez and others.

24 Just want to get thoughts on that.

25 Commissioner Yee?

1 COMMISSIONER YEE: I was going to say just that.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, is that generally a direction
3 that we would like to move? Okay.

4 Then, Tamina, let's go ahead and move San Leandro
5 into SD80 Corridor.

6 MS. WILSON: Am I moving the whole city, Chair?

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

8 MS. WILSON: Just a moment.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Yee, did you have
10 further comment?

11 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, just to mention we did get
12 testimony of San Leandro wanting to be with Oakland,
13 although a minority of testimony that would like to keep
14 it out of Oakland. So --

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

16 COMMISSIONER YEE: Majority included the mayor.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: I'm not understanding what's
18 happening. Did that -- did that go into COCO?

19 MS. WILSON: Sorry, just one moment, Chair.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so now we're looking at moving
21 Rodeo, Hercules, and Pinole? Can we look at the
22 population -- pending change? Let's look at moving
23 Rodeo, Hercules and Pinole into COCO?

24 MS. WILSON: Yes, Chair one moment.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so it leaves SD80 Corridor in

1 good position. We have some slight overpopulation in
2 CONTRACOSTA, but we're going to be dealing with Contra --
3 with the southern end of Contra Costa County. Is that
4 something -- do we want to go ahead and accept this and
5 take care of that overpopulation on the south?

6 Commissioner Turner?

7 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I'm not in support of
8 it. I would have rather looked at Alameda, which was a
9 smaller population.

10 We also have a lot of COI testimony wanting Pinole,
11 Hercules, Rodeo in with Richmond and some of those other
12 areas, so I think we're also breaking the COI in so
13 doing.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, let's hear from others.

15 Commissioner Andersen?

16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I agree with Commissioner
17 Turner. That's that little West Contra Costa school
18 district. And I think part of San Leandro, so just to
19 bring that up to 5. And then we'd have to take, you
20 know, the -- put the terrain layer on and take what
21 was -- what of Hayward or Castro Valley is already in the
22 valley.

23 I would take that portion, and I think we could
24 make -- get the portion of EDENTECH down to within its
25 range as well.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you, Commissioner.

2 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: San Leandro had a -- we did
3 have it split previously, and its -- we cannot go further
4 north than Davis Street, but I wouldn't -- I wouldn't
5 want to take all of that. I'd only want to take -- you'd
6 have to get that below the five -- you know, below the 5
7 percent.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Put the corridor in the 5
10 percent.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

12 Commissioner Sinay?

13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. This is one of
14 those areas where I think putting -- we did a lot of work
15 in our Assembly and look -- putting the Assembly
16 districts over this may give us some thoughts.

17 I mean, my gut is that -- you know, yeah. I think
18 wherever we could put East Bay and North Contra Costa,
19 you know, it just feels -- it feels like there might be
20 another configuration that we're not seeing, and so it
21 might be helpful to put the Assemblies that we created.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

23 Commissioner Fornaciari?

24 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I kind of feel like we're
25 leaving too much population behind. Need to get 25

1 percent, right, out to -- or 20 percent? I don't -- I
2 don't see 20 percent between here and there. Did -- am I
3 missing something?

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Maybe not.

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Chair, we had said that we
6 wanted to split up EDENTECH into different districts, not
7 put it all into one.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, but the -- but Commissioner
9 Fornaciari's point, we now have positive -- let's say 12
10 percent in EDENTECH. We have a negative deviation in
11 South SACSTANIS, so we can't pick up any population
12 there, and we have -- we need 25 percent in ECA. So
13 Commissioner Fornaciari is right. We've left behind too
14 much population without a way to get that population over
15 to ECA.

16 So thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari for that
17 reality check.

18 Commissioner Fernandez?

19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, that was going to be
20 my point, too, is that we've tried to max out the other
21 districts, and maybe we need to bring them down to like 2
22 percent or something like that in order -- so that it
23 meets -- or 1 percent. Let me do my calculations. Hold
24 on.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you, Commissioner

1 Fernandez.

2 Commissioner Andersen?

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just don't touch SD
4 Corridor, it's pretty -- that's simple. You want to take
5 from Eden-Tech, you want to take it over to COCO and take
6 it directly in. Don't leave any -- don't make any
7 changes, 'cause we adjusted it to the right number, so
8 then put EDEN -- south, you know, 80 Corridor the way it
9 was. Put the terrain layer on and see how much is
10 already over in the valley, and then take the little bits
11 of the -- to make those cities -- parts of those cities
12 whole as we need it to move the population over.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, very good. Thank you.

14 Commissioner Taylor?

15 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah, this is -- you know --
16 this is the work at hand. So we're having population and
17 COIs, that's what's fighting -- we're fighting against.
18 And we're doing -- trying to do it incrementally.

19 Is there any thought to just moving the population
20 and then adjusting the COIs? Or -- you know, and I'm
21 just trying to think of our time and what we have left --

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right --

23 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: -- to make a bolder step and
24 then see if we can adjust accordingly.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, well that's what we've done

1 in SANJOSE. We've gotten the population to a level that
2 we're more or less happy with and said that we will have
3 a commissioner work with a mapper to ensure that the
4 contour of the district respects as many COIs as
5 possible. So thank you for that.

6 Commissioner Tuner?

7 COMMISSIONER TURNER: So if we move Alameda into --
8 I don't know if -- if it can go into -- ultimately, what
9 I'm trying to do is to see if -- thank you, that's --
10 when it stops moving. Okay, if we move a portion that --
11 that number directly, not up into the 80COR, but into the
12 COCO, we can move Livermore, which is 88,006 into the
13 S,ACSTANIS and then move perhaps, Manteca, which is also
14 83, going that direction. So those are -- I'm just
15 looking for like numbers, Commissioner Taylor, talking
16 about just the population number and then seeing how we
17 need to adjust COI, but those are all 80, 80, 78ish or
18 so, so we may can move in that direction.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

20 Commissioner Toledo?

21 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, thank you. I was
22 just -- we have such amazing line drawers. I'm just
23 wondering if they can just present us some options,
24 'cause they've rotated the population all over this
25 region in all of their iterations and perhaps they might

1 have some suggestions on how to rotate the population and
2 the various options that they've tried in the past.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, we're just trying to get to a
5 point where we've narrowed down the options enough to
6 give them direction and let them work offline. Thank you
7 for that.

8 Commissioner Fornaciari? We're not hearing you.

9 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Good, 'cause I was
10 thinking. Yeah, I don't know what to say at this point.
11 I'll think some more.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you. So Tamina, we need
13 to not accept moving Rodeo, Hercules, and Pinole. We
14 need to move San Leandro back into EDENTECH. And is that
15 back into EDENTECH? I'm seeing that number in COCO, it
16 makes me think that it's sitting in COCO right now.
17 There we go, okay. So the -- right now the excess
18 population in EDENTECH needs to move east.

19 So, Commissioner Andersen?

20 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I recommend putting on the
21 terrain layer and seeing what part of Castro Valley,
22 Hayward is already in the valley. It doesn't appear that
23 most of it is still in the hills.

24 So then we need to say, well, Fremont connects
25 through -- to Sunol, you know, portions of this. We need

1 to start grabbing, kind of what's on the hill, by the
2 highways that can get it there and cutting this one up.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, Commissioner Fornaciari?

4 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: How about we use a
5 chainsaw, not a scalpel, and we just grab Castro Valley,
6 San Leandro, San Lorenzo, all of that stuff and parts of
7 Hayward and move in until we get to the population
8 numbers. And then we start grabbing Tracy, Mountain
9 House, Lathrop, and Manteca, who are already -- you know,
10 we got to move the Tri-Valley that way.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

12 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: You know, I mean -- I
13 think we need to just move major chunks of population and
14 fiddle with the details later.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Agreed.

16 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: 'Cause if we get to the
17 end, and we don't like it, you know, we'll have massaged
18 it all the way through, but we can swap around the edges,
19 but we still -- you know, we got to move 250,000 people.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

21 Commissioner Andersen?

22 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, that's what I was
23 thinking. Fremont does have a connection to Sunol, and
24 if you're taking that portion of -- essentially, from
25 that portion of -- like from Newark, not the north point,

1 but that's -- yeah, come down to the right -- yeah, that
2 point right there. Take that portion of Fremont, put it
3 over, and then take that -- most of Union City, because
4 that's where the Afghan community is as well, go up
5 through that portion of Hayward.

6 I would not take San Leandro. I would take Castro
7 Valley, that whole, essentially chunk down, direct --
8 yeah -- well, not -- yeah. Maybe a little bit more than
9 that. Yes, I'd take that chunk first.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, very good.

11 Commissioner Sadhwani?

12 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, I so appreciate this
13 discussion and everyone's care for all of the COIs in
14 this area, and certainly I share those concerns.

15 I understand, Chair, that you don't want to do this
16 offline despite the fact that there's like massive
17 amounts of population to move, and I understand that.
18 I'm just wondering if we could just ask Tamina.

19 Tamina, you know this area. You have -- have worked
20 it numerous times over the last several months. I hope
21 I'm not putting you on the spot. But you are an expert
22 mapper and an expert in this area. I'm wondering if you
23 have ideas about how we could move this forward? What --
24 what is the best way to move this forward in a timely
25 manner?

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.
2 Commissioner Yee?

3 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, if Tamina has thoughts
4 right now, I'd love to hear them.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Commissioner Fernandez?

6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Agree, and Fremont is about
7 230,000, so if you took that, you'd have to take --
8 pretty much would have to take everything to the north.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, which we can't do for
10 contiguity reasons.

11 Okay, Tamina?

12 MS. WILSON: I'm not sure I would have made any of
13 those moves. I think of what's been suggested, I would
14 go with Commissioner Fornaciari's idea.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

16 MS. WILSON: I would take these northern areas.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good, okay. So can we entrust
18 that to you?

19 MS. WILSON: Certain -- okay, so I will take these
20 northern areas through Hayward. I will push that into
21 COCO, will take out Livermore -- not more or less, push
22 it here with Mountain House and Tracy, take out Lathrop,
23 take out Manteca, part of Lathrop, depending on what --
24 I'm not -- I'd have to talk to Kennedy about what those
25 populations are. And those will go into ECA whichever

1 way she suggests.

2 Is that what I'm hearing?

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: That would be the general direction
4 at this point, and we can see what -- what you come back
5 with and make further adjustments from there.

6 MS. WILSON: Yes, Chair.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Ms. MacDonald?

8 MS. MACDONALD: Hello, Chair. Thank you so much.
9 Before sending this over my way -- so because you're in
10 the middle of moving a gigantic bubble around Northern
11 California, we wouldn't really be able to go to Kennedy
12 because we don't know where this is going to land.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

14 MS. MACDONALD: So that's the problem we're
15 having --

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

17 MS. MACDONALD: -- with the situation right now. So
18 if you want Tamina to work on this offline, then we would
19 have to figure out what you would like to do and -- yeah.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: I'm looking to you for a
21 recommendation on that.

22 MS. MACDONALD: Well --

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: We still have plenty to do down in
24 the south.

25 MS. MACDONALD: We do, and that's going to take a

1 minute because -- since they were not scheduled today, I
2 told the Southern California people that I would let them
3 know if they were needed, so we're going to need a little
4 bit of time to get them to come up and map.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. 2:30?

6 MS. MACDONALD: Yeah.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: 2:45?

8 MS. MACDONALD: Yeah, we can shoot for 2:45, please.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: 2:45? Okay.

10 So we have 20 minutes at this point.

11 Commissioner Toledo?

12 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm wondering if perhaps
13 Congress -- it might a possibility to go back to the
14 Congress, since we didn't finish the Central Valley
15 earlier today, and just hopefully -- oh, is that Tamina
16 also, and Kennedy?

17 Okay, so let's just give them time to do what
18 they're doing and then we'll follow. Thank you.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?

20 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I was going to say the same.
21 Commissioner Toledo and I seem to be on the same
22 wavelength today.

23 We've actually seen those iterations for the Central
24 Valley already. We looked at them this morning, but a
25 decision wasn't made, so I was wondering if perhaps

1 commissioners were just prepared to have a conversation
2 while the mappers -- while the mappers change over, just
3 so that we can see if there's any consensus around
4 iteration 3 or 4, or the first one.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you for that.

6 Ms. MacDonald?

7 MS. MACDONALD: Yes, thank you. So we just had a
8 little mini conference here. And if you wanted to hop
9 over to Congress, that would actually be appreciated.

10 Kennedy could perhaps start, because there are some
11 areas that you have not yet nailed down. And then Tamina
12 can come back and perhaps taking a little break, since
13 she hasn't had one today and also work with you on
14 Congress, if you wish.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, that's fine. So Tamina --
16 sorry, Kennedy and Commissioner Sadhwani, if you want to
17 remind us where we are on the Congressional districts in
18 the Central Valley, and I believe we were talking about
19 the -- primarily the VRA district, or Commissioner
20 Toledo?

21 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I was just -- I think
22 we're at a decision point now.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

24 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: In seeing the three versions -- the
25 three iterations, it's a question of whether we're going

1 to go with the -- just balancing or the -- or one of
2 the -- our preferred method, which was the 3 and 4. It's
3 a little bit -- the nomenclature on our titling was
4 interesting, but -- so it's either 3 or 4 what we're
5 recommending and the question becomes does the Commission
6 have a preference for 3 or 4 in the how we shift the
7 population throughout the area. And I had heard quite a
8 bit of support for 4, but I also heard a little bit of
9 support for 3. So I just wanted to get a consensus on
10 which of the two really makes the most sense.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.
12 Yes, my sense is that there is a good bit of support for
13 4. For those who are supportive of 3, most seem open to
14 4 as an alternative; whereas those who are in favor of 4
15 are less open to 3 as an alternative.

16 So it seems that if we were looking at a scale that
17 the balance is probably tipping towards 4. That's my
18 reading at this point, I'm happy to hear colleagues.

19 Commissioner Turner?

20 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Your read is one hundred
21 percent accurate for me.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.
23 Commissioner Fernandez?

24 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Just this confirmation,
25 we've already talked about this. But in terms of the

1 lower seat up in STANISFRESNO, the advice has been that
2 it's at a good number, correct?

3 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: We would have preferred for it
4 to be higher, but given the analysis we've received from
5 legal and from the community that it is the best we can
6 do at this time and also meet all of the criteria. Thank
7 you.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo and
9 Commissioner Fernandez.
10 Commissioner Anderson?

11 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes, I'd go with 4 with the
12 caveat that I then would really like to see how much of
13 the Central Valley further up we can get out of VCA. And
14 look further north to put population in because I'm
15 talking the Modesto area, but not in -- I'd go further
16 north in between this Stanislaus and the Sacramento area
17 and taking population, whatever that population is which
18 I do not know. But I'm concerned. If it's 117,000 this
19 portion together is more than or even close to 500,000,
20 then it's a Central Valley area.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, thank you very much,
22 Commissioner Anderson.

23 Commissioner Ahmad?

24 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I support 4.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

1 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Numero quatro.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Toledo?

3 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I also support 4, and I was
4 wondering if maybe Kennedy can show us how -- because the
5 population is balanced right now. I believe it's
6 balanced in the San Joaquin County area, but let's take a
7 look at what are the options are under the 4 so that we
8 can address some of Commissioner's Anderson's concerns.

9 MS. WILSON: So would that be you want to move to
10 live line drawing or?

11 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No, not so much as we
12 currently balance it. So if you can just go through
13 the --

14 MS. WILSON: So most of these pretty localized
15 changes. Really, the biggest difference here was that
16 the south San Joaquin just had -- and if I can find the
17 old version, hold on.

18 As you can see it came a little bit more into the
19 south San Joaquin County, and a difference is we had to
20 take out Lathrop. So I had to replace that, and I came
21 out a little bit more to Stanislaus. Otherwise, this is
22 very, at least in the San Joaquin district is very
23 similar to what we had before. And absence of Lathrop,
24 absence of people here in south San Joaquin, I think it
25 was about 30,000 people.

1 And just how we've had to move things around here
2 was pretty localized. There isn't much change to this
3 district, so going back to adding Modesto back in
4 wouldn't be the exact same but would be very similar to
5 the iteration that Commissioner Turner and Commissioner
6 Fernandez worked on together.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

8 Commissioner Sadhwani?

9 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, I just wanted to add
10 for Commissioner Anderson, I'm a big believer in no stone
11 left unturned. We did look at a host of options.

12 We were even looking at what if we put the
13 population down through Ridgecrest into ECA, and how do
14 we pull in more up into Truckee. And we were looking at
15 a whole range of options including even what if we cut
16 Inyo, Mono from ECA and start to rethink the whole map in
17 that regard, which is not what they want, obviously.

18 I think at this point, my sense is that this is the
19 compromise, right? That it's really tough to reconfigure
20 this. Given the placement of Inyo and Mono in the map,
21 given all of the COI testimony that we've received, given
22 all of VRA obligations and the equal population,
23 particularly here in congress where we are getting down
24 to a deviation of one person, I think that this is the
25 best that we can do. That's not to say we can't explore

1 more, but I do want to be cautious of our timeline.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

4 Commissioner Anderson?

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah. Thank you, very much.

6 I just want to know what's the population that is in --

7 is it Stanislaus County? Yes. That portion there that

8 has been put into ECA?

9 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, I can check that
10 really quick. One moment.

11 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you.

12 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Can I say something while
13 we're waiting?

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please, Commissioner Toledo.

15 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I did, in thinking about all
16 of these things, we did explore different options as
17 Commissioner Sadhwani said. And we wanted to go with --
18 we were fortunate because we had Kennedy as a line drawer
19 who had worked with many of our -- and she had all that
20 information about the Sierras and Sacramento.

21 And so we wanted to create, as Commissioner Sadhwani
22 said, the compromise, so keeping -- and to leverage
23 everything that had been done thus far into something
24 that was palatable. Every time we go further north we
25 end up -- I'm just going to say it, we end up in a

1 spiral, and then we don't make a decision.

2 So we thought it would make because the Sierras are
3 such an important area in the State, and we were taking
4 it very seriously. And so we wanted to make sure that we
5 were in alignment with the thinking of the Commission and
6 where we were going prior to this.

7 So we didn't want to cause additional further
8 problems by taking the issue further north or even
9 further south. Because even in San Bernadino there would
10 have been some additional issues.

11 So whether we up or down there would have been
12 issues, so we figured this had been the area that the
13 Commission was already exploring to address. Thank you.

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

16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I, like some of my colleagues,
17 are feeling a little nervous about time, and we haven't
18 really moved forward on a lot today.

19 I absolutely trust each of my colleagues when they
20 work with the line drawer, and the line drawers
21 definitely know this area and having worked with them,
22 they'll tell us when we're off or when we should be
23 looking at another stone unturned.

24 I think that when we've asked people to do
25 explorations at this point, the assumption should be that

1 they have turned over every stone. We can ask a few
2 questions, but really trust that that's taken place. And
3 stick to the question on the table, which is which
4 iteration do we feel comfortable moving forward with, so
5 we can move on to the next piece. There's some pieces
6 that just don't seem to get to put into the puzzle, and
7 it's time we put them in.

8 MS. WILSON: And sorry as I'm clicking all these
9 blocks again, this is a screenshot just because we had so
10 many, so it's not my working layer. I am getting --
11 clicking into all the cities, there's a little bit of
12 some unincorporated areas, so obviously, it'll be a
13 little bit higher. But this is about 310,000 people.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Four also is.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Kennedy.

16 Commissioner Anderson, is that the answer you were
17 looking for?

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: It is. Just one -- and this
19 should not take much. Could we go up and have a look at
20 the portion of Sacramento County that is not in
21 Sacramento that's been put into another district that you
22 created around Tahoe. Yeah, I guess it's just the full
23 scenario. What is the population in that, right -- that
24 small area there?

25 MS. WILSON: So there's Folsom and Orangevale.

1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Okay.

2 MS. WILSON: And we can see what those cities are
3 Folsom, Orangevale, and there's actually a tiny bit of
4 Citrus Heights, which I can also highlight for you, one
5 moment. This is as I'm still going 170,000. Clearly, I
6 don't have it all but --

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. That's close enough, thank
8 you.

9 MS. WILSON: Yeah.

10 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you. Yeah, I'm just
11 looking at that other one that's -- and that portion's
12 been added to this whole other area which has been
13 created. I still feel that a Sierra thing (ph.) was
14 available to put that much area of -- anyway.
15 Understood.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Fornaciari?

17 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm going to be a little
18 repetitive because I'm going to echo Commissioner Sinay's
19 comments.

20 You know, I mean, if you look at the job they did in
21 that north valley, the North Shore Valley with an
22 (indiscernible), I'm sure they scrub, and scrub, and
23 scrub you know, to do the best they could.

24 And I think that I agree that when we send folks off
25 to do these kinds of explorations that I think we just

1 have to trust in them that they've turned over the
2 stones. And I appreciate the hard work that they've
3 done.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.
5 Commissioner Turner?

6 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. We did turn over a
7 lot of stones, but know I currently do not remember why
8 we did not go with the other iteration that we had.

9 The Fernandez Turner iteration that we looked at
10 before for this area that did not take Modesto all the
11 way out of ECA. And we put both of them up. That was a
12 consideration.

13 I don't remember us not choosing it, and now we're
14 back to this. And both of them are, I still think,
15 viable options. I just don't remember how we got here
16 and how that got erased.

17 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think I can answer that. I
18 think it was because of the Central Valley. I think we
19 go to this, and then we decided until we settled on the
20 Central Valley that we wouldn't take action on the
21 Fernandez Turner proposal of the north.

22 And this, actually, well, Central Valley proposal
23 aligns -- is my understanding, aligns with both the
24 proposal that Turner Fernandez provided and also with the
25 original proposal, which was what we have, right, what we

1 currently have.

2 And so we're able to work through both of those, so
3 our goal was to align with what you guys were already
4 proposing, and if that didn't move forward, to default to
5 the previous.

6 So we were trying to work in an alignment so that we
7 could make the decision for the Central Valley and then
8 also cascade into the Sierras and Northern California.
9 Thank you.

10 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, so with that --

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, Commissioner?

12 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Oh, Kennedy, yes. I'd like to
13 see how that dovetails with that other work.

14 MS. WILSON: Okay. I can pull up your balanced plan
15 as well. There's going to be a lot of lines, so one
16 difference that I'll just point out before putting the
17 lines on top of each other was the difference was that
18 Mono, Inyo, Alpine were going up into being populated by
19 Roseville going up to Plumas and then Modesto was in with
20 Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne. And we didn't go with
21 that again because we knew there was going to be excess
22 population within these because they were planning to
23 take out portions of Lamont, Lamont Station, and Visalia.

24 So there was more going to north that couldn't
25 possibly mix with what you had at the time. Turning

1 these off and turning yours on, we have Modesto going in
2 with parts of San Joaquin and Amador down to Mariposa.

3 But now since you do like the VRA districts the way
4 they are that 117,000 is still going to have to come out
5 of here, which will still be putting it with Mono, Inyo,
6 and obviously, it's been a while since you've looked at
7 it and you can look at it again.

8 There was a lot of still not liking this version as
9 well and wanting to go back to the draft, but here is the
10 lines. So again, this had Fresno, Clovis, going
11 downwards.

12 Again, big change Modesto was with Amador,
13 Calaveras, Tuolumne, Mono, Inyo, Alpine, parts of El
14 Dorado, all of Placer, up to Plumas, which again, wasn't
15 all that popular with everyone, some people.

16 And then we had Tracy, Mountain House with Stockton
17 to Elk Grove, a small split in Vineyard and Excelsior,
18 keeping Sacramento whole. Parkway up to Fruitridge
19 Pocket together then, kind of, just the eastern side of
20 Sacramento County from Arden-Arcade up to Antelope out to
21 Folsom as well and Rancho Murieta also going east.

22 So those were some differences. If we were to, kind
23 of, to model this again, Fresno would still have to be
24 going north somewhere.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Kennedy.

1 Commissioner Fernandez?

2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, yeah, thank you,
3 Kennedy. And just based on the changes that were made to
4 the VRA districts we'd have to redo the whole Turner
5 Fernandez because the population is different from what
6 we were working with versus what we would have now. I
7 think we were working with like, 400,000, and I think,
8 now, Kennedy said it's 300,000. So it would have to be
9 redone.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: And is that something that you would
11 be willing to redo?

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I prefer the draft of what
13 we have now. I prefer that one but if the majority of
14 the -- if there's general consensus, right, is that the
15 word we're using now?

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

17 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: We could go back, but I
18 will also say if anyone has been reading the -- or if
19 we've had time to read the communities of interest in our
20 database, there's many, many, many people that did not
21 like our proposal, which I'm a little offended by -- just
22 kidding -- but that's okay. I thought it was pretty
23 good.

24 No, but I do understand because we were having to
25 think out of the box, right. And we were splitting up --

1 one of the major ones was San Joaquin. San Joaquin was
2 basically whole in the one we have now and probably over
3 30 different communities of interest, and plus we were
4 also placing Elk Grove with Stockton, which many did not
5 like.

6 So but I think anytime you make a change, you're
7 going to have people that don't like it. So I didn't
8 answer your question, but I'm willing to work on it if
9 that's what general consensus is.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner
11 Sadhwani?

12 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, so just to add, I
13 think I was eluding to this before, but so one of the
14 things that we kind of just talked through when
15 Commissioner Toledo and I were working with Kennedy is,
16 you know, the 117 people that come out -- right now, we
17 have them coming out through Fresno, and we did look at
18 what are some of the other options for that.

19 So I did mention, like, Ridgecrest, for example. I
20 think we looked at that, and it was like 27,000 people or
21 something like that. So it wasn't enough to push out
22 that way. So it opens a whole host of questions about
23 then how else would we do this, right?

24 So as it stands in this map we still have ECA being
25 populated to some extent by the Central Valley with

1 Fresno. If we wanted to look at an alternative to that
2 (indiscernible) against that, I think that could actually
3 make lots of sense, but it would require redrawing a lot
4 of the map.

5 And so that would be my only concern, and that's why
6 we didn't pursue it further because for us our task was
7 the VRA districts, and so we really, kind of, kept it at
8 that point.

9 But certainly just in talking through what might
10 look like, we had talked about, well, Inyo Mono might
11 need to go with San Bernadino, which would set off a
12 whole host of ripple effects down below or a whole redraw
13 of the Northern California area.

14 So I just wanted to highlight that the key piece
15 here is that because there's this 117 coming out of that
16 area because of the creation of that farm that population
17 has to go somewhere.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.
19 Commissioner Anderson?

20 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah, thank you. I --
21 Commissioner Turner, thank you for bringing that up. I'd
22 forgotten that we had not actually resolved the issues
23 that were trying to deal with in the Sacramento --
24 Sacramento in the draft was cut in half -- the city was
25 cut in half, and a lot of people did not like that. We

1 didn't really like that.

2 Also, the Tahoe area, even though we said well if
3 you have to cut it putting it in the middle of the lake
4 was okay. And we thought oh, this would be nice to
5 change this. And that was one of the reasons why we said
6 great, let's look at taking that portion of the Central
7 Valley from it was the 417,000, now it would be like 300.

8 I still think that's worth a go and keeping the
9 Sacramento County and Sacramento County and putting the
10 population Placer population in El Dorado in those
11 counties.

12 And I think that would actually help us solve this
13 whole issue to everyone's benefit, and I would really
14 hope to have a quick look at this again.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Anderson.

16 Kennedy?

17 MS. WILSON: Just one response to that was the draft
18 definitely was cutting through mid-town and the downtown
19 area. However, Commissioner Fornaciari did make
20 adjustments, and it is no longer doing that.

21 Now, the downtown areas are whole and kept together
22 as this follows the river. So that's just one thing that
23 Commissioner Fornaciari did just for everyone's
24 information about where the line goes now.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Kennedy. Commissioner

1 Turner?

2 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah thank you, and thank you
3 for all of that. I think for me it still feels like we
4 have given up on the Modesto area because including them
5 all the way out to ECA with the Sierra feels like we have
6 not done enough exploration to see if there's a possible
7 way that they can stay in the Central Valley.

8 We've carved them out of the like communities, and I
9 think along with Modesto and what was, it Lathrop, and
10 put them in with, you know, this Benton and Mammoth Lakes
11 and all these other wonderful areas, it just -- they just
12 don't go together at all in any stretch of the
13 imagination.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: So thank you for that, Commissioner
15 Turner. Could I ask you and Commissioner Fernandez to
16 take another look at this and see if you are able to --
17 based on the VRA districts and the southern part of the
18 Central Valley take another look at this, modify what you
19 previously had based on the earlier version of the VRA
20 districts and bring us back a proposal or options?

21 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I'd certainly would want
22 to look at it again because I would not be interested in
23 touching any of the VRA districts, and there were some
24 things that we really liked about what we were able to do
25 with Placer and some of those other areas.

1 And so we'll just have to see. And here's where I
2 think the Central Valley because of where it's positioned
3 not because of intent, desire, heart (ph.), but this is
4 where it feels like we are now just very limited in what
5 can happen in this area.

6 And so yes, let's look it at again and see if we
7 can't pull a miracle out of this.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much.

9 Commissioner Toledo?

10 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes, I'm just thinking in
11 terms of decision points, one just one decision point the
12 Central Valley number four right that we have general
13 consensus to lock that in. I like that term so let's --
14 if we have general consensus let's lock that in.

15 And then I actually -- we have a balanced map here.
16 The number four is a balanced map if we all can -- it's
17 not ideal, but I would almost want us to move in this
18 direction if we can't find any other stone unturned.

19 Certainly, there was also iteration 3, but we all
20 moved in this direction, and we have a balanced map, we
21 meet our compliance requirements. It's not ideal, but if
22 we cannot just live with it but support it, then I would
23 say let's move forward with the caveat that of course, if
24 Commissioner Turner and Fernandez are able to -- and I
25 know they are miracle workers because I've seen them

1 work.

2 If they are able to address the COIs that we'd like
3 to see united, then we can certainly take that and decide
4 upon that when they bring that back to us. But given the
5 time constraints, I would make this the default if we can
6 all -- well, if we can live with it and support it. I
7 like the addition of the support. Thank you.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. And yes, the charge
9 would be to not disrupt the VRA districts in any way.
10 Kennedy?

11 MS. WILSON: I have a question. So you know, it
12 would be about 100,000 people less, so that is, you know
13 a big difference.

14 However, I do think some things would kind of stay
15 generally close in structure. I do think that you know,
16 as far as what Mono and Inyo can be paired with, I think
17 that's a big question too.

18 What do you want it to be paired with because in the
19 Modesto balanced version it was with -- if I can pull
20 that up, it was with up to Roseville, but I think there
21 was some opposition about that.

22 And some oppositions about Modesto being with them;
23 Amador, Calaveras, Tuolumne, so I guess if there's just
24 specific Modesto has to go into Stockton, Mono and Inyo
25 have to be with Roseville, it would be really helpful to

1 know, like, what they are okay with being with.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, so Commissioner Turner and
3 Commissioner Fernandez will work with you on that.

4 Commissioner Turner?

5 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Absolutely, and the only
6 correction I wanted to add to my miracle-working comment
7 was that this miracle can't happen without Kennedy.
8 She --

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: So.

10 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I just wanted to make sure
11 that goes on record. She is, I think, the brains behind
12 all of this that can make this happen. She knows the
13 areas to carve out that we're not been able to find. And
14 so very confident working with Commissioner Fernandez and
15 myself and we're going --

16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: (Indiscernible)

17 COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- to do it, but man --
18 Kennedy's that anchor for us. So thank you, Kennedy.
19 We're going to try it again.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good, thank you, Commissioner
21 Turner. Thank all of you, for taking this on.

22 Commissioner Anderson?

23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah, I'd like to say
24 something on that one. Thank you for that question
25 Kennedy, and Commissioner Turner, I agree. Kennedy sort

1 of knows the ins and outs of this.

2 What -- because, you know, this was Commissioner
3 Akutagawa and I, this was our area, and so we heard
4 extensively from the people here. What they would like
5 to see is keeping the Mono, Inyo, Alpine with the portion
6 of the Gold Country and a Sierra.

7 Whatever that is -- it doesn't have to be Roseville.
8 It could be all of El Dorado, and that was enough
9 population, great. It could be Placer, you know, maybe
10 Placer and all that -- that's what they like.

11 They don't really want the Central Valley, and they
12 don't have to have Roseville in particular. They'd like
13 to have as far north as they can to be in to be a
14 district.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Anderson.

16 MS. WILSON: And if I may, really --

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

18 MS. WILSON: -- just in response to that, what parts
19 of this -- is that it's with Fresno and Madera that was
20 not desirable or what --

21 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: It's that it was the
22 controlling city, the controlling population was
23 something in the Central Valley. It's been Bakersfield
24 for years; it's been Fresno, it's been -- there will be a
25 portion of Fresno if that's the way it's going to be.

1 But let's not have it, you know, the 170,000 out of
2 the district that's certainly absolutely tolerable. But
3 almost half, that isn't.

4 MS. WILSON: I guess I meant from their previous
5 iteration has Mono, Inyo -- it goes close to the City of
6 Madera, but it's still really the foothills, foothills
7 of -- not Folsom, Fresno. And then it goes up into El
8 Dorado, takes all of Placer, and goes up to Plumas, and
9 maybe I don't remember what your commentary was on this
10 area, but if this area -- I think this is being populated
11 a lot by Placer. And so I was wondering how do we change
12 this, or is this okay?

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: No. It's that they want to
14 be -- and the Gold Country does as well --

15 MS. WILSON: (Indiscernible) Gold Country too.

16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: -- correct. That area would
17 like to be a Sierra district. It doesn't have to go just
18 as far as they could. The Gold Country doesn't really
19 want to be with the Central Valley either, and they were
20 saying that back and forth. And a couple of people did,
21 but that's not where the -- and all the people we were
22 talking with, that's what they were hoping.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Anderson.
24 Commissioner Fernandez?

25 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. We are

1 well aware of what Inyo, Mono, and Alpine want, and we
2 were working within those limitations. Again, this is
3 congressional, and we'll get it down to zero. So we do
4 know what the priorities are, and we'll work with Kennedy
5 on that. Thank you.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. And Commissioner
7 Sadhwani's hand went down. Okay. Thank you.

8 I think we have this resolved. We have resolved the
9 VRA districts in the southern portion of the Central
10 Valley.

11 We were going to be switching over to Sivan to look
12 at outstanding issues in Southern California while
13 Kennedy worked on Senate issues in the Northern Valley
14 and shifting the population around. So Ms. MacDonald ?

15 MS. MACDONALD: Hello, Chair. Thank you so much. I
16 think we decided that we wanted to go to Tamina for
17 Congress after Kennedy?

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: For Congress?

19 MS. MAC DONALD: Yes.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. That's fine. What does -- I
21 thought Tamina needed more time to do the work that she
22 was off doing?

23 MS. MACDONALD: No. I apologize. It's a little
24 confusing hopping from map to map. So Tamina will be
25 working on Senate --

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

2 MS. MACDONALD: -- but that's going to be happening
3 a little later.

4 And since we hopped over to Congress we talked about
5 perhaps going to Kennedy and then moving over to Tamina,
6 and then if you wish to go to Southern California after
7 that, I can make sure that Sivan is available.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Perfect.

9 MS. MACDONALD: And I'm sorry if this has been a
10 miscommunication.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. So is Tamina ready to hop
12 back on? Okay, very good.

13 MS. MACDONALD: Yes, one moment, please.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: We've got five minutes until break.
15 I was going to offer to go ahead and break early, have a
16 little bit longer break, and come back at 3:15.

17 Let's go ahead and do that. Let's go ahead and
18 break. It's 2:56. We will be back from break at 3:15.

19 MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much, Chair. We are on
20 break, everybody. If everyone could please be back at
21 3:15, thanks, everybody.

22 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 2:56 p.m. until
23 3:14 p.m.)

24 MR. MANOFF: One minute everybody. Checking in with
25 the map team. Hello, Tamina. Thank you, we see your

1 map. All right, you all, I think we are ready.

2 If the Chair could please, enable video. All right,
3 stand by to go live.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioners?

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm here. Tamina's here.
6 We're both here.

7 MR. MANOFF: Are you ready to go live, Chair, or do
8 you want to give it a couple of minutes?

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

10 MR. MANOFF: Standby. You're live.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Welcome back to today's meeting of
12 the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. Again,
13 I am Ray Kennedy, the rotating Chair for today's meeting.
14 We have been moving back and forth as availability of
15 mappers allows between Congressional Districts and Senate
16 Districts.

17 We apologize for any confusion. We just need to
18 maximize the availability of our mappers in order to
19 reach our targets dates successfully.

20 So Tamina is back with us, and as I understand it is
21 ready to walk us through some work on the Congressional
22 Districts in her area of responsibility.

23 So, Tamina, over to you?

24 MS. RAMOS ALON: Thank you, Chair. We are heading
25 back to San Jose, but this time we are in Congress. We

1 are not in Senate. And I'd like to review with you what
2 has been posted as Plan YA (ph.).

3 There are three different iterations in that PDF,
4 which are different options for how to address the issue
5 of San Jose being split four times in the congressional
6 maps.

7 The map that you are seeing currently with these
8 brown lines is the current map that we are looking at.
9 So this is the one with the four splits. You'll see that
10 Northern San Jose is in GREATERED. We have the western
11 tip of the CUPERTINO district comes into the middle of
12 San Jose the Alum Rock Latino neighborhoods. We have the
13 southwest in with Santa Clara, and we have the south with
14 MIDCOAST.

15 So we were asked to take a look at some different
16 iterations of what could possibly reduce the split, and
17 that's what I will be presenting to you now.

18 So this is iteration number 1, and this reduces the
19 splits in San Jose. San Jose is now in GREATERED, that
20 same area in CUPERTINO and Santa Clara. What allows for
21 this change is that the MIDCOAST district has been
22 reworked to take population up the coast, so it now
23 starts in Pacifica, which has been added to Santa Clara
24 area. So I'll zoom out, so you can see that full
25 district. So this'll be a coastal district, which goes

1 from San Mateo County down through the bottom of MIDCOAST
2 in San Luis Obispo County. That line has not changed.

3 In Santa Clara, we have a small split in Mountain
4 View, but we've taken Los Altos, La Jolla, and Los Altos
5 Hills over here into Santa Clara. Whereas the GREATERED
6 district remains unchanged.

7 I'm now going to go to the second snapshot. So this
8 is iteration number 2. And what this iteration does is
9 it takes Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, and Cupertino out of the
10 GREATERED district and puts it with Santa Clara reducing
11 that one split, so now San Jose is in GREATERED and
12 CUPERTINO.

13 And on this side in MIDCOAST none of these -- so
14 just a note to say that none of these district iterations
15 that we're looking at right now change the CUPERTINO
16 LCAP. I is all the exact same it was. This one has, in
17 order to reduce the neck that was over here, took a
18 little bit more of another Latino COI up in the north
19 from whereas before there was a little hook area that
20 came out over here. But the LCAP has not dropped in any
21 way.

22 The other two iterations use the same CUPERTINO
23 district that we've been looking at this whole time, and
24 so that obviously, hasn't changed any.

25 So we have Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Cupertino,

1 Saratoga, Los Gatos, Monte Sereno, and Lexington Hills in
2 with Santa Clara. And then all of this area of San Jose
3 that is to the mid to the north not including the
4 Cupertino area is with GREATERED. And then MIDCOAST
5 takes the south where it had pretty much before.

6 And I have one more. Okay. So this is number 3,
7 and number 3 is very similar to number 1 in that we have
8 the architecture of the coastal district. So we have the
9 Pacifica coming down to San Luis Obispo coastal district.
10 The difference is the geography in this area, and so this
11 moved this western area of San Jose in with Santa Clara,
12 where it previously had been up here with the Milpitas
13 area. That does create an additional split in Saratoga,
14 but aside from that, this is the same as iteration number
15 1 with the Mountain View, small Mountain View split here,
16 and with the Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Cupertino areas
17 still intact with Milpitas, Fremont.

18 And those are all the iterations I have, Chair.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much, Tamina.

20 Excellent work.

21 Commissioner Yee?

22 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, thank you Tamina. I'm going
23 to add a few more comments, and then Commissioner Ahmad
24 will as well, I'm sure. So all of these are motivated by
25 a desire to explore ways to have San Jose in three pieces

1 rather than in four. Nevertheless, in any of these three
2 options or the original four-way split option, in all
3 those options downtown San Jose remains in the CUPERTINO
4 district.

5 So the hope was possibly to get at least one San
6 Jose district with the majority in San Jose population in
7 it. I believe this third one that you have right now --
8 Tamina is this the one that has the largest single San
9 Jose slice of the options in that southern part in terms
10 of population?

11 MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes. The third option has the
12 largest population of San Jose in a single district, and
13 that is in Santa Clara.

14 COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. So that's the biggest
15 advantage of this one. We do have that long coastal
16 district though. For the second one, the question of the
17 second one, and we saw this the other day as well is that
18 you have that skinny neck. I think we got a preliminary
19 read from counsel that the neck was not problematic. I
20 think we'd want to recheck that today if we're going to
21 consider that one. That one also kept the whole west
22 valley together, which was a nice possibility.

23 Yeah, and then there was the first one that we
24 looked at. So all of them have trade off's, obviously.
25 We can also just stay with the four-way split, which we

1 were told is fine as well. So okay -- so this is the
2 skinny neck one.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: The second one.

4 COMMISSIONER YEE: And a more even division of the
5 three parts of San Jose, and then the other one as well.
6 So Commissioner Ahmad, thoughts?

7 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Commissioner Yee,
8 and thank you to Tamina for working with us on this and
9 bringing forward these different iterations.

10 As Commissioner Yee mentioned preliminarily we have
11 the okay on meeting our criteria with all four of these
12 options, right. And at this point, we're at a decision
13 point on how we are going to have community of interests,
14 city boundaries, neighborhoods, shape out -- and county
15 boundaries -- shape out in this general area. There's
16 pros and cons to each one, as I'm sure we can find for
17 every single iteration of every single district within
18 the whole State across all of the maps.

19 So at this point, we just need to narrow down which
20 iteration we are going to move forward with. And as
21 Commissioner Yee mentioned, we did keep intact Cupertino,
22 so CUPERTINO district in this view right here has not
23 been touched for all four of the iterations. Thank you.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

25 Commissioner Sadhwani?

1 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, thank you. I wanted
2 to really thank Commissioner Ahmad and Yee for their work
3 on presenting these options, as well as Tamina of course.
4 This is really exciting to see. I know we've been
5 receiving a lot of feedback from the San Jose area.

6 I just wanted to state my preference on this.
7 Actually, I don't have a strong preference per se. My
8 strong preference would be either iteration 1 or 3. 2
9 for me I really don't like very much. The skinny neck I
10 find concerning in general, but in addition, it really
11 breaks up a lot of COIs that we have received from very
12 early on from Cupertino, Sunnyvale, many of those
13 Milpitas areas.

14 So we've also had great feedback on that GREATERED
15 district, so for me I would feel comfortable throwing out
16 iteration 2, thank you for preparing it for our review
17 but I would feel comfortable with either 1 or 3. Thank
18 you.

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

21 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I would concur with
22 Commissioner Sadhwani, 1 or 3. 1 or 3. I was leaning
23 more to 3, but I think 1 or 3 would be -- I'd support.
24 And thank you again for the committee, I think it's a
25 difficult job to go through and try to meet all the

1 compliance requirements. Thank you.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.
3 Commissioner Tuner?

4 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I'm leaning
5 definitely towards 3 just because as it was expressed
6 that it has one of the districts that has a majority of
7 San Jose in it. I think with a city the size of San
8 Jose, over a million people, they need to have a strong
9 voice, and at least one district as opposed to being
10 evenly divided between all. So I like the reduced number
11 of splits, and I like number 3 for that reason that it
12 gives them more of a voice in one of the districts.
13 Thank you.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.
15 Commissioner Taylor?

16 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you to my Spanish tutor,
17 Commissioner Fernandez. I have trouble rolling my r's
18 still.

19 So I'd go with option number 3. It preserves the
20 largest amount of COI and a larger goal at hand. I think
21 that's what we were trying to accomplish in these
22 iterations. So number 3, numero tres.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.
24 Commissioner Akutagawa?

25 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, and I apologize, I

1 just walked back in. Could I see the closeup of the,
2 like that, Palo Alto, East Palo Alto area as well too?
3 And my apologies if you did cover this. I want to -- I'm
4 just curious if there's any significant differences there
5 because we worked so hard to preserve that COI as well
6 too.

7 MS. RAMOS ALON: We didn't go into that area,
8 Commissioner.

9 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Then I won't worry
10 about that. So just, generally speaking, it's kind of,
11 funny. I was leaning towards number 2 only because it
12 had the least length in terms of the coastal district.
13 But I agree, I think, if the precedence or if the
14 preference is to avoid that kind of skinny neck part, I
15 am comfortable with either one in terms of 1 or 2 -- 1 or
16 3.

17 When I was first reviewing all of these maps, I will
18 say that I was leaning more towards number 1. But I
19 could also support number 3. That was probably my least
20 favorite, but I could still support it.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good, thank you, Commissioner
22 Akutagawa.

23 Commissioner Anderson?

24 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah, thank you. I'm also
25 trying to compare 1 and 3. 2 is out for me because

1 having San Jose be the largest influence on the entire
2 MIDCOAST is completely out. And that's what I found
3 going this. This is 3, I think, which means Stanford,
4 and Portola Valley and Mountain View, that goes with
5 Monterey and San Luis Obispo. And that's why I wanted to
6 have a look -- what does 1 do? Does it do the same
7 thing? Is anyone having a -- this is -- no -- this is --

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead, Commissioner Ahmad.

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: This is three?

10 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Commissioner Anderson, we
11 didn't touch that line up there. So that line remains
12 the same. Where Commissioner Yee and I explored with
13 Tamina was that southern line of GREATERED and Santa
14 Clara. So we didn't go up into that area where the mouth
15 is right now. So that should be the same as previously
16 that you've seen already.

17 COMMISSIONER YEE: Commissioner Anderson, if you're
18 asking which of the --

19 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah.

20 COMMISSIONER YEE: -- ideas has the long coastal
21 district, 1 and 3, both have long coastal districts.

22 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Correct. And so the only
23 difference is in terms of what major cities are with 1
24 and 3? And you're saying -- they're not the same. Which
25 is the one that -- could I see 1, please? This is three.

1 Could I see 1?

2 Oh, I see. I can't see that on the handout. So
3 you're saying it's still the Portola Valley, Stanford,
4 Mountain View, and is that -- what's the other yellow
5 city there? That's Palo Alto?

6 MS. RAMOS ALON: Both parts of Palo Alto, yes.

7 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Is that Palo Alto?

8 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, I really appreciate
10 the work that you've been doing on this one. But thank
11 you, I'm going to think.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Fornaciari?

13 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm just going to support
14 3.

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

17 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Remember when we had that
18 really, really long coast and no one liked it and we
19 heard all about it?

20 Anyway, I think we've done good work, and the real
21 question here -- I support 3. If we don't go with the
22 original, then I would support 3 because the purpose was
23 really to get what we've heard from the communities they
24 wanted a majority district for San Jose. So if we're
25 just cutting it down to three -- if we're changing it to

1 three, but we still don't have a majority district, then
2 it doesn't meet with what the request was by the
3 community.

4 And so I think the conversation is exactly the way
5 Commissioner Ahmad said. It's about a majority district
6 for San Jose or the coastal COI. And it is a tough
7 decision one way or the other.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.
9 Commissioner Akutagawa?

10 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So just to check, two
11 questions. One, is Newark and Fremont, or is Newark
12 whole in both iterations? It looks like Fremont is split
13 in both. And then also could we see the CVAPs for all
14 the communities?

15 MS. RAMOS ALON: One moment, please.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa, for 1, 2, or
17 3?

18 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'd actually like to see it
19 for both 1 and 3.

20 MS. RAMOS ALON: This is map number 1, and Newark is
21 whole.

22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, this is 1 you
23 said? Can we see 3 also?

24 MS. RAMOS ALON: And this is number 3, and Newark is
25 also whole.

1 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. And it is 60
2 for Cupertino, or is it 50? I can't -- it's hard to
3 tell. Sorry for the Latino CVAP.

4 MS. RAMOS ALON: I'm sorry, what's the question?

5 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No, I was just saying I'm
6 blind. I couldn't tell whether that was a five or a six.

7 MS. RAMOS ALON: What was a five or a six?

8 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: For the Latino CVAP under
9 CUPERTINO?

10 MS. RAMOS ALON: Oh, we didn't touch CUPERTINO.

11 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: That's what I was also
12 told, so thank you. Yeah, thank you. I'm actually good
13 with either one. I think both look great. Great work.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Anderson?

15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, we're going to hear
16 about this, obviously. I don't think this is -- we won't
17 hear quite as much if we would -- San Jose was the -- San
18 Luis Obispo, and Monterey. Stanford, Palo Alto, Mountain
19 View -- it's still the heart of So-Co valley in the
20 PENINSULA.

21 I really appreciate the work that you're trying to
22 do. This was a very difficult thing to work on. I'm
23 sure you probably thought about this and tried to come up
24 with the numerous ideas of how to keep Pacifica maybe in
25 and take something else out. But that -- this is very

1 unusual we'll say.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Anderson.
3 Commissioner Yee?

4 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, two things. First just to
5 mention number 2. I realize nobody's preferring that,
6 but just to mention it, that was the one that would put
7 Sunnyvale, Cupertino, and the west valley, which was
8 something a lot of COI, especially, in the summer
9 mentioned wanting.

10 So we wouldn't be able to honor that unless we went
11 with number 2, and it sounds like we're not moving in
12 that direction.

13 The other thing just as we phrase this poll (ph.),
14 I'm assuming everyone is stating their preference
15 including staying with the four-way split. So you're
16 saying if you like number 3, you like it better, not only
17 than the three of these options, but including the
18 original four-way split. So if that's not the case, we
19 should hear from you too, please.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.
21 Commissioner Ahmad?

22 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. And to
23 Commissioner's Anderson's comment about Pacifica, we
24 didn't go up that far. We were told to keep the changes
25 localized in this specific area near the VRA area. So we

1 did not explore up the peninsula or further down beyond
2 the area that we were tasked to explore. Thank you.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.
4 Commissioner Fernandez?

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Can you remind
6 me on number 3 of some of the communities of interest
7 that we ended up breaking up? Thank you.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Was that directed to Tamina?

9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, please. Thank you.
10 Or -- yeah, and I'll just continue on that. I think we
11 spent a lot of time trying to respect as many community
12 interests as we could, and then, unfortunately, it lead
13 to four splits, so I'm trying to weigh the two.

14 So right now I'm kind of, leaning towards keeping
15 what we have, but I'd like to have a little more
16 information on this one. Thank you. Or actually, maybe
17 Commissioners Ahmad or Yee may also know.

18 COMMISSIONER YEE: Well, the most obvious one is the
19 City of Saratoga being split.

20 MS. RAMOS ALON: The loss of the City of Saratoga
21 here we do keep -- we were able to keep together two COIs
22 that were previously not kept together. There was one
23 Vietnamese COI that was split into three districts. And
24 now it's actually in one in this map.

25 And then -- oh, I take it back, there's a tiny bit

1 of it that's over here that's in the VRA district, but
2 it's in two instead of three. And then the rest of our
3 COIs are -- this map actually does better keeping all of
4 the COIs intact than the four-split did. We were able to
5 reunite at least three that I can think of off the top of
6 my head.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, and this is iteration
8 number 3?

9 MS. RAMOS ALON: This is iteration number 3.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

11 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: And to add to that in terms of
12 other COIs, we did split up the west valley COIs, so we
13 did hear about keeping those west valley cities together,
14 so those are split in this iteration that we see on the
15 screen.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.
17 Commissioner Toledo?

18 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, thank you. No, I do --
19 1, 3 -- but I also am okay with what we had as well. So
20 1, 2, and what we had given the amount of work that went
21 into it as well. And especially the larger cities, the
22 larger cities are going to see more splits, and I
23 understand the argument of four-splits in San Jose, but
24 the neighborhoods in San Jose are so different than in
25 other places and so unique. And so I can see all of the

1 options and weigh-in. Thank you.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.
3 Commissioner Taylor?

4 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Tamina, I have a question. So
5 there's -- you're able to salvage or -- salvage may not
6 be the best word. You were able to keep more intact that
7 Vietnamese COI. Would we be able to (indiscernible) that
8 small population that's left and still maintain that VRA
9 district?

10 MS. RAMOS ALON: Thank you, Commissioner. We
11 actually did explore that, and we were not able to keep
12 this (indiscernible) at that level.

13 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.
15 Commissioner Fernandez?

16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I can support either
17 staying with the draft or going with number 3. Either
18 one. We did split Saratoga, which is a 31,000 population
19 versus San Jose that's over a million. So either one's
20 fine, thanks.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Anderson?

22 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah. You were saying that
23 you were able to in, I guess, this was in version two, to
24 widen that gap. The gap that's right now right next to
25 Santa Clara in the Cupertino area, without changing the

1 CVAP. Could you do that in the original, and could you
2 do that, and would that possibly do something else, give
3 another option?

4 MS. RAMOS ALON: I'm sure. So the area in question
5 was really this little hook, right here, and this is the
6 original that we're looking at, it's brown. And so
7 instead of taking this, it went up instead.

8 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah. But could we do that
9 just as a -- regardless of what we do because I think
10 that shows us there's a few more -- I think, there might
11 be another possibility if Commissioner Yee and
12 Commissioner Ahmad could see that, sort of, originally.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Anderson.
14 Commissioner Sadhawani?

15 COMMISSIONER SADHAWANI: Yeah. Before we make a
16 final decision I just wanted to check in and see was it
17 ever explored -- it seems to me, and I mentioned this
18 yesterday, but this line that's coming through San Jose
19 in the southern portion here, was it explored to just
20 swap that portion of the City of San Jose from there to
21 Campbell and to Los Gatos, this purple area here? Oh, I
22 don't know where the cursor went but that small portion.

23 And then start just building back in parts of Santa
24 Cruz until we populate, just from a compactness
25 standpoint. It would keep some of these communities that

1 are further north together, and then San Jose, yes, going
2 down the coastline was that not optimal? So not going
3 all the way including Campbell. All right, just going up
4 to Campbell?

5 MS. RAMOS ALON: Yeah. So that wasn't enough
6 population, which is why we, kind of, had to go over a
7 little bit more. That's actually the swap that we made
8 here. So you can take a look at what the original line
9 was -- was over here.

10 And so what we did is in order to not leave this
11 section off and to make it more compact, and actually,
12 there are three overlapping communities of interest right
13 here.

14 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right.

15 MS. RAMOS ALON: And so in order to respect them
16 all, we moved this line up, and then to also respect the
17 (indiscernible) COI, which was here but that brought us
18 all the way over to the line as you see it now.

19 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right. But then further
20 down it stops. Can we just look it one more time,
21 further down? Right, so I guess my point, is like,
22 rather than taking in Saratoga and Campbell and those
23 areas and even potentially Los Gatos, leaving those
24 further north and then having San Jose take on more of
25 the coastline. Is that not a possibility?

1 And then all of these pieces here and I don't know
2 how much you would need to just populate upwards so that
3 you have one district that's further north and then San
4 Jose going further south down into the coast, down into
5 Monterey, having San Jose linked to Monterey?

6 MS. RAMOS ALON: That is how it is currently.

7 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right. So that's what I'm
8 saying, is like, can we not keep that and just move that
9 line further out so we get more of the City of San Jose
10 encompassed in that district? Yeah, like just that area
11 and bringing the line in MIDCOAST further down to balance
12 into Santa Cruz.

13 MS. RAMOS ALON: You'd be cutting off -- so Santa
14 Cruz doesn't have a lot of population at all. So it
15 would be kind of taking the entire county of Santa Cruz
16 for a little area of San Jose, which can be done, but you
17 would have to leave a tiny bit to make it continuous.

18 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: To connect, right. Yeah. I
19 think that's what I was originally thinking yesterday,
20 but anyway. To me, it would seem to keep the northern
21 areas more compact, and I think to Commissioner
22 Anderson's point that she raised about places like
23 Atherton and what is it called, Mountain View, these
24 extraordinarily wealthy areas, kind of, being more
25 compact together in that sense as opposed to going all

1 the way down to San Luis Obispo. Anyway, I'm fine with
2 these options.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.
4 Commissioner Toledo?

5 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: In looking around the room and
6 just on Zoom, I'm seeing that the general consensus seems
7 to be either 3 or what we had originally. I think either
8 3 or what we had seems to be the two. And possible
9 exploration if we go with 3 or around what Commissioner
10 Sadhwani said.

11 But probably committing to one of these in terms of
12 general consensus and then if there's additional
13 exploration that can come back maybe and influence us.
14 But having one of these either what we had or 3 be the
15 option. Thank you.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.
17 Commissioner Yee?

18 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, thank you, Chair. I
19 appreciate Commissioner Sadhwani's thoughts. Certainly
20 the long, long coastal district, it's just not ideal.
21 But the thought was that we do have San Jose with the
22 lower coast that it would dominate the lower coast, and
23 there was a lot of discussions about not really wanting
24 that to happen so even though it would certainly make for
25 a better shaped district. So it could be explored, but

1 that would be the hesitation.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

3 My very strong sense of the consensus is that there
4 was minimal support for 2, there was minimal support for
5 the original. The support between 1 and 3 was a little
6 more balanced, but the preponderance seemed to be on 3.
7 Does that -- Commissioner Anderson?

8 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: You know, I was just
9 thinking what would sort of make sense if you're in Santa
10 Cruz, you've virtually no connection whatsoever to Palo
11 Alto, Atherton.

12 You go over 17 -- it's not a favorite, but the first
13 cities you come upon in that direction, I'm wondering if
14 we might be able to actually go from -- thinking from the
15 Santa Cruz perspective, going first Lexington, whatever
16 Los Gatos, Campbell, a couple of towns that way just to
17 create enough population because there is a whole lot of
18 population in that San Mateo peninsula up there. But
19 kind of go, a little bit -- not go San Jose, but just
20 enough to keep it so there's San Jose's connected up the
21 peninsula.

22 But actually come at it from that direction in terms
23 of taking what you need to create the MIDCOAST and
24 leaving the wealthier areas north, is kind of what I'm
25 thinking.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Could you be a little more
2 specific, what are you moving into a district, and what
3 are you moving out of a district? What are you moving
4 into --

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I am moving say, I'm trying
6 to move out of a district as much as say Mountain View,
7 Palo Alto, Stanford, you know, those western areas. And
8 move in -- I can't see the cities here, but the first,
9 once you come up 17 and then it's Los Gatos -- yes, Los
10 Gatos, Monte -- Cambrian, I see Saratoga going maybe if
11 we have to, to Cupertino.

12 But Campbell maybe enough to leave to San Jose with
13 Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, Mountain View, that sort of
14 thing. And not having to take quite as much of --
15 essentially, I'm trying to put Woodside, Stanford back
16 into the area and taking some of the southern cities,
17 which are closer to the 17 and have more of a connection
18 with Santa Cruz down, than the ones just up mid-
19 peninsula.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, Okay. Thank you,
21 Commissioner Anderson.

22 Commissioner Yee, can you help us understand if this
23 was something that was explored.

24 COMMISSIONER YEE: It was not explored. I
25 understand the logic. My guess would be the populations

1 would not work out because those towns coming down the
2 mountain off 17 are pretty thinly populated, but we'd
3 have to take a look. We did not explore that.

4 By the way, just by my accounts, the tally was 7:3
5 for option number 3 over option number 1, with no votes
6 for option number two. 7:3.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, I think that I don't have
8 any -- I didn't note any preference from you or
9 Commissioner Ahmad, and I had not expressed any. And
10 other than that we have, I believe, Commissioner Le Mons
11 and Commissioner Vazquez who have not been engaged in
12 this discussion.

13 But my guess from that is that there's solid support
14 for 3, there's somewhat less support for 1, and as I say,
15 much less support for 2 or the original.

16 Commissioner Ahmad?

17 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I think I am
18 okay standing behind 3, but I am also okay standing
19 behind what we originally had.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that.

21 Commissioner Vazquez?

22 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, thanks for -- thanks
23 for everyone for the discussion. I have been listening
24 and watching, both not familiar with this area and also
25 felt like there were a lot of ideas. I was tracking, I

1 think most of them.

2 I do see the wisdom behind option 3. Could be
3 convinced that going back to where we were, the original
4 version, I also see in that as well. So that's where I
5 stand. And thanks for allowing me to check-in.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.
7 Commissioner Anderson?

8 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I'm actually kind of
9 original and maybe try this other idea.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Yee?

11 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I think I prefer 3, but
12 could live with the original.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: That was 3 or the original?

14 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, but preferring 3.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay. And I'm pretty solidly
16 behind 3.

17 Tamina, could you, for us just get us a population
18 estimate? Don't worry about picking up every little
19 census block, but that area of Mountain View, Stanford,
20 Woodside, Portola Valley, Palo Alto, we just need a
21 population number for that. West Menlo Park, Atherton,
22 that whole area.

23 MS. RAMOS ALON: Certainly, Chair. You'd like this
24 whole --

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

1 MS. RAMOS ALON: -- area?

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

3 MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Doesn't have to include La Honda.

5 Just, as I say a rough population number, yes.

6 MS. RAMOS ALON: For these guys. Okay, no problem.

7 One moment.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. We don't need areas that are
9 already in GREATERED. Just the areas are currently in
10 MIDCOAST.

11 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: You know, you could almost
12 leave Woodside and Portola Valley.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Woodside and Portola Valley are
14 roughly 10,000 people.

15 MS. RAMOS ALON: Sorry, Chair, one moment, please.
16 Chair, the highlighted area is 258,733 people.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. 258,733 if we excluded
18 Woodside and Portola Valley, that would be roughly 10,000
19 less. So we're talking 250,000 in round numbers. And so
20 could we then look at the -- in Santa Clara at Campbell,
21 towards Lexington Hills, and give it a population number
22 for Campbell, Los Gatos, Lexington Hills, Monte Sereno --

23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: And Saratoga.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- Saratoga.

25 MS. RAMOS ALON: The highlighted area, Chair, is

1 114,668 people.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So that's roughly half of the
3 population of the other area.

4 Commissioner Yee?

5 COMMISSIONER YEE: I was just going to mention the
6 original selection I think accidentally included East
7 Palo Alto and some other part, so it wouldn't be quite
8 that much, but still in that area.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. It's still roughly 2:1.

10 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Further thoughts, is this something
12 worth exploring? Commissioner Ahmad?

13 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Can I ask a clarifying
14 question?

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Where would you move Stanford,
17 Woodside, Portola Valley? What is the proposal here?

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Those were --

19 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Or the exploration.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, those would have to come into
21 GREATERED, and then the population would have to shift
22 from GREATERED into Santa Clara, and then moving areas in
23 the south out towards the MIDCOAST district.

24 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I see. I see.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner?

1 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. To answer your
2 question, Chair, I like iteration 3, and you asked about
3 to continue to move forward. I don't want 2, no.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Toledo and then
5 Commissioner Akutagawa?

6 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'm fine with iteration 3 and
7 then moving forward. I'm also fine with what we had.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa?

9 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. As much as I
10 appreciate what Commissioner Anderson is saying because I
11 do agree, I think that's a concern, I don't think the
12 solution is going to really help solve the issue. It's
13 just going to create a different issue of the same kind
14 because we are just swapping, basically, unlike
15 communities with other unlike communities. Unless we
16 were able to move it move north. I think if we're just
17 moving it south, I don't think it's really going to solve
18 the issue.

19 I'm comfortable with either way, but I mean, I do
20 like and I appreciate the work that Commissioner Yee and
21 Commissioner Ahmad did, so I'm ready to go with just 3.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you very much. So my
23 sense is that we have a solid block that is happy to
24 support iteration 3. So at this point, Tamina we will go
25 with iteration 3.

1 MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, Chair. I will incorporate
2 that back into our main map.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

4 MS. RAMOS ALON: And you can move into whatever area
5 you like.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Could you speak up?

7 MS. RAMOS ALON: I said I will incorporate that into
8 our main map. And then you can move to any other part of
9 the State you like. That concludes the iterations from
10 my area.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. Thank you. Do we
12 have other areas that you are responsible for that we
13 need to look at?

14 MS. RAMOS ALON: Not at this time, Chair.

15 Okay. Ms. MacDonald, could you chime in and let us
16 know where you think we could best use the mapper's time
17 at this point?

18 MS. MACDONALD: Thank you for that question, Chair
19 Kennedy. So Sivan is ready to take over, and I think
20 Kennedy and Tamina have plenty of work to do while Sivan
21 is mapping. So if you'd like to move over.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So with Sivan, we are going
23 to mapping Senate?

24 MS. MAC DONALD: If that's what you wish to do, yes
25 that would be Senate in Southern California.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

2 MS. TRATT: All right. Hello, everyone. Good
3 evening, or good afternoon I should say.

4 I just wanted to go over the Senate districts in
5 Southern California. I worked on this offline and a
6 little bit in collaboration as well with Commissioner
7 Sinay. But I will just go ahead and walk through those
8 changes. If anyone has questions or if Commissioner
9 Sinay has anything to add, please feel free to jump in
10 and interrupt me.

11 So just wanted to kind of, big picture, walk through
12 some of the things that we were able to achieve. I'm not
13 sure if Jaime has presented this swap yet. But as a
14 refresher or to kind of present it to you now, this was
15 the swap that was talked about at yesterday's meeting
16 where we would move the northern portion of Upland and
17 Rancho Cucamonga that had a lot of associations with the
18 national forest just to the north into the SD210
19 district.

20 I'm not sure what the exact swap she made were here,
21 but I think some population moved through the San
22 Fernando Valley and then up through the Antelope-Victor
23 Valley district. And Apple Valley was moved into the
24 Antelope-Victor Valley.

25 So that's just some regional context as well because

1 that move is also what allowed the Coachella Valley to be
2 reunited into the northern part rather than being split
3 into three as it was in yesterday's iteration.

4 So moving back into the Inland Empire. We have had
5 quite a bit of back and forth about these VRA districts.
6 And yesterday we worked live the SBRC district was a
7 little over 50.

8 We worked together to try and get it to 51. Offline
9 I was able to try a bunch of different things, and the
10 highest I was able to get it was 52.14, which is where it
11 is currently, which I was quite happy with.

12 I'm not sure if Mr. Becker had additional comments
13 on this district as it stands. But the Latino CVAP of
14 POF was 54 yesterday. It remains at 54.

15 The only way that the Latino CVAP for SBRC was able
16 to be strengthened was from splitting a small portion of
17 Southern Fontana. That obviously reduced the Latino CVAP
18 in (indiscernible), so to raise that back up to 54, I had
19 to remove Grand Terrace and a portion of Colton.

20 So other than those changes the Latino CVAP remains
21 the same, and it's just a slightly more negative
22 deviation. But no extra areas were added.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Sivan.

24 Commissioner Toledo?

25 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. Thank you, Sivan.

1 Great work. I know this is a difficult area. In terms
2 of -- we know about the Latino CVAP, but the African
3 American CVAP the black CVAP, I think, that if memory
4 serves me it either stayed the same or went up for SBRC;
5 is that correct?

6 MS. TRATT: I believe that is correct. I don't
7 have -- I don't believe I have what it was yesterday, but
8 I do think that it went up at least for SBRC.

9 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Do you have what it was in our
10 draft maps?

11 MS. TRATT: I do, yeah. So SBRC -- and I would
12 yes -- so the Latino and black CVAP are both slightly
13 less than they were in the Senate drafts.

14 So they were 55.58 for SBRC and 14.63, currently
15 52.14 and 10.7. POF (ph.) is currently 54.1 and 12.75
16 for the black CVAP. And it was 57.1 and 8.25, so the
17 black CVAP and POF has gone up significantly. And I do
18 understand that there's potential crossover voting in
19 this area so.

20 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay?

22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to add a couple
23 of things. I think Sivan did a great job and in thinking
24 through all the different COIs that we had in this area.
25 As she said Coachella Valley is grouped twice instead of

1 grouped in three different districts. It's protecting
2 the VRA -- all the different VRA districts and actually
3 increasing the CVAP in some.

4 And also the east Coachella Valley COI is with
5 Imperial, which is part of SECA, but there's a lot of
6 different competing COIs in this area plus the VRA areas,
7 and I think she did a great job.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

9 MS. TRATT: Thank you so much. So obviously, that's
10 just in an intro. The whole region is looking different,
11 so I just wanted to start where it made most sense and
12 also start in the order that I made these changes so that
13 you can kind of see where some of the other structural
14 changes came into play in other areas of the map.

15 So yeah. Obviously, first priority of SBRC was
16 strengthening the Latino CVAP there for electing
17 candidates of choice in that district. And then the
18 second priority was looking to see if Coachella Valley
19 and this COI, that is the cities of Palm Springs, Cath
20 City, LGBTQ COIs, as proposed by Equality California,
21 those areas are now intact and with the MCV district.

22 So moving south, we have our SECA district, which
23 goes and captures the Colorado River Basin, as well as,
24 obviously, the Salton Sea. Looking closer at San -- the
25 San Diego County portion of this district, we've

1 maintained this kind of southern link in the south part
2 of the state that connects this and makes it a contiguous
3 district, but also, I think, better pairs some of these
4 more rural San Diego County cities with other areas of
5 interest.

6 Additionally, it pairs Borrego Springs with Anza.
7 Initially yesterday, we had looked at pairing Anza in the
8 SECA district and actually for population, it made a lot
9 of other things possible if we moved Borrego Springs up
10 into the district with Anza. So understanding that the
11 goal of having them together was initially to have that
12 environmental COI with the Salton Sea, but still kind of
13 respecting on Anza-Borrego as their own COI kind of
14 together, separate from that.

15 So in the city of San Diego, the only changes that
16 were made, so we brought in -- let me turn on the
17 highways. So we brought in the rest of Barrio Logan,
18 obviously. And then we moved in as well, some population
19 from the southern portion of the City of San Diego.

20 Should I pause here? Are there questions so far? I
21 don't want to get too into the explanation if there -- I
22 see a hand, so --

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Sivan. Yes?

24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think what's important here,
25 Sivan, is talking about lowering the CVAP.

1 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So if you'll notice, a SECA is at
2 fifty-nine percent Latino CVAP. It was over sixty
3 percent yesterday. I know that there were some concerns
4 for packing there, and obviously, noting that these are
5 really large districts and pairing a lot of distinct
6 communities. I think the way that SECA is now pairs
7 several distinct communities together, but keeps those
8 communities together. I don't think I'm explaining that
9 very well, but hopefully you understand what I'm saying.

10 Moving north to this COR-CAJON district, we have
11 another kind of similar case of kind of separate,
12 distinctive communities of interest that might -- may or
13 may not be communities of interest with each other, but
14 are not split themselves. So, for example, we have
15 Coronado paired with the downtown areas, as well as the
16 coastal area of Point Loma and the LGBTQ COI areas of
17 Kearny Mesa.

18 And then we also have the City Heights area over
19 here. We have the Convoy Asian business district and the
20 southern portion of the -- that Asian business COI.
21 Those areas are paired with the cities of El Cajon,
22 Granite Hills, Crest, Rancho San Diego, La Mesa, Spring
23 Valley, La Presa, Lemon Grove. And we were able to keep
24 all of these cities whole and keep El Cajon and Santee in
25 separate districts.

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: And just to clarify, it wasn't
2 Kearny Mesa, but the LGBT community in Hillcrest.

3 MS. TRATT: Oh, Hillcrest. Yeah. Sorry. Thank
4 you.

5 COMMISSIONER SINAY: That's okay.

6 And it does have the Convoy district as well as the
7 Linda Vista. So we weren't able to keep the whole --
8 the -- all the business COIs together because it's a
9 large area. But we were able to kind of split it where
10 it made sense. So Linda Vista and Convoy are together
11 and then Kearny Mesa, Claremont, and some of the UTC is
12 together.

13 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Thank you so much for clarifying.
14 Sorry. So just moving on from there, and I put on --
15 this is the whole Asian kind of business corridor COI.
16 And we thought that splitting it at the 52 was kind of a
17 natural border, and it was not going to be possible to
18 keep it intact in a single Senate district, although I do
19 believe we keep it intact in the congressional map. But
20 preserving those kind of main areas and into two
21 districts, I think, was better than how it was before.

22 Additionally, we had the coast of the City of San
23 Diego split into three different districts previously.
24 Now, it's only split into two. And the vast majority or
25 the larger part of the coastal area in the City of San

1 Diego is paired with other northern coastal cities, as
2 well as southern coastal cities in Orange County. So
3 that's just kind of looking ahead.

4 There were no changes to the northern Orange County
5 portion of this border. What did change slightly was
6 this SD-POW-Escondido district. We -- in moving the some
7 of the East County cities out of SECA wanted, I think, to
8 make a more inland district. This previously went all
9 the way from the coastline inland, which I think this
10 iteration makes a lot more sense because it keeps this
11 kind of 15 corridor COI intact, as well as some of the
12 more rural East County cities, and a large portion of the
13 City of San Diego, because we've split San Diego quite a
14 few -- number of times. But I think the way that this is
15 split makes a little bit more sense in terms of COI
16 preservation than the previous iteration.

17 Are there any questions so far?

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commission Akutagawa, did you have
19 further questions?

20 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Actually, I'll just reserve
21 my questions for a little bit later. Thank you.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay?

23 COMMISSIONER SINAY: None. My apologies.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

25 MS. TRATT: So yeah. So those --

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Besides telling Sivan she did a
2 great job again, sorry.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Great.

4 MS. TRATT: Oh, thank you so much.

5 So those are the big picture changes in the San
6 Diego County area. Some other changes. Again, we did
7 not change how the districts in Orange County were
8 looking. We did, like I mentioned earlier, bring in
9 Borrego Springs to be with Anza, and that was to
10 rebalance population in the SWRC district after the
11 portion of the Coachella Valley that had previously been
12 in this district was removed and also removed some
13 population when we were working on SBRC.

14 So those are the main kind of structural changes.
15 We obviously started looking at some of those community
16 partner maps and what we heard from a lot of them was,
17 you know, liking a lot of the pairings that had taken
18 place in the Assembly maps. And so even though these
19 aren't nested exactly from the Assembly maps, they take a
20 lot of the same architecture from there, pairing it
21 together for these Senate districts.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

23 Commissioner Fernandez?

24 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Yes, great job,
25 Sivan. Can you just zoom out just a little bit, please?

1 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Absolutely.

2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

3 MS. TRATT: Let me turn the highways off.

4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I guess, the only thing I
5 was noticing -- the numbers person in me, right -- is
6 most of those districts are negative. So it looks like
7 it's a negative -- overall negative ten or eleven
8 percent. So LA must have absorbed the extra 100,000, or
9 someone absorbed them. But I was just trying to see if
10 there was anywhere else that we could possibly move
11 population, but we keep getting negatives up there. That
12 was my only comment. Thanks.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Sivan, I don't know if you wanted to
14 say anything about that. My recollection is that both
15 MCV and SECA were roughly eight percent under when we
16 started. So I'm not surprised with these numbers. I
17 think they are all within the allowable deviations. You
18 know, and we could play around the margins. But I'm
19 generally happy with this and I would be happy to support
20 these districts.

21 Commissioner Fernandez, did you have anything
22 further?

23 Okay. Commissioner --

24 MS. TRATT: The one -- oh, Chair, the one thing I
25 would add, too, is that we -- I think we've been really

1 successful in keeping cities whole, for the most part, in
2 these maps, aside from some of the splits that we made in
3 these VRA areas in the Inland Empire. But obviously,
4 those were for VRA concerns. But especially in the San
5 Diego area, the way that we've able -- we've been able to
6 keep cities together, if we -- I think it would be
7 definitely possible to get the deviations a little bit
8 closer to zero. But I think it would, again, involve
9 potentially creating some unnecessary city splits.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, right.

11 Commissioner Akutagawa?

12 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thanks for your
13 great work, Sivan.

14 I do have a question, and this is going to, I guess,
15 kind of lead into a little bit of that LA County area.
16 And I think I -- I'm looking for both clarification and
17 perhaps just to see if something else needs to be done.
18 We're getting a lot of COI testimony now about the
19 combination of the San Gabriel Valley with the Inland
20 Empire and concerns from a number of individuals from the
21 Latino community, as well as the Asian community about
22 feeling that their votes, particularly in that west San
23 Gabriel Valley, that their votes as both the Latino and
24 Asian community could be disenfranchised given the
25 changes to the districts.

1 I believe it was previously a VRA district. And if
2 possible, I'd just like to be able to see just a
3 comparison, if we could. I don't know if that's possible
4 to see, because I think in the quest to shift the VRA
5 district, we may have also done potentially a disservice
6 to the communities that were encompassed within the
7 previous VRA district.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you for that,
9 Commissioner Akutagawa.

10 So anyone who wants to please take note of any
11 numbers that you want to write down and compare to the
12 November 10th drafts so that when we have the November
13 10th drafts up with these statistics, you can immediately
14 understand what the differences are. So we'll wait for a
15 minute or two for -- oh, that was handy.

16 MS. TRATT: Well, I can turn --

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Sivan, do that again.

18 MS. TRATT: --if it's not that artificial. Okay.
19 I can do magic. Let me -- I'm assuming -- Commissioner
20 Akutagawa, I'm assuming you're talking about this SD10
21 West draft?

22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And that got combined with
23 the Inland Empire. I think it's Riverside or San
24 Bernardino.

25 MS. TRATT: Yeah. It was kind of merged, so the --

1 previously, POF was centered around Pomona, Ontario,
2 Fontana. Now, it looks a little bit different and it's
3 also, like you'd mentioned, combined with the San Gabriel
4 Valley. I would ask Mr. Becker or VRA counsel to respond
5 to the other part of your comment though, because I don't
6 know if I can speak to the voting strength of folks in
7 that area.

8 MR. BECKER: What's the specific question?

9 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: We're getting COI testimony
10 that the splitting off the west San Gabriel Valley is now
11 doing -- is coming at the cost of both Asian and Latinos
12 in the San Gabriel Valley to combine it -- to combine now
13 a portion of it with the 210, but also the other portion
14 with the Inland Empire.

15 MR. BECKER: So I'll just look. I'll just talk
16 about the districts that are in front of us. These
17 districts that comprise the VRA areas, including -- I
18 think we're talking predominantly about -- are we talking
19 about SD10WE right now, predominantly?

20 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, I believe so.

21 MR. BECKER: Yes. That district, by every piece of
22 evidence we've seen, adequately protects Latino voting
23 interests in that area; that is, Latinos are protected by
24 the Voting Rights Act in that area. I would also point
25 out that most of the Voting Rights Act districts in these

1 areas in this latest iteration are at stronger levels
2 than the previous iteration. So you know, given the COI
3 testimony is significantly lower than VRA considerations,
4 I think the very considerations are nicely handled here
5 and credit to everyone who's worked on them so far.

6 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: If I can perhaps ask, I
7 think from -- and I could be wrong. I mean, from my read
8 on the testimony, it's not so much about COI testimony
9 per se, but that the previous levels allowed more equal
10 protection for Latinos in both the SD10W, as well as the
11 Inland Empire. I think it's the POF areas or throughout
12 that -- what's currently more of the east San Gabriel
13 Valley. Yes. The voting strength has definitely
14 increased. But the way I'm reading the COI testimony is
15 that now those, particularly Latinos in the west San
16 Gabriel Valley, are also feeling like they've now been
17 left behind in that being combined into the 210 draft
18 disenfranchises them.

19 MR. BECKER: Yeah. I'm not seeing that at all. I
20 don't what kind of equal protection violation would be
21 here. What I'm seeing is the POF has very similar -- it
22 is lower in L-CVAP, but it also has overall pretty good
23 demographics for Latino -- to protect Latino voters in
24 that area. 10West is considerably better than it was
25 before, and 60 -- I don't know if I can see the previous

1 percentages on 60X605, but 60X605 adequately protects
2 Latino voting rights in that area as well.

3 I think these -- I don't -- I -- there might be
4 other considerations you want to take into account, but
5 with regard to the top two criteria, which are equal
6 population and Voting Rights Act compliance, these
7 districts adequately protect those interests, the top two
8 criteria.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Yes. I mean, the two
10 things that I am picking up from the public input is
11 there are San Gabriel Valley communities, particularly
12 west San Gabriel Valley communities that feel that they
13 are being left at the mercy of foothill communities, much
14 more affluent foothill communities. Secondly, that
15 communities in the Inland Empire don't care to be linked
16 with Los Angeles County and vice versa. So those, to me,
17 seem to be the two main strains of public input that
18 we're getting on this district.

19 MR. BECKER: Chair, may I make just make a brief
20 comment on that?

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

22 MR. BECKER: I just want to stress again, these, I
23 think, are the largest legislative districts anywhere in
24 the country. They are nearly a million people. They're
25 going to be a lot of areas linked with other areas that

1 don't look like those areas. And there's really no way
2 to avoid that in Senate districts, particularly where you
3 have large concentrations of population, as you do in LA,
4 you know, going into San Bernardino -- the western parts
5 of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, and then, of
6 course, North Orange County as well.

7 So I definitely -- I'm not surprised you're getting
8 that testimony. I think that's very likely to be a
9 sincere feeling on the on the part of a lot of residents.
10 But there's really no way to draw Senate districts in
11 this area where there aren't going to be some areas that
12 look a little different than other areas elsewhere in the
13 district just because they're so large. There are nearly
14 a million people.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Right. No. And I think
16 that's a helpful reminder for us and for the public.

17 Commissioner Akutagawa, I'm sorry. Did you have
18 anything further?

19 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I mean -- Mr.
20 Becker, so I just want to ask I'm looking at the
21 SD60X60 -- 605, the SD10West. The one place where I
22 guess we saw the greatest increase and it was at the cost
23 of the 60X605, and I guess to a degree the 210 district.
24 I guess, this is just what I was saying.

25 I think just instead of being able to ensure that

1 multiple communities could be better protected, where
2 we're -- I guess we're seeing quite a -- in looking at
3 the draft versus the actual numbers. Sivan, just for
4 clarity, is the draft the old numbers? Maybe before I
5 say what I'm going to say, maybe that -- if it -- if the
6 draft is the old numbers, then I will stand down.
7 Because then it's actually okay.

8 MS. TRATT: I'm sorry. What do you mean by the old
9 numbers?

10 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So you're seeing -- you're
11 showing these drafts --

12 MS. TRATT: These in gray -- yeah. In gray --

13 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Is that --

14 MS. TRATT: -- the gray labels with the gray lines
15 are the November 10th Senate draft that the --

16 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Got it. Okay.

17 MS. TRATT: -- Commission voted on.

18 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

19 MS. TRATT: The darker labels are what is posted on
20 the website as the current iteration for Senate, not
21 official.

22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you. I stand
23 down, then.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

25 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: We actually saw

1 improvements then. Sorry.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

3 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was looking at it the
4 other way around.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much.

6 Commissioner Vazquez?

7 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I, again, share the concern.
8 I've been really trying to ensure equity for everyone in
9 the San Gabriel Valley. And I think that being said, as
10 Commissioner Akutagawa noted, I think this current
11 iteration strengthens the VRA district, particularly, you
12 know, SD10West, as it relates to Latinos in this area.
13 And so I just -- I'm not sure there was another way to do
14 this. And by do this, I mean, I have a strong VRA
15 district for Latinos who live in protected areas. And
16 this was the map, I feel like, that kept the most
17 communities together while also meeting our VRA
18 obligations.

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

20 Commissioner Sadhwani?

21 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Thank you. I wanted
22 to weigh in on this, because I know a lot of the
23 testimony has been coming in with some very targeted
24 attacks on the place where I live, actually, which is La
25 Canada. So I just wanted to note that. You know, I

1 don't have a strong preference for where my city goes.
2 It could go anywhere, actually. It's not a strong
3 concern for me, and I certainly don't want my personal
4 preferences to weigh in here.

5 I wanted to note a couple of things, however.
6 Notably, we are hearing all of this testimony in what is
7 now this Senate map that pairs the Asian American
8 community of east San Gabriel Valley with a place like La
9 Canada Flintridge. We have the same exact pairing in our
10 congressional maps, but we never heard this concern. And
11 so I'm just kind of curious, if we're talking about
12 making a significant change to our Senate maps, does the
13 community have the same concern for our congressional
14 maps too? And should we blow that up as well?

15 I'll also just point out that La Canada, yes,
16 definitely is a more a higher-income area. It also
17 happens to have -- about thirty percent of the population
18 is Asian American. So I don't necessarily find it to be
19 a terribly strange pairing necessarily. But again, I
20 live there. And actually, if others want to change it,
21 I'm fine with that. If we want to keep it there, I'm
22 fine with that, too. I actually don't have a strong
23 preference there. But I just wanted to point out some of
24 the inconsistencies in the testimony that we're
25 receiving.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

2 Commissioner Akutagawa?

3 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I guess I'll just

4 address that, because I said the same thing yesterday.

5 And so we did get responses in response to my comment.

6 So what I was -- what I received or what I saw in the COI

7 testimonies that I read was that on the federal level,

8 the stewardship of the national forest is important and

9 hence the advocacy for the communities.

10 I will say that one -- just doing a quick glance at

11 the numbers and comparing them, the numbers for both

12 Asian and Latino communities actually did go up. So

13 that's why I feel pretty comfortable still continuing to

14 support what we have. We also saw a strengthening in the

15 VRA district. And then also I will say that the core

16 cities that we received a lot of advocacy and community

17 input on are kept together along with -- yes, there are

18 other cities. But as we've been reminded, this is a

19 very, very large district. So I think I will probably

20 get a lot of, you know, unhappy people. But I think this

21 is -- this, for right now, I think we're in the best

22 interest of all right now. Thank you.

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

24 Commissioner Vazquez?

25 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you. Yeah. I

1 actually -- no. I'll keep my comments to myself. Thank
2 you.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you all.

4 So are we -- we're looking at this essentially as
5 Los Angeles and all of southern California. So we're
6 looking at this as Los Angeles, Orange County, San Diego
7 County, Imperial County, Riverside County, San Bernardino
8 County. Are we at a point where this is a map of the six
9 counties of southern California that we are able to
10 support?

11 Commissioner Fernandez?

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And I
13 think I missed it, whenever we talked about it for
14 congressional. But again, in this one, Upland and --

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Rancho Cucamonga.

16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- Rancho Cucamonga are
17 split. So I was wondering if we could maybe unsplit one
18 of them so that they're at least both whole, if possible.
19 Because the -- let's see -- the POF is a negative 4.52
20 and then the SD210 is a positive 4.7. So I was just
21 wondering if the numbers would allow it? And I
22 apologize, I don't have the numbers. So if you wouldn't
23 mind -- if Sivan could maybe highlight it really quick?
24 That'd be great.

25 MS. TRATT: Yeah. And --

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: The numbers -- sorry, Sivan. The
2 population of the cities is right below the city name.

3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. But I don't know --

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- like, how much is above
6 or below, if that makes sense.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

9 MS. TRATT: Yeah, Chair -- and if I could also just
10 respond to that, Commissioner Fernandez? So I believe
11 the reason that the Upland and Rancho Cucamonga cities
12 are split, I believe they're split like this in multiple
13 other districts as well. The reason being that the folks
14 who lived in the northern parts of these cities did have
15 a lot of testimony talking about the forest and that was
16 also the reason for Jaime working yesterday to move those
17 areas into this SD210 district with the rest of the
18 forest. So that was the thinking there.

19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

20 MS. TRATT: I'm happy to --

21 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, you know what, Sivan?

22 MS. TRATT: -- take a look.

23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. I mean, that's fine.
24 That was -- I don't remember that piece of it. And if
25 that's the reason, that does make sense to me. So I'm

1 fine. I mean, I haven't gone back to see the communities
2 of interest for Upland, other than they don't want to be
3 next to -- or they want to be with Santa Clarita. That's
4 all I had. Thanks.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
6 Fernandez.

7 Sivan, could you zoom in a bit more on Upland and
8 Rancho Cucamonga and put the highways on for us?

9 MS. TRATT: Yeah, absolutely. I was also just going
10 to highlight it quickly. I just -- I haven't tried
11 adding the rest in, so I would just want to watch the
12 Latino and black CVAP numbers for this POF district to
13 make sure that those weren't negatively impacted. But
14 let me turn on the streets.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. While you're doing that,
16 Commissioner Fernandez?

17 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I did remember
18 something. We did receive calls, that's right. I was
19 reading the -- in our database, and I do remember that we
20 did get calls from Rancho Cucamonga complaining that they
21 were -- or stating that they were split in the Senate and
22 Assembly twice and then congressional three times.

23 So it sounded like they preferred not to be split,
24 but maybe they didn't want to be split, but included with
25 the forest. I'm not sure. Thanks.

1 MS. TRATT: So I'll look at Rancho Cucamonga next.
2 If we added this northern portion of Upland that's split
3 from POF, that would be moving almost 9,000 people. Both
4 districts would stay within legal deviation. But it
5 looks like the Latino CVAP for POF would drop from 54 to
6 53.71, and the black CVAP would drop slightly as well.

7 And let me just look at Rancho Cucamonga quickly.
8 So again, would lower the Latino CVAP even further to
9 52.65, and additionally lower the black CVAP to 12.43.

10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Great. No, thank you.
11 Thanks, Sivan. I appreciate it.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

13 Commissioner Akutagawa?

14 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Before we move on, I
15 just wanted to bring back up the question.

16 Sivan, just since you're on the -- in the Inland
17 Empire right now, I believe I heard you say that you were
18 able to reunite or reduce the split for the LGBTQ
19 community in the Coachella Valley?

20 MS. TRATT: Yes. So we have received a lot of
21 testimony and some emails from Equality California
22 specifically asking for the areas that would not be under
23 VRA protection and consideration in this eastern southern
24 portion of the Coachella Valley, but basically everything
25 from La Quinta north to be together in a single district.

1 My understanding is that there's a lot of,
2 especially, elderly LGBTQ folks who are particularly
3 vulnerable and living in homes in this area. And so it'd
4 be largely to protect their voting interests.

5 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: All right.

6 MS. TRATT: And previously, again, it was split
7 three times. So the fact that we were able to make this
8 split, obviously, to protect VRA concerns and then keep
9 the rest intact as a single COI.

10 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Wonderful. Thank you. The
11 other -- one other question that I wanted to ask about
12 since we've received even more testimony now is -- well,
13 one is around the Glendale, Burbank, Montrose, La Canada
14 Flintridge, La Crescenta area. And I just wanted to
15 see -- there was concerns from the Armenian community.
16 And it looks like everything except for Burbank is
17 included. But Burbank is a lot of people, so that may
18 not be possible to fix.

19 MS. TRATT: Yeah. I would have to defer to Jaime
20 for the specifics in this region, but I do think that
21 moving Burbank into this SD210 district would cause quite
22 a big ripple in this area, as that is over 100,000
23 people.

24 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Okay. That's it,
25 Chair. The only other one was around the Calabasas area,

1 but I'll wait for Jaime then since --

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

3 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- yeah. Thank you.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good.

5 Commissioner Turner?

6 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Thank you. Sivan,
7 Encanto and Paradise Hills split between COR-CAJON and
8 SECA. Can I see the area and the populations there?
9 There was -- there is COI testimony desiring to keep
10 Paradise Hills and Encanto together. I don't think -- I
11 want to see if either of them are really large places and
12 see what happens if we move them both into COR-CAJON.

13 MS. TRATT: So I believe that Paradise Hills is
14 right here. Encanto is right here. I would definitely
15 be able to look at -- I had a different iteration where I
16 just grabbed more population north of Imperial Ave.,
17 rather than just north of Bonita. So I can definitely
18 look at making that swamp, if you would like to explore
19 that now.

20 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. And not so much a
21 swamp. I'm looking to see if we can bring Paradise Hills
22 in with COR-CAJON.

23 MS. TRATT: Right. Right.

24 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Okay.

25 MS. TRATT: So that would be just --

1 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I see.

2 MS. TRATT: -- moving this population in Paradise
3 Hills back into COR-CAJON --

4 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Um-hum.

5 MS. TRATT: -- and then instead grabbing more
6 population kind of north of where this line moves.

7 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Thank you.

8 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Let me start exploring that
9 change. I'm just going to move this population out first
10 to see how many folks we'll need from this area. One
11 moment, please.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Sivan.

13 Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

14 We are three minutes from break, so this is -- we
15 can see how this plays out before we go to break. If
16 Sivan needs additional time, we would be back at 5
17 o'clock.

18 Yes, Commissioner Sinay?

19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sivan, I'm not sure if -- if we
20 do that swap, I think it's better just to see if we can
21 move the -- move in Paradise Hill, because I think that
22 area, unless I'm mistaken, that's also part of this COI,
23 the southeastern San Diego COI. And the reason we had
24 agreed -- you know, we had looked at a lot of this to try
25 to figure out, is that we had received requests in the

1 past from National City to be with Paradise Hill, because
2 there's a lot of crossover relationships with those two
3 communities. But we had split them in every single map
4 but this.

5 So I do think it's worth exploring to see if it fits
6 into to the El Cajon -- Coronado, El Cajon. But just I
7 don't think the swap is -- might be the best decision.
8 We'll have to see, because I think we continue to split
9 the community.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay, so let's go ahead and
11 get the population in Paradise Hills and South Bay
12 Terraces and see what it is.

13 MS. TRATT: Well, so I could leave South Bay
14 Terraces in and just take Paradise Hills, if you think
15 that that South Bay Terraces is more closely associated
16 with Bonita. I guess the other thing we could look at
17 would be removing this area and trying to bring Encanto
18 down into SECA, although it sounds like they would rather
19 be in the COR-CAJON district.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. First step, we need to know
21 the population in Paradise Hills.

22 MS. TRATT: Yes. Yeah. One moment, please.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: And we need the pending changes box.

24 MS. TRATT: Yes. Let me bring that back right here.
25 And I will just -- okay. So it looks like that would be

1 moving -- and let me just make sure that I exclude any
2 portions of National City that I might have grabbed by
3 accident and Bonita.

4 Okay. So just grabbing this San Diego city
5 population in these two neighborhoods would be about
6 35,000 people. So why don't I go ahead and move this
7 out?

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Hold on. Hold on. Let me navigate
9 this for a second.

10 So Commissioner Sinay, does it make sense to move
11 both of these in or does it make sense to move only the
12 Paradise Hills portion in?

13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, here's the challenge,
14 look at the -- the Latino CVAP is high again. It's up to
15 sixty --

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

17 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- sixty percent. I mean, I
18 think my gut has always said that moving this in along
19 with the Lincoln Park area is, you know, keeping that
20 whole southeast San Diego COI together. But we were
21 instructed to try to bring in parts of San Diego that
22 would balance the population and balance the COI -- I
23 mean, the CVAP.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So then, Sivan, can you
25 remove the Bay Terraces portion from the selection?

1 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So I don't have official
2 neighborhood boundaries --

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Let me just do it.

4 MS. TRATT: -- but just looking --

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

6 MS. TRATT: -- Whitman Street --

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

8 MS. TRATT: -- maybe all -- that's -- Okay. Great.
9 Just wanted to double check and one moment while I
10 remove --

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So that now has us within
12 deviation in both districts. SECA, L-CVAP is below sixty
13 percent. Does the --

14 Commissioner Sinay?

15 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, they've been asking for
16 Paradise Hills to be moved in with Encanto, not Bay
17 Terrace.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: And so that's what is currently
21 selected.

22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Thank you. Sorry.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

24 MS. TRATT: Yeah. And this would, as Chair Kennedy
25 just mentioned, this would not require an equal

1 population swap, so we could move this population in and
2 then -- and leave it if Commissioners felt happy with
3 that change.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. So that's now my question.
5 Commissioner Akutagawa?

6 Well, we're over time for break, so let's break and
7 I'll take questions when we get back from break at 5
8 o'clock, or 5:02 now. So we are on break until 5:02.

9 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 4:48 p.m.
10 until 5:01 p.m.)

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your
12 patience during our mandatory break. We are back. We
13 are currently discussing Senate districts in Southern
14 California. We left off with a pending change along the
15 southeastern edge of the COR-CAJON district in San Diego.
16 We have a selection highlighted in red here that would
17 take our population in COR-CAJON from 1.83 percent over
18 the target population to 4.28 percent over the target
19 population. This is still within acceptable deviation
20 ranges.

21 The SECA population would go from negative 0.11
22 percent to negative 2.56 percent. Again, still within
23 acceptable deviations. The Hispanic CVAP in SECA would
24 go from 59.11 to 59.55. The Hispanic CVAP in COR-CAJON
25 would go from 22.53 to 22.95.

1 Just wanted to get the reaction from Commissioners
2 on this pending change. Commissioner Turner is not in
3 the room.

4 Commissioner Taylor?

5 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No. My comment was related to
6 a different issue.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Do we have any objection to
8 making this change in southeastern San Diego? Okay.

9 Sivan, can we go ahead and commit this, please?
10 Thank you.

11 MS. TRATT: All right. That change is committed.
12 Let me zoom out. One moment.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And Commissioner Turner has
14 returned.

15 Commissioner Turner, I don't know whether you wrote
16 down your question before break.

17 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I think --

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Your hand wasn't up, Commissioner
19 Fernandez.

20 COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- what we were looking at was
21 the switch by adding Encanto and Paradise into COR-CAJON,
22 and I think that matched or balanced or something when I
23 left. But we were going to still talk about it, I think.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. The switch of Paradise Hills,
25 we have moved that from SECA into COR-CAJON. Our

1 population deviations are still within acceptable ranges.

2 So are there any further questions on this at this point?

3 COMMISSIONER TURNER: No. That's beautiful. Thank
4 you.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent. Thank you.

6 Commissioner Taylor, your question?

7 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Nothing earth shattering. I
8 just wanted to provide a little bit of context as we were
9 talking about that Upland-Rancho dividing line.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I believe that when we created
12 that, it was to increase both the Latino CVAP and African
13 American CVAP in those communities of interest. Hence,
14 any movement lowers them both. And I think that's what
15 it proved out. Thank you.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

17 Any further questions on -- well, we'll exclude LA
18 for now -- on the other counties in southern California,
19 Orange County, San Diego County, Imperial County,
20 Riverside County, San Bernardino County.

21 Sivan, if you would be so kind, just walk us around
22 those five counties one more time so that we can marvel
23 at your handiwork?

24 MS. TRATT: Absolutely, Chair. Here's Orange
25 County, and then moving south into San Diego County, and

1 then into Imperial County, Riverside, and San Bernardino.

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

3 Commissioner Sadhwani?

4 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, thanks. Can we just
5 zoom back real quick to Orange County? I know we'd --
6 you know, yesterday when we were working, we were
7 predominantly focused on VRA districts, so we looked at
8 and improved on the SAA district. I'm actually
9 interested in the Costa Mesa COI with Irvine.

10 Was there ever an attempt to try and get Costa Mesa
11 in Irvine back together? It wasn't something -- I don't
12 believe we had a chance to discuss that area yesterday.
13 So I just wanted to raise that and see if there are
14 options to bring that in?

15 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So just from localizing sort of
16 ripple effects, as we love to call it, standpoint, moving
17 Costa Mesa in which is a little over 100,000 people in
18 with this IOC district, I think it would make most sense
19 to swap out population from the Lake Forest, Mission
20 Viejo, Laguna Hills area to kind of limit that to a two-
21 district swap. Did you have another idea of how to
22 accomplish that or did that sound like something you
23 wanted to explore?

24 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That sounds reasonable to
25 me, depending on how the rest of the Commission feels on

1 it. Yeah. Thanks.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: That strikes me as reasonable.

3 Commissioner Akutagawa?

4 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Actually, I would then
5 advocate more for a three-district swap and then bringing
6 in Dana Point and/or San Clemente if the numbers bear,
7 and then move -- then that way then you shift over, like,
8 maybe either Trabuco Canyon or Mission Viejo. And yeah.
9 Maybe Mission Viejo and into the SOC-NSD, so that you're
10 keeping at least those inland counties in there. And
11 then the connection to Camp Pendleton will be through
12 Rancho Mission Viejo.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Got it. Got it. So I think we can
14 spend a few minutes exploring this. And so I think my
15 thinking on this would be -- and Sivan, tell me if this
16 is not the right way to go about it -- if we moved Costa
17 Mesa into IOC, move Mission Viejo into SOC-NSD and then
18 look at moving Dana Point, San Juan Capistrano, and San
19 Clemente into N-OC-COAST.

20 MS. TRATT: Yeah. I think that would --

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Or at least two of those.

22 MS. TRATT: Yeah. I think that makes a lot of
23 sense. And, obviously, I think, if I'm understanding the
24 larger goal being to create a coastal district --

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct.

1 MS. TRATT: -- probably Dana Point and San Clemente,
2 trying those two first --

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

4 MS. TRATT: -- before going north into San Juan
5 Capistrano.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yep.

7 MS. TRATT: There may be some city splits with this
8 just -- but I had not tried this. So if you'll go on
9 this journey with me now, I'm happy to play that out.

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. I think we might be able to
11 fit it within allowable deviations. So let's go ahead
12 and try this.

13 MS. TRATT: Okay. Perfect. I will start that now.
14 And Commissioners can keep an eye on the pending changes
15 as well as I do that.

16 Commissioner Akutagawa, do you have a preference of
17 where we bring additional population in from?

18 I think Laguna Hills has a bit of a weird shape in
19 this kind of noncontiguous area. So I think it might
20 make sense to split this kind of separate area of the
21 city if we -- because otherwise, it would make more sense
22 to add in Laguna Woods as well, and that would be a --

23 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

24 MS. TRATT: -- probably too much population.

25 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I think it'd be --

1 MS. TRATT: Otherwise, we could look at Trabuco
2 Canyon would be another option. But I know that Trabuco
3 Canyon, Modjeska, Silverado, that would be kind of
4 separating.

5 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

6 MS. TRATT: So we --

7 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I think try -- let's
8 try the Laguna Hills split for right now and see how that
9 works.

10 MS. TRATT: Okay. Sounds good.

11 (Pause)

12 MS. TRATT: Perfect. So it looks like this swap was
13 successful. If I add Dana Point and San Clemente, just
14 these coastal cities, the deviation of SOC-NSD would be
15 negative 1.83, N-OC-COAST would be at a negative 0.6
16 percent deviation, and IOC is at a 1.78 percent
17 deviation. So really great deviations for that three-
18 district swap.

19 Again, keeping together Costa Mesa and Irvine and
20 then bringing in Dana Point and San Clemente for an all-
21 OC Coastal district and tying Rancho Mission Viejo in
22 with Camp Pendleton for the north Orange -- excuse me,
23 north San Diego County District.

24 So I'm --

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: I am -- I'm happy with this.

1 Commissioner Taylor, did you have comment?

2 Any further comment from Commissioners?

3 Commissioner Andersen?

4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I like this. I just
5 have one little question. What is the blue city that is
6 between, like, Laguna Hills and Laguna Niguel -- it's
7 that little one to the west? Yes. What is that?

8 MS. TRATT: Aliso Viejo.

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I mean, does that make more
10 sense going to does that make sense going -- well, it's
11 fifty-two.

12 MS. TRATT: So that would --

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Does that make more sense
14 going with the Inland and start at the San Juan
15 Capistrano, going with San Clemente and Dana Point?

16 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Thank you so much for that
17 question. I can definitely explore that. I think in the
18 first round of making these swaps, it was kind of going
19 in a clockwise motion between these three districts. And
20 we already moved to Costa Mesa out from this coastal
21 district, which is why we pulled Laguna Hills in --

22 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Um-hum.

23 MS. TRATT: -- rather than Aliso Viejo. But if you
24 would like me to explore making the swap for Aliso Viejo
25 and San Juan Capistrano, I would be happy to visualize

1 that for Commissioners.

2 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I don't know. I
3 was -- I've always thought they were a little more
4 closely related, but Commissioner Akutagawa is more
5 familiar with that area or someone else. I mean, does
6 that make sense?

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa?

8 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Yeah. It -- I think
9 it -- yeah, it could work. I mean, Aliso and Laguna
10 Woods and Laguna Hills have a close relationship and San
11 Juan Capistrano also has a close relationship with, like,
12 Mission Viejo and Ladera Ranch. But I think it also has
13 close relationships with San Clemente, too. So I
14 think -- let's see what that looks like.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yep. Let's see what it looks like,
16 Sivan. Thank you.

17 MS. TRATT: Yeah, absolutely. One moment while I
18 complete this population trade.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: No. San Juan Capistrano was in the
20 Inland -- yeah.

21 MS. TRATT: Yes. So now San Juan Capistrano is with
22 San Clemente, Dana Point, Laguna Niguel, and Laguna Beach
23 in this N-OC-COAST district.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner?

25 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I just was trying to be clear,

1 Aliso Viejo, did we move it out of the coastal?

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Because, you know, we
4 do have COI testimony requesting that it's in the coastal
5 district. So I'm wondering if that was response to
6 coastal or just something we thought we were cleaning up.
7 Looking at -- what's the number on this little thing
8 here?

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa?

10 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. You know, now that
11 I'm looking at this, I'm just kind of thinking just from
12 a compactness, I guess, maybe it's not super compact.
13 But I think leaving San Juan Capistrano in would be
14 better because of its closer proximity, because it is
15 part of the San Diego district. And I think leaving
16 Aliso back in the North OC District --

17 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah.

18 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- would make more sense.

19 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Yep.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, Aliso would go into the
21 Coastal District --

22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Um-hum.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- and San Juan --

24 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- goes back to the --

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- would go back into the SOC-NSD.

1 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So --

3 MS. TRATT: Right. Both coastal districts, one
4 would be an OC-based coastal district and one would be a
5 largely San Diego-based coastal district. But both are
6 mostly coastal COIs that are kept intact.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

8 MS. TRATT: Just to clarify.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

10 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. And Aliso Viejo has
11 more closer connections to would be -- to -- closer to
12 OC. San Juan -- they would -- I know that they would say
13 the same thing too, but they're just from a proximity --
14 they're just a little bit closer down to San Diego.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

16 MS. TRATT: Chair, should I go ahead and swap those
17 back?

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, hold on just a second.

19 Commissioner Turner, did you have anything else?

20 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Nope, just reading the COIs.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

22 Commissioner Akutagawa, you're finished? Okay.

23 Commissioner Sinay?

24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can we scan out a little bit
25 and see the San Diego side of this? Thanks. That's

1 exactly what I thought. I would actually rather keep San
2 Juan Capistrano because that actually equalizes the two
3 sides more in that -- on the San Diego side, it's not --
4 you know, you've got Carlsbad and -- I mean, you have
5 Oceanside and Vista and San Juan Capistrano has some in
6 common with them.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So you'd like to go back to
8 what we -- to the previous iteration? Okay.

9 And Commissioner Akutagawa, your thought on that?

10 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I would agree. I
11 think putting -- reversing it --

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- going back to what we
14 had. San Juan Capistrano would be in the SOC-NSD and
15 then Aliso Viejo would be in the North OC-COAST district.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Any objection to reversing
17 that change? Okay.

18 Sivan, yeah, please proceed.

19 MS. TRATT: All right. That change is complete,
20 Chair. Thank you so much.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So again, SOC-NSD deviation
22 negative 1.83 percent, North OC-COAST deviation negative
23 0.6 percent, Inland Orange County deviation 1.78 percent.
24 All of those deviations are within acceptable ranges.

25 Any further comments, questions, requests on the

1 five southern California counties other than Los Angeles?
2 Okay. Seeing none, I am going to mark this one as
3 completed and able to be passed on to Commissioner
4 Fernandez to lead the discussion over the weekend on any
5 final refinements.

6 Commissioner Sinay?

7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. Seeing what we've done
8 in Orange County, what seems -- I'm tempted once again to
9 revisit the -- bringing in the 78 corridor, because I
10 think it would have more in common. But I'm just saying
11 it out loud for you all to say to me, no, we're fine.
12 It's --

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Sivan, if you -- yeah.

14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- Oceanside, Carlsbad, Vista,
15 San Marcos, and Escondido versus --

16 Yeah. Because we have a coastal city and very
17 wealthy communities connected to Oceanside and Vista.
18 It's kind of a mix right now. And it would go with the
19 COI that we've been hearing a lot about. And that's the
20 only reason I'm bringing this up, is just that we created
21 an inland district. I mean, San Clemente is important to
22 the base because that's where the military families live
23 and go to school, but most of them, I think, are in
24 Oceanside.

25 So anyway, I'm okay either way. I'm just bringing

1 it up because I don't want to just leave any stone not
2 turned -- whatever the right word is.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And if we had a population
4 overage in SD-POW-ESC, you know, that might be more
5 easily done. We are getting close to maximum negative
6 deviation already. So moving San Marcos out, we'd then
7 set off a ripple and have to figure out where to get that
8 population from.

9 Commissioner Fernandez?

10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I was trying to
11 figure out how to make it work. But yeah, you're right,
12 because that's negative. And then we've got that
13 population in the Orange County. So I'm just talking out
14 loud right now. So I'm done. Thanks.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

16 Commissioner Sadhwani?

17 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Before we move on, I
18 just wanted to go back and double check our VRA districts
19 in the area. We had received -- we've received testimony
20 today, and I recall a caller last night also specifically
21 suggesting that the SAA district, we had raised it -- we
22 were under fifty percent before, and I know that we had
23 worked to increase that. But community testimony is
24 suggesting it needs to be even higher and the request is
25 to raise it a full percentage point. So I just want to

1 raise that.

2 There was some concern also raised about the
3 SD60X605 just north of there.

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- about raising that one
6 percentage point as well, so I just want to raise that
7 and see what we're thinking.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

9 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I don't know if counsel
10 wants to weigh in on it.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Great. Thank you for that,
12 Commissioner Sadhwani.

13 After we finish with Sivan, I'm going to ask Jaime
14 to join us. But right now, we're focusing on Sivan's
15 area, which is the five other counties of southern
16 California. The discussion here of SAA is timely.

17 Sivan, could you please put on the heat map?

18 And then I'll ask Commissioner Akutagawa for her
19 question or comment?

20 MS. TRATT: Chair, can I comment just really
21 quickly? I turned on --

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

23 MS. TRATT: -- the Senate labels. I just wanted to
24 point out that SAA in the Senate draft was 45 percent
25 Latino CVAP is now 50.56, which was, I believe, the same

1 as some of the community-submitted maps were able to
2 achieve in this area.

3 Additionally, this 60X605 was at 51.09 and it's
4 currently at 55.31. So I just wanted to point that out
5 quickly and let me turn on the heat map. Sorry for
6 interrupting.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

8 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. No, I appreciate
9 that. And in fact, actually, last night when the caller
10 had called in, I did go back and look at the maps that
11 have been submitted by the People's Redistricting
12 Alliance and had seen the same. So I don't know if
13 there's little areas that we can pick up still or not. I
14 see that SAA is underpopulated, so I figured I would at
15 least raise it.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. No, it's an excellent point.
17 And I'm looking there in the southwestern corner of
18 Orange, and I know that we were we were very proud of
19 having kept Orange whole. But maybe we need to look at
20 moving that. It almost looks like a dog head or a
21 kangaroo head from the southwestern corner of Orange into
22 SAA, and see what that does for us.

23 Commissioner Akutagawa?

24 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I think there may be
25 some hunting and pecking to be done in Orange, but -- and

1 also I would also suggest that little corner of Anaheim.
2 I also want to point out that Stanton is also a possible
3 area. You don't see the red on there, but it would also
4 unite, I believe, a Arab American COI or a Middle East
5 Muslim South Asian COI as well, too. If we don't take
6 the whole thing, at least a portion of it could be
7 another option that I just want to suggest.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we see that taking that
9 area of Orange would actually decrease the Latino CVAP.
10 So that was not a successful exploration.

11 Let's try that area of Anaheim. Well, I don't know
12 whether it's technically west Anaheim, but let's give it
13 a try.

14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Could you also zoom in so that
15 we could see the streets in the area, too?

16 MS. TRATT: Sorry. I was on mute. But yes, let me
17 turn on the Google map. It's a little obscured with the
18 heat map. Can I turn the heat map off momentarily?

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Momentarily, yes.

20 MS. TRATT: Okay. Just so you all can orient
21 yourselves.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we see --

23 MS. TRATT: So we were looking at adding more of
24 Anaheim in this kind of --

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct.

1 MS. TRATT: -- skinny portion right here? Okay.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct.

3 MS. TRATT: Let me turn the heat map back on, and
4 I'll turn the base map off. So moving more population in
5 from the City of Anaheim would have a slightly negative
6 effect on SAA's Latino CVAP. It would become 50.53,
7 currently at 50.56.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we will abandon this one
9 and we will next look at Commissioner Akutagawa's
10 suggestion to explore moving Stanton from SAA into --
11 where'd it go? Sorry. From N-OC-COAST into SAA.

12 MS. TRATT: So it looks like that is also driving
13 our Latino CVAP in the wrong direction.

14 Chair, if I may, what was really successful in
15 raising the Latino CVAP in some of the other VRA areas
16 was actually removing population. And I was looking at
17 this corner of Placentia that's split. Perhaps we could
18 look and see what it would look like if we place this
19 corner of Placentia back with the IOC?

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. Yes. Let's explore that.

21 MS. TRATT: So not quite. It looks like that still
22 lowered it to 50.43, and also would leave us needing to
23 add additional population, so --

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we will --

25 MS. TRATT: -- (indiscernible). I retract my

1 suggestion.

2 Is there any other exploration in this district that
3 Commissioners would like to see live?

4 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

5 Commissioner Sadhwani?

6 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I mean, I can
7 certainly just mention the -- what has been submitted to
8 us, but I think a lot of this would be challenging given
9 that we just built out that whole coastal district. But
10 some of it is moving Cerritos and Artesia into the OC-
11 COAST district, moving Buena Park south of the 5 freeway
12 from SAA into the North OC-COAST. So you know, to your
13 point, Sivan, perhaps portions of Buena Park could be
14 lowering that CVAP.

15 Another suggestion, which I think we've already
16 done, because I don't think we have much of any of Orange
17 in there, but you can correct me if I'm wrong. Moving
18 orange west of North Glassell Street from SAA into IOC.
19 I think we've done that already, haven't we?

20 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So there's no portion of Orange.

21 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right.

22 MS. TRATT: Another thought that we could explore
23 would be moving -- and again, this is in two different
24 districts, so I'm not sure that it would work out with
25 the deviations --

1 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Um-hum.

2 MS. TRATT: -- but we could look at removing more of
3 Garden Grove and adding more of this portion of Orange,
4 which I think would potentially help.

5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

6 MS. TRATT: Is that something --

7 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm definitely open to
8 anything with that goal of increasing. My understanding,
9 actually, when we had worked on this and other maps, was
10 that actually that portion of Garden Grove did have a
11 high proportion of Latinos in it, but I am happy to
12 explore.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: And we had heard from folks in
14 Little Saigon that they were interested in moving Garden
15 Grove east of Euclid out of the district with Little
16 Saigon. So that would seem to be the line or a line to
17 explore.

18 Commissioner Sadhwani, did you have anything
19 further?

20 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: The last one was move Brea
21 and the surrounding unincorporated areas from IOC into
22 the SD60X605. That's to --

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

24 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- increase that one, so
25 sorry.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: I think we might, once we look at
2 eastern Garden Grove, we might go to your suggestion of
3 exploring moving far southern portions of Buena park and
4 seeing if that makes a difference.

5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I think would.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: So -- but let's explore the far
7 eastern portion of Garden Grove first, followed by the
8 far southern portion of Buena Park.

9 Commissioner Fernandez?

10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I was just going to
11 suggest Brea, but that's just another piece of it.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

13 Commissioner Fornaciari?

14 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I was going to suggest
15 grabbing some of Whittier. It's very -- seems to be very
16 densely populated. But that's jumping into LA.

17 MS. TRATT: Chair, should I start with the Garden
18 Grove Orange?

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. If you can zoom into that area
20 of eastern Garden Grove. We had already tried that that
21 kind of dog's head corner of Orange, and that was
22 depressing the number. So I'm wondering, are we -- is
23 either of those lines -- the north-south lines in Garden
24 Grove at Euclid already?

25 MS. TRATT: All right. Let me --

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: You can turn off the heat map for
2 now.

3 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Thank you. Let me turn off the
4 field for the cities as well, just so we can see that a
5 little bit better.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Euclid is to the west.

7 MS. TRATT: Okay. Yes. This does not appear to be
8 split on Euclid.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. So Euclid is right there.
10 Yeah. So let's check and see if we move that -- the rest
11 of that segment from North OC-COAST into SAA, that is
12 east of Euclid.

13 MS. TRATT: Oh, so you -- oh, my suggestion had been
14 to move the line further in this direction, but you're
15 saying move it back to Euclid?

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct.

17 MS. TRATT: Okay. Okay. Yes. Let me try that now.
18 One moment, please.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: The Little Saigon community has been
20 suggesting that Euclid is a better dividing line. So I
21 wanted to explore that.

22 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And my understanding is that
23 that portion of Garden Grove is, you know,
24 disproportionately Latino, not necessarily as Vietnamese.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: It didn't help our numbers at all.

1 Oh, okay. So we abandon this one and I think SAA, you
2 know, we've gone around, and -- oh, we -- the next is to
3 look at the very southern portion of Buena Park.

4 Commissioner Toledo?

5 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No. I was just going to
6 suggest the southern portion of Buena Park. Thank you.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Yeah. Thank you.

8 And Commissioner Akutagawa?

9 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I noticed that there's a
10 corner in Fullerton up near La Habra, too, that had,
11 like, a lot of red. So that may be also a small portion
12 to try to look at.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Let's do southern Buena Park
14 first, and then we'll do that piece of -- we'll look at
15 that piece of Fullerton next.

16 MS. TRATT: So Chair, just to clarify, it was moving
17 a small section of southern Buena park out from SAA into
18 N-OC-COAST; is that --

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: That's --

20 MS. TRATT: -- what the directions were?

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- that's the idea, yes.

22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. South of the 5
23 freeway.

24 MS. TRATT: Okay.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: South of --

1 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- of the 5.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- of the 5. So let's start with
3 trying south of the 91.

4 MS. TRATT: Yeah. And even much that might be a
5 little bit too much, but let me --

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

7 MS. TRATT: -- let me see how much we can add. One
8 moment, please.

9 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm noticing that a lot of
10 the entertainment areas are actually there. That's what
11 we would be taking out. Can we just look at this area a
12 little bit more broadly? Is the Latino CVAP on?

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: It's going up.

14 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

15 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So Commissioners can watch. This
16 is the Latino CVAP for SAA.

17 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Got it. I'm just thinking
18 about our conversation earlier about resources being
19 inside of communities. And I recall, in particular, a
20 lot of the testimony from this area was that these are
21 workers in the -- these -- this entertainment zone. So
22 then taking them out, you can taking out the driving
23 factors. But that's okay. Let's explore it, because our
24 VRA considerations are the first priority.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: We've got it over fifty-one.

1 MS. TRATT: Just trying to remove population north
2 of the 91. How -- so if we added this population in from
3 Buena park, it would raise the Latino CVAP to fifty-one
4 percent, and we would still be within our deviation of
5 plus or minus negative -- or plus or minus five percent.
6 Excuse me.

7 I could probably add a little bit more -- or add
8 in -- being removing a little bit more population and
9 keep it under five. But I would ask to see how folks are
10 feeling about moving in this direction before I do that.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: I think in general we're feeling
12 good, Sivan. Could you grab that one little block at the
13 far southeastern corner of the highlighted area? That
14 little -- yeah. Right there. Okay.

15 So Commissioner Akutagawa?

16 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Can we see just the whole
17 area, just for context? Okay. So a couple of things
18 that I just want to mention, I think to build a little
19 bit upon what Commissioner Sadhwani was saying. It's
20 looking like we're -- it's not really a one percent
21 change. It's a tenths of percentages change. And the
22 reason why I'm going to say this is that, to her point,
23 that entertainment area, that's Knott's Berry Farm,
24 that's Medieval Times, that's what used to be the wax
25 museum. I don't think it's that anymore. But there's

1 also another one of those dinner theater -- pirate's
2 dinner theater kind of places alongside there.

3 Within the remainder of Anaheim, it also includes
4 Disneyland. And I'm just thinking that from a -- you
5 know, from a representation perspective, whether or not
6 it just makes sense for all of that to be in together.
7 Since the Disneyland area is also included in the same
8 district. And also where a lot of the individuals who
9 would work in those areas as hourly workers and others
10 live in and around that area, whether it would be better
11 for them to all be combined in one area so that they can
12 also hopefully help create, you know, different kinds of
13 policy changes that will help the people who live in that
14 area. So just a thought.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Thank you for that,
16 Commissioner Akutagawa.

17 My understanding is that that would be a community
18 of interest consideration where we're considering a VRA
19 consideration.

20 Mr. Becker, do you have anything to say on this?

21 MR. BECKER: Yeah, I just say I think all -- COI
22 testimony, obviously is relevant, but VRA considerations
23 are more relevant, and this is an area where the
24 percentage of Latino CVAP is on the lower end and it is a
25 VRA -- it is a district that comprises some significant

1 VRA areas with regard to the Latino community.

2 So look, this is this is nearly a half of a
3 percentage point boosted, which is significant. I mean,
4 anything boosting it up is significant at this point and
5 should take -- given the constitutional criteria,
6 priority level should take precedence over communities of
7 interest.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much for
9 that.

10 Commissioner Akutagawa?

11 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Just a question.
12 Can we look up at that La Mirada, East Whittier area?
13 And I'm wondering, would we be better off -- or would it
14 make sense -- I know it would take away a little bit from
15 the 60X605, but would it be better to take a little bit
16 from there and then also widen that neck a little bit at
17 the same time?

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Then let's all remember where
19 we are on this one. We don't need to commit it quite
20 yet. Let's go ahead and explore up in La Mirada, East
21 Whittier, La Habra, and the other one was in southwest
22 Fullerton -- or where in Fullerton, was the --

23 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yep.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- area that you wanted to explore?

25 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It's that upper northeast

1 corner, La -- yeah. Right there. Do you see that little
2 red dot, or the square? Yeah. Right there.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So if you can have the --
4 keep the pending changes box up for us to see, and let's
5 hunt and peck a little bit and see what we can do in this
6 area.

7 MS. TRATT: That's a really good way of putting it?
8 It's hunting and pecking; isn't it?

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

10 MS. TRATT: Yes. One moment while I explore those
11 changes, Chair. Looks like it brought it down to 50.55
12 from 50.56.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

14 MS. TRATT: This is the only area that you were
15 interested in, correct, Commissioner Akutagawa?

16 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. That's correct. And
17 it didn't make a difference.

18 MS. TRATT: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

20 MS. TRATT: And then next, would you like me to look
21 at La Mirada?

22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Do you see that
23 little -- I don't know. It looks like a hat or a ship or
24 something. Yeah. Right there.

25 MS. TRATT: Yeah. So unfortunately, it looks like

1 that is lowering the Latino CVAP as well.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Does it make any sense to
3 explore that area to the north of south and East Whittier
4 between the city boundaries and Highway 72?

5 MS. TRATT: Absolutely. I can look at that right
6 now.

7 So it looks like that actually would raise the
8 Latino CVAP slightly in SAA to 50.7. Looking at the
9 Latino CVAP in 60X605, it would lower from 55.31 to
10 55.26, as this is also a VRA district that we would be --

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

12 MS. TRATT: -- pulling population from.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And how are we -- okay. So
14 on deviations, we're still doing well. Can you extend
15 that out to the western end of the South Whittier city
16 boundary?

17 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Where my --

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

19 MS. TRATT: -- cursor is?

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct. Correct.

21 MS. TRATT: Yes, absolutely.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So Mr. Becker, we have
23 explored in this area, and this gets us to virtually the
24 same place on the CVAP in SAA. That has brought down the
25 CVAP in SD60X605, but it's still over fifty-five. So we

1 have SD60X605 at over fifty-five percent. We have SAA at
2 over fifty-one percent, and we are within permissible
3 deviations. And we will --

4 MR. BECKER: So I'd just say briefly --

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: -- and we've widened that neck.

6 MR. BECKER: Yeah. So I don't think the neck is
7 really a concern there. That is --

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

9 MR. BECKER: -- I mean, you've grabbed populations
10 that are in proximity to each other. You haven't
11 bypassed other populations. I don't think that's a
12 significant legal compactness concern.

13 I'm just not sure why you would why you would reduce
14 Latino CVAP in a VRA area to boost it to a level that is
15 slightly lower than you could gain by not touching the
16 VRA area for --

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

18 MR. BECKER: -- for COI reasons, which again, I
19 can't stress this enough, because it comes up a lot and
20 we're in the home stretch. COI is significantly lower
21 than VRA and equal population considerations.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay. So the bottom line is
23 we achieved virtually the same thing in two different
24 ways, one of which did not materially impact the Latino
25 CVAP in the other district, whereas this one did. Am I

1 understanding that correctly?

2 MR. BECKER: Yeah. I think that's right. And if
3 I'm recalling correctly, I don't remember the exact
4 percentage, but I think this is actually lower in SAA
5 by -- I mean, not by a lot, by hundredths or maybe a
6 tenth of percentage --

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Two hundredths.

8 MR. BECKER: Yeah. But again, given that at best
9 it's equal, and you've touched a VRA district and reduced
10 it slightly, whereas the other alternative doesn't do so
11 at all. And it was only -- it was being done for a much
12 lower priority criteria. I mean, I would advise whenever
13 possible don't reduce the VRA area where -- when you
14 don't have to. And you've now demonstrated you don't
15 have to do that.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Perfect. Thank you. That's
17 very helpful.

18 Commissioner Sadhwani?

19 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. You know, earlier,
20 Chair, I was trying to give you the testimony that also
21 was about both SAA and this district, 60X605. The
22 testimony was to increase both of them. So I certainly
23 would not support this change.

24 I would prefer to do the Buena Park change in order
25 to boost that CVAP in SAA. Because as Mr. Becker just

1 laid out, right? We're taking from one VRA district,
2 which we've had testimony to improve and just adding it
3 to another. So my preference would be the Buena Park
4 swap.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

6 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Commissioner
8 Sadhwani.

9 Commissioner Toledo?

10 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I'm almost thinking, at
11 this point, maybe taking out more of Buena Park,
12 actually, and swapping for other portions of lesser L-
13 CVAP areas. And I believe we looked at Orange and a
14 couple of other places.

15 It does seem like there's a lower Latino CVAP in
16 Buena Park, and that might actually help us to raise the
17 L-CVAP even more than fifty-one percent.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Just an idea. And I'm just
20 throwing it out there.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So you would underpopulate
22 SAA and then go elsewhere to find population to replace
23 it?

24 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: That's correct.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

1 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I would be looking for a swap.

2 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So Sivan, can we go back to
3 that area in Buena Park and take that initially?

4 MS. TRATT: Yeah. Chair, I was also going to ask,
5 there is this southern, kind of tail portion of the City
6 of Buena Park.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

8 MS. TRATT: Can -- should I first explore maybe
9 moving from more of the southern part that wouldn't be in
10 these entertainment areas to see what effect that would
11 have?

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: You know, there's that north-south
13 street, I can't quite make it out. Just below where it
14 says Berry.

15 MS. TRATT: Right here?

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

17 MS. TRATT: This is Knott Avenue.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So I'm thinking we explore
19 using that as the boundary, the 91 as the northern
20 boundary, and going all the way down to the southern
21 boundary of Buena Park and seeing what that gives us.

22 MS. TRATT: Just --

23 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Chair?

24 MS. TRATT: -- one moment.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?

1 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I was just going to
2 suggest -- I think when we looked at this previously, it
3 wasn't a huge area that gets us to underpopulation pretty
4 quickly.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

6 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: It seems like perhaps, I
7 don't know Cypress College very well, but it looks like
8 we're right there on the border. And certainly, as we've
9 looked at other places, we've tried to keep colleges
10 together. I'm wondering if we use the street just above
11 it as a starting point. Yeah, Crescent Avenue. And then
12 come downward to that corner. Yeah. And at least start
13 there and then work for further north.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, my sense is and this is
15 building on what Commissioner Toledo said, his suggestion
16 was that we could afford to underpopulate SAA, and then
17 look to bring in population from perhaps Orange or
18 somewhere else. So I'm not concerned right now about
19 keeping the deviation within the five percent.

20 And so if we if we took Knott Avenue up to the 91,
21 all the way to the southern boundary, let's see what the
22 population of that is. Let's see how far underpopulated
23 we'd be at that point, and look at where we might make
24 that up.

25 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Let's try it.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

2 Commissioner Akutagawa?

3 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I almost did a Toledo
4 there. I was going to just say a couple of things. One,
5 I don't know if Orange is going to make that much of a
6 difference. We already saw that it wasn't.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

8 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And I'm a little hesitant
9 to take it. I mean, it's -- I mean, to be honest, I
10 mean, this is already going to be a huge district and we
11 know it is. I'm wondering if, from a compactness point
12 of view, since we know that the tradeoffs are going to be
13 probably minimal to zero, if we're better off just
14 leaving it as it is.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Leaving Orange as it is?

16 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. And just taking away
17 the portion of Buena Park that gets us up to the fifty-
18 one percent.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

20 MS. TRATT: Chair, I have highlighted in red this
21 selection that was requested.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, actually, the idea was to
23 bring Knott Avenue all the way down to the south.

24 MS. TRATT: So that would be cutting into the City
25 of Orange. I'm happy to --

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Oh, okay.

2 MS. TRATT: -- (indiscernible) as well. But it
3 does -- the border is at Knott Avenue within the City of
4 Buena Park.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And I actually saw that at
6 one point we had it at 51.8. So I don't know exactly
7 where we were when it got to 51.8. But perhaps it's
8 worth -- I don't know if you recall which order you did
9 things in, but I'm backing up a couple of steps and
10 seeing if we get it back up to the 51.8.

11 MS. TRATT: Yeah, I think I had more things selected
12 in Orange up to Knott Ave, so let me add that selection
13 back in quickly. That's not 51.8, but it's 51.62.

14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

15 MS. TRATT: Then it would be underpopulated by 6.59.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. So then do we want to look
17 at bringing the northern boundary down from the 91
18 slightly?

19 MS. TRATT: So more in line with what Commissioner
20 Sadhwani had wanted to explore at Crescent Ave.?

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: No, something Park, just below where
22 it says -- in between where it says Knott's Berry Farm
23 and Medieval Times -- or maybe try La Palma.

24 MS. TRATT: Okay, La Palma? That's right, yes.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so then let's try Crescent.

1 That dropped the LCVAP by almost a quarter of a
2 percentage point, I think. Okay. Does anyone have
3 thoughts on where we might look to rebalance the
4 population if we left it at this point? Commissioner
5 Sadhwani?

6 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I don't. I think that this
7 could probably be something that we could work on offline
8 and see if we can get it up any higher?

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Jaime is going to be available
10 to us in about half an hour. So I was trying to vamp.

11 MS. CLARK: I'm actually here. I chatted you, Chair
12 Kennedy. I'm sorry if you missed that. Hello, I'm here.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. So then let's go
14 ahead and try to finish this off then. Or no. Let's
15 allow Sivan to just do a little bit further exploration
16 around this corner of Buena Park and Orange and see where
17 we maximize our Latino CVAP and then bring that back to
18 us, if that's okay with colleagues.

19 Commissioner Sadhwani?

20 Thank you.

21 Okay, Commissioner Akutagawa?

22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, just real quick, I'm
23 wondering, you know, just maybe like just along the
24 border of Westminster and Santa Ana, maybe, you know, I
25 wonder if that might also make a difference.

1 MS. TRATT: In terms of adding population from
2 Westminster, or --

3 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, because if you want to
4 take that Buena Park part out, you've got to add some
5 back in, right? Otherwise you're going to be over five
6 percent deviation?

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

8 MS. TRATT: That would be if we added all of the
9 selection that's currently highlighted in red.
10 Previously we had highlighted just a more northern
11 portion of Buena Park that would raise SAA's Latino CVAP
12 above fifty-one percent and would keep it within
13 deviation. So that was less of a swap between districts.
14 I think the second part of removing this would be adding
15 in population, potentially revisiting this corner of
16 Orange in from IOC.

17 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, that's what I was
18 just suggesting. Instead of looking at Orange, because
19 we already looked at it didn't really make -- in fact, it
20 brought the CVAP down. We didn't explore that that that
21 kind of border with Westminster. And maybe just looking
22 to see is that even -- would that even at this point, you
23 know, would that even make a difference. And if it does,
24 then take from there.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. My recollection is we, as

1 Sivan was clicking, was that we were able to get the
2 Hispanic CVAP up to perhaps as much as 51.45 without
3 exceeding the maximum five percent deviation. So what I
4 would like to do is instruct Sivan to continue exploring,
5 to see where she is able to maximize the LCVAP without
6 exceeding the five percent maximum deviation.

7 MS. TRATT: Thank you for that direction, Chair.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Leave her to explore that. Is that
9 acceptable? Okay.

10 So Sivan, we are asking you to continue exploring in
11 this area. We believe that we can do slightly better on
12 the Hispanic CVAP without exceeding maximum deviations,
13 and just do your best and get back to us when you're
14 ready.

15 MS. TRATT: Okay, absolutely, Chair. I will
16 continue exploring that offline. Am I okay to stop
17 sharing my screen --

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

19 MS. TRATT: -- so Jaime can take over? All right.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. Thank you so much.

21 MS. TRATT: Kristian, I am going to stop sharing my
22 screen just to give you a heads up.

23 MR. MANOFF: Thanks, Sivan.

24 MS. CLARK: Hello.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Hi, Jaime.

1 MS. CLARK: Hi, I hope you are all well. What is on
2 the screen now is the current iteration for the Senate
3 maps in Los Angeles County, and if you'd prefer to look
4 at a different map, let me know and I can change.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: No. This is what we need to look at
6 at this point.

7 Does anyone need a tour around or are colleagues
8 ready with questions and comments at this point? Okay,
9 I'm not seeing reaction either way. Okay, now, thank
10 you.

11 Commissioner Fernandez.

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And we
13 might have already done this, Jaime, so just please stop
14 me. The Glendale-Burbank combo -- did we already try
15 that? I know that you -

16 MS. CLARK: Can you elaborate please on what you
17 mean by the --

18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: In terms of that's a
19 frequent flier communities of interest of Glendale with
20 Burbank. That's what I was asking. Sorry about that.
21 Because I, you know, I don't want to decrease any of the
22 numbers per se with my CVAP number, so I just didn't know
23 what that could potentially look like. Thanks. And
24 either way is fine with me right now.

25 MS. CLARK: Yeah, thank you for that question. So

1 just in terms of the current configuration of the map,
2 moving either wholly into a district with the other would
3 cause pretty big ripple effects. Burbank itself is
4 100,000 people -- I think 107,000 people, so about ten
5 percent of a Senate district. Moving into SD210 would
6 make the percent deviation of SD210 about fifty percent.
7 Definitely then, yeah, there would need to be big
8 reconfigurations, whether that's, you know, moving these
9 cities on the eastern end of the district in the 110 out,
10 which were moved in yesterday, which -- and including
11 other cities because these two areas where they're split
12 it's 58,000 people, or so, I believe. So yeah, there
13 would be big reconfigurations in the works.

14 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you Jaime. I'm not
15 interested in lots of ripples right now. Thanks.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, and I mean, if both SD10 --
17 210 and POF were underpopulated to the same extent, there
18 might be possibility of Burbank shifting east, but then
19 we would have the problem that SCSCV (sic) is already
20 well underpopulated and it would be difficult to do a
21 rotation to get population back in there.

22 MS. CLARK: Yeah, that's right. So SCSCV (sic)
23 would become negative fifteen percent, and then -- I
24 mean, minimizing what the ripple would be would be
25 including these areas of Rancho Cucamonga, Claremont,

1 potentially parts of Glendora and with the Antelope
2 Valley/Victor Valley-based district, and then
3 combining -- you know, splitting Santa Clarita Valley and
4 combining that with SCSFV I think would be the smallest
5 number of districts that could be impacted, although not
6 necessarily the most elegant of trades that would be
7 possible, but that would be the way to, like, minimize
8 the change and -- yeah.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Jaime, one other option that I can
10 see is that we would not be able to move all of Glendale
11 into SCSCV (sic), but we could potentially move 75 to
12 80,000 from SD210 into SCSFV and essentially, we'd be
13 switching the deviations. So SCSFV would go from a
14 negative 4-something to a positive 4-something, and SD210
15 would go from the positive 4.7 to a negative 4-point-
16 something. I mean, do colleagues want to explore
17 dividing Glendale?

18 MS. CLARK: Just a quick, like, note on that.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

20 MS. CLARK: I'm so sorry to interrupt. Adding any
21 substantial population from Glendale would change the
22 Latino CVAP in SCSFV to below fifty percent.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so that's why we don't want to
24 do that. Yeah, that's already -- okay. So thank you for
25 that.

1 Commissioner Akutagawa?

2 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I was going to ask
3 about something similar, but for the Armenian community,
4 there's been -- I brought this up already a couple of
5 times. We've done so much for other communities. And it
6 seems like they're very -- they're the largest community,
7 you know, in terms of one of the largest Armenian
8 communities, I think, in the U.S. is here in that
9 Glendale/Burbank area. They've asked to be kept
10 together. They also asked to include La Crescenta and La
11 Canada Flintridge. But it seems like reading one of the
12 COI testimonies that Glendale and Burbank has the densest
13 population of Armenians in the U.S.

14 And so just a question; if we were to try to move
15 more of Burbank, I know that SD210 is overpopulated.
16 There was also requests by both the -- I'll say the LA
17 County side and the San Bernardino side to keep their
18 respective county lines, you know, separate. If Burbank
19 or parts of Burbank were to be moved in, you know, could
20 we move -- I think, what is it, is it Claremont that's --
21 or I don't think it, well. I don't know. Actually, it
22 wouldn't really matter. It'd be the other way around.

23 It's -- anyways, I was just trying to see if there
24 was some way to make it -- try to see if we could try to
25 make it work because I know that SCSFV is underpopulated,

1 but I'm wondering if Burbank, how much of a difference it
2 makes to the Latino CVAP and if there's another
3 configuration that could help raise that but also achieve
4 this other goal. But I guess the question I would just
5 like to ask is, is this an exploration that the
6 Commission, the other Commissioners would want to give a
7 try just for the sake of at least trying, or is this
8 something that the preference is just to move on? I'd
9 like to at least try to see if we could do something, but
10 I also will defer to the rest of the Commissioners
11 because I know where we are, too.

12 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Jaime, do you do you see any
13 way of combining any parts of Burbank and Glendale in
14 either district without decreasing the Latino CVAP in the
15 surrounding districts?

16 MS. CLARK: Creative thinking might mean that
17 Glendale and Burbank could be in the East Ventura-based
18 district together. I think the SCSFV could still be
19 fifty percent Latino CVAP. Again, this would be a big
20 exploration with a lot of creative thinking. And then
21 what would happen with the rest of SD210, I couldn't say
22 off the bat in terms of how to balance it.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Let me let me go to the other
24 hand.

25 MS. CLARK: I --

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead, Jaime.

2 MS. CLARK: -- and just to add to that really
3 quickly is I do think that it would definitely require
4 putting part of the San Fernando Valley with Santa
5 Clarita and Antelope Valleys.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you. Let's go first to
7 the other hands.

8 Commissioner Turner?

9 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I know
10 we've got a lot of recent response to that, so I'd be
11 interested in seeing if it makes sense and not if the
12 testimony makes sense, but where we are currently, if
13 there is something that could be done but I raised my
14 hand. When we're ready to move from this area when I go
15 SBRC Moreno Valley, I guess our latest iteration in SBRC
16 split Hemet, East Hemet and San Jacinto. Is it [Huss-
17 into] or [Juss-into]?

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: San [Ya-cinto].

19 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Jacinto. Anyway, they want to
20 be with Moreno Valley. I know a lot of those are under
21 there. There's a couple of spaces. I just wanted to
22 look at it, Jaime, and see what it is that we've done.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Turner, I
24 appreciate that that. That is in Sivan's area which we
25 just, I thought, closed down. So (indiscernible) --

1 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I waited. I thought it was in
2 this area.

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: Jaime, can you help us?

4 MS. CLARK: I will absolutely try to help. So the
5 question is whether Hemet can be included in SBRC. Is
6 that the --

7 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Moreno --

8 MS. CLARK: -- request or question?

9 COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- Valley. Yes. East Hemet,
10 San Jacinto with Moreno Valley.

11 MS. TRATT: I'm still here. I'm still listening
12 from the background. So Jaime, you can phone a friend if
13 you'd like.

14 MS. CLARK: I'd like to phone a friend, Sivan.

15 MS. TRATT: Thank you so much for bringing that up,
16 Commissioner Turner. I did definitely explore trying to
17 keep -- because I know we've definitely heard a lot of
18 testimony about Hemet, East Hemet, San Jacinto with
19 Moreno Valley. I really, really worked this, like, for a
20 long time, trying a lot of different ways.

21 I was -- just again, keeping in mind that VRA is the
22 number one consideration, I was not able to find an
23 iteration, like, in this area that would keep all of the
24 areas of interest, Hemet, East Hemet, I was -- tried to
25 bring a portion of Hemet in, was unsuccessful. It

1 lowered it below fifty. Remember, we started at fifty
2 yesterday.

3 So I think potentially it would be a question of
4 maybe moving out San Jacinto and moving in Hemet. But I
5 think that that would be far more disruptive to
6 communities of interest and potentially lower that Latino
7 CVAP that's already at fifty-two percent. And I can
8 explore that offline with you if you would like. But I
9 definitely had it in mind when I was looking at this area
10 and definitely tried my best.

11 COMMISSIONER TURNER: No, no, I wanted to hear that,
12 that is what you did. And I apologize. I missed that
13 option. I thought that you were in -- this area was in
14 Los Angeles, I guess. But and I'm so glad you were still
15 there, friend. Thank you for responding.

16 MS. TRATT: I'm just (indiscernible) here in the
17 background, just, yeah, bringing you up to date, so.

18 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Great, thank you.

19 MS. TRATT: Were there any other questions I can
20 answer about this area?

21 COMMISSIONER TURNER: No. I just knew that it had
22 been together, and I'm glad you tried it, and we'll move
23 from here.

24 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Can I have a brief question on
25 this as well -- same issue, same question. Just in terms

1 of -- certainly the Latino CVAP, but also, we know
2 there's a lot of cohesion with African American CVAP.
3 Was there effort to try to raise the African American
4 CVAP? I know we've done everything we can to raise the
5 Latino CVAP in this area.

6 MS. TRATT: Yeah.

7 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm just curious if that was
8 also --

9 MS. TRATT: From where it was before I started
10 working on it, it has been raised. It is lower, I
11 believe, than it was in -- Jaime, do you have the draft
12 labels, or I can look on my side as well.

13 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And I think that's okay. I
14 think I remember it was around fourteen percent, but I
15 know you've raised it from where we have it. So that's
16 what I was looking to hear. Thank you.

17 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I'm noticing that we do have
18 a very minimal underpopulation in MCV. Okay.

19 Commissioner Vazquez has to hop in the car soon.
20 Let's hear from her first.

21 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry, jumping around, but I
22 wanted to make my comment before I got in the car, so
23 thank you. I am interested in exploring, you know,
24 trying to keep Burbank and Glendale together in any
25 iteration. My contingency, or at least my energy would

1 be to see if we can get some of the, I would say, more
2 working-class areas of the West San Gabriel Valley into
3 the SD10 West district.

4 And again, I know we've got conflicting testimony
5 about keeping that Asian COI together versus, like,
6 keeping working-class communities of the San Gabriel
7 Valley together. If we can do something with Glendale
8 that helps us to add some population from Monterey Park,
9 Rosemead, Alhambra, and San Gabriel, that would seem to
10 me, like, maybe a compromise. Not necessary, and I can
11 support this map as is. But that would be where I -- I
12 would try to add population if we took out Glendale.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez. Be
14 safe on the roads. The issue that we deal with, of
15 course, if we if we try moving population east, as it
16 were, so if we if we moved Burbank in moving population
17 down, moving Alhambra, Monterey Park, Rosemead, San
18 Gabriel east is then what do we do at the other end? And
19 I'm not sure we have a good answer for that question.

20 Okay, we've got thirteen minutes.

21 MS. CLARK: Chair Kennedy, could I just respond
22 briefly --

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Um-hum.

24 MS. CLARK: -- which is that if that is something
25 the Commission is interested in exploring, I think that

1 looking at, you know, this is similar, although not
2 exactly what we had in the draft, the lines on the map or
3 the draft right now, it includes those with San Gabriel
4 Valley cities that were just noted in with some of the
5 East San Gabriel cities that are sort of like the core of
6 the current iteration, which I'll turn back on. And then
7 also just to note is that Glendale hasn't moved districts
8 between the different iterations. So moving these areas
9 into 210, or out of 210, I think Glendale would stay put.
10 And definitely, absolutely the question then of what to
11 do with Ontario, Chino, Montclair, Pomona areas on the
12 eastern side of this district certainly arise.

13 And just a note also that I think that including
14 these -- or moving these cities out, we would then need
15 to pull more population from SD210 whether -- yeah. And
16 at this point, if that is talking about such a big
17 rotation that I can't really speak to exactly what that
18 would do, aside from essentially going back to something
19 really similar to the draft, specifically in the west San
20 Bernardino and west Riverside County areas.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you so much for that,
22 Jaime.

23 Commissioner Andersen?

24 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I'm back at the
25 Glendale-Burbank. I was wondering if we take Glendale

1 add it to the Burbank and then took, you know, the areas
2 that are right at the 210, right at the forest, like
3 Sunland-Tujunga, Coyote, Trails (ph.) -- that area and
4 move that into the 210, would that be a, you know, one
5 for the other, and I do -- I do not know whatsoever if
6 that would affect the Latino CVAP or (indiscernible)
7 that.

8 MS. CLARK: I -- so I'm just going to, because I
9 don't remember off the top of my head, but I can tell you
10 that Glendale is almost 200,000 people, so twenty
11 percent-ish of a Senate district. Sunland-Tujunga and
12 Foothill Trails were not 200,000 people. I can find out
13 exactly how much they are right now quickly. But I think
14 it wouldn't be an equal population swap.

15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And it was just a -- it was
16 a thought to (indiscernible).

17 MS. CLARK: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

18 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. And Jaime, just as part
19 of this, so that we're all clear on what we're dealing
20 with, if when you finish this, if you could just
21 highlight Glendale and let us know what the LCVAP is in
22 Glendale.

23 MS. CLARK: Absolutely. So this highlighted area is
24 sixty -- oh, here, I'll move it so everyone can see.
25 It's 66,000 people -- 66,800. And if I pretend like I'm

1 going to make it a new district, we can see just the
2 Latino CVAP in this area alone is 23.58 percent. And for
3 just the city of Glendale, it's 196,000 and the Latino
4 CVAP is 15.79 percent.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. So this is our conundrum.
6 Moving Glendale in is going to crater that LCVAP in SCSFV
7 and not sure we have a reasonable path to building it
8 back up. Okay.

9 Commissioner Toledo?

10 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I thought we were closer
11 to consensus yesterday, that we were, you know, that we
12 were all -- although these aren't perfect maps, but they
13 were maps that we could all support. Certainly, I'm open
14 to exploration in the area as long as it is able to
15 maintain all of our -- all of the criteria we discussed
16 yesterday. But I thought we were -- and maybe we are.
17 Maybe I'm just -- I just want to make sure that we all
18 continue to be able to support these maps that we have.
19 Thank you.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

21 Commissioner Turner?

22 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, right when we had to
23 switch to -- or when we wanted to switch to Commissioner
24 Vazquez, you were still saying something about MCV and I
25 was trying to see where you're going. And if not, I just

1 wanted to be clear as we move from this area that what we
2 answered in response to that particular COI is trying to
3 put San Jacinto, Hemet, East Hemet in with the Moreno
4 Valley, lowered the Latino CVAP and it could -- ought to
5 be done, is what we said.

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: That that is my understanding. I
7 was I was going to say that if we wanted to -- and I
8 believe we tried this exploration looking at, you know,
9 the top portion of Hemet, you know, trying to make this
10 sort of move and without negatively affecting the LCVAP
11 in SBRC, you know, we've got five minutes or so before we
12 are going to be headed to break, we can have the heat map
13 up, we can have the Latino heat map, we can have the
14 black heat map up to see if there are any marginal
15 changes that we want to make. But you know, I think we
16 have tried to explore this, and we haven't been
17 successful before.

18 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Andrew, I see you nodding,
19 yes, Andrew.

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Andrew?

21 MR. DRESCHLER: Yes, if I may, Chair, yeah. I was
22 working with Sivan a little bit last night after we went
23 off camera just to explore this option a little bit more.
24 And you know, we started the day with Latino CVAP at just
25 over fifty percent, and you know, when we worked -- I

1 remember working in the meeting, playing around moving in
2 population from Hemet and just -- we struggled to get to
3 fifty-one percent Latino CVAP. And then, you know,
4 offline, she did continue to explore a couple of
5 different options with the Hemet, and we were unable to
6 get it, you know -- get the Latino CVAP to fifty-two --
7 over fifty-two percent with Hemet. And so yes, we did
8 explore this quite a bit, Commissioner Turner.

9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Andrew.

10 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fernandez?

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. At this point I'm
13 fine with the maps and I just -- I feel that the moves of
14 Glendale and Burbank would cause all this ripple effects
15 and then to get them together, then it's going to cause
16 some other issues somewhere else with other communities
17 of interest. So I would suggest we just move on. So
18 thank you.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: You. Thank you, Commissioner
20 Fernandez.

21 Commissioner Sinay?

22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I would recommend we move
23 forward. I mean, what's really difficult is kind of
24 buyer's remorse to a certain extent, or remorse, you
25 know, could I -- could we -- could I and you know, we're

1 all doing it in different parts of the maps. And you
2 know, I keep wanting to say let's do something that makes
3 us a little scared every day, and I think we're doing a
4 lot that makes us scared. And I'm, you know, it's a
5 journey we're doing together. And I just keep asking us
6 to please trust each other and no, I can tell you right
7 now, I'm feeling -- I'm trying to think, okay, San Diego
8 and Imperial Valley, we did it so quickly -- what did I
9 miss. What did -- and you know, we can do that on any
10 part and every part of this map. And I'm sure, you know,
11 people can tell me everything I missed. But
12 collectively, I think we've caught each other. And let's
13 just keep moving forward and then sleep on it and see
14 what we feel in the morning.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

16 Commissioner Akutagawa.

17 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I have a question for
18 Jaime. And again, I'm trying to -- without going into
19 line drawing, I'm just trying to make sure that we
20 explore everything. The -- besides the Glendale/Burbank,
21 the other COI testimony that I read was the cities of
22 Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village -- I guess
23 they, along with Hidden Hills and Malibu, we had read in
24 other testimony that they form a COG and they noted that
25 in the Senate map they are separated or they were, I

1 guess, Hidden Hills is separated. It looks like they're
2 together with Malibu now.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not Hidden Hill.

4 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Not Hidden Hills, okay. I
5 think that was the only other thing. So I thought Malibu
6 was separated. So I was thinking, I was like, would that
7 make a difference if we were to move Glendale in and all
8 that stuff? But okay, it's a much smaller problem than I
9 thought we had, so okay. I am hearing what the
10 Commission's saying. Just a question. Do we want to try
11 to move Hidden Hills in, is it worth it, is it worth it,
12 is it possible -- since they do have that COG together?

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. And we have done that in at
14 least one of the other maps.

15 So Jaime, just if you could let us know if it's
16 possible to move Hidden Hills over without pushing
17 SHORELINE over the five percent. It is possible.

18 MS. CLARK: It is possible; would you like me to
19 make this change?

20 CHAIR KENNEDY: Any objection?

21 Okay, please proceed. Thank you.

22 Commissioner Taylor?

23 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you, Chair. So I look
24 at some of some of what we're asking for right now as
25 just trying to refine what we're doing and not

1 necessarily trying to reshape the map, so I think we're
2 trying to be responsive to some of the feedback we're
3 getting. I think it helps to put out into the public
4 sphere some of the whys (sic) things work and why things
5 don't and adds more context into the entirety of this
6 matter. So I think some of these questions are
7 helpful. -- this Burbank/Glendale was helpful. And I
8 think it's appropriate in this -- they need to ask and
9 if -- and we can see why we can and can't do it. So I
10 don't see it as trying to reshape or think of anything
11 differently, we're merely trying to do those last little
12 final steps and explain to our public why -- and
13 explained to our community partners why it is we can and
14 can't do something.

15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. No, that's excellent. Thank
16 you for making that point.

17 Commissioner Toledo.

18 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. Thank you, Commissioner
19 Taylor for providing that insight. I think that's right.
20 And I think I'm fully supportive of these maps as are,
21 and I am fine with looking at additional refinements as
22 long as we have -- are able to do so. But time is
23 running out.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Time is running out. Thank you so
25 much.

1 I understand from Andrew that Sivan does have some
2 options for SAA. Unfortunately, it is time for a break.
3 We also need the instructions for call-in to be read.
4 Public comment will begin at 6:45 immediately upon our
5 return from the break. In accordance with our newly
6 adopted policy, the lines will not close. We will
7 instead respect a total limit of three hours of public
8 comment.

9 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much, Chair.
10 In order to maximize transparency and public
11 participation in our process, the Commissioners will be
12 taking public comment by phone.

13 To call in, dial the telephone number provided on
14 the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted,
15 enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream
16 feed. It is 85932989398 for this meeting. When prompted
17 to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound key.

18 Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a
19 queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press
20 star nine. This will raise your hand for the moderator.
21 When it is your turn to speak, you'll hear a message that
22 says, the host would like you to talk and to press star
23 six to speak. If you would like to give your name,
24 please state and spell it for the record. You are not
25 required to provide your name to give public comment.

1 Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream
2 audio to prevent any distortion during your call. Once
3 you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is
4 your turn to speak. And again, please turn down the
5 livestream volume.

6 And Chair, I will pass it back to you.

7 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. As mentioned, it is now
8 time for our fifteen-minute break. So we will be back at
9 6:45 to begin taking public comment. Thank you,
10 everyone.

11 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 6:30 p.m.
12 until 6:45 p.m.)

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your
14 patience during our fifteen-minute break. We have
15 concluded our mapping for the day. We made some good
16 progress on both congressional districts as well as
17 Senate districts. And we are now ready to hear from the
18 public. Our public comment period is open. Katy, could
19 you please take it away?

20 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Absolutely. Thank you,
21 Chair.

22 Public comment periods will be a minute and thirty
23 seconds this evening; you will receive a verbal warning
24 at thirty seconds and fifteen seconds remaining. We will
25 be taking public comment for three hours, up until 9:45.

1 I will be identifying you by the last four digits of your
2 telephone number. If you will please remain alert for
3 when I call those numbers out. And if you will please
4 speak at a steady pace with all county names, numbers,
5 cities, and your comment in general so that the
6 Commissioners and translators can understand.

7 Right now we have caller 0013, and up next after
8 that will be caller 0396.

9 Caller 0013, please follow the prompts. And one
10 more time, caller with the last four digits 0013, if
11 you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing
12 star 6. 0013, I do apologize for some type of
13 connectivity issue at the moment. I will come back
14 around to you momentarily.

15 Right now, we have caller with the last four digits
16 0396. Up next after that will be caller 0805.

17 Caller 0396, please follow the prompts to unmute by
18 pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.
20 I'd like to share my strong opposition to the iteration
21 STCV-2 (ph.), 3, and 4 of the KINGSTULAKERN congressional
22 district (indiscernible). The Commission should honor
23 the draft maps that they put out. The district need to
24 be compact and reflect the community. Maps that connect
25 random areas from around the Central Valley are not

1 honoring the community of interest. Some of these maps
2 can only be justified as -- justified by race as primary
3 criteria and CVAP score. The Commission cannot allow any
4 organization to dictate the entire Central Valley. The
5 Commission shouldn't cave to every wish, want, and desire
6 of a hyperpolarized political group such as Dolores
7 Huerta Foundation, because all she is doing is putting
8 communities of interests in jeopardy. Thank you.

9 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
10 right now, we have caller 0805, and up next after that
11 will be caller 1043.

12 Caller 0805, please follow the prompts. The floor
13 is yours.

14 MS. STERLING: Hi there, this is Claire Sterling
15 (ph.) from the San Fernando Valley. Thank you to the
16 Commissioners again for doing such a great job. I really
17 just wanted to call in one more time. I know that you
18 guys are doing such a great job, but unfortunately, the
19 San Fernando Valley and the Assembly maps have not been
20 finished completely.

21 So I really just want to say if we could go back,
22 I've been looking, and I support the LA firefighter map.
23 It does a really great job of creating a Latino
24 opportunity (indiscernible) including some really
25 incredible communities like Van Nuys, North Hills, Valley

1 Glen, making sure the Filipino community stays whole, the
2 Jewish community stays whole, the LGBTQIA community stays
3 whole. And that's really what we're looking for here in
4 the San Fernando Valley. So if you guys can think about
5 that when you go back to it, that's really what we're
6 looking for. Thank you so much. Have a good night.

7 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
8 right now we have caller 1043. And up next, after that
9 would be caller 2714.

10 Caller 1043, please follow the prompts. The floor
11 is yours.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioner. We, the
13 Little Saigon community, we're continuing to calling in
14 every day to make sure our voice heard.

15 Commissioner Andersen, thank you for listening to us
16 for months. We have been calling in, sending email
17 (indiscernible) to make our voice is heard. All we ask
18 for is to keep the inland part of Huntington Beach with
19 Little Saigon in congressional, Senate, and Assembly. I
20 am asking you to please go back to the GGW and add in
21 Huntington Beach. Every time I call in, I only hear
22 overwhelming support for Huntington Beach and Little
23 Saigon and very few not. So I don't understand why
24 Commissioner Akutagawa hesitate and always make up
25 excuses not to add Huntington Beach in. I'm asking you

1 to make sure leaders of Saigon community --

2 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- have one voice to protect
4 our community of interests. Thank you for listening and
5 good night.

6 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

7 And right now we have caller 2714, and up next after
8 that will be caller 3640.

9 Caller 2714, please follow the prompts. The floor
10 is yours.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. I have made
12 comments and also call in the last couple of months
13 regarding Little Saigon district. I have spent at least
14 a couple hour on the phone waiting to be called on to
15 make public comment almost every day, and I will continue
16 to do so because this is very important to me and our
17 Little Saigon community. This will affect us for the
18 next ten years.

19 Thank you, Commissioner Andersen, for wanting to
20 revisit the Little Saigon congressional map. Your
21 comments give us hope. You talk about adding Huntington
22 Beach to Senate and congressional map, and we can't thank
23 you enough for it. When you are finished with the
24 congressional map, please go back and relook at the GGW
25 Assembly map again. Please consider Inland Park or

1 Huntington Beach to Assembly map by adding all of North
2 Garfield Street and --

3 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- (indiscernible) Street in
5 Huntington Beach. You can remove Stanton and east Garden
6 Grove, since they have no common interest with us. By
7 doing this, the Commission will give the Vietnamese
8 American community a vote in the Senate, Assembly to
9 ensure that we have a true representation for the next
10 ten years. Please respect our community, family, and
11 children. Have a good evening.

12 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

13 And right now we have caller 3640, and up next after
14 that will be caller 4434.

15 Caller 3640, please follow the prompts. The floor
16 is yours.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.
18 I would like to share my strong opposition to iterations
19 STCV-2, 3, and 4 of KINGTULAKERN congressional
20 visualization. The Commission should honor the draft
21 maps that you put out. These districts need to be
22 compact and reflect the community. Maps that connect
23 random areas from all over the Central Valley are not
24 honoring the community. Some of these maps can only be
25 justified by race as the primary criteria. The

1 Commission should not allow one organization to dictate
2 the entire Central Valley. The Commission should not
3 cave to every wish, want, and desire of a hyperpolarized
4 political group such as Dolores Huerta Foundation,
5 because those doing so will put communities of interests
6 in jeopardy. Thank you.

7 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

8 And right now, we will have 4434, and up next after
9 that is caller 4607.

10 Caller 4434, please follow the prompts. The floor
11 is yours.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, my name is Sue (ph.), and
13 I'd like to comment on the map for this eastern central
14 California district, and I'm asking that you not combine
15 Clovis and North Fresno with the Sierra Mountain area.
16 Our issues are really different from each other. Rural
17 California's pressing issues include wildfires and forest
18 management and difficulty getting homeowner insurance,
19 and logging and recreation. We're a tourism area.
20 There's just a lot of different issues. And we are --
21 we're a more rural area and the Fresno and Clovis area
22 are much more compact, much more metropolitan than us.
23 And so I'm just asking that you would consider that and
24 not throw us into an area that doesn't really reflect the
25 same needs.

1 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

2 And right now we have caller 4607, and up next after
3 that is caller 5038.

4 Caller 4607, please see the prompts. The floor is
5 yours.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioner. I just
7 wanted to express my appreciation to Commissioner Kennedy
8 for your comments the other day for wanting to go back to
9 Little Saigon district map. Please protect Little Saigon
10 and stand by our side. Adding North Garfield Avenue in
11 Huntington Beach to give us the final presentation for
12 Assembly we need for the next decade. Just adding North
13 Garfield Avenue but stopping at Beach Boulevard doesn't
14 make any sense because by stopping there, it would not
15 include Huntington Harbor, where over forty percent of
16 residents are Vietnamese Americans and still doesn't make
17 our education or school district cross over complete. I
18 had a lot of comments this week surrounding Little
19 Saigon, but I am disappointed that while our community
20 has advocated for months to act to include Inland Park
21 portion of Huntington Beach with Little Saigon, it was
22 only suggested to have a few (indiscernible) added to our
23 community. Thank you for listening.

24 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

25 And right now, we have caller 5038, and up next



1 after that will be caller 5179.

2 Caller 5038, please follow the prompts. Caller with
3 the last four digits -- oh, there you are. The floor is
4 yours.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi there, Commissioners.
6 Thank you so much for agreeing to make the swap with
7 Sylmar and connecting it with the eastern San Fernando
8 Valley for the congressional map; it's super important
9 for the eastern San Fernando Valley to be together in
10 this congressional map. Additionally, too, I'd like to
11 thank you all for listening to the community and creating
12 the supermajority Latino Senate district in the San
13 Fernando Valley.

14 The last thing that you guys need to do is please
15 focus on the Assembly maps. Specifically, you should
16 listen to the community and please create the
17 supermajority Latino Assembly districts in the San
18 Fernando Valley, keeping the San Fernando Valley
19 together. That remains the last thing that you guys need
20 to do to do.

21 Additionally to that is create Santa Clarita Valley
22 and connect it with the northwestern part of Los Angeles.
23 You guys can probably reference the Senate map that you
24 all drafted, which is perfect. It's exactly what
25 everyone needs. So it correctly solves the issue with

1 the San Fernando Valley and Santa Clarita Valley and
2 creates equitable representation for everyone in the
3 community. So thank you all for listening. And I know
4 I'm not alone on this, so thank you all for the hard work
5 you do. Thank you.

6 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

7 And right now is caller 5179, and up next after that
8 is caller 5777.

9 Caller 5179, please follow the prompts. The floor
10 is yours.

11 MS. WONG: Hi, good evening, Commissioners. This is
12 Amy Wong (ph.), and I'd like to comment on the San
13 Gabriel Valley. You all did a great job at the
14 congressional level, but I'm calling in with concerns
15 about our San Gabriel Valley Senate districts. The
16 cities in the West San Gabriel Valley, which include
17 Alhambra, Monterey Park, San Gabriel, and Rosemead,
18 deserve to maintain their political power by remaining in
19 a Latino majority AAPI-influenced Senate district that
20 adequately represents the diversity of our region.

21 But while we support shared federal stewardship of
22 the San Gabriel Mountains and communities in Alhambra and
23 Monterey Park who use it, we don't think the Senate seats
24 should follow the congressional seat logic. In regards
25 to state and local policies, affluent white communities

1 in the foothills hold an enormous amount of political
2 power over smaller working-class cities in the west San
3 Gabriel Valley. This is especially shown in the 710 and
4 10 freeway debate.

5 A secondary effect is that the eastern San Gabriel
6 Valley is pushed into the Inland Empire, which stretches
7 El Monte all the way to Pomona, Chino, and Ontario.

8 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

9 MS. WONG: Grouping these separate communities of
10 interest does not make any sense. Regarding Assembly
11 districts, I do want to thank you for including El Monte
12 in Assembly District 49. However, I urge you to use
13 Garvey Avenue or Rush Street instead of the 10 freeway as
14 the border. That way, more API communities -- community
15 members can be included in the API-majority district.
16 Thank you so much.

17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

18 And right now we have caller 5777, and up next after
19 that is caller 6311.

20 Caller 5777, please follow the prompts. The floor
21 is yours.

22 MS. MUN: Hello, Commissioners and first of all,
23 thank you for all your hard work. My name is Tina Mun
24 (ph.). I have been a resident in Huntington Beach for
25 over ten years. Keeping Huntington Beach with Fountain

1 Valley, Westminster, and Seal Beach makes a lot of sense
2 for our many shared community of interests. All of these
3 cities currently together in our Assembly, Senate and
4 Congress districts.

5 Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy, for exploring the
6 GGW map to remove East Garden Grove starting Euclid for
7 the Assembly district for the Little Saigon. You are
8 going onto the right direction that we have asked for.
9 Please do all of north of Huntington Beach, all Garfield
10 and Huntington Beach. It would be a good idea to remove
11 Stanton as well, since they don't have any community of
12 interest with Little Saigon. I actually haven't been to
13 Stanton. I don't even know if they have any --

14 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

15 MS. MUN: -- Vietnamese business there. Thank you
16 again, Commissioner Kennedy.

17 And I'm asking if all of other Commissioners would
18 please do consider our comments as well. Thank you for
19 all your hard work and have a good evening.

20 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

21 MS. MUN: Good night.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

23 And right now, we have caller 6311, and up next
24 after that will be caller 6855.

25 Caller 6311, please follow the prompts. The floor

1 is yours.

2 MS. COLE: Hi, thank you. My name is Robyn Cole
3 (ph.) from San Joaquin County. I've been in San Joaquin
4 County for forty years, and I'm asking you to keep us
5 whole as -- as whole as possible. Please do not put us
6 with Sacramento and Elk Grove. Our needs -- our
7 infrastructure is completely different. By putting us
8 with Sacramento in Elk Grove, anyone in San Joaquin, all
9 of our voices will be silenced because we're just not big
10 enough to compete with the Sacramento area. We are our
11 own community, and we don't have anything in common with
12 Sacramento and Elk Grove other than we're in the central
13 part of California. But our needs are different. Please
14 take those into account, make San Joaquin County as whole
15 as possible. Do not include us with Sacramento and Elk
16 Grove. We really need to have our own independent voice
17 in Congress to support our needs. Thank you very much
18 for taking the time. Thank you for all your hard work.
19 We do appreciate it.

20 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

21 And right now we have caller 6855, and up next after
22 will be caller 7682.

23 Caller 6855, please follow the prompts. The floor
24 is yours.

25 MR. SUKATAN: Commissioners, good evening, Samuel

1 Sukatan (ph.) from Navarro (ph.) Voters Education Fund
2 here. It's been a couple of days since I've spoken to
3 you. Seems like you're having a bear of a time, and I
4 know that the deadline is bearing down upon us. So I
5 appreciate your good humor and your consistent attempts
6 to draw and redraw. Commissioner Sadhwani made some
7 comments earlier about the 210 -- an SD210, excuse me,
8 district and the questions of federal stewardship, and I
9 figured I'd kind of return to that on a principal
10 question. You see, I feel in SD210, you've done the same
11 thing that you're doing in eastern California with the
12 kind of Modesto water user versus water loser question,
13 and doing the same thing again in the north coast, the
14 north San Diego congressional district, in that there was
15 a very specific kind of environmental question that
16 people have opposite sides of and the opposite sides of
17 that community bound by that environmental question
18 should be able to elect somebody who will fight the
19 corner on the question.

20 So in the case of the Sierra --

21 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

22 MR. SUKATAN: -- water, somebody who was keeping
23 water rather than somebody and versus somebody mixing
24 with Modesto, right? Same thing with the San Onofre
25 Nuclear Generating Station. And in the case of the

1 Senate seat (indiscernible), dealing with the 710 and 10
2 freeways.

3 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

4 MR. SUKATAN: We did support the federal change.
5 While we don't support it in the Senate, you'll hear more
6 about that as the night goes on. But definitely
7 appreciate your consideration, and please keep talking.

8 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

9 And right now we have caller 7682, and up next after
10 that will be caller 7726.

11 Caller 7682, please follow the prompts. The floor
12 is yours.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, Commissioners. My name
14 is Rami, and I've been a lifetime resident of San Diego.
15 I'm calling in concern of Encanto and Paradise Hills in
16 southeastern San Diego, specifically in the Senate
17 district maps. I'm really concerned that Encanto and
18 Paradise Hills are split between COR-CAJON and SECA.
19 Paradise Hills is on the southern boundary of the COR-
20 CAJON map. They're super important areas in the
21 southeastern SD area that should remain whole in this
22 COR-CAJON district. Encanto and Paradise Hills are
23 historical black communities in southeast San Diego that
24 will face the backlash if they're split. I please urge
25 you to keep all of southeast San Diego in COR-CAJON

1 district. Thank you so much.

2 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

3 And right now, we have caller 7726, and up after
4 that will be caller 8037.

5 Caller 7726, please follow the prompts.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. Good evening,
7 Commissioners. My name is Matt and I'm a resident of
8 Alhambra. I'm calling to express my opposition to the
9 state Commission splitting the West SGV from the East
10 SGV. West SGV cities along the 10 freeway, such
11 Alhambra, Monterey Park, San Gabriel, and Rosemead are
12 currently being connected to white, affluent foothill
13 cities such as Pasadena, La Canada, and Bradbury.

14 The SGV has its unique issues and challenges and
15 deserves its own representative in the Senate. Small SGV
16 cities are constantly fighting for resources. We have
17 been working in a coalition together to improve our
18 neighborhood and secure regional dollars. In policy
19 decision, preference is often given to affluent
20 communities such as in the 710 and 10 debate while low-
21 income residents in the SGV continue to carry the burden
22 of poor air quality and traffic congestion. We deserve
23 proper representation. Please respect working class
24 communities of color in the SGV. Thank you.

25 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

1 And right now we have caller 8037, and up next after
2 that will be caller 9938.

3 Caller 8037, please follow the prompts. The floor
4 is yours.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. First of all, I want to
6 say thank you to all the Commissioners for your work.
7 When you revisit the congressional districts one last
8 time, I hope you don't plan on making too many major
9 changes in Orange County. Our community has engaged a
10 lot in this process, and I certainly think the current
11 maps are close to reasonable compromise. Any changes
12 should be contained swaps within our Orange County
13 districts because we are happy to have four strong
14 congressional districts mostly contained within our
15 district -- mostly contained within our county. Thanks
16 for all your work and for listening to the callers from
17 our community.

18 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

19 And right now, we have caller 9938, and then up next
20 after that we will retry that caller 0013.

21 Caller 9938, please follow the prompts to unmute by
22 pressing star -- there you are. The floor is yours.

23 Caller 9938, will you please double check your phone,
24 make sure you are not on mute. You are unmuted in the
25 meeting.

1 MR. MANOFF: Caller 9938, if you could please call
2 back from a different phone.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

4 Right now, we have caller 03 -- I'm sorry, wait, no,
5 we were retrying caller 0013, and then up next after that
6 will be caller 0317.

7 Caller 00 -- caller 0013, if you will please follow
8 the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. Caller with
9 the last four digits, 0013, please follow the prompts to
10 unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Commissioners, for
12 preserving the voice of San Jose. We agree with the
13 decision to implement Map 3 as discussed today. Thank
14 you so much for listening to our community and not
15 splitting us up into four districts. We appreciate all
16 your hard work on this matter and agree that Map 3 allows
17 the tenth largest city in America to keep a
18 representative that speaks for us. Happy holidays.
19 Thank you.

20 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

21 And right now, we will have caller 0317, and up next
22 after that will be caller 0983.

23 Caller 0317, please follow the prompts. The floor
24 is yours.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, good evening,

1 Commissioners. I have spoken before the Commission many,
2 many times and have participated today listening in to
3 your comments since about 3 o'clock this afternoon. I
4 would like to begin my comments by saying the following.
5 And thank you so much.

6 Thank you, Commissioner Yee and Commissioner Ahmad
7 for developing a plan YA, San Jose congressional district
8 iteration 3. And thank you for so many of the
9 Commissioners supporting the map iteration 3. Thank you
10 to Commissioner Sadhwani and Commissioner Toledo fully
11 supportive of this idea. Thank you, Chair Kennedy, for
12 asking for this exploration.

13 I support Plan YA, Senate and congressional district
14 iteration 3 which is September 15th, 2021. It is very
15 similar to CD_GREATERED which has been roughly the same
16 for several weeks due to many COI's testimony that
17 support it. Iteration 3 is similar to current
18 CD_GREATERED, which is ascribed to many ways COI's
19 testimony from now to back in the summer. The COI
20 (indiscernible) included many letters --

21 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- unanimous votes by
23 (indiscernible) City Council, Santa Clarita Council,
24 majority of Fremont, (indiscernible) and the MALDEF maps
25 submitted led by the Asian Law Alliance Organization and

1 hundreds of individuals for GREATERED submitted during
2 the summer.

3 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you again for this
5 (indiscernible) process, (indiscernible) to consensus,
6 collaboration, cooperation. This Commission has been a
7 on a model of hard work, effectiveness, and dedication,
8 and I thank you for your time.

9 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

10 Right now, we have caller 0983, and up next after
11 that will be caller 2567.

12 Caller 0983, please follow the prompts. The floor
13 is yours.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. I have
15 been living in Huntington Beach for five years, and more
16 and more Vietnamese Americans have moved here because of
17 better school districts. I am asking you to listen to
18 the hundreds of calls, emails and (indiscernible) that
19 have been submitted for months from the one Little Saigon
20 community has been very involved and watching the meeting
21 very closely. We are asking (indiscernible) Garfield
22 Street on the way to (indiscernible) in the Huntington
23 Beach (indiscernible) and East Garden Grove at Euclid
24 street. Keep Little Saigon together and allow the growth
25 for the next decade. Thank you and have a good night.

1 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

2 And right now we have caller 2567, and up next after
3 that will be caller 2911.

4 Caller 2567, please follow the prompts. The floor
5 is yours.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Commissioners, I would like
7 to share my strong opposition to Iteration STCV-2, 3, and
8 4 of Kings-Tulare-Kern congressional visualization. The
9 Commission should honor the draft maps that they put out.
10 These districts need to be compact and reflect the
11 community. Maps that connect random areas from all
12 around the Central Valley are not honoring a community.
13 Some of these maps can only be justified by race of the
14 primary criteria.

15 The Commission should not allow one organization to
16 dictate the entire Central Valley. The Commission
17 shouldn't cave to every wish, want, and desire of a
18 hyperpolarized political group such as the Dolores Huerta
19 Foundation, because doing so will put communities of
20 interests in jeopardy. We strongly urge the Commission
21 to keep Kings County as a whole, as they have no interest
22 in being separated into two congressional districts. It
23 is a disservice to its people and will harm their ability
24 to be represented in an equitable way. Thank you.

25 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

1 And right now, we'll have 2911, and up next after
2 that we'll have caller 2931.

3 Right now we have caller 2911. Please follow the
4 prompts. The floor is yours.

5 MS. ARICA: Good evening, Commissioners and staff.
6 My name is Janine Arica (ph.), speaking on the Senate
7 maps in San Diego County. I've been calling for the past
8 month and our community members have been calling in
9 since January 2020, and time and time again have
10 continued to express their communities of interest, which
11 is why I'm alarmed that Encanto and Paradise Hills are
12 split between COR-CAJON and southeast CA. Important
13 areas in southeast San Diego should remain whole in COR-
14 CAJON district, as months and hundreds of communities of
15 interest testimony and commenters told you.

16 There are historical black communities in southeast
17 San Diego. And we know that across the nation, across
18 the state, our black communities continue to be the most
19 marginalized and will be the ones who face repercussions
20 if they continue to be split. I urge you to please,
21 please honor the diversity of our state and continue to
22 keep southeast San Diego whole. So please keep all of
23 San Diego in COR-CAJON --

24 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

25 MS. ARICA: -- district and set a precedent that

1 will dramatically change the next ten years. Thank you.

2 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

3 Right now we have caller 2931, and up next after
4 that will be caller 4201.

5 Caller 2931, please follow the prompts. The floor
6 is yours.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioner, I have
8 calling in every day and willing to wait in the queue for
9 hours because of Assembly map of GGW is not done for
10 Little Saigon. Please complete by adding on the North
11 Garfield Street south at Seapoint Street in Huntington
12 Beach to Little Saigon map. This area has been nearly
13 50,000 Asian Americans, ninety percent of which are
14 Vietnamese Americans.

15 Thank you, Commissioner Andersen, for paying closing
16 attention to Little Saigon. Please protect us and make
17 sure Little Saigon have a true presentation.

18 Commissioner Akutagawa, if you already consider
19 adding the Island Park of Huntington Beach in
20 congressional and Senate district, why didn't you go back
21 to change Assembly district as well? I don't understand
22 your thought process. Do you have a different agenda
23 that you can please share with us? Please, please listen
24 to the voice of Little Saigon. Please keep us together.

25 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. Have a good
2 night.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

4 Now, right now, we have caller 4201, and up next
5 after that will be caller 5181.

6 Caller 4201, please follow the prompts. Caller with
7 the last four digits 4201, please follow the prompts to
8 unmute by pressing star 6. Caller 4201, you appear to
9 have some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I
10 will come back around.

11 Right now, we have caller 5181, and up next after
12 that is caller 6070.

13 Caller 5181, please follow the prompts. The floor
14 is yours.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.
16 I'm pleased to see that you have all changed the Senate
17 map, the San Fernando Valley, to properly represent
18 everyone. I'm also pleased to see that you are also
19 honoring the Latino communities' request for Sylmar to
20 join the eastern San Fernando Valley. This is absolutely
21 necessary for proper representation.

22 The last thing you need to do is please change the
23 Assembly map for Santa Clarita, so it looks like the
24 Senate one and extends all the way to northwest Los
25 Angeles. Please remember that Acton and Agua Dulce are

1 part of the Santa Clarita Valley. So they have to be
2 together when moving the map north. Thank you for your
3 time, Commissioners.

4 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And thank you so much.

5 And right now we have caller 6070, and then up next
6 after that will be caller 6957.

7 Caller 6070, please follow the prompts. The floor
8 is yours.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. Thank
10 you for all your hard work and for listening to the San
11 Fernando Valley community. My name is David. We are
12 pleased to see that you have changed the Senate map
13 (audio interference) involve specifically the Latino
14 community. Also, thank you for agreeing to keep Sylmar
15 with the eastern San Fernando Valley in the congressional
16 map. This is really important.

17 You all need to focus on creating an Assembly
18 district for the Santa Clarita Valley that has Acton and
19 Agua Dulce in it. They're a hundred percent part of the
20 Santa Clarita Valley. So please keep the Santa Clarita
21 Valley intact in making the maps and make the Assembly
22 district push northwest into the rest of Los Angeles like
23 (indiscernible) Park. The Senate map is a good blueprint
24 as to how the Santa Clarita Valley Assembly map should
25 look. So please these changes so our community can be --

1 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- properly represented for
3 the next decade. Thank you.

4 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

5 And right now we have caller 6957, and up next after
6 that is caller 7592.

7 Caller 6957, please follow the prompts. Caller with
8 the last four digits 6957, please follow the prompts to
9 unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

10 MS. CASTILLO: Hi. My name is Felicia Castillo
11 (ph.), and I'm the Vice President of External Affairs of
12 the (indiscernible) Associated Student Government of UCR.
13 I'm here to urge you all to adjust the California State
14 Assembly district boundaries that encompass UCR. UCR is
15 located at 900 University Avenue, and it's a community of
16 interest. Students like myself have a greater connection
17 to the communities in the proposed AD 58 district that is
18 included in the December 8th iteration. I'd like to draw
19 your attention to the alternative maps that were
20 submitted by campus architect Jacqueline Norman. And
21 Norman's comment ID number 40611 for the actual map and
22 shapefile. We very much appreciate your attention to
23 this matter. Thank you.

24 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

25 Right now, we have caller 7592, and up next after

1 that will be caller 8224.

2 Caller 7592, please follow the prompts. The floor
3 is yours.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you and good evening.
5 In regards to congressional redistricting in Santa Clara
6 County, I ask that the Commission to reconsider its
7 adoption of Plan YA iteration number 3, which you
8 approved today. With the adoption of this plan versus
9 the current Congressional District 17 for CD_GREATERED,
10 Asian majority areas from Fremont in West San Jose would
11 be removed, while nonAsian majority areas of San Jose
12 would be added, as well as the white majority Los Altos,
13 Los Altos Hills, and Loyola. I would guess that
14 CD_GREATERED's Asian CVAP is lower than the current CD 17
15 Asian CVAP. Plan YA iteration number 3 splits the 2020
16 census Asian majority Saratoga, a city with fewer than
17 35,000 residents between two congressional districts. By
18 comparison, San Jose is more than one million
19 residents -- more than one million residents. I ask that
20 the Commission reconsider Plan YA iteration --

21 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- number 1, which, as with
23 iteration number 3 divides San Jose among three
24 congressional districts. You can also see my public
25 inputs 4536 and 4585. And please ask Tamina to explore

1 if an Asian CVAP majority CD_GREATERED could be created.

2 Thank you so much.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And right now we have
4 caller 8224, and up next after that will be caller 6789.

5 Caller 8224, please follow the prompts. The floor
6 is yours.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening -- good evening,
8 Commissioners. Our Little Saigon community has grown in
9 the last forty years from the (indiscernible) of
10 Westminster to Garden Grove, Fountain Valley, and now
11 into -- in Huntington Beach, Seal Beach, Rossmoor, and
12 Los Alamitos. It's important to the elders in our
13 community to have access to health care system like
14 hospital and doctor who speak Vietnamese or has immediate
15 access to translate. This a very important with Garden
16 Grove, Westminster, Fountain Valley, and Huntington
17 Beach. We need your help to make sure our community is
18 well-represented by an Assembly member who truly
19 understands the culture and unique tradition of our
20 community. The inland part of Huntington Beach belong to
21 Little Saigon, though the Vietnamese American community
22 has grown beyond Westminster and Garden Grove. While I
23 appreciate Commissioner Andersen consider -- sorry --

24 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- consider add Huntington

1 Beach to Little Saigon for our congressional and Senate.
2 Please don't forget to go back and Assembly -- and
3 complete the Assembly district. Thank you.

4 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

5 And right now we have caller 6789, and then up next
6 after that will be caller 9799.

7 Caller 6789, please follow the prompts. The floor
8 is yours.

9 MR. TRAN: Hey, Commissioners. My name's Vincent
10 Tran (ph.). I'm a Fountain Valley resident. Firstly, I
11 want to thank the Commission for keeping Little Saigon
12 full and keeping Huntington Beach out of Little Saigon.
13 A number of the callers have called Huntington Beach a
14 vibrant Vietnamese community of over 25,000 people. If
15 anyone simply goes on data.census.gov and type in
16 Vietnamese Huntington Beach, the only available data
17 clearly states that there are only 8,000 Vietnamese
18 people -- less than five percent of the total population.
19 When you search Asian Huntington Beach, you will see that
20 the Asian population is 25,000. It's clear that these
21 callers are trying to provide false facts and are
22 politically motivated and organized by interest in
23 Huntington Beach.

24 Second, I heard the Commission was attempting to
25 increase the Latino CVAP for the state Senate district

1 SAA. I want to suggest to add portions of west Santa Ana
2 into North OC-COAST district. And I think that would
3 increase the Latino CVAP for SAA and also bring together
4 the Vietnamese COI in N-OC-COAST.

5 As I mentioned before, there are over 24,000
6 Vietnamese in Santa Ana all concentrated in west Santa
7 Ana. And in 2018, when the city was sued by the Asian
8 Americans Advancing Justice because there --

9 MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

10 MR. TRAN: -- at large election was disenfranchising
11 Asian American voters, the city created a board for Asian
12 voters, and eventually elected their first --

13 MR. MANOFF: Ten.

14 MR. TRAN: -- Asian American council member. Now,
15 west Santa Ana west of Harbor Boulevard contains a large
16 portion of Vietnamese voters --

17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

18 And right now we have caller 9779, and up next after
19 that we have caller 5719.

20 Caller 9779, please follow the prompts. The floor
21 is yours.

22 MS. TAYLOR: Good evening. My name is Courtney
23 Taylor (ph.), and I'm calling from the City of Los
24 Angeles to thank you all Commissioners and Commission
25 staff for your tireless efforts on behalf of the

1 residents of the State of California. You took on the
2 Herculean task of drawing these lines in consideration of
3 the legal and regulatory framework while also trying to
4 be responsive to the enormous amount of public input and
5 many competing interests. I mean, there's no possible
6 way for you to satisfy everyone. But I am confident,
7 having watched this process from the beginning, from the
8 lottery selection of the first part of the staff and then
9 watching them take in public comment to choose what
10 became the final fourteen Commissioners -- and community
11 outreach and billboards popping up and all the social
12 media. You really want to engage with the community and
13 hear what they have to say.

14 It's just been amazing to watch. I appreciate it.
15 I have such a great appreciation for what you're doing,
16 and I'm confident that you're going to do your best in
17 the spirit of compromise to put forth the best maps on
18 behalf of all Californians. So again, thank you for your
19 effort.

20 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

21 MS. TAYLOR: Keep up the hard work, keep up the good
22 work. You're nearly done. You're almost there. And
23 happy holidays.

24 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

25 We have caller 5719, and up next after that, we'll

1 have caller 9605.

2 Caller 5719, please follow the prompts. The floor
3 is yours. Caller with the last four digits 5719, please
4 check your phone to make sure you are not on mute. You
5 are unmuted in the meeting. Caller 5719, please double
6 check your phone, make sure you are not on mute on your
7 telephone.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you hear me now?

9 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we can.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right. Thank you so
11 much. Thank you so much for the opportunity to address
12 the Commission and for all of your hard work throughout
13 this process. I really appreciate seeing some of the
14 changes that have happened most recently, especially with
15 the congressional districts, the Senate district --
16 primarily the Antelope Valley area and also the Santa
17 Clarita Valley area. The congressional district map
18 really seems to embrace the communities of interest as a
19 good sense of the geography of the region. Same thing
20 with the updates that have made to the Senate map.

21 It's the Assembly district map that continues to be
22 troubling, especially for the Antelope Valley, especially
23 the way that they completely divide our community, and
24 the fact that if those maps could be reworked, for
25 instance, you know, in Santa Clarita or bring them over

1 into the Antelope Valley. But right now, the way that
2 Senate maps have been drawn are doing a tremendous
3 disservice to the entire northeastern Los Angeles County
4 area. Like I say, this particular area is often
5 overlooked in the way of resources --

6 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- and we really need to have
8 representation that can reflect our needs, and that comes
9 by not dividing our communities of interest. Thank you
10 very much for your time, and thank you again for all your
11 work, and a very happy holiday season to you all.

12 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

13 And right now, we have caller 9605, and up next
14 after that is caller 2966.

15 Caller 9605, please follow the prompts. The floor
16 is yours.

17 MS. RUMETTO: Yes, good evening, my name's Elizabeth
18 Rumetto (ph.). First, I would like to thank you for the
19 time you've invested in this process. Yesterday I was
20 pleased to hear the attention of several Commissioners
21 were paying to the requested edits by the greater UC
22 Riverside community. Thank you for your comments and to
23 ensure that UC Riverside as a community of interest, is
24 kept fully into Assembly District 58 within a Senate
25 district.

1 UCR, located at 900 University Avenue, extends
2 beyond the university boundaries, including research,
3 district land preservations, art, and much more that
4 contribute to a larger university and college town.
5 Currently, UCR campus is being split in the December 8th
6 iteration that can be altered to better acknowledge the
7 UCR community of interest.

8 Currently, the community is split in the December
9 8th versions of the Assembly Districts 58 and 63. The
10 UCR community of interest can be defined as our main
11 campus, as well as surrounding infrastructure, landmarks,
12 and communities that surround UCR.

13 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

14 MS. RUMETTO: When you review the Assembly district
15 maps, I encourage you to consider the maps that were
16 submitted by campus architect Jacqueline Norman under
17 comment 40611 -- again, comment 40611. Yesterday, as
18 part of the official record that include a shape file map
19 for your reference. Thank you very much for your time
20 and attention to this matter.

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

22 And right now, we have caller 2966, and up next
23 after that will be caller 1619. Caller 2966, please
24 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. I am a

1 member -- or I am a resident of the Central Valley
2 wanting to express my views on the current ECA
3 Congressional District. As a resident of Clovis, I
4 believe we should remain with the mountains and ECA
5 District. Clovis has a strong connection to the foothills
6 and rural communities. Many Clovis residents own
7 property in Shaver Lake and the mountains and regularly
8 travel between the two communities. During wildfire
9 season, Clovis often acts as a place of shelter for many
10 mountain residents escaping the fires and many whom are
11 displaced.

12 We're also both concerned with forest management.
13 Many residents, also of Clovis and the mountain
14 communities, regularly commute to work through the city
15 and foothills and large events in Clovis like the Clovis
16 Rodeo, our annual antique fairs, and BIG Hat Days draw
17 large crowds from the mountain and foothills. As the two
18 communities are so similar, please consider keeping
19 Clovis and Northwest Fresno with the ECA.

20 MR. MANOFF: Twenty.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you for your time and
22 all your hard work on the committee. Thank you.

23 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

24 And right now, we have caller 1619, and up next
25 after that will be caller 2108. Caller 1619, please

1 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.
3 If you go through with this STCV-2, 3 and 4 of Kings,
4 Tulare, Kern Congressional Visual -- Visualization as it
5 is being presented, you should no longer even call
6 yourself an independent commission at this point. I know
7 my neighbors and community leaders have called numerous
8 times and asked you to repeatedly not to split up Kings
9 County, yet you are bowing down to a leftist organization
10 which doesn't even live in our district. Things need to
11 be balanced.

12 The Voting Rights Act is very important, but not to
13 such a degree that communities that are not shared are
14 joined together. It is clear that you are not being
15 independent. This district is so gerrymandered to a
16 degree that it's setting a dangerous precedent.

17 Please, me and my community are imploring you not to
18 split us up. Please don't bow down to outside politics.
19 If you still want to be considered independent, do not
20 split us up. Thank you.

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

22 And right now, we have caller 2108, and up next
23 after that is caller 7312. Caller 2108, please follow
24 the prompts. The floor is yours.

25 MR. MATHIAS: Hi. My name is Metaborach Mathias

1 (ph.) and I'm calling from the western part of San
2 Bernardino County, and I was calling regarding two -- two
3 different maps that impact lines that -- of San
4 Bernardino County. The first one being the SD10WE draft
5 from 12/14, which drew South El Monte to Onterio. But as
6 a West San Bernardino County resident, I could say that
7 this map didn't -- doesn't really quite make sense in
8 tying communities together where the west -- or those
9 parts of San Gabriel Valley don't really connect to the
10 Western San Bernardino County region; whereas, I think,
11 Pomona is really considered -- the Pomona Valley -- the
12 cutoff of the connection -- the connection of the western
13 part of San Bernardino County going into LA County.

14 And the other map that I wanted to make a comment on
15 was also --

16 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

17 MR. MATHIAS: -- the ADJRC iteration. And while I
18 want to thank the Commission for keeping Corona, Hoopa
19 Valley and Riverside together, it included Grande Terrace
20 in this map. Which, Grande Terrace is in San Bernardino
21 County and it's also part of a completely different
22 school district --

23 MR. MANOFF: Ten.

24 MR. MATHIS: -- it's actually part of the Colton
25 Joint Unified School District, and so it splits up that

1 community from San Bernardino County. But it might make
2 more sense to include --

3 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

4 And right now, we have caller 7312, and up next
5 after that will be caller 9424. Caller 7312, please
6 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

7 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, my name is Vince Sanchez. I'm a
8 constituent of North Hollywood, and I'm very concerned
9 not only about the State Assembly, but the State Senate
10 maps. What you have done is put white, wealthy
11 communities in the State Senate San Fernando Valley
12 areas.

13 Commissioner Toledo, I'm calling on you as a
14 champion for the Latino community to move these
15 communities out of our district. These are predominantly
16 communities that have been racist to our communities in
17 North Hollywood and Sun Valley. Burbank and Sunland-
18 Tujunga do not share our concerns. Move them into the
19 South San Fernando Valley and unify us with North
20 Hollywood, Valley Glen, and the communities that are
21 Latino and immigrant heavy. This, let alone, will
22 increase the Latino CVAP by one-and-a-half percent. You
23 need to do this to protect our communities.

24 In addition, on the State Assembly maps, please,
25 please try to create two districts that get to fifty

1 percent, at least.

2 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

3 MR. SANCHEZ: I really support the Firefighter map,
4 which seems to be the best strategy to combine the East
5 San Fernando communities, Latinos, Philipinos, Armenians
6 all in solidarity in one community. And it's most
7 important (In Spanish, not transcribed) that these --

8 MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

9 MR. SANCHEZ: -- maps get instituted. Please, please
10 look at my suggestions. I've emailed the entire
11 Commission.

12 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

13 And right now, we have caller 9424, and up next
14 after that, will be caller 0688. Caller 9424, please
15 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

16 MR. ECKOV: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is
17 Trevor Eckov (ph.). I called earlier this week about San
18 Jose being split into four districts, and I am absolutely
19 ecstatic to see that you, in your third map, have decided
20 to reunite San Jose into a majority Congressional
21 district. And I -- I just cannot thank you enough for
22 listening to the hundreds of voices that have written on
23 your public input page and have called in this week and
24 last week. Your consideration for keeping San Jose
25 intact really shows to me the faith the State of

1 California has put into you for our democracy is very
2 much intact. And I greatly appreciate how much you are
3 listening to the voices that have been calling in day by
4 day. Again, it -- it really reaffirms the oath that you
5 have all taken to serve this state's democracy.

6 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

7 MR. ECKOV: And I just want to thank you again for
8 keeping San Jose intact. And have a great holiday.

9 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

10 And right now, we have caller 0688, and up next
11 after that, will be caller 4560. Caller 0688, please
12 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, this is Vivian, and I'm a
14 lifelong resident of the San Gabriel Valley. I'm calling
15 because San Gabriel Valley needs to remain whole. The
16 State Commission's new districting maps will split the
17 San Gabriel Valley and does not reflect the majority of
18 working class Asian American, Pacific Islander, and
19 Latino American voters in the cities of Alhambra, San
20 Gabriel, Rosemead, and Monterey Park. Social media
21 outreach is not enough data because the residents here
22 are busy and tired from working and fighting for
23 resources to improve our neighborhoods.

24 Just take a walk or visit a restaurant here, and you
25 will see that the redistricting does not reflect the

1 demographics of my community. I have never heard of La
2 Canada or Bradbury until the redistricting map, because
3 they are majority white households of incomes around
4 \$150,000. My mom just retired from USPS and her annual
5 salary is around \$60,000, like the majority of my
6 neighbors and residents in the community. Preference is
7 given to these affluent neighborhoods in the foothills
8 when it comes to issues like the 710 or 10 Freeway while
9 my family, friends, and neighbors bear the burden of poor
10 air quality and traffic.

11 The cities of San Gabriel Valley deserve to
12 maintain --

13 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- a majority Latina and of
15 Asian American Pacific Island a majority senate district
16 because that would adequately represent the diversity of
17 our community and accurately reflect the demographic
18 makeup of the region. Thank you for your time.

19 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

20 And right now, we have caller 4560, and up next
21 after that will be caller 4644. Caller 4560, please
22 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. Good evening,
24 Commissioners, and thank you for taking my call and for
25 all the work you are doing. This is Nancy from Elk

1 Grove. I'd like to say that it has been frustrating at
2 times watching these meetings and the lack of attention
3 to Sacramento County. You had promised to make more time
4 on Old Fig Garden and the entire County of Sacramento.
5 I'm kidding just a little, and if you recall, you did
6 wait until the eleventh hour to fix our Assembly maps.

7 Now, when it comes to Congressional maps, there is
8 no justification whatsoever for Elk Grove to be connected
9 to Stockton, just like the earlier caller said. We tried
10 this with the first visualizations only to be met with
11 lots of testimony from Elk Grove and Stockton residents
12 indicating our opposition. Please, please discard the
13 Plan FT Iteration entirely. If this is in Sacramento
14 County, how does the population need for only two major
15 Congressional districts; not three? Instead, please use
16 the draft maps --

17 MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- as your foundation. And
19 if you want to improve on this plan, all you have to do
20 is take the City of Sacramento splits and move it south
21 similar to the Assembly maps. You can even move Rancho
22 Cordova in with Elk Grove and add other communities for
23 population, such as Fair Oaks --

24 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- Old River, Folsom or

1 others. Bottom line, Elk Grove does not belong with
2 Stockton in Congressional district.

3 Thanks a lot for all your time and have a good
4 night.

5 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

6 And right now, we have caller 4644, and up next
7 after that will be caller 9230. Caller 4644, please
8 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. My
10 name is Haleigh (ph.). I'm a second generation Mariposa
11 resident. As the Commission continues to look at my
12 region, I think it's important to know that communities
13 like mine up here in the mountains do not belong with
14 city areas like Clovis or of Fresno. Thank you for your
15 time. Have a great evening.

16 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

17 And right now, we have caller 9230, and up next
18 after that will be caller 6089. Caller 9230, please
19 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. Thank
21 you so much for finally creating that super majority
22 Latino District within the San Fernando Valley. I also
23 want to thank you for agreeing to swap Sylmar out of
24 Santa Clarita and into the eastern San Fernando Valley
25 where it belongs.

1 The main focus for you all now is to create two
2 super majority Latino Assembly districts within the San
3 Fernando Valley. And please create an Assembly map that
4 San -- that has Santa Clarita within the northwest Los
5 Angeles County similar to the newly proposed senate
6 districts here. This will make everyone happy and ensure
7 equitable representation for the Latino community and all
8 Angelinos.

9 Thank you, Commissioners. We look forward to these
10 positive changes.

11 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

12 And right now, we have caller 6089, and up next
13 after that will be caller 8108. Caller 6089, please
14 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Problem. By not referencing
16 it carefully, the Commission has drawn an assembly line.
17 And by drawing the assembly line as a guide, the floor
18 seat unintentionally split the Latino community with
19 Victor Valley by particularly exploiting Northern
20 Hesperia.

21 Solution. An easy two district swap between
22 ANTVICVAL and MCV, all the portions of Hesperia and AV 39
23 Antelope plus all portions north of Main Street to
24 ANTVICVAL. Number two, add Apple Hill, Spring Valley
25 Lake, Phelan, Pinon Hills, Wrightwood, and Lytle Creek to

1 MCV.

2 Stats. Victor Valley's area kept in ANTVICVAL area
3 are forty-nine percent Latino; areas added at fifty-three
4 percent Latino; areas removed are twenty-seven Latino.

5 Result. ANTVICVAL would have Adelanto, Victorville,
6 and Northern Hesperia. MCV would have Apple Valley to
7 Southern Hesperia, Oak Hills, Phelan, Pinon Hills,
8 Wrightwood and Lytle Creek. Thank you.

9 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

10 And right now, we have caller 8108, and up next
11 after that is caller 3952. Caller 8108, please follow
12 the prompts. The floor is yours.

13 MR. MANORE: Good evening, Commissioners. My name
14 is Ben Manore (ph.). I'm long-time resident of Santa
15 Clarita Valley. I want to thank you very much and
16 endorse your adoption of CV Greater Iteration Number 3.
17 I believe that that action will keep the district whole
18 in its diversity and its continued value of community
19 within its own community of religion, education, social
20 and economic standards.

21 I also want to congratulate the effort of keeping
22 San Jose more whole and only having two districts, rather
23 than four. I would like to see a larger number of maybe
24 two districts in the future, but this is -- this is a
25 good start.

1 Anyway, thank you for your service. Happy holidays.

2 And again, very good work to all of you. Good evening.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

4 And right now, we have caller 3952, and up next

5 after that will be caller 3588. Caller 3952, please

6 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

7 MAYOR LICCARDO: Thank you to the commissioners for

8 your incredible, tireless work on behalf of all of

9 California. My name is Sam Liccardo; I'm again, the

10 Mayor of the City of San Jose. And I just wanted to say

11 thank you for hearing our voices from the City of San

12 Jose and to enabling San Jose to have a clear voice in

13 Washington in the Congressional map that was revised to

14 enable San Jose to have at least one district that would

15 have a majority of San Joseans. It is a wonderful

16 Christmas gift to us. We appreciate it very much, and I

17 just wanted to say thank you for hearing us. Happy

18 Holidays.

19 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

20 And right now, we have caller 3588, and up next

21 after that is caller 9002. Caller 3588, please follow

22 the prompts. The floor is yours.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.

24 First, Happy Holidays. And after watching the video this

25 afternoon of how painstaking this process is, you guys

1 totally deserve a joyful and restful holiday season. So
2 thank you for all of your work.

3 I wanted to thank you, also, for making the --
4 the -- what I think are the right changes to the San
5 Fernando Valley Senate and Congressional maps. I'm
6 really happy that you were able to honor the communities'
7 input in creating a senate Latino VRA district and
8 agreeing to fix the Congressional map by keeping Sylmar
9 with the Eastern San Fernando Valley.

10 I would only ask now that -- that you consider
11 focusing on fixing the Assembly map and making Santa
12 Clarita Valley District mirror the Senate map and push
13 towards Northeast Los Angeles to keep it to -- to make
14 sure -- so that in the event -- so that the Assembly map
15 also just makes sense and is consistent. Acton and Agua
16 Dulce really are a -- a -- an extension of that Santa
17 Clarita Valley --

18 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- and they're all part of
20 the same community. Thank you, again, Commissioners, for
21 your hard work. Happy holidays and you're almost there.
22 You're almost there. Thank you so much.

23 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

24 And right now, we have caller 9002, and up next
25 after that will be caller 2395. Caller 9002, please

1 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

2 MR. LIMA: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is
3 Joseph Lima (ph.) from Modesto. Thank you very much for
4 taking my call. There's no question that the solution
5 proposed by the Commissioners Sadhwani and Toledo, which
6 I believe you have been referring to in a collation, is
7 the best choice for Central Valley. I believe this
8 proposed district will effectively represent our
9 communities. You have done the right thing by this -- by
10 not rushing through this process. Thank you very much
11 for taking my call.

12 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

13 And right now, we have caller 2395, and then up next
14 after that will be caller 4920. Caller 2395, please
15 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.
17 I live in Victorville, and I'm calling to generally
18 support the State Senate map titled SDM6L Iteration. The
19 new Senate iterations in Los Angeles County are far
20 better when it comes to representation, especially for
21 the Latino and Black communities. My only request is
22 that the east side of the district follow the same
23 dividing line as Victor Valley as the Assembly map titled
24 AV39 Antelope. The Assembly map keeps part of Hesperia
25 with Victorville and Adelanto and cuts out Apple Valley.

1 By doing that, the Assembly map protects the Latino
2 community at interest in the Victor Valley. The Senate
3 map should do the same.

4 The way that the AD39 Antelope cuts through the
5 Victor Valley keeps the Latino community together. I
6 only ask that SCS6L Iteration make this minor adjustment
7 by including part of Hesperia, which is mostly Latino,
8 and removing Apple Valley, a predominantly white, non-
9 Latino community --

10 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- from the district. Thank
12 you for your time and for your consideration.

13 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

14 And right now, we have caller 4920, and up next
15 after that will be caller 9006. Caller 4920, please
16 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. This is Tanai
18 (ph.) in Eastern California and asking to not combine our
19 area with Clovis and North Fresno with the Sierras and
20 the mountain communities. Our issues are extremely
21 different and unique. We have different pressing needs
22 of wildfires, forest management, difficulty getting
23 homeowners' insurance, catastrophic wildfires, water
24 issues, logging, recreation, and health care. We are a
25 gateway to -- for tourism to Yosemite National Park, and

1 just very, very different from North Fresno/Clovis area.
2 Our trash issues are quite different, and we are just a
3 rural -- very rural and not city at all.

4 So we want to stay connected to Mariposa, Yosemite,
5 Oakhurst. The mountain communities, and Course Grove
6 (ph.), and Yosemite Lakes, and the whole mountain area is
7 very unique. So thank you for taking that into
8 consideration. And God bless you and merry Christmas.

9 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

10 And right now, we have caller 9006, and up next
11 after that will be caller 3647. Caller 9006, please
12 follow the prompts. And one more time, caller with the
13 last four digits 9006, please follow the prompts to
14 unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.
16 I'm calling from Modesto. I just want to let you know
17 I've been really glad to see the updated VRA maps for
18 Congress. I'm really happy to see three effective Latino
19 seats in the Central Valley. I know the Central Valley
20 often gets passed over in these processes, but it's clear
21 to me that the commissioners' commitment to taking public
22 input seriously has helped very much. We thank you for
23 that.

24 Please stick with the iteration on the table right
25 now. I think it's number 4. It's what's best for our

1 local communities. Thank you so much for your time and
2 for being committed to fair representation for California
3 citizens. Thank you.

4 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

5 And right now, we have caller 3647, and then up next
6 after that will be caller 1123. Caller 3647, please
7 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners,
9 and thank you all for your commitment to this process.
10 I -- I want to commend you on the new State Senate maps
11 in LA County. These iterations are a big improvement.
12 And in particular, SDAMP6L (ph.) Iteration Northern LA
13 County. It's fantastic; far better when it comes to
14 representation for Latino and Black communities, and the
15 Latinos see that.

16 The only request I have -- and I heard Commissioners
17 earlier say that, you know, minor adjustments they're
18 interested in seeing. One that I'd love to see the line
19 drawers just try is on the east side of the district,
20 following the same dividing line in the Victor Valley as
21 the Assembly Map AD39 Antelope. It divides -- it keeps
22 Victorville, Adelanto, and part of Hesperia together and
23 it preserves the Latino community of interest as one unit
24 in the Victor Valley. And so --

25 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- rather than having Apple
2 Valley in this District, Victorville, Adelanto, and
3 Hesperia -- parts of Hesperia -- would be much better for
4 the Latino community of interest in the Victor Valley.
5 Otherwise, SDAMP6L Iteration --

6 MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- looks great. And I just
8 want to commend you all. Thank you for going through
9 this process. And as another caller said, you're almost
10 there. Thanks so much.

11 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

12 And right now, we have caller 9471, and then up next
13 after that will be caller 2297. Caller 97 -- 9471,
14 please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. Very
16 nice to meet you. I'm calling about the San Fernando
17 Valley Congressional District. I represent the
18 (indiscernible) and I'm concerned that on the last day of
19 line drawing, you removed Porter Ranch and Granda from
20 the San Fernando Valley and placed these communities with
21 (indiscernible). One of the largest and strongest in
22 community in this part of the San Fernando Valley and
23 this move cuts it off from the rest of the Valley. I
24 think this has something to do with how you want to
25 handle (indiscernible). It doesn't have to be this way.

1 Porter Ranch and Granada can remain with the San Fernando
2 Valley and you can stay connect for lands if you want to
3 leave that District with the North, which has a similar
4 character. This will then undo what you achieved
5 (indiscernible).

6 Please don't tear up the Valley at the last minute.
7 Please keep all our communities together by connecting
8 Porter Ranch and Granada with other Valley neighborhoods
9 like Northridge, (indiscernible), and (indiscernible),
10 which are all in the same (indiscernible) district by the
11 way. I would appreciate it if you can take a minute to
12 examining -- examine that area one last time. Thank you.

13 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

14 And right now, I have caller 2297, and up next after
15 that will be caller 1002. Caller 2297, please follow the
16 prompts. The floor is yours.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. I'm calling to
18 support the State Senate map entitled SDANTDICVAL
19 Iteration. I agree with several earlier callers that we
20 should follow the same lines of the Assembly maps for
21 that same area -- AD39 Antelope and swap in Hesperia and
22 remove Apple Valley. The district should follow the same
23 dividing line in the Victor Valley as that Assembly map I
24 just mentioned because it keeps Hesperia with Victorville
25 and Adelanto and cuts out Apple Valley. And by doing

1 that, the Assembly map protects the Latino community of
2 interest in Victor Valley. So this makes sense that the
3 Senate ap should do that same thing.

4 So what I'm asking is that we make a minor
5 adjustment, as I mentioned, by including Hesperia. And
6 that's because it's mostly Latino and removing Apple
7 Valley, which is predominantly white, non-Latino
8 community. And in order to add population, if that is
9 needed, I would suggest and hope that you would consider
10 adding some of the northernmost sections of the San
11 Fernando Valley to the map if needed.

12 And I want to join the chorus of applause for all of
13 your hard work and your constant efforts. Happy Holidays
14 to each of you.

15 MR. MANOFF: Ten.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You certainly earned some
17 rest.

18 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

19 And right now, we have caller 1002, and then up next
20 after that will be caller 9205. Caller 1002, please
21 follow the prompts. All right. One more time. Caller
22 with the last four digits 1002, please follow the prompts
23 to unmute by pressing star six.

24 I do apologize. Caller 1002, we do appear to have
25 some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I have

1 you down for a retry and I will be coming back around.

2 Right now, we have caller 9205, and up next after
3 that will be caller 4263. Caller 9205, please follow the
4 prompts. The floor is yours.

5 Caller 9205, if you could please doublecheck your
6 phone and make sure you are not on mute. You are unmuted
7 in the meeting.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. I've been
9 watching this process play out and I'm disappointed by
10 the recent maps. When it comes to the San Joaquin
11 Valley, foothills and the mountains, the Congressional
12 districts should pair likeminded communities. For
13 example, many residents of Oakhurst commute to Madera
14 City and Madera Ranchos daily for work and errands; not
15 to North Fresno or Clovis. This is why these two
16 communities do not belong in the same district. So
17 please, do not put Clovis and North Fresno with the ECA
18 district. Thank you.

19 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

20 And right now, we have caller 4263, and then up next
21 after that will be caller 7483. Caller 4263, please
22 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

23 MR. DONALDSON: Hi, this is David Donaldson (ph.)
24 and I live in Santa Clara, Santa Clara County. In
25 support of your decision that you made earlier tonight

1 regarding the Iteration number 3 for San Jose
2 Congressional District map and I had been calling in to
3 support either one or three. And I have to congratulate
4 the entire commissioner team. They did outstanding and
5 brilliant. And the idea -- the ideas -- I -- I would
6 also like to thank Yee and Ahmad and Sadhwani for their
7 excellent leadership.

8 As far as what you're doing, I considerate it a
9 public service that hopefully other states will follow
10 because of this excellent leadership. That's basically
11 it. I had other things to say if there was a question
12 about one or three.

13 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

14 And right now, we have caller 7483, and up next
15 after that is caller 2019. Caller 7483, please follow
16 the prompts. The floor is yours.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, all. I'm
18 calling about Stanislaus County. We are a county of
19 (indiscernible), and Quinceaneras, and American Graffiti
20 nights, and apricot fiestas, and (indiscernible), and
21 yes, agriculture. I've been looking and pondering the
22 maps, especially Iteration 4 for the Central Valley, and
23 I would especially like to thank Commissioners Anderson
24 and Turner for their thoughts and consideration of trying
25 to move Modesto and Turlock back into the Central

1 District.

2 We are a relatively small population area compared
3 to a lot of those around California, and for many years
4 we have felt that we were never heard. I understand the
5 need to maximize the VRAs and would suggest moving
6 Turlock and Modesto into our Central Valley District to
7 possibly attain your goals for this area. We absolutely
8 belong with agricultural --

9 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- areas of the Valley and I
11 hope you will continue to make that happen. We are a
12 Central Valley District now, so I know it's possible.
13 One representative cannot possibly perform meaningful
14 work while dealing with --

15 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- forest land, desert, and
17 ag. Thank you.

18 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

19 And right now, we have caller 2019, and then up next
20 after that will be caller 6556. Caller 2019, please
21 follow the prompts. Caller with the last four digits
22 2019, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing
23 star six. The floor is yours.

24 MR. HOLLOWAY: Good evening, Commissioners. Can you
25 hear me?

1 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

2 MR. HOLLOWAY: Hello? Okay. Great. First, my name
3 is Brian Holloway (ph.). Thank you very much for your
4 service. I'm a lifelong resident of Sacramento and am
5 speaking in opposition to the map for the Sacramento
6 Congressional District. Sacramento is at the confluence
7 of two major rivers, and we are the most at risk of
8 devastating floods in the entire nation. There are over
9 600,000 residents at risk of flooding, and it could be
10 said that this is the largest community of interest in
11 the region. Under the proposed map, most of the flood
12 plain of both rivers are no longer in one Congressional
13 district and this will harm our ability to protect
14 Sacramento.

15 To help visualize, the flood plain of Sacramento is
16 basically the same as the City of Sacramento boundaries.
17 And we need both to be kept together in the same
18 Congressional district. Please keep the flood plain in
19 one Congressional district, as it has been --

20 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

21 MR. HOLLOWAY: -- for decades. Thank you very much.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

23 And right now, we have caller 6556, and up next
24 after that will be caller 1220. Caller 6556, please
25 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, my name is Paul (ph.),
2 and I'm calling from Fresno. I just want to say I think
3 that the maps that you guys have drawn today is really
4 great. I think drawing the arm through Visalia was a
5 really good idea. And I think that at this point you
6 guys did a lot of good work, especially making sure that
7 the VRA Districts have good -- good representation. So I
8 hope -- just want to say that you've done a great job
9 with the current map, and I hope that going forward, you
10 can approve this map without going back to the drawing
11 board again.

12 So again, thank you for all your hard work in making
13 sure that the VRA Districts have good representation.
14 And that -- that I think that the current map
15 (indiscernible) Valley with the arm going through Visalia
16 was a good move. Thank you.

17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

18 And right now, we have caller 1220. Please follow
19 the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

20 MS. ROWE: Hello, my name is Kris Rowe (ph.). I'm
21 calling from West Hills in the San Fernando Valley. I'm
22 looking at your Assembly District AD40SCV, and you
23 have -- I have very strong environmental concerns. I --
24 I look at -- the East San Fernando Valley is fine for a
25 VRA area, but what you've done is divided West San

1 Fernando Valley in particular. And I've sent my comments
2 on ID40297. You have divided the San Fernando Valley and
3 put parts of the Santa Susana Field Lab, a toxic site
4 that qualifies as a federal Superfund site, with West
5 Hills and it's in Ventura County and west its nearby.
6 But then, you take us all the way out to the Santa
7 Clarita Valley. And because of issues like -- of
8 environmental justice, I support -- there was a gentleman
9 that was an Asian member from Granada Hills that said,
10 yes, we are all in Council District 3. We should be --
11 San Fernando Valley should be whole.

12 And if you could divide the districts differently on
13 the Assembly district and the Congressional district --

14 MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

15 MS. ROWE: -- you -- you would -- you would achieve
16 greater Hispanic population, but you would keep the
17 communities whole. You've divided West Hills from its
18 adjacent Canoga Park and Woodland Hills, and I really
19 would appreciate it if you look at my comments, as I
20 said, 40297 in Malibu -- she did Malibu S --

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: At this time, Chair, we
22 are up against a break.

23 CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Katy. It is
24 8:14. My alarm is going off to remind me that it's break
25 time.

1 We are on break until 8:30. For those of you in the
2 cue, please remain in the cue. We will be back in
3 fifteen minutes to continue taking your calls. Thank you
4 so much everyone.

5 MALE SPEAKER: Thank you so much, Chair. We are on
6 break until 8:30. Nice to see you up late on the CRC
7 nightshift.

8 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 8:15 p.m.
9 until 8:30 p.m.)

10 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your
11 patience during our break. We are back with you. It is
12 8:30 p.m., and we are looking forward to continuing to
13 hear from the public after -- or at the end of today's
14 meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting
15 Commission.

16 Katy, please take it away.

17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Absolutely, Joe.

18 And thank you those that have called in. If you
19 have not done so already, please press star nine. This
20 will raise your hand indicating you've called in to give
21 comment. We do have some hands raised here. Right now,
22 we'll be going to caller 4458, and up next after that
23 will be caller 5115.

24 And a brief announcement for those that have
25 recently called in. Please speak at a steady pace, as

1 our meeting is being translated. Please take your time
2 with county names, cities, numbers, and your public
3 comment in general.

4 Right now, we have caller 4458, and up next after
5 that will be caller 5115. Caller 4458, please follow the
6 prompts. The floor is yours.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, can you hear me?

8 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. Thank you so much. My
10 name is John (ph.), and I live in the mountain area
11 community of Ahwahnee. And what I would like to do is
12 to -- I'm going to talk about ECA -- eastern county --
13 Eastern California. And I would like to recommend that
14 you do not, and I repeat, do not combine Clovis and North
15 Fresno with the Sierra Mountain communities of interest.

16 Our interests are extremely different and very
17 unique. For example, in rural California, we have
18 pressing issues of wildfires, waste management, a lot of
19 the people up here can't get fire insurance because of
20 the catastrophic wild -- wildfires. We have water
21 issues, we have logging, recreation. Health care is a
22 whole different animal up here.

23 We are also a gateway tourist community that thrives
24 off tourism, and North Fresno and Clovis is not that way.
25 And even the trash issues are extremely different as we

1 have rural areas that have seventy-five households per
2 square mile or less, so we have different issues on that.
3 We have many backgrounds, walks of life from Oakhurst to
4 Madera, Mariposa and Merced. And the mountain
5 communities that share a special interest --

6 MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- need to be in the same
8 district that does not include highly populated cities
9 like Clovis and North -- and North Fresno. So keep the
10 mountain communities unique regarding the seats.

11 MR. MANOFF: Ten.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, and God bless you,
13 and Merry Christmas.

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

15 And right now, we have caller 5115, and then up next
16 after that will be caller 6883. Caller 5115, please
17 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. My
19 name is Cassandra (ph.), and as a lifelong San Jose
20 resident, I just wanted to extend my gratitude for your
21 work on our Congressional maps today. Especially,
22 Tamina, for all your hard work drawing these maps, and to
23 the entire Commission for choosing Iteration 3 that
24 preserves a majority San Jose voice in Congress. Thank
25 you so much for listening to our community and for not

1 splitting us into four Congressional districts. We
2 really appreciate it and agree that map Iteration number
3 3 allows our tenth largest city in America to keep a
4 representative that speaks for us. So thank you, again,
5 and I wish you a happy holiday. Thank you.

6 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

7 And right now, we have caller 6883, and up next
8 after that will be caller 6743. Caller 6883, please
9 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

10 MR. ROTH: All right. Thank you. Can you hear me?

11 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

12 MR. ROTH: Great. Good -- good evening,
13 Commissioners. It was afternoon when I started, so I --
14 my name is Joseph Roth and I'm on the boards of the
15 Westside Neighborhood Council and the Westwood South
16 Homeowners' Association. I appreciate your service and
17 your continued consideration throughout these
18 deliberations.

19 I'm calling tonight about an LA County SD West of
20 110. Please revisit the composition of this SD West of
21 110 Iteration as it separates the west side from
22 longstanding communities of interest to the north, as in
23 Westwood, and to the west like Santa Monica and West LA
24 and Brentwood, where we share some common arterials,
25 business districts, and issues.

1 Additionally, I also want to point out -- and I'm
2 familiar with VRA -- VRA -- and I know this doesn't
3 count -- but lots of other ethnicities are being taken
4 into account, and the Jewish community on this side of
5 the hill is being disbursed into three different
6 districts. So if you could give more consideration to
7 that, as well, that'd be great. Thank you very much.

8 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

9 And right now, we have caller 6743, and then up next
10 after that will be caller 3899. Caller 6743, please
11 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

12 MS. SOULE: Hi. Thank you, Commissioners. My name
13 is Karen Soule (ph.), and I'm a resident of the Yorba
14 Linda in Orange County. And on the December 8th version
15 of the Congressional maps, you guys really got it right
16 and it seemed that you listened and honored the input of
17 North Orange County residents by keeping the close-knit
18 communities of Brea, Fullerton, Yorba Linda, and
19 Placentia together. However, after the 8th, something
20 strange happened and when you redid the maps, you split
21 up North Orange County.

22 It just doesn't make any sense that Yorba Linda
23 isn't with Fullerton, Brea and especially Placentia
24 because we have common interests with shopping, dining,
25 and education in these communities. Especially Yorba

1 Linda and Placentia share a school district and Yorba
2 Belinda Boulevard runs through Yorba Belinda, Placentia,
3 and Fullerton. We had fair and balanced districts, but
4 you destroyed our district, and I can't fathom why. And
5 please, please, just take another look at it -- how you
6 had it on the 8th. And I hope you can change it back and
7 keep our neighbors together. Thank you.

8 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

9 And right now, we have caller 3899, and then up next
10 after that will be caller 5352. Caller 3899, please
11 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. I want
13 to thank the Commission for all the time they spent in
14 Long Beach and just to say that we're generally happy. I
15 know there's been a lot of testimony, some of it even
16 conflicting, but we saw many of our top priorities were
17 heard. We definitely don't want the Commission to go in
18 the wrong direction at this point and divide our city
19 even more. So we certainly can live with our current map
20 and we hope we see minimal changes in the future. Thank
21 you.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

23 And right now, we have caller 5352, and up next
24 after that will be caller 6483. Caller 5352, please
25 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, can you guys here me?

2 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, so my name is James
4 (ph.). I am a lifelong resident of Rancho Cucamonga, and
5 I was just wanting to comment that while you guys have
6 been doing a good job with the districts so far, I would
7 just like to point out that Rancho Cucamonga and Upland
8 really don't have any -- any ties to Los Angeles County.
9 We want to be grouped into San Berardino County
10 districts, not with Los Angeles County districts. It's
11 just a different culture, different -- different --
12 different economics; things like that. We just would
13 really like to be -- over here in Rancho Cucamonga and
14 Upland, really like to be placed with San Bernardino
15 districts, especially the State Senate District. Thank
16 you and have a good night.

17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

18 And right now, we have caller 6483, and up next
19 after that will be caller 7268. Caller 6483, please
20 follow the prompts. Caller 6483, have you intentionally
21 lowered your hand? I don't believe you did so. All
22 right. There you are. Caller 6483, if you will please
23 follow the prompts by pressing star six. The floor is
24 yours.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. I'm calling

1 about the Assembly, Senate and Congressional districts
2 and the very large district VCA. I'm concerned about
3 adding the cities of North Fresno and Clovis to the
4 Sierra National Forest and mountain communities of
5 Verona, Oakhurst, Mariposa, Bass Lake, Madera and others.
6 If this happens, the mountain communities will be
7 disenfranchised. The important issues are water and
8 trash, transportation, employment, and economic issues,
9 and the Valley cities do not share these same concerns.

10 Please consider keeping the cities out of the ECA
11 district and allow the mountain areas to be joined with
12 their truly communities of interest like Bass Lake,
13 Verona, Sierra National, Mariposa, Madera and others.
14 Thank you so much for your time. Greatly appreciate it.

15 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

16 And right now, we have caller 7268, and up next
17 after that is caller 1535. I'd like to invite those that
18 have just called in to please press star nine. If you
19 haven't done so already, please press star nine
20 indicating you wish to give comment. This will raise
21 your hand. Makes my job a little bit easier. Right now,
22 we have caller 7268, and up next after that will be
23 caller 1535. Caller 7268, please follow the prompts.
24 The floor is yours.

25 MR. RUIZ: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is

1 Angel Ruiz. I am a member of the Central Valley
2 Equitable Coalition Map. I live in the City of Tulare.
3 It's a beautiful city, by the way; I encourage people to
4 move here. We recommend you to adopt -- I mean to
5 prioritize the creation of three effective VRA
6 Congressional Districts: CVAP level -- CVAP level and
7 VRA are appropriately reflective of what we have done in
8 the county where they adopted our guidelines for what we
9 were doing. And I am proud to say that I didn't miss one
10 meeting for redistricting in the County of Tulare. That
11 was a lot of fun. Also, as a CSU Bakersfield student
12 GIS program, I'm wondering how many layers Jaime has on
13 her map because I am fascinated by everything that you
14 guys are doing.

15 Thank you so much for serving. Thank you for being
16 the voice of the state of California. Thank you for
17 helping everybody. And please, one last thing --

18 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

19 MR. RUIZ: -- I urge you to help Little Saigon. I
20 have heard so many comments from there. I have heard
21 people from all parts of -- of -- of California, but
22 please, I urge you to help the people of Little Saigon.
23 Thank you again so much for doing what you are doing. It
24 means a lot.

25 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

1 And right now, we have caller 1535, and up next
2 after that is caller 2641. Caller 1535, please follow
3 the prompts. The floor is yours.

4 MR. MALDONADO: Hi, can you hear me?

5 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

6 MR. MALDONADO: Commissioners, it's Tony Maldonado
7 (ph.) again from Santa Clarita. Thank you and the
8 mappers for your hard work on our Congressional, Senate
9 maps, but please, no more drastic changes. You've done
10 the right thing pairing us with (indiscernible) Valley
11 and moving so much to the San Fernando Valley East. So
12 thank you. However, we suffer from wildfires and it's a
13 serious concern. So if you remove Porter Ranch and
14 Grenada Hills, which are part of the City of Los Angeles,
15 and then go further into the rural parts of Sunland-
16 Tujunga and the foothill trails by moving the eastern
17 side boundaries of Santa Clarita further into the Angeles
18 National Forest, you will help us to strengthen our
19 wildfire risk management, which is quite a serious
20 concern. Currently, the boundary sits off the 14 Freeway,
21 this is area to Placerita Canyon State Park and Magic
22 Mountain Wilderness, but are entirely within the Santa
23 Clarita Valley and experience wildfires often. I've sent
24 you some shape file so you can actually look at this.

25 On another note, please revisit Santa Clarita's

1 Assemblies Map -- Assembly map, which should match our
2 Congressional --

3 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

4 MR. MALDONADO: -- Senate maps. Currently, you have
5 us connected to the San Fernando Valley, which makes no
6 sense at all and should be removed. And it should be
7 replaced as Agua Dulce, Acton, Lake Elizabeth and the
8 unincorporated areas of Northwest LA County. Then we're
9 cooking with gas.

10 Before I go, a big shout out to Katy, the call
11 moderators, and ASL interpreters. Thank you for doing a
12 great job. Everyone, have a good night.

13 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

14 And right now, we have caller 2648, and up next
15 after that will be caller 8563. Caller 2648, please
16 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

17 MS. MENENDEZ: Hello, my name is Magda Menendez.
18 I've been a resident of Bakersfield my entire life, and
19 I'm asking that you allow for better representation of
20 the Latino community in the Central Valley. The draft
21 maps dilute -- diluted the voice of our community by
22 including too many areas and have always voted against us
23 in the past. But it looks like there's a fix. Map STCV4
24 was posted on your website today and it's effective.
25 STCV4 includes two very strong Latino voting rights acts

1 seats instead of three weak seats. It keeps far more of
2 the communities together.

3 The District of Bakersfield is fifty-nine percent
4 Latino CREP. The District with the City of Fresno is
5 fifty-three percent Latino CREP. These are both
6 effective seats according to the Dolores Huerta
7 Foundation. Dolores Huerta Foundation knows the Central
8 Valley and knows our community. Please support STCV4 and
9 the map for Congress. Thank you. Good evening.

10 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

11 And right now, we have caller 8563, and up next
12 after that will be caller 1623. Caller 8563, please
13 follow the prompts. The floor is yours. Caller 8563, if
14 you would please double check your phone, make sure you
15 are not on mute. You are unmuted in the meeting.

16 MS. KADIR: Hi. My -- sorry about that. My name is
17 Karima Abdul Kadir (ph.). I'm calling from the high
18 desert region of Victorville. I'm calling regarding our
19 State Senate District. I'm calling because we want to
20 keep Hesperia in our State Senate District. It's a high
21 Latino population and we need to protect our communities.
22 So that map I am looking to protect in SDANTVICVAL
23 Iteration.

24 So just a minor change of removing the Apple Valley
25 if possible if needed and including Hesperia. That would

1 make it a stronger for the voting rights of the Latino
2 community. So I hope the Commission keeps these
3 communities together. Thank you for your time and
4 consideration.

5 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

6 And right now, we have caller 1623, and up next
7 after that will be caller 0566. Caller 1623, please
8 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. Hi. Thank you
10 all for your hard work. I'm just calling to say if you
11 could please keep Rancho Cucamonga and Upland in the San
12 Bernardino County District. We do not have a lot in
13 common as far as interests go with Los Angeles County.
14 We also have different taxes in both of those counties
15 and Upland and San -- excuse me -- Upland and Rancho
16 Cucamonga are in San Bernardino County and I feel like
17 the district should stay that way, too, and not put us in
18 with LA County. Thank you so much. Have a happy holiday
19 season.

20 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

21 And right now, we have caller 0566, and up next
22 after that we will retry caller 1002. Caller 0566,
23 please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, this is Barbara (ph.),
25 and I live in Madera, but I do business up in the

1 mountain areas -- Oakhurst, Coarsegold, and also in the
2 Clovis/Fresno area. And those are two completely
3 different communities. Clovis has -- especially has high
4 density neighborhoods. I know because I'm looking for a
5 house there. And the needs of both those communities are
6 so diverse that they should not be put together. So I'm
7 asking that you consider leaving the mountain area the
8 mountain area. Thank you.

9 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

10 And right now, we will retry caller 1002, and then
11 up next after that will be caller 4993. And for those
12 that have not done so already, please press star nine to
13 raise your hand. Caller 1002 -- caller 1002, if you will
14 please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.
15 The floor is yours.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello?

17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, hello.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, can you hear me?

19 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. Hello the
21 Commissioners. This is upsetting to hear one voice
22 tonight from the political group (indiscernible) which is
23 start calling last week and call (indiscernible). You
24 know, it is for sure, it has not been to our local
25 schools or even (indiscernible). There are so many

1 Vietnamese American students and customers in this area
2 that (indiscernible) population of Vietnamese American in
3 Huntington Beach.

4 Please, listen to our collective voices. This is
5 one. Put north of (indiscernible) Street in Huntington
6 Beach to Little Saigon, which will include Huntington
7 Harbor where the majority of the residents are Vietnamese
8 American. If adding Huntington Beach with Little Saigon
9 on in the Congressional and Senate, why wouldn't it make
10 sense to also --

11 MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- do so with the Assembly?
13 Leave our community the collective voices we need to
14 protect our school districts between Westminster,
15 Huntington Beach, and Sun Valley. Please, put Huntington
16 Beach with Little Saigon for our three maps --

17 MR. MANOFF: Ten.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- including the State
19 Assembly maps. Thank you so much for your hard work.

20 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

21 And right now, we'll go to caller 4993, and up next
22 after that will be caller 2313. Caller 4993, please
23 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I just wanted to thank
25 the Commission for the incredible work that they've done

1 through all these many months, but most of all just what
2 they did to protect the City of San Jose and to listen to
3 the concerns of over 600 San Jose residents who have
4 weighed in following the lead of Mayor Liccardo saying
5 you can have a heavily Asian district from the north part
6 of our city; you can have a heavily Latino district that
7 includes the east side; and you can still also have a
8 district that is the majority of the city of San Jose.
9 So we know that we've always got one person who will be
10 fighting for us.

11 And we're fortunate that we're a large city - the
12 tenth largest city in the country. And not every
13 district -- not every jurisdiction has the ability to
14 count on one person who will be fighting for them. But
15 we are the largest city in Northern California, and
16 knowing that we're going to have that voice fighting for
17 us was just enormously important --

18 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- is enormously important to
20 our community. And the fact that you all listened,
21 you -- you saw that we could do what we -- it was
22 possible to do what the Mayor and others have said could
23 be done. And you tried and you gave us that voice was
24 just, like, enormously appreciated. So we're very, very
25 grateful for what you've done and hope you all have a

1 wonderful holiday season.

2 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

3 And right now, we have caller 2313, and up next
4 after that will be caller 1536. Caller 2313, please
5 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. Good evening. My
7 name is Pedro (ph.), and I'm calling from Fresno. Thank
8 you all, first off, for your hard work and really just --
9 it's very impressive the way you're hearing out the --
10 the most-populated state in the entire country. And as
11 somebody that experienced redistricting heavily in the
12 local level, the way you're conducting things really has
13 me desiring more at the local level.

14 But I do want to express my support for the
15 (indiscernible) Congressional Plan. I'm here to support
16 the changes made to the Central Valley Congressional map
17 as shown in the fourth visualization. Then you can -- I
18 also wanted to just add that even though the
19 Merced/Fresno District is -- is great as it is currently
20 drawn, even though the Latinos see that it's slightly
21 slower at 50.24 percent, we believe it will perform for
22 our families and it creates most opportunities for fair
23 representation throughout the Central Valley. That's all
24 I wanted to share. Thank you, all, and great job.

25 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

1 And right now, we have caller 3516, and up next
2 after that will be caller 1597. And for those that have
3 just called in, please press star nine to raise your hand
4 indicating you wish to give comment. Caller 1536, please
5 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, this is (indiscernible).
7 I just want to take this opportunity to thank the
8 commissioners for listening to the community and I -- I
9 want to comment regarding the San Jose Congressional
10 District Iteration 3 map from December 15th. Looks like
11 you guys finally heard us. Asian community, we feel like
12 we need other voices (indiscernible).

13 And we really appreciate the brilliant work of
14 Commissioner Sadhwani, Commissioner Yee, Commissioner
15 Ahmad, and the entire commission. It is not easy the
16 task that you guys were given. You guys were to -- able
17 to listen to different groups and you still heard us and
18 gave us a voice and we really are grateful for it. Thank
19 you so much for your hard work and dedication and you
20 have a happy holidays.

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

22 And right now, we have caller 9517, and up next
23 after that is caller 7452. Caller 9517, please follow
24 the prompts. The floor is yours.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commission. My name

1 is Vanessa, a resident of Fountain Valley. Please keep
2 Huntington Beach with the Fountain Valley, Westminster,
3 and (indiscernible) make a lot of sense for our many
4 (indiscernible) communities of interest of those cities
5 and communities together in the Assembly, Senate, and
6 Congressional District.

7 Commissioner (indiscernible), thank you for wait --
8 thank you for wanting to visit Little Saigon District
9 map.

10 Please make sure you include (indiscernible) of
11 Huntington Beach with -- of all the north (indiscernible)
12 Street to the Little Saigon Assemblies to allow the
13 communities to be represent by the same Assembly member
14 who understand the great Little Saigon community. Thank
15 you very much. We say goodnight.

16 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

17 And right now, we have caller 7452, and up next
18 after that is caller 4521. 7452, please follow the
19 prompts. The floor is yours.

20 MR. SOTO: Thank you. Good evening, Commissioners.
21 Thank you for your hard work and diligence. My name is
22 Michael Soto. I'm an Alhambra homeowner and Advisory
23 Housing Commissioner. I'm calling today regarding the
24 latest San Gabriel Valley State Senate maps. Alhambra,
25 San Gabriel, Rosemead, and Monterey Park are Latino API

1 minority majority cities along the 10 Freeway and should
2 be included with the rest of the San Gabriel Valley,
3 rather than Pasadena and other predominantly white portal
4 communities north along the 210 and 134 Freeways. These
5 west San Gabriel cities do not share concerns around fire
6 danger with the (indiscernible) communities and have a
7 high -- and are working class communities as opposed to
8 more affluent communities to the north.

9 Also, just another further distinction, is that
10 these communities to the north have major higher
11 education institutions, such as Caltech and The Claremont
12 Colleges. I urge the committees who are working the San
13 Gabriel Valley back to the November maps where the San
14 Gabriel was united in one district and represents a more
15 accurate community.

16 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

17 MR. SOTO: Please do not dilute Latino or API voices
18 in the San Gabriel Valley. Thank you.

19 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

20 And right now, we have caller 4521, and up next
21 after that will be caller 1587. Caller 4521, if you'll
22 please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, this is Deborah with
24 the City of Rancho Cucamonga, and I'm calling to request
25 to please keep the City of Rancho Cucamonga whole. We

1 are a community of 177,000 people and are currently split
2 into two Assembly districts, two Senate districts, and
3 three Congressional districts. We respectfully request
4 that you keep us into one district, as we have a sense of
5 identity and historically been in all one district. And
6 we thank you to keep our neighborhoods together so that
7 we do not have diminishing community power and have the
8 opportunity for strong representation. Thank you so much
9 and have a nice evening.

10 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

11 And right now, we have caller 1587, and up next
12 after that will be caller 2737. Caller 1587, please
13 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

14 MS. RAMOS ANDERSON: Hello. Thank you, Congress --
15 Commission. My name is Patricia Ramos Anderson, and I'm
16 from Santa Nella, which is a gateway to Silicon Valley to
17 Central Valley in Merced County. For generations, Merced
18 and the Salinas Valley have been -- have much
19 similarities in Central Valley far, far from any kind of
20 central cove. I have a family of three generations. I
21 was raised here and actually retired and came back.

22 What's important about our area is the demographics
23 are very similar to those in Merced County, Central
24 Valley, and its agricultural-based economy. And also, we
25 have great fishing, by the way, at the San Luis

1 Reservoir. Our communities and (indiscernible) many
2 unincorporated rural communities such as ours need a
3 strong voice who will represent us in Sacramento and
4 advocate who understand our issues that impact us here in
5 Central Valley. We must keep Salinas, Merced, and
6 Central Valley together.

7 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

8 MS. RAMOS ANDERSON: Support the communities of
9 interest instead of the status quo. That's been a
10 challenge because we've not had enough representation
11 that brings back infrastructure especially to many of our
12 rural communities. And my little town --

13 MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

14 MS. RAMOS ANDERSON: -- might be small, but it
15 brings in like 4 million dollars of revenue yearly for
16 the past fifty years with the same supervisor -- now, he
17 retired and left in the district election, but never had
18 a park built in three --

19 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

20 And right now, we have caller 2737, and up next
21 after that will be caller 2450. Caller 2737, please
22 follow the prompts. Caller with the last four digits
23 2737, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing
24 star six. The floor is yours.

25 MS. RAMOS: Yes. Senora Ramos. (In Spanish, not

1 transcribed).

2 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (In Spanish, not
4 transcribed).

5 MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (In Spanish, not
7 transcribed).

8 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

9 And right now, we have caller 2450, and up next
10 after that is caller 7100. And these are the last two
11 hands I have in the cue. So if you have not spoke this
12 evening, please press star nine to raise your hand
13 indicating you wish to give comment. Makes my job a
14 little easier. And if you have not spoke this evening,
15 please press star nine.

16 Right now, we have caller 2450, and up next after
17 that will be caller 7900. Caller 2450, please follow the
18 prompts. The floor is yours.

19 MR. NAIL: Hello. My name is Mike Nail (ph.). I
20 live in Hesperia and work in Victorville. I am calling
21 to generally support the State Senate map titled
22 SD_ANTDICAL_Iteration. The new Senate iterations in Los
23 Angeles County are far better when it comes to
24 representation, especially for the Latino and Black
25 communities. My only request is that the east side of

1 the district follow the same dividing line in the Victor
2 Valley as the Assembly Map 8039 Antelope. The Assembly
3 map keeps part of Hesperia with Victorville and Adelanto
4 and cuts out Apple Valley. By doing that, the Assembly
5 map protects the Latino community of interest in the
6 Victor Valley.

7 The Senate map should be the same. The way that the
8 AV39 Antelope seat cuts through the Victor Valley, keeps
9 the Latino communities together. I only ask that
10 SDANTVICAL Iteration makes this minor adjustment by
11 including part of Hesperia, which is mostly Latino, and
12 removing Apple Valley, a predominantly white, non-Latino
13 community from the District.

14 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

15 MR. MAYO: Thank you for your time and
16 consideration.

17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

18 And right now, we have caller 7100, and up next
19 after that we have caller 5178. Caller 7100, please
20 follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

21 MR. PORTALA: Thank you. I've been waiting for a
22 long time. My name is Majesh Portala (ph.), a thirty-
23 year resident of Fremont, California, and I work in
24 Cupertino. And I basically am representing the San Jose
25 (indiscernible) District. I'm calling for the third

1 time, actually, over the last few months. And two days
2 prior to this meeting, I was pretty educated. The
3 community was calling me to make a presentation, but as
4 before, the commissioners were not listening. But I was
5 very presently surprised and very happy that you all
6 chose the Iteration number 3.

7 As you may have guessed, I represent the South Asian
8 community, which has created many jobs and supported the
9 community (indiscernible) created prosperity and realized
10 the human potential here in the Valley. Keeping Fremont
11 and Cupertino together will not only strengthen our
12 democracy, but stop this (indiscernible) my south Asian
13 community as thriving today as we were feeling
14 disenched (sic) by what we were noticing -- what was
15 happening. Especially the Iteration number 2 was a clear
16 insult as it was (indiscernible) --

17 MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

18 MR. PORTALA: -- and difficult to (indiscernible) to
19 my community by targeting (indiscernible).

20 Thank you so much for listening and (indiscernible).
21 Finally, I'd like to thank (indiscernible) Commissioner
22 Sara Sadhwani for really listening to the community, and
23 we are pleased to listen to her. And I'd also like to
24 thank the Commissioner Yee. Have a --

25 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

1 And right now, we have caller 5178, and up next
2 after that is caller 0413. Caller 5178, please follow
3 the prompts. The floor is yours.

4 MR. LONG: Hi, my name is John Wong. I was born and
5 raised in the community of Rancho Penasquitos. First of
6 all, I want to thank Commissioner Sinay and Sivan on
7 their work in the Southern California area of East
8 (indiscernible) District. Overall, I am mostly pleased
9 with what you all have done so far (indiscernible) today.

10 I understand tomorrow you may adjust a few things in
11 the North County San Diego District, but if you keep the
12 Coast/Inland two district format, I just want to do a
13 little bit of cleanup. This will be really good news for
14 you, Commissioner Sinay, since I know you want to keep
15 the (indiscernible) High School District together. If
16 you could just move the SSD and SD Coast District in
17 Carmel Valley east of the 5 down to Penasquitos Creek to
18 keep Carmel Valley whole, that would be really great.
19 And then, we can keep (indiscernible) Unified whole by
20 making sure that --

21 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

22 MR. LONG: -- (indiscernible) Highland and Rancho
23 Penasquitos are -- are back in the SD (indiscernible)
24 Escondido District. You can kind of follow the Fairbanks
25 Ranch, City of San Diego boundary and kind of just

1 like -- just --

2 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

3 MR. LONG: -- continue that south to Penasquitos
4 Creek, and there you have it, keeping both of our school
5 districts whole.

6 I'm putting it out there. If you can do that,
7 Commissioner Sinay, that would be really good. Thank you
8 so much.

9 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

10 All right. Now, we have caller 0413, and up next
11 after that will be caller 8116. Caller 0413, please
12 follow the prompts. Caller with the last four digits
13 0413, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing
14 star six. Caller 0413, you appear to have some type of
15 connectivity issue at the moment. I do have you down as
16 a retry. I will come back around.

17 Caller 8116, you'll be right now, and up next after
18 that will be caller 7215. Caller 8116, please follow the
19 prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. Can you all hear me?

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, awesome. Hi, everyone.

23 My name is Cassandra and I'm a resident from Merced
24 County, and thank you for the opportunity to speak
25 tonight. I want to first state that I support the

1 (indiscernible) redistricting plan overall, and I
2 especially really like the three Central Valley Districts
3 from the fourth visualization.

4 I think the Merced Congressional District is great
5 as it clearly is drawn. And even though the Latino CVEC
6 is slightly lower than 50.24 percent, I think it will
7 benefit my district and I believe it will perform for our
8 families. I really think it creates the most
9 opportunities for fair representation throughout the
10 entire Central Valley. And I especially really like how
11 it keeps the Central Valley whole, because that way we
12 have the chance to elect a senator that lives there and
13 is there 100 percent of the time. And I think that's
14 really important.

15 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So I think that's -- that's
17 it for my comments. And thank you for your time and for
18 all your hard work.

19 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

20 And right now, we have caller 7215, and up next
21 after that is caller 2078. Caller 7215, please follow
22 the prompts. The floor is yours.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, my name is Samantha, and
24 I am calling in just to show my support for the map of
25 congressional plan. I am here to support the changes

1 that have been made into the Central Valley congressional
2 map as shown in the 4th visualization. And these
3 districts draw the current district stronger than before
4 with an overall fifty-nine percent LCVAP. And I
5 particularly think this is necessary because I believe
6 that it will greatly perform for families over the next
7 decade. That's ten years, so it's a long time. And in
8 this historically underrepresented region, it is going to
9 be really important for all of our communities for our
10 day-to-day life. So thank you so much for this
11 opportunity. That will be it. Thank you.

12 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

13 And right now, we have caller 2078, and up next
14 after that will be caller 1123.

15 Caller 2078, please follow the prompts. One more
16 time. Caller with the last four digits 2078, please
17 follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The
18 floor is yours.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. My name is Vanesh
20 (ph.). I'm calling about the San Fernando Valley
21 congressional district. I represent the (indiscernible)
22 Association of Los Angeles. And I'm concerned that on
23 the last day of line drawing, you removed Porter Ranch
24 and Granada Hills from the San Fernando Valley and placed
25 these communities with Palmdale and Lancaster. There is

1 a large South Asian community in this part of San
2 Fernando Valley. And this move cuts it off from the rest
3 of the Valley. I think this had something to do with how
4 you wanted to handle Sylmar. It does not help in the
5 district.

6 Porter Ranch and Granada Hills can remain in the San
7 Fernando Valley and you can instead connect Sundland-
8 Tujunga with the district to the north because they're
9 similar character. This would not undo what you achieved
10 with Sylmar. Please do not tear up --

11 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- the Valley at the last
13 minute. Please keep all of our communities together by
14 connecting Porter Ranch and Granada Hills with these
15 other wealthy neighborhoods like Northridge, South
16 (Indiscernible), and North Hills. We share all in the
17 same LA City --

18 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- Council district, by the
20 way. I appreciate if you can take a minute to examine
21 that area one last time. Thank you.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

23 And right now we have caller 1123, and then up next
24 after that will be caller 5319.

25 And for those that have just called in, please press

1 star nine indicating you wish to give comment. This will
2 raise your hand. It will help me sort through the queue.
3 Please press star nine.

4 Caller 1123, please follow the prompts. The floor
5 is yours.

6 MS. VALADEZ: Hello, Commissioners. My name is
7 Samantha Valadez (ph.). Thank you all for allowing me
8 the time to speak tonight. I seek to support the MALDEF
9 congressional maps and want to state my support for the
10 changes made to the Central Valley congressional map as
11 shown in the 4th visualization. As a resident in Kern,
12 these new districts draw the current district stronger at
13 over fifty-nine percent Latino CVAP. This is a necessary
14 change and will greatly perform for our families for the
15 next ten years in this historically underrepresented
16 region. The Kings-Tulare-Kern district of MALDEF's CD 21
17 needs to be as strong as possible in Latino CVAP to
18 perform for our community. I urge you to please support
19 the MALDEF congressional map with the changes made to the
20 Central Valley as shown in the 4th visualization. Thank
21 you all.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

23 And right now we have color 5319, and then up next
24 after that, we will retry caller 0413.

25 Caller 5319, please follow the prompts. The floor

1 is yours.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners, I'm
3 calling from Napa County. I just wanted to thank the
4 Commission for all your hard work and for keeping Napa
5 County whole as an agricultural district. I also wanted
6 to thank you all for changing the public comment process
7 and not closing the line. Many vulnerable populations
8 live in areas with limited or unpredictable service, and
9 dropped calls happen often. Keeping the three-hour
10 window open addresses this issue. Finally, I want to
11 thank everyone behind the scenes. The Commission is
12 great, but the staff behind the scenes is what makes it
13 all possible. Thank you all again. Have a good night
14 and happy holidays.

15 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

16 And right now, we will retry caller 0413, and up
17 next after that will be caller 2956.

18 Caller 0413, please follow the prompts.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello?

20 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, good evening. Hi,
22 Commissioners. my name is Ginger (ph.), and I live in
23 the Madera Ranchos. I've been watching the Commission
24 process very closely for the last several months,
25 especially the recent map ideas. I think it's important

1 to know that areas like the Ranchos should be paired with
2 communities like Madera, Chowchilla, especially the
3 mountain counterparts like Mariposa, Oakhurst and
4 Coarsegold. Clovis and Fresno should not be with
5 countryside and mountain communities. Will you please
6 keep that in mind? Thank you so much. Have a good
7 evening and have a Merry Christmas. Thank you. Bye-bye.

8 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

9 And right now, we will have color 2956, and up next
10 after that will be caller 1808.

11 Caller 2956, please follow the prompts. The floor
12 is yours.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, all. I first want to
14 start off by just thanking the Commissioners for all the
15 work that they've done. I know that this has been an
16 extremely intense process and I completely understand
17 this is a ton of public comment to listen in to. I want
18 to go ahead and share in with -- many other commenters
19 have shared already in regards to the San Gabriel Valley.
20 The west San Gabriel Valley and the east San Gabriel
21 Valley cannot be split up. They need to be made whole.
22 This is diminishing the power of our communities. And so
23 much of the coalition work that we've been doing around
24 homelessness, around transportation issues, we just got
25 put in place with San Gabriel Valley Regional Housing

1 Trust that it's going to be serving our communities.

2 What is going to happen to that trust should this happen?

3 I also want to underscore that I've been listening
4 to the meeting, and I've been very concerned that it
5 seems like Commissioners aren't willing to make any
6 changes at this point. And if that's the case, then what
7 is the point of public input? I understand the VRA
8 districts are incredibly important, but we are trying to
9 offer public feedback --

10 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- to this process because we
12 know our communities and we love our communities. And we
13 would just appreciate if you took into account some of
14 our feedback that we are providing here. Thank you so
15 much and have a very good evening.

16 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

17 And right now we will have caller 1808, and up next
18 after that will be caller 3331.

19 Caller 1808, please follow the prompts to unmute by
20 pressing star 6. And one more time. Caller 1808, if you
21 wish to give comment this evening, please press star six
22 to unmute. Thank you, caller 1808. Please contact the
23 Commission in other ways if you still have comments.

24 Right now we have caller 3331, and up next after
25 that will be caller 3656.

1 Caller 3331, please follow the prompts to unmute.
2 Caller with the last four digits 3331, if you wish to
3 give comment this evening, please press star six. The
4 floor is yours.

5 MS. PEREZ: Good evening, Commissioners. First of
6 all, I'd like to thank you for listening to our comments
7 and concerns. My name is Dora Perez (ph.) and I'm living
8 in Alhambra in the San Gabriel Valley. And I'm calling
9 to speak in opposition of redistricting of the west San
10 Gabriel Valley. This map dilutes the AAPI and the Latino
11 votes, reversing decades of policies that were meant to
12 ensure equitable representation.

13 I'm calling to share my concern that the State
14 Commission is reducing the political power of Latino and
15 AAPI voters in the west San Gabriel Valley. The west San
16 Gabriel Valley cities that encompass Alhambra, Monterey
17 Park, San Gabriel, and Rosemead are currently being
18 connected with white, affluent foothill cities such as
19 Pasadena, La Canada, and Bradbury. Bradbury is one of
20 the wealthiest zip codes in California, with an average
21 household income of 150,000 dollars; La Canada with an
22 annual household income of 175,000 dollars. These cities
23 are predominantly white. However, in Alhambra and
24 Monterey Park, our annual household income is 61,000
25 dollars. And these cities whites make up less than ten

1 percent of the residents. The affluent white communities
2 in the foothills --

3 MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

4 MS. PEREZ: -- hold a tremendous amount of political
5 power over the small -- smaller working-class cities in
6 west San Gabriel. Our communities in west San Gabriel
7 are constantly fighting for resources to improve our
8 neighborhoods.

9 MR. MANOFF: Five seconds.

10 MR. PEREZ: And policy decisions -- thank you.

11 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

12 And right now we have caller 3656, and then up next
13 after will be caller 7726.

14 Caller 3656, if you will please follow the prompts
15 to unmute by pressing star 6. Caller with the last four
16 digits 3656, if you wish to give comment this evening,
17 please press star six. Thank you so much for calling in
18 this evening, caller 3656.

19 At this time, we will be going to caller 7726. If
20 you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing
21 star 6. And one last time. Caller with the last four
22 digits 7726, if you wish to give comment, please press
23 star six.

24 At this time, Chair, everyone in the queue has had
25 an opportunity to speak.

1 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much, Katy, and thank
2 you to all of our callers this evening. In accordance
3 with our new public comment policy, I wanted to take a
4 moment to invite anyone who might be out there listening
5 or watching the live feed who might wish to give public
6 comment to go ahead and call in. Katy, could you please
7 read the instructions again?

8 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Absolutely, Chair. One
9 moment.

10 In order to maximize transparency and public
11 participation in our process, the Commission will be
12 taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the
13 telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is
14 877-853-5247 and enter the meeting ID number 85932989398
15 for this meeting. Once you have dialed in, please press
16 star nine to enter the comment queue.

17 The full call-in instructions were read at the
18 beginning of this public comment and input session, and
19 they're provided in full on the livestream landing page.

20 At this time, Chair, we do not have any new callers,
21 but we will give it a few minutes.

22 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yep. We will stand by for a couple
23 of minutes to see if anyone else calls in.

24 Commissioner Fernandez?

25 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, I just wanted to remind

1 all our viewers that we'll be on the same channel

2 tomorrow at 9:30 as well as on --

3 CHAIR KENNEDY: (Indiscernible).

4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It's tomorrow. Is

5 tomorrow --

6 CHAIR KENNEDY: Friday.

7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Friday.

8 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: These days are just
10 meshing. And then Saturday is also 9:30. Thank you.

11 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And we do have a caller
12 that appears to be joining us.

13 Caller with the last four digits 9938, can you see
14 that yet? Give one moment. Caller 9938, if you will
15 please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.
16 The floor is yours.

17 MS. SAL: Hi, my name is Linda Sal (ph.) and I
18 wanted to thank Commissioner Yee and Commissioner Ahmad
19 for developing the Plan YA, San Jose Congressional
20 District iteration 3. Thank you also to Commissioner
21 Sadhwani for proposing this direction as an alternate to
22 the NEC (ph.) map, and Commissioner Toledo for being an
23 early supporter of this idea and Chair Kennedy for asking
24 Commissioner Ahmad and Commissioner Yee to try out this
25 map iteration 3 -- that direction.

1 And I also think that the end result is brilliant,
2 creating a long coastal district, which is a tradition in
3 California of protecting the coast. The district has a
4 lot in common. A lot of people drive down the coast,
5 have activities and events, and we cherish our coast.
6 This plan meets all of San Jose Mayor Liccardo's
7 request --

8 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

9 MS. SAL: -- and I support the plan because it's
10 very similar to Greater CD -- GREATERED, which has been
11 roughly the same for several weeks because it's had so
12 many COIs in support of it since the summer. So thank
13 you again for all your dedication. You are a model of
14 effectiveness, collaboration, and great decision making.
15 Thank you so much.

16 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

17 And at this time, we have caller with the last four
18 digits 7840, if you'll please follow the prompts to
19 unmute by pressing star 6. One moment. Caller 7840
20 appears to have had a dropped call. One moment, please.

21 At this time, we have caller 1915. If you will
22 please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.
23 The floor is yours. Caller --

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, thank you so much for
25 preserving the voice of San Jose. We agree with this

1 decision to implement Map 3 as discussed today. Thank
2 you so much for listening to our community and for not
3 splitting up us into four districts. We really
4 appreciate all your hard work on this matter and agree
5 that Map 3 allows the tenth largest city in America to
6 keep a representative that speaks for us all. Thank you.
7 Happy Holidays.

8 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

9 And caller 7840 is back and please follow the
10 prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is
11 yours.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, hello. My name is Arman
13 (ph.), and I am calling from the San Fernando Valley,
14 specifically Valley Glen. I first of all want to thank
15 you all, Commissioners, for the incredible work you've
16 done at building these maps. From there, I do want to
17 let you all know that I am a long-time resident of the
18 San Fernando Valley and that I am calling on you and
19 asking you to adopt the San Fernando Valley firefighters'
20 Assembly map. So I'm specifically talking about the
21 Assembly map right now.

22 The LA firefighter map is supported by neighborhood
23 leaders and community members such as myself. And the
24 reason why I support this map is that it incorporates all
25 of North Hollywood and Toluca Lake into a single Assembly

1 district and unites the Filipino community -- my brothers
2 and sisters -- in Van Nuys, North Hills East, Panorama
3 City, and North Hollywood into one district instead of
4 the current map outlining which divides this growing
5 population into three districts.

6 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Finally, I support this
8 because the map aligns traditionally Jewish neighborhoods
9 and keeps our LGBTQ populations in the Valley unified.
10 Once again, thank you for your work. I urge you to
11 change the maps and to support the LA firefighters' map
12 or the San Fernando Valley firefighters' map for the
13 Assembly district. Thank you.

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

15 And right now, we have caller 2672, and right up
16 next after that will be caller 9379.

17 Caller 2672, please follow the prompts. The floor
18 is yours.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, I'm calling from
20 Arcata. I wanted to call in response to the -- I noticed
21 that you have that really long coastal district, which I
22 appreciate, but I noticed you do a little cut in
23 Humboldt. I'm referring back to the -- I know that was
24 done because the Native Vote Project asked for that. And
25 I note that there's some letters from the tribes the

1 Karuk and the Yurok that wanted Siskiyou County to be
2 drawn into the west.

3 With that in mind, I would just appreciate -- I know
4 you're looking at southern California and that's kind of
5 the big thing on your minds right now. But I think it's
6 a pretty easy fix. The population isn't that big and
7 there's no VRA question. So like, just drawing the
8 western half of Siskiyou County into the NORTHCOAS
9 district and then taking that out on the Sonoma side,
10 further down the coast. I know that the Environmental
11 Protection Information Center up here has been really
12 supportive of that as some of our environmental friends
13 up and down the state, and then the Karuk and Yurok
14 tribes. So I'm just asking for Point Reyes to Castle
15 Rock in one district with the Karuk and Yurok in their
16 traditional lands. Thank you.

17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

18 And at this time, I'd like to give caller 9379 an
19 opportunity. Please follow the prompts to unmute by
20 pressing star 6. The floor is yours, hello.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello -- oh, I'm sorry.
22 Hello, my name's Manson and I'm calling again from Orange
23 County. I've been a lifelong resident for almost two
24 decades. I'd just like to recommend a small fix to the
25 SANTAANA and SAVANAANA districts between Garden Grove and

1 Santa Ana in order to maximize the representation of the
2 Latino community and the Asian American community in
3 those areas. I recommend you split Santa Ana along
4 Harbor Boulevard and Garden Grove along Harbor Boulevard
5 and West Street.

6 That way, by splitting these two cities, you can
7 increase the Latino voting age population in SANTAANA by
8 0.5 percent and the Asian American voting age population
9 in SAVANAANA by 0.7 percent. Another suggestion I'd like
10 to make is that in the Assembly -- in the Assembly
11 drafts, you have a district going on the Orange County
12 coast. But I feel like Costa Mesa would be a better fit
13 in that district than Lake Forest and Laguna Woods.

14 Those areas are across a ridge, and I think a district --

15 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- that would represent the
17 coastal economy would be one that includes Costa Mesa and
18 that district. That is all, and have a great night, and
19 thank you for your work.

20 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

21 One moment. And right now, we have caller 5038, if
22 you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing
23 star 6. The floor is yours.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.
25 Thank you for taking these calls in so late at night. I

1 just want to emphasize again one more time that you all
2 keep the San Fernando Valley together, no matter what,
3 for all the congressional and Senate and Assembly maps
4 like you did for the Senate maps, specifically, which is
5 great.

6 Just remember also to please keep the Santa Clarita
7 Valley together. That includes Acton and Agua Dulce as
8 well. And remember to push the Assembly map specifically
9 northwest. And if you know what -- I'm sure you all know
10 what that means, because that's kind of what the Senate
11 district maps specifically -- that you all made is a good
12 template for it. So just keep doing that, push up north;
13 Frazier Park, that's a good area. So just keep doing
14 that and create the supermajority Latino districts, too,
15 in the San Fernando Valley for Assembly. I think that'll
16 make everyone happy. So just keep pushing forward to
17 that. And yeah. Well, we appreciate all your hard work,
18 especially late in the night. So thank you so much for
19 your hard work. Thank you. Bye.

20 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

21 And right now we have caller -- wait; right now we
22 have caller 6349. Caller 6349, if you'll please follow
23 the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is
24 yours.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, thank you. I'm

1 calling from the city of San Juan Capistrano. I want to
2 actually draw some attention to the SOCNSD district. I
3 noticed that it kind of incorporates most of our coastal
4 neighbors, but just, like, jacks to the east and picks up
5 San Marcos, which was a bit of a surprise to me. I know
6 that the 78 corridor is a thing there, but -- and I know
7 that there's been a lot of conversation about that. But
8 I recognize personally that somebody who really believes
9 in rail and kind of -- there's kind of a federal rail
10 corridor there, and I know that some of that have tied up
11 with Pendleton and tied up with the San Onofre Nuclear
12 Generating Station.

13 So I'm calling to request that there's a kind of a
14 coastal question there. Like, so there's, like, there's
15 bluff erosion. There's people dealing with climate
16 change, people dealing with oil spills. And so like,
17 people closest to that question, like, all the coastal
18 cities. So your San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano, Dana
19 Point, Oceanside, Vista, Carlsbad, Encinitas, and then
20 reach down for some of the folks that are working on
21 climate change, like in Solano Beach, Del Mar, and then
22 all the way to La Jolla and UCSD; the Scripps Institute
23 works really closely with a lot of the communities that
24 are dealing with the sea rise and its consequences. And
25 a really truly coastal district. And then having San

1 Marcos, Escondido, Fallbrook, and Rainbow, because all of
2 those east county and northeast county communities kind
3 of line up together.

4 It also separates the educational institutions. So
5 you've got Cal State San Marcos in one and UCSD in the
6 other. Again, I would really appreciate that. And I
7 know that you say that you're close to done, but I would
8 appreciate you taking a look at this. Thank you so much.

9 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

10 And right now, we have caller 4059. Please follow
11 the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners -- long-
13 time listener, first time caller. I'm a resident of
14 Dublin, and first of all, I just wanted to say that you
15 guys have done a very, very phenomenal job. You listened
16 to a lot of testimony, including people like the previous
17 caller who called in multiple times tonight already and
18 other callers who keep repeating themselves night after
19 night.

20 I just wanted to say that as a resident of Dublin, I
21 don't like that the COCO Senate seat is the only one that
22 respects the community of interest of the Tri-Valley. As
23 you look at the Senate districts tomorrow, please don't
24 nest districts with Assembly -- two Assembly seats. As
25 you know, nesting is not required. Please keep the COCO

1 Senate seat district as is. Thank you.

2 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

3 And at this time, Chair, everybody in our queue has
4 had an opportunity to speak.

5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Katy. Everyone in the
6 queue has had an opportunity to speak and I have invited
7 further comment as required by our new policy. So thank
8 you very much to our listeners, to our callers, to our
9 staff, to our ASL interpreters, our captioners, and
10 everyone. We will close the lines and conclude this
11 part.

12 We have a few minutes. We will just quickly recap
13 the day and preview tomorrow. And as Commissioner
14 Fernandez mentioned earlier, we look forward to seeing
15 everybody at 9:30 tomorrow morning. So audio staff,
16 thank you very much. We can close the lines.

17 No, we're not adjourned. As I said, we have a few
18 moments to continue with our recap of the day and our
19 preview of tomorrow. So we -- today was a little less
20 organized than I had hoped, but this is due largely to
21 what mappers are available to us when. I do believe that
22 we still accomplished a good bit today; we certainly need
23 to keep our noses to the grindstone tomorrow. As today,
24 we will start with a -- going back to any congressional
25 iterations that are outstanding -- would appreciate it if

1 you all would let me know what, from your perspective,
2 what iterations are outstanding.

3 And then after our 11 o'clock break, we would shift
4 back to Senate. My highest priority tomorrow for Senate
5 is to take a look at the work that's been done by Tamina
6 and Kennedy to continue shifting that excess population
7 that came up from San Benito over to ECA. I anticipate
8 that we might have a good bit of discussion on that,
9 depending on how they've handled that. And then we all
10 have a variety of ideas on how to handle that. So that
11 is probably going to be an important conversation that we
12 have tomorrow.

13 Ideally, under the original time line, we should
14 also finalize all of the Senate work tomorrow, as well as
15 the Board of Equalization Districts. I don't anticipate
16 the Board of Equalization Districts to take up a huge
17 amount of time, but we do need to discuss them, take them
18 seriously and do what we need to do to ensure that they
19 are the best Board of Equalization Districts that we can
20 come up with. Of course, those are approximately ten
21 million people each. We'll be approaching this primarily
22 by way of nesting Senate districts or possibly
23 congressional districts to make sure that we get our
24 Board of Equalization Districts completed by the end of
25 the day.

1 I hope to turn over a clean plate to Commissioner
2 Fernandez on Saturday, who will be leading us through a
3 full review of all of our districts in hopes of landing
4 on Monday with agreement to adopt these maps as final,
5 after which they would go out for further public review
6 before we certify and deliver them to the Secretary of
7 State.

8 So Commissioner Turner, your hand was up.

9 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I thought you were
10 asking a question about what to expect for tomorrow.
11 Commissioner Fernandez and I -- we do have iterations
12 tomorrow --

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect.

14 COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- for the northern Central
15 Valley area.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, for something. For Senate?
17 No?

18 COMMISSIONER TURNER: For congressional.

19 CHAIR KENNEDY: Congressional, okay, perfect. So
20 that --

21 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, I just want to warn you
22 it may be slightly less than the miracle we hoped for,
23 but yes, we have something.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, but this is what we're here to
25 do. We're here to explore these things. And sometimes,

1 as colleagues have said, the wisdom of the of the crowd
2 might be able to come up with a solution where, you know,
3 one of us or another of us haven't been able to. So I
4 look forward to that discussion tomorrow morning. Thank
5 you for the work that you've been doing on that.

6 Commissioner Yee?

7 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, likewise, Commissioner Ahmad
8 and I have not only the homework we were assigned, which
9 was to work out the splits for the Senate in San Jose and
10 we've worked those out in a way that we're pretty happy
11 with, so we'll show you those.

12 But we also worked out the whole ECA situation
13 picking up from Kennedy and Tamina's work and continuing
14 it up and around the north part of the state. We're
15 happy with a lot of the things that we were able to do.
16 There are some unfinished bits, including leftover
17 population in SACSTANIS. And some -- the worst part is
18 the Alameda/Contra Costa Counties. There's just some
19 things that we're just really not happy with. We ask
20 Commissioners to be open minded tomorrow about
21 possibilities. Assuming there'll need to be compromises,
22 but we think you'll be interested in what we've been able
23 to accomplish.

24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent. Thank you so much. We
25 look forward to that. And thank you to both of you for

1 your work.

2 Commissioner Ahmad?

3 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah, I just wanted to add to
4 that. Let's come in with an open mind and an open heart.
5 This was for Senate. We are excited to have conversation
6 with everyone on what works and what doesn't work.
7 There's a lot of pros and cons here, a lot of population
8 that needed to be moved because of the big deconstruction
9 that we did in the San Benito area. So that population
10 has to be moved somewhere. So these are just ideas. And
11 Tamina is amazing. I just want to make sure everyone
12 agrees with that one. Thank you.

13 CHAIR KENNEDY: That's for State Senate, yes. Thank
14 you, Commissioner Ahmad.

15 Commissioner Akutagawa.

16 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I want to -- I know I
17 keep coming back to the San Gabriel Valley and hearing
18 some of the comments tonight, especially from the person
19 who just felt that we're not listening or we're not
20 willing to listen. I think that Commissioner Vazquez,
21 she's not on, but she had also talked about particularly
22 focusing on some of the more working-class cities within
23 San Gabriel Valley. We have Assembly districts that do
24 include them at the higher Latino CVAP. I would like to
25 try to see if there's a way to, I think, address some of

1 the concerns. I did look up the household incomes for
2 Monterey Park, Rosemead, San Gabriel, Alhambra, and also
3 including Temple City. I compared them to the two cities
4 that were named -- Bradbury and La Canada Flintridge. I
5 also looked up Arcadia and San Marino because those are
6 wealthier areas. And all four of those cities, Bradbury,
7 La Canada Flintridge, Arcadia, and also San Marino have
8 average household incomes that exceed well over 100,000
9 dollars, in the range of about 150,000 dollars.

10 In comparison, the highest for Monterey Park and
11 Alhambra are around 80,000 dollars for San Gabriel --
12 yeah, for San Gabriel and Rosemead they're in the 50-to-
13 60,000-dollar range. So we're talking about very
14 different communities. And since we're hearing from both
15 members of the Latino and Asian American communities in
16 these cities, I think, you know, we've spent a lot of
17 time taking on some of the other more knotty, you know,
18 kind of challenges in these cities. I'm well aware of
19 the VRA obligations, but I want to see if there's a way
20 to just combine both.

21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.
22 I would suggest that we also need to be looking at
23 another metric. So anyone who wants to do some research
24 tonight could tackle this one. If we if we looked at the
25 proportion of that district that falls -- or let's say

1 the distribution of average incomes associated with
2 population. So if, you know, I guess in my mind, if
3 seventy percent of the population has lower incomes and
4 thirty percent of the population has higher incomes, you
5 know, it doesn't necessarily mean that the communities
6 with lower median incomes are always going to lose out.

7 I understand the power of money in politics. I like
8 to fight against the power of money in politics a lot of
9 times. But I believe very much in the power of people.
10 And people who understand how to organize themselves can
11 quite often beat people who just have money. So let's
12 not lose track of the power of the masses, the power of
13 the people, and think that we're -- just because we're
14 comparing and seeing that there are income disparities,
15 we don't need to despair because there are income
16 disparities.

17 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Well, I will say, though,
18 if I can, we're not just talking about income
19 disparities. We're talking about predominantly immigrant
20 and also nonnative English speakers versus those who live
21 along the foothills that are much more -- they tend to be
22 more American born. They're also more proficient in
23 English and navigating the systems. And I mean, I see --
24 I think -- I see what is being said. I -- you know, I'm
25 also being -- I'm trying to be responsive, and I think

1 I'd like to. And coming from those communities, I
2 understand what they're saying.

3 And so but I'm also very mindful of the kind of
4 constraints that we have. But I would not feel right if
5 I didn't at least give it a try. So I could do the
6 research in terms of household income. But you know,
7 across all of the percentages of the cities that are
8 included there. But you know, the majority are foothill
9 cities and they're definitely economically a little bit
10 more better off than the cities that have been cited
11 numerous times by callers. And you know, it does hurt to
12 hear someone say that they don't feel like we care and
13 that we're not listening when I feel like we've tried our
14 best. But if that's what they're feeling, and we've done
15 so much for the other cities.

16 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, yeah. I fully agree with you.
17 You know, I fully endorse us looking at this. I mean, we
18 still have to be mindful of our calendar, but I don't
19 want the -- I don't want that eliminate the possibility
20 of doing some further thinking, some further exploring.
21 We just -- as long as we're conscious of the calendar
22 full speed ahead, you know, let's take a look at this and
23 see.

24 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

25 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. It is 9:54. We've been here

1 for almost twelve and a half hours. I appreciate your
2 patience. I appreciate your support during the day
3 today, and look forward to spending tomorrow with you, so
4 thank you all. Have a good evening.

5 Meeting adjourned, 9:54 p.m.

6 (Whereupon, the State of California, CRC Live
7 Line Drawing Meeting adjourned at 9:54 p.m.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

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 7th 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.

Trelinda Wilson

TRELINDA WILSON, CDLT-148

January 7, 2022