

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

7 Ravi, would you please call roll?

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