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CHAIR TURNER: Good morning and welcome back as we will continue to day 2 of our restricting session for this go around. Welcome back. We're going to go right into our session today with roll call, please.

MR. SINGH: Thank you, Madam Chair, and good morning.

Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: On time, yes.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Anderson.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Present.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Lemons. Commissioner
Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Present and logging on.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.

MR. SINGH: And Commissioner Turner.

CHAIR TURNER: Here. Thank you. Thank you, Ravi.

All right, Commissioners, I'd like to start the day off today with commending you for doing an amazing job on yesterday and getting through the material that we did, the visualizations that we did, and today we are going to try a couple of things different to ensure that we're able to get through the rest of our visualizations more simply and have ability to move onto Congressional and Senate districts.

So a couple of updates. Number 1, I'd like to ask, again, for you to consider your time and ensure that you are adding new information and not just cosigning and repeating information. Commissioners, that will be important as we get ready to move into Los Angeles and Southern California, which we know are large areas.

I also want to try -- this is a trial, something
different for Commissioners, so if I can really have your undivided attention. We're going to go through the process where we will have our staff read out generalized comments that we've heard; we will have our mappers talk to us about what they've seen and what they're presenting; we will have a discussion point. And here's where the change will come in. During our discussion point, Marcy's staff, Andrew, today, when we get to Southern California, if something about a visualization causes you concern or you recalled something about that, Commissioner Anderson, if there's something about a visualization and you're thinking, hmm, I'm not sure, we don't want to take the time while you find it. Staff will be there to say what is your concern, and once you name it for us, if you say, my concern had something to do with Madera, for example, staff will say we received testimony about this or this, and then you'll be, like, great, this is -- so therefore that informs me how I want to move forward. Because we want to get rid of some of that downtime while we are trying to find it.

We recognize that we have thousands of bits of information and we want to consider all of it. So I'm hopeful that staff will try being able to help us access the information.

There was material -- or there was a database that
was provided for us that summarized all of the information before and sometimes on the spot; we can't get to it quick enough. Staff is just going to help us weed through some of that information and remind us about the testimony that we've received.

And last piece is that Assembly districts are smaller. We cannot do everything in the Assembly districts; so if we don't get things done and accomplished in the manner that we want to in Assembly district, please make a note of that. We'll try for it again in the Congressional districts and the Senate districts and do as best as we can. Everyone may not get what they need in every map iteration. Okay? Everybody good? Is that clear? So we're going to trial and we'll see what happens. So let's get in it today.

We're going to start with reviewing and finishing up where we were in the Central Valley. And so we have Tamina that's back with us today and I'm going to -- one moment please, my computer is trying to help me by bringing everything up.

Okay. So we'll go ahead and go into our session today and pick it up right where we left off. There were hands that did not quite get into the queue last night. There were others that may have comment that they wanted to lift. So if that's the case, Commissioners, did you
wake up with any burning thoughts that you want to start with as Tamina is preparing?

Okay. Sounds like all hearts and minds are clear.

Tamina, when you are ready, we'll pick it up with you.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Thank you, Chair.

We have three more to discuss today to round out this session. This is the MONTCOAST, SBARBARA, and VENTURA. I'll just go over them quickly to refresh your memories from yesterday. MONTCOAST begins with the coastal cities of Santa Cruz, including Twin Lakes, Pleasure Point, Capitola, Seacliff, Rio del Mar, La Selva Beach, and Pajaro Dunes. It then comes into the coastal cities of Monterey including Moss Landing, Marina, Seaside, Del Rey Oaks, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Del Monte Forest, Carmel by the Sea, and Carmel Village.

We then go along to the 101 Corridor, where it's Soledad, Greenfield, King City, Pine Canyon, San Lucas, San Ardel, and then Fort Hunter Liggett, Lockwood, and Bradley. And then from San Luis Obispo County, Oak Shores, Lake Nacimiento, San Miguel, San Simeon, Cambria, Paso Robles, Whitley Gardens, Shandon, Templeton, Atascadero, Creston, Cayucos, Morro Bay, Santa Margarita, Los Osos, San Luis Obispo, Cal Tech State, Avila Beach, Los Ranchos, Edna, Pismo Beach and Grover Beach. This
visualization does not include Arroyo Grande or Oceano.

This is page 56. I apologize.

And then we were going to go to 58 and then 59.

58 is Santa Barbara, which starts in San Luis Obispo
County with the Arroyo Grande, Woodlands, Nipomo. It
takes in entire west coast of Santa Barbara County,
Guadalupe, Santa Maria, Orcutt, Casmalia, Garey, and
Sisquoc, Vandenberg Air Force Base, Vandenberg Village,
Mission Hills, and Lompoc, Los Alamos, Buellton, Los
Olivos, Ballard, Santa Ynez, and Solvang. It comes to
the North and East borders of the county, New Cuyama and
Cuyama. And for the southern coastal areas includes
Goleta, UC Santa Barbara, La Vista, Eastern Goleta Valley
and Santa Barbara City. These cities are all whole in
this visualization.

Moving to the next page, 59. This takes Ventura,
which takes all of Northern Ventura County to the borders
of the county line. The western boundary of the
visualization comes into Santa Barbara, takes Mission
Canyon, Montecito, Toro Canyon, Summerland -- don't know
where my little label went -- and Carpinteria. And then
coming into Ventura County, Ojai, Meiners Oaks,
Miramonte, and Oak View. Ventura, Port Hueneme, Oxnard,
El Rio, Saticoy, Santa Paula, Filmore, and Piru.

This visualization then stops before Somis,
Moorpark, Camarillo, and does not split any of these cities.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So yesterday, you gave us directions about the East Bay and we talked about San Francisco. We talked a little bit about the Santa Cruz area. Where we have not discussed anything is actually the -- basically, the southern -- the Northern coastline -- southern/Northern coastline -- central coastline. Sorry, there we go. The central coast. So San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara, and then maybe going up there into San Bernardino and so forth. So if you have any comments on those visualizations, then we're all ears.

MS. MACDONALD And just a note to Commissioners, that the bright yellow areas in the middle that you're seeing are the colored VRA district areas that are under consideration. So that's why they are of this darker yellow color.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: And we have Mr. Becker on, who will let us know if he needs anything from us, any kind of other, you know, lines on there, or if he'd like to have CVAP displayed, then I'm sure he will let us know. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Tamia and Karin, appreciate you.
I'm just wanting, also, to remind us that Commissioners, we've received -- and to our public, we've received now 8,000 -- over 8,500 bits of public comment, visualization COIs, et cetera. So lots of data, which is why we're trying to do something different to ensure that we're holding it all. Also wanting to remind the public that though we are taking comment at the end, please do utilize the tools that does allow us to see your comments real time. So please continue to use that.

And with that, I have hands, Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Sinay. And to let you know, our first break we'll prepare for will be about 12:30. So hopefully we'll be through.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: All right. Thank you.

This is going to connect together between that MONTCOAST and the Santa Barbara maps. Just reading through some of the public comments, there seems to be a number that is commenting on the inclusion of -- or the noninclusion, I should say, of Northern Santa Barbara County, and specifically naming the -- a county and specifically naming the Gaviota Tunnel, which having recently driven down that 101 stretch from -- I am not sure who that -- okay. I could see what they're saying, that Northern Santa Barbara area is very rural. So my
question to the line drawers is, I don't want to say this is necessarily the instruction, but I guess it could be. Can we -- I'm looking at the standard deviation. It looks like we can add Northern Santa Barbara County at the Gaviota Tunnel, which is just below Buellton -- Solvang, Buellton, yeah, around that area. Around the 101, if we use that as that Gaviota Tunnel, that pass as the cutoff on the 101 side.

MS. MACDONALD: I'm sorry, Commissioner, add it to where?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: To the MONTCOAST.

MS. MACDONALD: Oh, oh, so you want this -- the entire western area here --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MS. MACDONALD: -- added --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Northern Santa Barbara County. There's a number of comments. It looks like they're a little under the population and in terms of the MONTCOAST visualization that I'm looking at, about 20,000 short. So it looks like they're -- one, if that portion were to be added, would it throw off the standard deviation.

MS. MACDONALD: So if that portion were to be added, it would -- not only would it not fit in this MONTCOAST district, but actually what would happen is that it would
create the need to pull more from Ventura.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, and I actually --

MS. MACDONALD: And that would split this Piru, (indiscernible) Piru COI.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, you already have Ojai in when they had asked for it to not be in anyway. I think there's going to -- I understand that there's going to be some repercussions, but I just want to ask if that were to be done. Because they are a more rural area then the rest of Santa Barbara. That was pretty clear.

AlAlso, the cutoff I want to ask you about is -- you made the cutoff at Santa Barbara. Montecito is oftentimes very closely connected to Santa Barbara. So that's also, I guess, an unusual cutoff. I'm just wondering if you were to go further down. I know -- this is the part that if you go further down and you cut it off after Montecito, and then since for Ventura, the Ventura visualization that's next, I am aware that in the communities of interest testimony that we heard, the Port Hueneme, Oxnard, Santa Paula, Filmore and Piru communities asked to be kept together, but they wanted to be separate from Ojai, but given the current visualization, it would be -- and I looked at the maps. Down below, it would be hard not to include Ojai. It's -- I do wonder if we could go a little bit further
South, include Camarillo at least. Can you just move
the -- yeah -- Camarillo's not very much like the Oxnard,
Port Hueneme, Santa Paula, Piru communities. I'm just
wondering if, you know, maybe that's where I'm going to
need some -- maybe some help from the line drawers in
terms of --

MS. MACDONALD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- the numbers.

MS. MACDONALD: Okay. We'll take a look. Thank
you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Commissioner
Akutagawa. I was going to say the same thing about the
Gaviota Pass. And then we also -- we heard, you know,
North Santa Barbara with San Luis Obispo and -- at the
Gaviota Pass, as well as -- at least if we can't do all
of that, Arroyo Grande deals closer with San Luis Obispo
than it does with Santa Barbara, which is at the tip --
the North tip, that little piece up there. And then it
is true that we have heard -- I was just kind of going
through.

We have heard that Piru and all that to be separate
from Ojai unless the only way to keep them together is
they feel closer to Ojai than they would going South.  
And so that was kind of how they brought it up. So it 
depends which one you're reading, but they'd rather not 
be with Ojai, but they'd rather be with Ojai than heading 
South into the other areas. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And I'd just like to ask.  
We do have Jose on that is capturing and looking at 
testimony, public input.

Jose, do you have anything in regards to Ojai that 
would help with this discussion? And if not, if the 
search doesn't pull up anything specifically -- 

MR. CHAVEZ: Hi, Chair. Hi Commissioners. I am 
pulling some data and I can share in -- if you give me 
thirty seconds, I would do that.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. If you'd just prepare to do 
that, we're going to go back to Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Just real quick, if you go 
down to that Santa Barbara/Ventura map, you have the 
Channel Islands, it looks like. Part of it is blue, part 
of it is green. Is that just because of the way the 
census blocks are? It's just kind of weird. And then 
you have those other little -- like, two islands that are 
green, two that are blue, and then one that's light blue.  
I understand the light blue one, but is there a way to 
include it all in one district? It just seems weird that
we just got that one tip that's green.

CHAIR TURNER: I think -- and let me know, on the blue is all in one county. It's -- I think it's separated out by counties. So you're -- go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Those are part of the those other counties.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I understand that, but can we cross counties in this way so that they're -- so the one island is all in one district?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think it's a census block.

MS. MACDONALD: If you would like me to explore putting the current green islands into blue, then I can definitely do that.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Or you can do vice versa, I mean, which -- you know, whichever one makes sense in terms of also population numbers, too.

CHAIR TURNER: Jose? Are you prepared --

MR. CHAVEZ: Hi, Chair. Yes. I do have data available, but I believe that I'm not a panelist, which means that I'm not able to share my screen.

CHAIR TURNER: You don't have to share the screen. Just tell us, what are you seeing.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: You are a panelist and you can share your screen.
MR. CHAVEZ: Oh, that's good. So there is -- there's COI where residents of Ventura, they would like to specifically belong to Santa Paula, Oxnard, Port Hueneme, Santa Clara, Santa Paula, and Fillmore to be included together. And there is also input where communities of interest want to keep western Ventura County together for environmental justice purposes. They would request communities of interest that include Ventura, Ojai, Oxnard, Santa Paula, and Fillmore.

There's a divide between West and East Ventura. Western is more agriculture working class Latino, more disparate in housing, education. There is also a large population of communities of interest such as (indiscernible), Zapotecs, and (indiscernible) communities. I also see that -- and that's a large -- there's a handful of communities of interest with similar requests in communities of interest.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Jose. Continue to stand by.

Commissioners, this is just a trial. We know we have almost 9,000 public comments. Getting it real time that we are seeing come in and so Jose is just another resource, trying to help us recall and keep all of the information upfront as we're making decisions.

So Jose, I appreciate your willingness. He was just...
made aware of this a little bit ago. And I appreciate your support and what you're attempting to do. So stand by.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sorry about that. Yeah, this is super helpful, so thank you, Jose, for being here and providing that update. I definitely just want to agree -- and I'm hoping I'm adding here to Commissioner Akutagawa's concern about going all the way up to Montecito. You know, much of the COI testimony, as Jose just identified that Port Hueneme, Oxnard to Piru was largely around working class values. And then when we think about Montecito, and you've got, like, Megan Markle and Oprah in Montecito. So I do think that probably going further South, taking that portion of -- keeping Montecito with Santa Barbara and then going further South. Whether that's exploring Somis or Moorpark, to some extent, could make a little more sense for that district in maintaining that COI, which has more to do with the working class values, I think is what we had heard from that testimony.

CHAIR TURNER: Tamina, do you have what you need?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: I do. Thank you very much.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Is there any other Commissioner? Do you have anything else you want to lift
for this area?

Okay. We're going to move on. Yes. So at this point, we're going to move into the next area of our -- we're going to Los Angeles, and so Jamie's going to present right after we hear from -- let's see, who's up for Los Angeles? Kim is going to give us an overview. And we'll get our maps and our public comments ready once our staff transitions.

And to the public, thank you. We see your comments coming in. We'd ask for you to continue. We are seeing them real time. We're not waiting until the end, and we're responding to them real time. So we appreciate that. You moved a little quicker than we thought.

Okay. So thank you. So Kim, whenever you're comfortable and are ready, we'll go ahead and get started into our next area.

Commissioners, again, I'd love for you to just know that we're trying to make adjustments as needed. We won't drill down too far with the numbers. We're just having high level -- this is our first opportunity to work with one map. So to that end, we are ready for Los Angeles.

MS. BRIGGS: Good morning, Commissioners. I'm going to go over public input sources first I received for Los Angeles County. I guess I should introduce myself. My
name's Kimberly Briggs. I'm the field team lead for LA and Orange Counties.

So for visualization feedback, we received over 300 submissions. We received over 500 submissions for the draw my community website. We've received over 450 submissions via live meetings, over 250 submissions via email, 75 via letter, 3 via the website, and 3 via the report, that referenced LA County. Please note records that span multiple outreach zones are counted in more than one.

The following is an overview of high level trends derived from submissions to the Commission. This overview is meant to provide Commissioners with some samples of public input received. So I have them broken down in geographical areas, as my colleagues have, starting with the Santa Clarita Valley. Received some direction to keep Simi Valley and Santa Clarita in the same Congressional district, which is the Twenty-fifth.

CHAIR TURNER: Kimberly?

MS. BRIGGS: Yes.

CHAIR TURNER: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MS. BRIGGS: We also received some direction to have Simi Valley and Moorpark together. Some also referenced including Thousand Oaks with this pair. Also heard some submissions that Moorpark belongs with Ventura County,
not the San Fernando Valley and LA County. Also saying that Simi Valley belongs in Ventura County. For the San Gabriel Valley, stakeholders in cities like Alhambra, San Gabriel Rosemead, and El Monte, which is the western San Gabriel Valley, asking to be kept together. Some submissions say that El Monte and South El Monte need to be kept whole. And some submissions said that Pasadena should be Glendale and Burbank.

Going to the San Fernando Valley, submissions strongly insisted, they don't want any of the districts to go South of Mulholland Drive and to the west side, and to minimize splits within Valley neighborhoods. They said if splits must occur, they need to have a minimum fifty percent hold in that district, and if you do move, you can go into Santa Clarita to the Northeast into the San Gabriel Valley or west into Ventura, but absolutely just don't go South.

We also received numerous submissions regarding the Northern part of Sherman Oaks called POSO. They asked to keep them united with the greater Sherman Oaks area in all maps and districts. And then some comments mentioned Calabasas and just letting you know that it shares commonalities with the communities of Agora Hills, Hidden Hills, and Westlake Village.
Hills, and West Lake Village.

For the Antelope Valley, some submissions referenced that the Twenty-fifth Congressional District has been divided for some time. Part of the Antelope Valley is in the Twenty-third, which includes Bakersfield and Fresno. They say the Twenty-fifth needs to be the main place for the Antelope Valley. And some submissions referenced feeling like the red-headed stepchild of LA County. They're concerned about underrepresentation and attention. And for this reason, they want to be -- for this reason, they want to be kept together to have a strong voice.

And then some submissions, discussing the City of Lancaster mentioned that they're split between two Congressional districts, the Twenty-third and Twenty-fifth, which doesn't make sense to them. Some referenced preferring the city to be included in the Twenty-fifth district whole.

For beach communities, most say they want to keep the beach cities together. And some define this as Palos Verdes up the coast to Santa Monica.

We also received a significant number of submissions that strongly disagreed with visualizations that had Simi Valley and Moorpark included in a district with Malibu, due to different socioeconomic backgrounds and needs.
Now, I'm going to the greater LA area, and it's kind of broken into subcategories. So for Northeast LA, we do have limited submissions for this area. But stakeholders did express concerns about gentrification and housing affordability. One submission noted that Los Feliz is split into two Senate districts, which makes no sense due to their small size.

For west LA, some submissions said Hollywood and west Hollywood should be together. And some submissions referenced using the City of LA Neighborhood Council boundaries as a guide, some referenced using the Westside Council of Government as a guide, and overall just asking to reduce the number of splits in unincorporated areas and adjacent cities.

For East LA, some submissions referenced having Boyle Heights and East LA together. And then some submissions disagree with visualizations that group East LA with Gateway Cities.

For South LA, a couple of submissions disagreed with the visualization that broke apart South Central LA and the Zapata-King Neighborhood Council from South LA and added them to Northeast LA. South Central neighborhoods want to stay whole and together. And then some submissions disagreed with the visualizations of Senate maps that reduce Senate seats from two to one in this
area.

For Harbor Gateway, responding to the visualizations, some San Pedro submissions are asking to not be included with Long Beach. Some are also saying they don't want to be included with Palos Verdes either. They're saying they have more in common with Harbor Gateway communities in South LA.

For Gateway Cities, some submissions reference this is an area where cutting up of districts happens a lot. Pollution from freight and freeway traffic are big concerns. Some submissions disagree with the visualizations that group Gateway Cities, like Maywood and Vernon with San Gabriel Valley communities. And a few submissions wanted Cerritos and Artesia together in LA County base districts, and the cities asked to be kept whole.

For the South Bay and to Long Beach, submissions asked to keep the South Bay coastal communities together. And we also heard overwhelmingly from Long Beach to keep them together. Some submissions are asking to keep Torrance whole. And some submissions referenced making sure the Palos Verdes peninsula is kept with the South Bay. And again, this is just a high-level overview of submissions submitted to the Commission.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Kim. Very, very helpful.
We appreciate it. We're going to move now to our mappers and to -- is it Jamie, I believe, today?

MS. CLARK: It is Jamie, and we are going to start with page 62 on your Assembly handout, please.

Thank you and good morning, everybody. This is where you just left off with Tamina. This visualization includes areas in Eastern Ventura County, including Somis, Camarillo, Moorpark Santa Susana, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks areas. And additionally in, sort of very Western Los Angeles County, include Agora Hills, West Lake, Calabasas, Topanga, Malibu, and the Palisades area. And Palisades here is split at Sunset.

And the next page is 60- --

CHAIR TURNER: Jamie, I'm sorry. But before you go on.

Commissioner Akutagawa, is your hand up? Nope, I see it.

Okay. Go ahead.

MS. CLARK: Thank you. And next going to the Westside district. This is page 63. And this visualization includes Santa Monica, Westwood, Westside Neighborhood Council, West Los Angeles Neighborhood Council, Palms, Mar Vista. This part of Culver City that is West of 405, Del Rey, Marina Del Rey, and Westchester.

To the South Bay visualization -- this is on page
64. And this visualization includes El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Lawndale, Gardena, Torrance, which is whole, Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, Palos Verdes, Lomita, and Rolling Hills.

Then we're going to page 65. Okay. So this visualization includes San Pedro, Wilmington, Carson, West Carson, Harbor Gateway Cities, Compton, West Rancho Dominguez, East Rancho Dominguez, and Watts, I believe it's South of East 103rd, and that's just for population.

And next, we are going to page 66. This visualization includes most of Long Beach, Signal Hill, Lakewood, Hawaiian Gardens, Los Alamitos, and Rossmoor.

And next, we are going to page 67. So as you may see from the bright yellow color, this is one of the areas that we have been collaborating closely with your VRA team to create this visualization. And of course, working with Commission direction from last time. This is includes -- in Orange County, La Palma, and the rest of these are in Los Angeles County, including Artesia, Cerritos, Norwalk, Bellflower, Downey, Bell Gardens, Bell, Maywood, and Commerce. All of the cities that I just named are whole and intact in this visualization.

And next, we are going to page 68 of the handout. Okay. And in this visualization, which 7 -- sort of follows the 710. Again, this is based on Commission
direction from last time. Includes Vernon, Huntington Park, South Gate, Lynwood, Paramount, Northern part of Long Beach, this unincorporated area, just west of Long Beach. I'm going to zoom in to see some of the details here on the Western -- Northwestern side of this area, includes Florence-Firestone and Watts, North of 103rd. And again, that was just for balancing population. And this area that I just described to you also is part of the area that we are working with your VRA team to create.

And next, we're going to page 69 of the handout. This visualization, which is on page 69 of the handout, is on both sides of 110. In the City of Los Angeles it includes much of the Arlington Heights, West Adams-Jefferson Park community, historic South Central, Zapata King, Empowerment Congress Central, Empowerment Congress Southeast, Westmont, and again, just includes areas on both sides of 110, and roughly up North bounded by the 10 -- pardon me, and to the South, 105.

And next, moving onto page 70 of the handout. And again, page 70 of the handout, this visualization includes Neighborhood Council areas of Olympic Park, Pico, Mid City, West Adams, Park Mesa Heights, and includes Culver City East of the 405, Madera Heights, View Park, Inglewood, Lennox, Del Aire, Hawthorne, and
West Athens.

And next, we're going to page 71 of the handout, just North of this area. Again, that's page 71 in the handout. And this visualization includes South Robertson, Beverly Hills, West Hollywood, Mid City West, Greater Wilshire, Koreatown, East Hollywood, and Hollywood Hills areas.

Next, we are going to page 72. And the visualization on page 72 includes Pico, Union, Westlake areas, Downtown, Lincoln Heights, LA 32. This area I'm circling is generally the El Sereno area, East Los Angeles, and Boyle Heights.

And next, we're going to page 73 of the visualizations. And this visualization includes whole and intact Glendale. I'm going to zoom in a little bit more. Also includes South Pasadena, Eagle Rock, Echo Park, Silver Lake, Los Feliz, and Hollywood United Neighborhood Council.

And next, we are going to page 76, please. Okay. Moving towards the San Gabriel Valley, and again, this is an area that we worked with your VRA team on. And this visualization includes Montebello, Pico Rivera, The Whittiers, Whittier, West Whittier, East Whittier, South Whittier. Also includes Santa Fe Springs, La Mirada, La Habra Heights, Hacienda Heights, much of the City of...
Industry, La Puente, Avocado Heights, South El Monte, and Rose Hills.

And next, we're going to go to page 77. Again, an area that we worked with your VRA team on. And this visualization includes whole and intact, Glendora, Azusa. It includes the area of Duarte, which is South of the Angeles National Forest. Includes South Monrovia Village, Mayflower Village, Irwindale, Baldwin Park, West Puente Valley, Valinda, Covina, and West Covina.

And next, we're moving to page 75, please. And again, an area we worked with your VRA team on. This includes whole and intact the following cities, Arcadia, North El Monte, El Monte, Temple City, East San Gabriel, San Gabriel, South San Gabriel, San Marino, Rosemead, Alhambra, and Monterey Park.

And now, we're going to go to San Fernando Valley, then we'll go to Northern Los Angeles County, and then head back East. So one moment, please.

Next is page 80. This visualization includes in Ventura County, Bell Canyon, and in Los Angeles County includes Hidden Hills and the areas of West Hills, Canoga Park, Winnetka, Woodland Hills, Tarzana, Encino, Sherman Oaks, Valley Village, Studio City, and Bel Air.

And next, we are going to go to page 81, please. This visualization includes Reseda, Lake Balboa, North

And next, we're going to go to page 82. This visualization includes Sylmar, City of San Fernando, Mission Hills, Arleta, Pacoima, Sun Valley, Foothills Trails District, Sunland-Tujunga, and Burbank.

And next, please, we'll go to page 84. And this visualization includes Northridge, Granada Hills, Porter Ranch, Chatsworth. And in the Santa Clarita Valley, includes Santa Clarita, Stevenson Ranch, Val Verde, and Castaic.

And next, we'll go to page 85, please. This visualization includes Antelope Valley, and additionally includes areas in Southern Kern County. It includes the Tehachapi area, as well as the California City, Mojave, Rosamond, Edwards Air Force Base, and Boron areas.

And finally, we're going to go to page 74, please. This visualization includes areas along the 210 corridor and to the North, areas in Angeles National Forest. This includes La Crescenta, La Canada Flintridge, Altadena, Pasadena, San Pasqual, Monrovia, Bradbury, the part of Duarte that is in Angeles National Forest, San Dimas, Claremont. All of those are in Los Angeles County. And then in San Bernardino County, Northern areas of the City.
of Upload, parts of Rancho Cucamonga, and then including Lytle Creek and Wrightwood. And as part of the San Bernardino Forest area and here Upload and Rancho Cucamonga were split. They're adjacent to areas that you'll go over with John later today. And those are areas where there are VRA considerations.

So I'm going to zoom out and looking forward to hearing your feedback.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Jamie. All right. Let's see.

We'll start with Commissioner Sinay, please.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. Jamie, we received a lot of input from the San Fernando Valley. And so I was hoping we could start there and you explain, kind of, how we ended up going South of Mulholland Drive just to understand that big picture.

MS. CLARK: Sure. Thank you for that question. I will zoom into this area you're talking about, which includes Bel Aire. Is this a specific visualization you're looking at?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, where it goes down to Bel Aire and -- yeah, exactly.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. So part of this -- part of this is around as we were creating the statewide visualization, so going from, you know, regional to
statewide. And all of the mappers were working together to try and keep, you know, different areas together per Commission direction. So part of this includes trying to keep Oxnard to Piru COI intact. And then additionally, had -- okay.

Additionally, I'm going to zoom out and go up to the Antelope Valley area. So right now, this Antelope Valley area is included with some of these areas in Kern. This, in part, is also to try and keep the Oxnard-Piru area together and to keep, sort of, the Santa Clarita Valley intact.

Additionally, we had heard feedback from Commissioners to keep these, Chatsworth, Northridge, et cetera areas, with Santa Clarita Valley. And then additionally, there are some other COIs in these areas that were, I guess, just sort of trying -- there were COIs and feedback about, for example, keeping Sherman Oaks and Van Nuys separate, et cetera. So it's really just a population, kind of, move and also about keeping the Neighborhood Council of Bel Aire together.

It could be with an architecture or a structure like this for the visualization, it could be split and potentially not have that area go North into -- or North of Mulholland and yeah -- and hadn't received any direction to, you know, split it, and we're just trying
to follow the criteria and that is how that happened.
And I hope that that made sense.

    CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

    Commissioner Kennedy.

    COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. You know,
in general, I want to say, I really admire this work. I
know it's very, very difficult, but you know, most of
these, in general terms, make a lot of sense to me. I
think there's certainly room at the margins in a lot of
these to make the kinds of adjustments that we want to
make over the next couple of weeks. But in general, I
think the architecture looks good to me.

    I do have three questions. First of all, is it
possible, please, to make Watts whole? I'd really like
to see that happen, even if we have to rotate some
population around.

    Second of all, is -- I couldn't tell from the
detail, but is Thai Town in the same district as
Koreatown?

    And third, I'm not understanding why South El Monte
is not with El Monte because the district that South El
Monte is currently in is overpopulated by just over the
exact population of South El Monte, and the district --
the visualization in which El Monte currently sits is
under by a little bit less than that population. So to
me, it would seem to make sense to better balance those
two visualizations by shifting El Monte to be in the same
area with El Monte. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Jamie?

MS. CLARK: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy, for
those questions. And I'm going to address them in
reverse order.

So in terms of South El Monte being with El Monte
and North El Monte, this visualization that the hand is
circling right now in West San Gabriel Valley, right now
is an area that we're working with your VRA team on. And
specifically looking at Asian CVAP. Adding South El
Monte to that area would bring the present Asian CVAP in
West San Gabriel Valley base district, as we're looking
at it right now, to below what we have been advised by
your VRA team to draw that district at for Asian CVAP.
And perhaps -- yeah, and I don't -- Mr. Becker might have
more to add to that.

MR. BECKER: Yeah, I'll just say I don't recall what
the -- can you tell me, Jamie, what is the Asian CVAP in
the current visualization in the West San Gabriel Valley
district?

MS. CLARK: One moment, please. And I believe that
it's fifty-three percent, actually.

MR. BECKER: Okay. And what would the -- what would
the additional South El Monte reduce it to?

MS. CLARK: I don't remember that off the top of my head.

MR. BECKER: Okay.

MS. CLARK: And I did try it and it was below what we had been --

MR. BECKER: So one of the things -- because I don't recall that specific number. If the Commissioners want to give an instruction to try that and see what the numbers are, I think that would be appropriate. And we can take a look at it. That is an area where Asian populations clearly have required the protections of the voting (indiscernible) for redistricting purposes.

MS. CLARK: And this is on page 75.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes, please.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So noted.

And Jamie, he had a couple of other questions.

MS. CLARK: Yes. Thank you.

Next is about if Thai Town and Koreatown are together. This is the Koreatown Neighborhood Council area. I'm also going to -- I have many layers on my map and I am going to try and find also the -- finding the
correct layers. So here's the Thai Town COI. And it is with the Koreatown area. We also have received COI input from Koreatown, where the boundaries of Koreatown do go into this area that is labeled as Greater Wilshire on the map, and that is also whole and intact in this visualization.

And then, finally, your question about Watts. So this is a tricky one. And with the -- I will continue to try to work with the VRA team and also find a way to keep Watts intact. It could potentially include splitting a city. It could include not including all of the Harbor Gateway Cities with this, sort of, South LA version -- or South LA visualization. Please excuse me. Or it could include, for example, moving some of this area that is currently in the 110 LA visualization out of that visualization and with some of the Gateway Cities. So it is a very tough spot.

And there also from Watts has been community of interest testimony, where the Watts neighborhood is a little bit larger than the Neighborhood Council definition. And that's absolutely an area that I'm happy to, like, really keep drilling into to try and keep that whole. Thank you.

MS. SADHWANI: Would you remind us of the page number for this visualization? Sorry to interrupt.
MS. TURNER: Could we have the page number of this visualization?

MS. MAC DONALD: One second, please.

MR. KENNEDY: 65.

MS. CLARK: So it would be in 65 and 69.

MS. TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Vazquez?

MS. VAZQUEZ: Yes, thank you. Agree that this is, I think, a good first pass at the architecture of Los Angeles.

I have questions about the Northeast L.A. Assembly district that includes South Pasadena. Mostly, would love to hear just maybe from Mr. Becker what, if any, VRA considerations are happening in this particular district. And then whether or not there are considerations, would just like to know the thought process behind this particular district. And I'm particularly interested in hearing -- so then third, would also like to hear what if any feedback we have gotten from Highland Park residents. So yeah, I'll stop there. Thank you.

MR. BECKER: I'll just say briefly -- thank you for that question -- that the district that is next to it, the West San Gabriel Valley, is that district which has the significant Asian populations that are protected by the Voting Rights Act. I'm not sure if there's anything
in that South Pasadena area -- I think that district
called Burbank North L.A., is that the one we're talking
about?

MS. VAZQUEZ: Yes.

MR. BECKER: Right, and Brown, yeah.

MS. VAZQUEZ: Yeah.

MR. BECKER: So Jaime, can you tell me what the CVAP
percentages in that district are?

MS. CLARK: In which district, please?

MR. BECKER: The brown one, Burbank North L.A.

MS. CLARK: So for this visualization, the percent
Latino CVAP is 28.38 percent. Percent Black CVAP is 3.07
percent. Percent Asian CVAP is 17.87 percent. Percent
White CVAP is 49.4 percent.

MR. BECKER: Right, so I think there's -- I think
that particular district, the Burbank North L.A.,
probably doesn't have any significant Voting Rights Act
considerations. Although, as I said, there are
populations that are very close to it that are
encompassed in other districts. I don't know if that
answers your question, Commissioner Vazquez, but I'd be
happy to look into that a little further if you want.

MS. VAZQUEZ: It does. That's sufficient. Thank
you.

MS. TURNER: And Commissioner Vazquez, Kim does have
information -- I think you were inquiring about Highland Park. Would that be helpful, or are you good?

MS. VAZQUEZ: Yes.

MS. TURNER: Kim, if you would --

MS. VAZQUEZ: Highland Park.

MS. BRIGGS: On the website, under "data", there's eleven submissions. I didn't get to go through all of them, but one submission says "do not break apart Pico-Union, Rampart, Historic Filipinotown, Boyle Heights, East L.A., El Sereno, Lincoln Heights, Echo Park, Elysian Valley, Arroyo Seco, Glassell Park, and Highland Park". Another submission said, referencing El Sereno and Highland Park, "El Sereno is part of L.A. and East of Alhambra, East of the 710 Freeway and North of the 10 Freeway, keep my community whole as much as possible, my city and the 51st Assembly district, 24th Senate, 34th Congressional district, share in common with Highland Park and Eagle Rock areas to the North".

Another references Highland Park in terms of an LGBTQ community of interest. And I can search for more, but that's what I've pulled right now.

MS. TURNER: Thank you.

Is that helpful, Commissioner Vazquez?

MS. VAZQUEZ: It is. That's all for now. Thank you.
MS. TURNER: Thank you.
Commissioner Akutagawa?

MS. AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I am going to go back to the San Gabriel Valley. I'm going to ask for a clarification on the direction that Commissioner Kennedy gave for the West San Gabriel Valley. Is it to add South El Monte to that visualization? It's a little unclear. Yes? Okay, thank you.

So this is where, I guess -- Chair, what do you want us to do when I have a conflicting, I guess, instruction?

MS. TURNER: Yeah, so for now, since we're in visualization still, we'd just like to note it that there are a couple of different thoughts still. And we'll move until we see some of the other districts, and then we'll come back to it.

MS. AKUTAGAWA: Okay, so in this particular case, I would like to see all of Arcadia added to this current visualization as is, excluding South El Monte as it currently stands right now. And just to see what it would be with the inclusion of the entirety of Arcadia, right now, it's a little under. So I think that should work.

The next one that I'd like to go to is -- this is the visualization that is the 5 corridor. This is on
MS. TURNER: Before you from there?

MS. AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MS. TURNER: So for Arcadia, Jaime, and that wondering, not just yet an instruction, that Commissioner Akutagawa had, and perhaps an instruction, what does that -- does that number work? Does it change? I think that's a VRA area. What's your immediate thoughts on that?

MS. CLARK: Happy to explore that.


MS. AKUTAGAWA: Okay, thank you. Next one is I'd like to move to the 5 corridor visualization on page 67. So on this particular one, I think the inclusion of Cerritos and Artesia and La Palma is a little odd within this particular visualization. I'd like to -- I'm going to need some help from the line drawers on this. But I'd like to suggest adding the City of Vernon to this particular visualization.

I know that it is not touching the 5 Freeway. But as someone who drives through these neighborhoods to avoid the traffic congestion of the 5, I think that they do feel the effects of the 5 because, the GPS, they are sending all of us through those neighborhoods. And so I know that there's -- that's something that I wanted us to
take a look at in terms of the impacts of that.

And then also, too, it was already slightly under the deviation in terms of population. I'd like to suggest -- and this is where I'm going to need some help from the line drawers, too. I do understand that it's going to have ripple effects to that Southern part with the removal of Cerritos and Artesia and La Palma.

I'd like to also see the impacts of, perhaps, for population purposes -- but I think it would still be alignment with the VRA, adding either Pico Rivera or Santa Fe Springs or maybe portions of Pico Rivera and possibly all of Santa Fe Springs, only because they do also butt up against the 5, except they're on the other side of the 5. But they do share similarities with some of the other cities in that area. And again, I think I would need some guidance from the line drawers, both -- in terms of what that would do in terms of population.

MS. CLARK: Sure. Could I please ask --

MS. AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MS. CLARK: -- a couple of questions? One note is that Vernon has less than 300 people.

MS. AKUTAGAWA: Yes, I saw that. I was --

MS. CLARK: Okay, yeah.

MS. AKUTAGAWA: I thought maybe that was a typo. It said 226, and we thought, okay.
MS. CLARK: No, yeah, it's not very --

MS. AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I know, so I mean, maybe it doesn't make that much of an impact. But I would like to also request the removal of Cerritos, La Palma, and Artesia from that grouping.

MS. CLARK: Thank you, and happy to look at that. And just wanted to clarify that there's a preference for that and then potentially having Montebello or Pico Rivera split if it couldn't be -- if they can be wholly included for population?

MS. AKUTAGAWA: Yes, yes.

MS. CLARK: Okay.

MS. AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Any other clarifications, and then I'll -- otherwise, I'll move on.

MS. SINAY: Linda, Commissioner Akutagawa, can you explain -- and you might have said it and I blanked out, I'm sorry -- why Bellflower, Artesia, and Cerritos --

MS. AKUTAGAWA: Not Bellflower, just Cerritos, Artesia, and La Palma.

MS. SINAY: -- and La Palma, why you want to pull them out, and?

MS. AKUTAGAWA: At least with those cities, one, there is -- I think there's -- socioeconomically, I think there is a difference in terms of the populations that are there, also much more heavily Asian. It may make
sense to look at them with some of the other cities like Buena Park, even though there is some -- there is more of a working-class community in places like Buena Park, La Habra.

I think they see themselves probably more similar in terms of, I think -- just thinking about what communities go with other communities, my understanding is that they would align themselves more with the Orange County communities less so than the North L.A. Gateway Cities.

Does that help? Okay.

So for the line drawers, any other questions?

Otherwise, I will move on to the next one that I'd like to ask about.

This would be the one that we were also just talking about. I guess maybe, since Vernon is only 226, it may not make an impact. I was going to say, if you move Vernon out, would you be able to then move all of Watts into that 710 gateway visualization?

MS. CLARK: No.

MS. AKUTAGAWA: I'm seeing a no. Okay, all right. Ignore that, then. All right.

And one last thing, and this is about the visualizations that were asked about. You were talking about maybe possibly splitting Bel Air, and I also wanted to suggest or perhaps give direction. Looking at the
West side visualization, this is maybe more broadly looking at it.

I know that there's some comments about Malibu, about their inclusion with some of the West Valley communities. They are rural. However, if it helps, perhaps we should look at splitting Malibu, and maybe in a -- I guess it would be what, East-West? Is that how it would be instead of, like -- vertically instead of horizontally, so then the Eastern portion being more towards L.A.?

If that helps in terms of -- and I say that because as you're maybe relooking at some of those other communities based on what Commissioner Kennedy was also asking about, I'm also conscious about, I think other, communities of interest that are in that particular area that border the airport area. And there's some historic neighborhoods there, too, that we've gotten COI testimony on. And so if that gives you flexibility, then I wanted to suggest splitting Malibu, also. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Just a quick question for the room. Where would you have Bel Air?

MS. AKUTAGAWA: As in grouped with? West side.

MS. TURNER: Kim, I know you're researching something else, but while we're discussing -- scrap the other and just if you would search Bel Air.
And we'll be right back with you.

MS. AKUTAGAWA: I would say it's the West side, like UCLA, not the Valley, definitely not the Valley.

MS. CLARK: Agree.

MS. TURNER: Okay. Well, we agree, Kim. We don't need to --

Commissioner Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Good morning, and I know this is tough work.

On page 72, as we look at East L.A. and those areas -- and again, I think communities have a lot in common. So I don't always think of it from an exclusionary point of view, but where do these communities best fit together so that they can elect of candidate of their choice.

I think that Los Feliz and Silver Lake is slightly out of place, for lack of a better term. And I'm wondering if we can play around maybe with moving those, as Silver Lake is a Northern border, or Eastern border, to those other communities of Echo Park, Elysian Valley, Arroyo Seco. And then to the South, we have East L.A., Lincoln Heights, and all those communities. Those communities are bound by culture, history, displacement, and a number of other socioeconomic issues that I think those communities of Los Feliz and Silver Lake don't
experience. So I think that's something that binds them
together. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Could I please ask a clarifying
question?

MR. TAYLOR: Of course.

MS. CLARK: Thank you. Is the direction to try and
add Echo Park with the other communities in this
visualization?

MR. TAYLOR: When I look at it and I read some of
the feedback, Echo Park, Cypress, Arroyo, Glassell, they
have a lot of commonalities, as well. And we get that in
the feedback. They have commonalities with Lincoln,
Lincoln Heights, some of the Downtown L.A. communities.
So from what I'm reading, that little triangle, or it's a
triangle in my mind, they fit together.

And although there's separation in those
communities, I can see the community of interest on each
side of that border that we have there. And again, my
division seems to be in that Los Feliz and Silver Lake
don't experience some of the same issues that those other
communities share. So when I think of who I would want
to represent me in those -- those issues of those
communities don't necessarily touch the surrounding area as
much. And we're always going to have pieces or places
that are just different. But I think Los Feliz and
Silver Lake can be vastly different than those other communities.

I'm sorry, Jaime.

MS. CLARK: One moment.

MR. TAYLOR: And in reading the community input, as well.

MS. TURNER: Our mappers are back just for one minute, and we'll stand ready, stand down.

MS. MAC DONALD: Could we please just clarify -- okay. So you would like to look into keeping Echo Park and Cypress with Lincoln Heights in the green district, if possible.

MR. TAYLOR: If possible, but --

MS. MAC DONALD: If possible, yeah. And then keeping Silver Lake and Los Feliz together in the separate district, basically?

MR. TAYLOR: Correct.

MS. MAC DONALD: And then can you talk about Glassell Park really quickly?

MR. TAYLOR: Glassell Park has some similarities as Echo Park and Elysian Valley.

MS. MAC DONALD: Okay, so if we were to move, of course, Echo Park and Cypress and Glassell Park out of this visualization that's already unpopulated, do you have a general idea about where that might move?
MR. TAYLOR: That's a good question.

MS. CLARK: I'm going to --

MS. TURNER: And Commissioner, were you saying move out Glassell Park, too? I got -- which way were you saying?

MR. TAYLOR: Yeah, and again, just as we think of visualizations, it's a tough question. I'm still wrestling with that, but I just didn't necessarily say. Karin, I wish had all the answers right now. I would roll it down and throw out a map, but that's what I'm feeling.

MS. MAC DONALD: We would love to have all the answers right now, also. And so why don't we take a look at it and then let you know what we find?

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you. That would be perfect.

MS. CLARK: And if I may, I think that a lot of what you're talking about is possibly, definitely, for a larger district than Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR: Good.

MS. TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay?

MS. SINAY: Thank you, Chair. I just had a clarifying question. On the 110 and the North L.A., page 69 and page 72, are those not VRA districts, as well? So page 69 and page 72.
MS. MAC DONALD: That would be a Mr. Becker question.

MS. SINAY: Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: I don't have the pages. Can you refer to them by the district names? That might be helpful.

MS. SINAY: Yes, it is the 110 L.A. and the North L.A., NLA.

MR. BECKER: Jaime, can I ask you to put the old Assembly districts on there?

MS. CLARK: These generally are looking at old Assembly districts, 59 --

MR. BECKER: Yeah.


MR. BECKER: Thank you. Sorry about that. I'm just trying to get -- that was an area where we think it's unlikely that all three Gingles -- in the area of old District 59 where -- which is mostly overlayed with that 110 L.A. district. It's an area where it appears the third Gingles precondition is likely not met.

MS. SINAY: Okay, and then for the other one?

MR. BECKER: What was the other one?

MS. SINAY: North L.A., the green one.

MR. BECKER: Can you put the Assembly districts back in there, please, the old ones? It looks like --

MS. CLARK: It's generally looking at --
MR. BECKER: -- 51 and 53?
MS. CLARK: Yeah.
MR. BECKER: Yeah, same answer. It looks like the third Gingles precondition is likely not met in those areas.

MS. SINAY: Okay, thanks. And then I had kind of a clarifying question, and it might be that it just comes up later for Commissioner Akutagawa. We were looking at the currently VRA district on page 67. I understood why the Southern part would -- that it might make more sense to move it. But how would we keep the VRA -- was there a recommendation on how to keep the VRA without moving into the other two that are already VRA districts?

Because communities of interest are important, but that's the fourth priority, and VRA is the second. So I was just trying to see, did you have a thought on where we would get more?

MR. BECKER: Was that a question of Commissioner Akutagawa or a question of --
MS. SINAY: Commissioner Akutagawa.
MR. BECKER: Yeah.
MS. SINAY: If she had thought about that, or if you had, Commissioner.
MS. AKUTAGAWA: Oh, sorry.
MS. SINAY: Because I mean, I was thinking you might
be able to go North, but then that's a whole nother
community, the East L.A., Boyle Heights, but just a way
to maintain that VRA.

MS. AKUTAGAWA: So are you asking if --

MS. SINAY: If you had some thoughts, if you had
thought about that, if we --

MS. AKUTAGAWA: Like what other -- to pick up the
additional VRA districts? Or if we remove -- because
Cerritos, Artesia, and La Palma, I don't think will
greatly impact the VRA numbers. And I also did think
about Santa Fe Springs and Pico Rivera. I think they're
also still part of the -- you'll see it's still part of
the larger yellow. So it would still keep it in
compliance, or it should. According to the yellow, it
should still keep it in compliance with a proposed VRA
district.

MS. SINAY: But then they're going to need more
people.

MR. BECKER: Jaime, this might --

MS. SINAY: Yeah, there's an align --

MR. BECKER: It might assist the Commissioners here.

Can you remind us what the Latino CVAP is in the 5
corridor district?

MS. CLARK: 58.57.

MR. BECKER: Okay. I think that's likely at a level
where there's room to explore some other visualizations if you like.

MS. SINAY: Yeah, I just wanted to make sure that we don't lose a VRA, obviously. That was it. Thank you so much.

MS. TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

We're about six minutes out from a break, just FYI. Commissioner Fernandez, you're out next, followed by Commissioner Kennedy.

MS. FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Mine is quick since others have already asked most of the questions. Jaime, I think I know the answer to this one. But on 66 and 68, I believe, we split Orange -- I mean, Long Beach. And I'm wondering, that's probably because of VRA considerations? I just wanted to confirm that.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, that's for VRA considerations and population.

MS. FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, thank you.

MS. TURNER: Commissioner Kennedy?

Good job, Commissioner.

Commissioner Kennedy?

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Two things.

First of all, just wanted to remark that, of Artesia, Cerritos, and La Palma, two of those, Artesia
and Cerritos, are members of the Gateway Council of Governments; La Palma is not. So I don't know if we want to take that into consideration.

Second of all, Jaime, could you show us where Historic Filipinotown ended up in this? Because my recollection is that we wanted it either in the district with Chinatown and Little Tokyo or with Koreatown and Thai Town. And I'm hoping that we haven't stranded it.

MS. CLARK: I believe it's here with Koreatown and Thai Town.

MR. KENNEDY: Is it, though? I'm thinking it's a little bit East of that, but I may be wrong.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, I will verify.

MR. KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

MS. CLARK: And if it's not, then we'll move it in.

MR. KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

MS. TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa had a response to that.

MS. AKUTAGAWA: Historic Filipinotown is along Temple. I think if you look towards where it says "historic culture North", and it could actually be -- to Commissioner Kennedy's point, it could be -- you've got to go a little South of the 101, actually. Yeah, so around -- see that Beverly Boulevard? And can you just zoom in, like, a lot more? Sorry, I can't see anything.
It's, like, around -- do you see Temple, also?

MR. KENNEDY: Yeah. See, it's in that brown pocket South of the 101.

MS. FERNANDEZ: Yeah, yeah, yeah, there it is, yes.

MR. KENNEDY: That's what I was thinking.

MS. FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

MS. CLARK: Okay. Thank you for flagging that.

MR. KENNEDY: Thanks.

MS. TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner -- okay, three minutes, Commissioner Sadhwani and then Commissioner Vazquez.

MS. SADHWANI: All right. We're jumping around the map a lot here. So I have some scattered thoughts, but I'm going to do my best.

I want us to -- on the conversation around Watts, I don't have strong direction here. But I just want to be cautious of the COI testimony we've received and what's happening in these areas, particularly for African American COIs that we've heard a lot of testimony from. I believe the thought was keeping the other -- Watts, Compton, and West Adams. Did we do that? Where is West Adams on this map? All the way up top, yeah, so we're kind of splitting across those. So I just want to raise that. I don't have a strong recommendation at this point in time, but I want to be cautious of it.
While I have the floor, I wanted to weigh in on a couple of other pieces that have been raised. Cerritos, Artesia, I hear what Commissioner Akutagawa is saying. Socioeconomically, yes, there are very real differences between Cerritos, Artesia, and Commerce, Bell Gardens, et cetera. But I can also see them being connected, as well. Like, I could see it going both ways.

But considering that this is a VRA consideration district, open to exploring. But I would also be comfortable with this, as well, if this was the ultimate determination of how we need to meet our obligations. I think Cerritos and Artesia, from what I know of them -- and a part of that is, right, like, there is -- Little India kind of falls in this area in Norwalk along Pioneer Boulevard. And so Cerritos is a very mixed, racially mixed, neighborhood, and so I think it could work. It could work in this way, and I think we're also open to exploring other options.

The other piece, Echo Park, that Commissioner Taylor had raised, going further back up North, I hear what you're saying, Commissioner Taylor. At the same time, I could certainly see why you might want to put Echo Park with Lincoln Heights and other areas and separating it from Silver Lake. I can also see it going with Silver Lake, as well. And I think about, you know, the 2
Freeway, the 5, that kind of run through that area. I do think it's a major corridor from Glendale, La Crescenta area. Even the combination of South Pas and the Northern parts of Glendale, I think goes up to, like, La Crescenta sort of area. Is that correct? Yeah, right up in here.

South Pas and La Crescenta are interesting places. You have a lot of folks moving there who are working at places like USC and Downtown L.A., for the school districts and whatnot. So it's a tough part because I think these are neighborhoods that are in flux, but I could see something like this working.

And overall, I think that the general architecture -- yes, definitely some changes here and there. But the general architecture that's been laid out for Los Angeles is something I feel really comfortable with at this point in time. And certainly, we can continue to make some shifts. But really well done, Jaime. Thank you.

MS. TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Right before we go to break, Commissioner Vazquez had a quick comment.

MS. VAZQUEZ: Thank you so much, Chair. I'll keep it brief.

Commissioner Taylor, in particular, I would love to continue to be thinking about this Burbank North L.A.
Assembly district. I absolutely honor and validate and
have heard the community input about places like Echo
Park and Glassell Park -- honestly, even Eagle Rock, Highland Park -- sharing a similar history to the folks,
I think is really captured in the North L.A. district just South of it.

My concern is just that, given how much and how quickly gentrification is impacting all of these neighborhoods, and as you see -- as you can see in the CVAP numbers for the Burbank North L.A. district, those communities are changing so rapidly. My concern, by drawing a district that pairs rapidly already gentrified districts with North L.A. districts, that we may be diluting the voting power of folks in the North L.A. Assembly district. So want to keep thinking about how we can -- how we can find maybe a third way. I'm just not sure I see it here for the Assembly districts.

Thanks so much.

MS. TURNER: Thank you. With that, Commissioner Sadhwani, we'll come back to you after break. And then -- no, hands down?

Okay, so we'll start with you, Commissioner Sinay after break. Fifteen-minute break, everyone.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 12:52 p.m. until 1:32 p.m.)
MS. TURNER: Thank you so much, and welcome back from our break. We left and we had a few hands that were up, and we're going to continue in that process.

Commissioner Sinay? Commissioner Sinay?

MS. SINAY: Thank you, Chair. I hope everyone had a great break. I just wanted to make sure -- because I didn't look it up, so I'm just going to ask -- that we heal the divide in the Wilshire district, that they were asking us to make sure -- I forgot how -- what their logo was. But I didn't want to -- I wanted to make -- I just want to ask if we did look at that and if we resolved that. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, so greater Wilshire is whole and intact in this visualization.

MS. TURNER: Thank you.

And just a quick reminder for those in the room. I just want to make sure we have our videos on for our court reporter.

And any other hands, any other comments, for this area before we move to our next phase? Going around, okay, we do have one quick hand. Commissioner Andersen?

MS. ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair.

It was actually on page 77, which, I'll have to tell you the name of the area. And actually, it is a VRA consideration, so I don't know if this is a possibility.
But the town of Azusa, we had from COI inputs, and that area is a gateway to the San Gabriel Mountains. And it's also, for lots of people, specifically for minorities, for engaging, pushing minority engagement, in the outdoors. And I was wondering if, if we do Azusa out, that would, of course, affect the population. And I'm wondering, if we put La Puente in, if that would accommodate things, and I don't know if that's a possibility. I'd just like the --

MS. CLARK: We'll take a look at it, yeah.

MS. ANDERSEN: -- if you'd have a look at that.

Great. Thank you.

MS. TURNER: Okay, so we'll explore that area.

Thank you.

If there are no other comments for Jaime, we're going to move to the Inland area. And John is ready.

Andrew?

MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you, Chair. I'll just pass it over to John. We're going to do the Inland, starting from the North and going to the South. And John will be walking through these and giving page numbers as we go through.

MS. TURNER: Okay. Is there a summary that we're going to have for this area, Marcy? Oh, a different Andrew. You started going with it. I got confused, too.
I'm like, okay. He's on? Okay.

Andrew, we're ready for you, the other Andrew.

(Pause)

MS. TURNER: Andrew, if you're talking, you're muted, and your video is off, so we can't see you or hear you.

MR. AMORAO: Okay. Just give me a second, Chair. Let me pull up -- Chair, did you want me to do the other zones that I have written this high-level narrative for, as well? Should I go through the whole thing?

MS. TURNER: Yes, please.

MR. AMORAO: Okay, great.

Hello, everyone. Hello, Commissioners. Hello, public. My name is Andrew Amorao. I'm the Southern California field team lead responsible for the Inland Empire, which includes San Bernardino counties, or San Bernardino County, Riverside County, as well as the San Diego region, which is San Diego County and Imperial County.

The following is an overview of high-level trends derived from submissions to the Commission. This overview is meant to provide Commissioners with examples input received. So this is going to be a tally of public input sources, so visualization feedback. And I should note, too, these are for Zones I, J, and K, so this also
includes Orange County.

    The visualization feedback that we've received from the form is 258. The Draw My California Community website, we've received 552. Live meetings, we've received 502. Excuse me. Draw My California Community website was 552. Live meetings was 502. Emails was 355. Letters were 60. CRC website was three. And via a report was two. And as you already know, records that span multiple outreach zones are counted in this tally more than once.

    So first, I will discuss Zone J, which is Orange County. So we've had a significant number of stakeholders requesting to keep Little Saigon together, which many have identified as Westminster, West Santa Ana, West Garden Grove, Midway City, and North Fountain Valley.

    Several stakeholders also submitted input to keep Little Arabia together in Anaheim because of shared interest around businesses, faith, and culture.

    A handful of stakeholders mentioned the cities and communities around the 57 Freeway and their shared interests with each other rather than the wealthier communities to the West.

    Many stakeholders discussed keeping Orange County coastal cities from as far North as Seal Beach to San
Clemente together because of environmental issues such as shoreline erosion and the recent oil spill.

We also heard more input from stakeholders to keep South Orange County and North San Diego County separate rather than together in the same districts.

We received a significant amount of input from stakeholders about being grouped together with communities in Southeastern Los Angeles County.

We also received a fair amount of input from stakeholders requesting to be drawn together in a district that includes Gateway Cities and Los Angeles County with communities in Orange County along the Pacific Ocean, and their communities have shared interests.

And several stakeholders have shared that they would like their district to encompass the 405 and 55 Freeways East of Harbor Boulevard where the main streets are Bristol and Main Street in Santa Ana.

Next, I have Zone I, which is San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. A significant number of stakeholders requested keeping East Coachella Valley, up to and including the City of Indio, with communities along the Imperial County border because of the shared environmental and health issues caused by the Salton Sea.

Several stakeholders asked for the Morongo Basin,
which includes the incorporated cities of Yucca Valley and Twentynine Palms, to be included with other High Desert communities because of shared geography, climate, and excuse me, economies.

A few stakeholders in the tri-community area, which is Phelan, Pinon Hills, and Wrightwood, want to be considered as a community of interest due to the region's rural setting, limited broadband access, and shared emergency services.

A large number of stakeholders requested that Big Bear has more in common with San Bernardino County residents as opposed to suburban residents in Riverside County around issues such as wildfires, changes of season, and recreational activities.

A handful of stakeholders from Palm Desert -- from Palm Springs, Desert Hot Springs, and Cathedral City, requested to be considered as a single LGBTQ+ community of interest.

And stakeholders from Moreno Valley, Perris, Hemet, and San Jacinto, asked to be included in the same Assembly, Senate, and Congressional districts, due to shared interests, around culture, faith, and historical events, such as Juneteenth and Kwanzaa.

Next is Zone K, which is the Imperial and San Diego Counties. Several stakeholders submitted input to keep
Barrio Logan, Sherman Heights, and Logan Heights, together, but not to be included with the City of Coronado.

We also heard from a large number of stakeholders from Southeast San Diego, which include the neighborhoods such as City Heights, Encanto, Skyline, and Paradise Hills, and the cities of Spring Valley, Lemon Grove, and El Cajon, requesting to be kept together because of their shared interests around their experiences as immigrants and people of color, housing, quality of life, and education.

Many stakeholders from the 78 Freeway corridor, which includes the cities of Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos, and Escondido, and Marine base Camp Pendleton, submitted input wanting to be together because of their shared interests around transportation, similar demographics, and existing geographic and natural boundaries. In addition, a few stakeholders also shared that Vista should be kept whole.

We also received input from the communities such as Alpine, Jamul, Poway, and Ramona, that requested to be together as part of an East San Diego County COI.

And as I mentioned before, we've received strong input from the Imperial County stakeholders that want communities in the Imperial Valley to be included with
Eastern Coachella Valley because of the shared environmental concerns and health issues associated with the Salton Sea, as well as similar demographics.

And that concludes my presentation.

MS. TURNER: Beautiful, thank you. Thank you. All right, Andrew, and stick around; if we have questions, we'll come back to you.

Now, if we'd please have John.

MR. O'NEILL: Okay, great. First, just a brief apology. I was asked this morning to totally change the order of the presentation, so the slides will -- I'll have to jump around a little bit. Sorry about that.

So I'll be starting here in -- well, actually, before I get started, Andrew, any last comments? All right, great. So I'll be starting here in the North with San Bernardino. I'll move South through some of these potential VRA area districts into Riverside, and then go over into Orange County, and then work South into San Diego, which is where I'll end.

So the first district I'm going to start off with is on page 111. That's the second-to-last page. It's this Victor Valley/High Desert region that's in green. And so you can see here some of the communities that are kept whole. As I'm going through, I'll just mention some of the Commissioner direction or some of the communities of
interest that I was considering in producing these
districts. On the slides themselves, you'll see what
some of the cities are that are kept whole.

So here, of course, I received Commissioner
direction to keep this Victor Valley community whole, as
well as COI testimony reflecting the same, and some COI
testimony requesting that Lucerne Valley be included in
that, and also that Big Bear Lake and Big Bear City be
kept with Lucerne Valley.

Shifting South, this is on page 91. This is
called -- it refers to Pomona, Chino, Ontario. This
reaches in -- it's in yellow because this is in a
potential VRA area. It reaches into Los Angeles. We
received a great deal of community of interest testimony
requesting that Pomona be kept in a district with a San
Bernardino district. And with the previous
visualization, I also received requests from
Commissioners to keep Ontario whole as opposed to a prior
configuration that divided Ontario.

Additionally, this border up here to the North where
it's dividing Upland, we'd received some community of
interest testimony asking for North Upland to be kept
with Northern Rancho Cucamonga, Alta Loma, and the San
Bernardino Forest.

Shifting East, this next district is on the next
page, 92, titled R-C-F-O-N-I-R-A, that refers to Rancho Cucamonga, Fontana, Rialto. Again, as I noted, this border here, this is based on the community of interest submission that we'd received asking for this Northern portion to be kept in a district with the Northern communities, separate from the rest of Rancho Cucamonga, this border of Rialto where it follows the 10. And then, of course, another request that we had received was for Fontana and Rialto to be kept together. That's not wholly accomplished, but substantial portions are kept together.

Shifting again to the East, this district is on the next page. It's on page 93. This is called SBHIGRED, so this is San Bernardino, Highland, Redlands. Let me just take a look. There was a Commissioner request in a prior -- or a version of this -- a similar visualization, a request to remove Grand Terrance and incorporate that into a Riverside district. I was able to do that here, which we had also received community of interest testimony about.

Shifting South now, again, onto the next page, 94, into Riverside, this next district is called JURRIVCIT, as in Jurupa/Riverside city. This is on page 94, as I said. And these divisions here in Riverside are following the neighborhood boundaries as I was able to
find them from a Riverside City official neighborhoods
map, and as was requested by Commissioners.

Shifting to the East, also on the next page, this is
MORPEHEM. This is another district in a -- by the way,
let me just pause. All these districts I've been
showing, which are very strongly yellow, are districts
which are in potential VRA areas. This is also one of
those. This district can -- I previously presented a
similar visualization to this to the Commission. One
request that Commissioners made was that East Hemet be
included in that district, so I've added that in.

And there was also a question from some
Commissioners in a previous meeting about whether we had
been incorporating the public testimony or community of
interest input that requested for Moreno Valley, Perris,
and Hemet -- or Moreno Valley, Perris, Hemet, and San
Jacinto -- to be kept whole in a district. And so this
would be an example of where that's incorporated into a
district.

Continuing North and to the East, this is a -- we'll
have to -- oh, we'll have to jump here. This is to page
110, so this is the district in red. This is called
MORCOA, on page 110. So I'm showing here the entirety of
district, and then I'm just going to zoom in to the
Southwestern half just so that you can see the city
names, since that's where the population tends to be concentrated.

So this primarily contains the Morongo Basin, Northern portions of the Coachella Valley, which was again, a Commissioner request. And then also, we received some community of interest testimony requesting, for example, that African American communities in Beaumont, Banning, and Desert Hot Springs, be kept together, which is something else that this particular district is accomplishing. And this border -- well, I'll get to that with the next district.

So moving to the next district, and again, I apologize. You'll have to jump. This is on page 90, and this is called S-E-C-A for Southeast California. This is shaded in yellow because this is a district in a potential VRA area. So you can see here that this district takes in all of Imperial. And actually, I received quite a bit of Commissioner direction on this particular district, so let me just run through what I'm doing here.

So the first piece of direction, of course, which was incorporated into prior visualizations, was to incorporate Imperial, as well as some tribal area community of interest submissions that we'd received in Riverside and Eastern San Diego, and that's certainly
being accomplished.

A second direction was for the border here in Coachella to be adjusted so it took in Indio Hills and Indio and did not include La Quinta.

Another direction was for this particular district to continue North up into San Bernardino. It extends to Needles, and then this portion up here -- actually, let me just turn on reservations. It includes a reservation up here.

And then another piece of direction that I received from Commissioners was the prior configuration of this district ended about here, inadvertently split this reservation. That's no longer split. But another Commissioner request was to actually extend it further North and to incorporate -- and I'll zoom in here so you can see -- to incorporate the reservation land here, which I did.

And then another direction was with the Northern Coachella Valley, to treat Whitewater as the -- kind of this border to entering the Coachella Valley, so I'm incorporating that here. And I believe that actually -- that was one where there was a lot to do. But I was able to incorporate, I think, all of it. So if you don't like it, you can tell me, but I was getting it all in there.

All right.
MS. ANDERSEN: Sorry. John, I do have a quick clarification.

MR. O'NEILL: Yes, of course.

MS. ANDERSEN: And it's on the Eastern portion of Riverside. You kind of dip up and then back down. What's going on there?

MR. O'NEILL: Right here?

MS. ANDERSEN: Eastern, Eastern portion of Riverside.

MR. O'NEILL: Oh, sure. So on the Eastern portion here, that's --

MS. ANDERSEN: And you pop into -- yeah, so you go up to San Bernardino and back down.

MR. O'NEILL: So this is just following a road, and I can just turn on the roads. The direction was to follow the road and --

Or Commissioner Kennedy, please correct me.

But I believe that there's a major water area here, a river, and I'm capturing all of that. If you'd like to make adjustments around here, and if I'm not accurately capturing what you wanted me to be capturing, it's a very, very low population area. It's fewer than 10,000 people, I would guess, here. And so moving that border would be very easy.

MS. ANDERSEN: Yeah, I --
MR. O'NEILL: But what I'm doing currently is I'm just following the road that's here.

MS. ANDERSEN: Okay, all right. Thank you.

MR. O'NEILL: So I just turned off the districts for a moment, so I'm just following that road.

MS. ANDERSEN: Right. Now, I see it. Thank you.

MR. O'NEILL: Yeah.

MS. TURNER: John, do you have more?

MR. O'NEILL: Yes.

MS. TURNER: Okay.

MR. O'NEILL: I was just pausing to make sure that I'd covered everything with that particular one.

MS. TURNER: Um-hum.

MR. O'NEILL: Actually, one other thing that I will just note with this one is there's some flexibility here with the Western side there. And so for example, Jamul had requested to -- Jamul is down here -- had requested to be with a more rural -- I apologize. There was some community of interest submissions from Jamul requesting to be included with a more rural district, and so I just incorporated that, as well. But the exact boundaries here beyond, where it was reflecting the tribal community submission, is something where it would potentially need to be adjusted to reach population equality. So if Commissioners have specific direction there, that's
something that I would find helpful. Okay.

Moving back to Riverside, and then again, we're going to discuss Riverside and shift into Orange, and then get back down to San Diego again.

So looking here at the next district, which is on page 109, this is called MENAREA (ph.); it refers a Menifee. So it refers to a community of interest submission that we had received called "Menifee and its neighbors". And so the boundaries here on this district, it does split a few cities, but I'm just following what the community of interest submission suggested, with the exception of where those community of interest boundaries would have cut into cities that were being incorporated in potential VRA area districts, this particular blue district, this MENAREA district, just follows the boundaries of that particular community of interest submission.

And so one other thing that I'll just note here. I'll talk about this a little bit later when I get down to San Diego. But other Commissioner request I had received was prior versions of districts here had -- in Southwestern Riverside had reached into San Diego. And I got a request to -- or a few requests to certainly not do that. So that shapes where some of these districts are that we're about to look at.
Moving to the Northwest, this is on the previous page, 108. This is called Cleveland National Forest, CLENATFOR. This is a district which presents a little bit of a challenge. As you can see from the -- all these areas in yellow, it's bounded by a number of potential VRA district areas.

In a previous iteration of this that I presented to the Commission, it reached North and included some of these portions in Chino Hills or Los Angeles. I got some strong responses from the Commissioners that that wasn't something that you thought made sense. Some direction I received was that it might make a little bit more sense with some communities further South or with this Cleveland National Forest.

I actually did present previously a version of the district at the state Senate level that looked like this. And I got some very enthusiastic responses from the Commissioners that that did not make sense. But this is an area where -- this is an area where I think it will require a bit of work on the Commissioners' part, hopefully. I'm happy to carry out whatever you're requesting, but this is an area where it's just there's a significant population. And it's difficult to draw it to combine it with another district in a way that I think necessarily makes sense or is consistent with some of the
direction I've received. So I'm just flagging that just for -- constrained by the VRA districts and also by just some of the other population considerations.

Shifting into Orange County now, and pausing just for a moment. In approaching Orange County, we've received quite a bit of community of interest testimony. We received quite a few visualization requests from Commissioners which could lend themselves to district-sized visualizations. One challenge, though, that I ran into was choosing a few of those inevitably winds up with kind of some odd areas needing to be added to other districts. And so I'll run through these districts, and I'll try and point those out as they occur.

But I'll just note that down here with -- in the Laguna area, that's an area where Commissioners have raised some concerns. But I was still finding that there's kind of odd pockets of population that need to be added to other district-sized areas. And then especially here along this Orange County Los Angeles border is another area where I've ran into some challenges.

So starting off with on page 103 -- no, I apologize. Starting off on page 102, a district here called NOCCOAST, which is North OC coast. This is saying -- we received quite a few community of interest submissions about, as well as Commissioner requests. This is a
1 Assembly sized visualization reflecting a district that
2 might be on the Northern Orange County coast.
3
4 Shifting inland and turning to the next page, a
5 district called SANANANA (ph.), so this is Santa Ana and
6 portions of Anaheim. This is again an area where we'd
7 received some community of interest submissions
8 requesting Santa Ana be kept with portions of Anaheim, as
9 well as portions of Orange -- and let me just turn on
10 freeways here -- portions of Orange West of, I believe,
11 the 57 here.
12
13 One other thing which I'll just mention, with the
14 previous -- in a previous presentation, I had shown a
15 couple of potential configurations for this area. There
16 was a Commissioner request to incorporate community of
17 interest submissions in identifying the border, not only
18 here between Anaheim Hills and Anaheim Valley, but also
19 with this -- within Anaheim Valley, where there need to
20 be divisions. And so that's something -- I'll talk about
21 that when I get to a future district, but that's
22 something which I was -- I did take a look at and I did
23 incorporate. I chose a configuration which involved
24 splitting fewer of the community of interest submissions
25 that we'd received in this community here of Anaheim
26 Valley.
27
28 Shifting a little bit to the West, this district is
called GGWES, and this is on page 104. This is the
district in blue. This district largely corresponds,
largely captures, a lot of the community of interest
submissions that we had received, identified as Little
Saigon, or broadly in this area.

One thing I will note, which -- Cypress, for
example, wasn't included in a lot of those, but that's
included here for population reasons. The community of
interest testimony we'd received from Cypress often asked
for them to be included, for example, with Los Alamitos
or Seal Beach, but that wasn't possible in this
particular configuration because Los Alamitos was being
included with an L.A. district.

Let me just take a look real quick. Oh, and here,
you'll see that there is a split here with Santa Ana.
That's something I've mentioned before. That's following
a line which was included in a couple of those -- Little
Saigon, or this general area -- submissions. Okay.

Shifting to the North, this is on the next page.
It's called N-O-C, North OC. This visualization contains
the entirety of several cities. And then down here in
Anaheim, we'd received several submissions. Many of them
were from -- either identified as Little Arabia or from
individuals who were identifying themselves as associated
with the Arab American Civil (sic) Council.
And so in this area, one thing I just want to note to the Commission, I did keep the Anaheim portions of those communities of interest whole. But one thing I'd -- one request I had received from the Commission previously was to keep Stanton whole and with this Southern district. So where those communities of interest reached into Stanton, I did not include that population. But just flagging that as one area where I was splitting those.

Continuing to the next page, there was some error in the transcription, this should be LAOSB, so Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino. In this area -- so with the prior visualization, I had received direction to include -- here let me just go soft a little bit -- include Tustin with Yorba Linda, Villa Park, portions of Orange to the East, as well as some of these forest mountain portions.

There was also a request to include Placentia, but as I mentioned, for population reasons, that wound being needed to be included with this Northern L.A., Orange Country border district. This district also includes these portions of Los Angeles, Walnut, Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar, and Chino Hills.

We'd receive community of interest testimony requesting that those communities in Los Angeles County
and Chino Hills be kept together. And also some
community of interest testimony requesting all those
communities be kept with Northern Orange County District
as well.

Okay. Shifting South, this is on the next page, 107, this is Irvine, so a prior visualization -- a
similar visualization had included Irvine, and also had
extended further South to include Aliso Viejo and Laguna
Niguel. The Commissioners asked me not to do that. I
didn't, but I still wound up needing to include Laguna
Woods and Laguna Hills for population.

And contrary to some community of interest testimony
that we had received requesting to keep Tustin, North
Tustin with Irvine and keep those whole, as you saw in
the previous district, I wound up needing to split those
and that was for population reasons.

Another request with this general area, that I'd
received from Commissioners was to include Lake Forest
here into this district with Irvine. And that's
something that I was able to do.

We had also received some -- there is also some
question of splitting Irvine or keeping it whole. We had
received some community of interest testimony requesting
that we keep Irvine whole. So this also reflects that
request.
Okay. So shifting further to the South, we're looking now a page 101, this is SOCNSD, so this refers to Southern Orange County, Northern San Diego. And this is a district in red, and again, that's page 101.

One thing I'll actually just note as we're getting into the border of Orange County and San Diego. With the potential VRA districts on the Eastern side here of -- here, let me just turn off roads for a moment, so it loads faster.

So with the potential VRA districts here on the Eastern side of San Diego, and with Commissioner request not to go up into Riverside from San Diego too much, or (indiscernible), just given the way that the population is distributed, and the requirement to be drawing, marginally equally populated districts, or for visualizations, I wound up creating a district that stretched from Orange County into -- from San Diego into Orange County, in all three levels.

And so if that's something which Commissioners would like to see something different, just note that that would likely just require splitting this tribal area, and not including that with the VRA district, or just in some other way drawing from San Diego up into Riverside. So just noting why that would up happening in all those maps, because I know we had also received some requests
to potentially treat this Orange County/San Diego border as a hard border in a visualization. Okay.

So looking specifically at this visualization we had since -- I'd previously presented some similar sorts of visualizations in this area, requests that I had received -- and I'll turn the streets back on here -- requests I had received were to drop Laguna -- to drop Laguna Beach, here, up in the North, exclude that from this districts, which I did. And to include Rancho Mission Viejo Hill instead, which is, here, what I'm circling; to remove Vista, which is down here in the South, and to include Fallbrook and Bonsall.

And also in other iterations that like somewhat similar like to this, to not include Temecula, or extend further North to include other populations. So that's what's happening with this visualization.

Moving to the South, this is on the previous page, it's called VISSMESC, so Vista, San Marcos, Escondido, here we received a number community of interest submissions requesting Vista, San Marcos, and Escondido be kept together, as well as some requesting Vista, San Marcos, Escondido, and Valley Center.

And so Valley Center here is split, and that's based on -- there's some tribal lands here, which are included in Valley Center, and so that was incorporated into the
Moving to the West, and this is on page 97. This is a Blue district, it's called SD Coast, this includes -- this is a coastal district stretching from Carlsbad in the North, South to Coronado. We did receive some community of interest testimony here, for example, from someone in Encinitas requesting that, Encinitas, Del Mar, Solano Beach, and also other coastal beach areas be kept together.

One thing I'll note is that they were asking that the coastal portions of Encinitas be kept, and Encinitas be split, that's not something that happened here. And then one Commissioner request that I had received, based on prior visualizations, was that Rancho, Santa Fe, and Fairbanks Ranch be included into a coastal district, as opposed to a more inland district. And so that is something which is done here with this visualization.

Moving to the South, and a bit East, this is a poorly named visualization, I'm realizing, since I mixed up West and East as I was naming it, so I apologize. This is on page 99, this is a Blue district, and this is called West SD City, and it captures an Eastern portion of San Diego City.

Yes, so this is -- this is where this is, it's partially incorporating some community of interest input,
but I want to flag that for the Commission. So here in the North with Poway, we did receive some submissions requesting that it be kept with, for example, some of these portions of San Diego. And to an extent I did, although you'll notice that it is somewhat included in a couple different districts up North here.

Down in the South with El Cajon, with Rancho San Diego, with some of these communities, we also received some community of interest testimony asking that they be kept together. And so to an extent that's happening, but the thing I'm flagging here is that many of the folks in this community were saying, please don't then, keep us with this Northern area. They were asking to be kept more with Southeastern San Diego City, City Heights area, but just as the Assembly level, just given the way that the population is distributed, it's not actually possible to include all these folks with all the placed they wanted to be included with, while maintaining that kind of population equality.

So these folks did want to be -- many submissions asked that this community be together, many submissions asked this community be together, but some submissions asked that these do not be together, so that might be something that needs some fixing.

Okay; shifting, again, back one page, to page 98.
This is San Diego City. There was a Commissioner request to keep Miramar base whole. I'll note that that's happening, but I'll also note that there another Commissioner request to keep Miramar whole, and with -- well actually, no. I think this is right. I think this is the one where I got it right.

There was another district where I needed to include it with the portion. There were some questions of where the primary facilities were, and so there was a preference there. So I think this one managed to capture that.

So this district includes some community of interest submissions we had received referring to the Mesa area, the Convoy District, some other Commissioner direction I'd received asking for some of these communities, Convoy, Linda, Mesa, to be kept whole. And it also includes most of a community of interest identifying with -- some are identified as San Diego's LGBTQ+ community down here in the South.

Moving back two pages, to page 96; this is a district visualization called SESDCITY, the border here, you'll see it, it cuts through a number of cities, essentially the border is largely defined by overlaying -- we received quite a community of interest submissions from this area. It is essentially just
overlaying about, I'd say, twenty of those submissions, and identifying the outer span of those areas.

And then here in the South, it was defined by the borders of National City and Bonita being included in a potential VRA district. One thing I'll just note, this district is colored in yellow, but this is shaded in a lighter yellow. This isn't an area that was, as far as I know, and VRA attorneys are always welcome to correct me. But this wasn't an area where I received direction to draw this as a -- as a potential VRA district.

So by and large, quite a few communities of interest submissions here, many of them kept whole, with the exception of the Southern border, where it was going into potential VRA district areas.

And then the final district that we're going to look at here in San Diego, it's on page 112, so this is on the very last page. This is called CHUVISAN -- Chula Vista, San Ysidro, received a few community -- I received a few Commission requests to modify previous visualizations here. So you'll see that this includes Imperial Beach, this includes Bonita, and then we had received community of interest submissions requesting the district, essentially, including all of this as well as Paradise Hills.

And so this includes some portions, although not all
of what some of the community of interest submissions
that we had received were, that defined what Paradise
Hills might be. And this is colored in yellow, because
this was an area that the VRA attorneys had identified as
a potential VRA district area, or Assembly.

All right. Chair, that's all that I have.

CHAIR TURNER: Well, that was quite a bit. We
appreciate it, and I appreciated the readout in the
manner that you read out. I see hands right away, which
is good, and exiting. We're going to go with
Commissioner Kennedy, followed by Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. And thank
you John, for all this work. Again, I think in general
terms, this is really a great point that we've reached,
there are some issues to address, but I think we're in
pretty good shape.

First of all, on places like Barstow and Needles,
where you're cutting right at the city line, but there
are low population areas nearby. I would really like to
see the city sphere of influence included with the city,
so you have what are called disadvantaged, unincorporated
communities around some of these places like Barstow and
Needles, and you can -- you can easily find maps
including shape files, I think, of those areas online.

If you just like, search Barstow DUCs it'll take you
to a page where you can get the shape file for the
disadvantaged, unincorporated communities surrounding
Barstow. Likewise for Needles, and all of these other
places.

So I would just encourage or like to instruct
mappers, where possible, to include the entire sphere of
the influence, particularly of these isolated cities.

Second of all, on Grand Terrace, Grand Terrace, you
know, may be one of those things that will take a while
to work out. I will want to hear more from the community
in Grand Terrace as to how they feel about this. My hope
was that we could find a way coming through Riverside
County to link Grand Terrace with Loma Linda and
Redlands.

That was the -- the real objective, was to link them
with Loma Linda and Redlands, rather than so much linking
them into a Riverside-based district. So I really do
want to hear from the community in Grand Terrace whether
they would prefer the way it is now, or incorporated into
that larger district that includes Bloomington, Colton,
San Bernardino, Loma Linda, Woodlands, et cetera.

Next, if you could go down to Mead Valley. Yeah.
You know, I'm looking at the population figures to -- in
the visualizations to the left, and the visualization
that Mead Valley is currently in. I looked up the
population in Mead Valley, and I'm wondering if you need
Mead Valley and Good Hope for VRA purposes, because those
two might go better in the visualization to the West.
That's kind of like the 215 Corridor --
MR. O'NEILL: It might be possible -- could I respond to that?
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Sure.
MR. O'NEILL: It might be possible to, but I would say -- I would find it challenging to comply with the
guideline I received from the VRA attorneys, if I wasn't
including Mead Valley and Good Hope in that district.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Then next is Cabazon
and White Water, and I -- you know, I understand what the
thinking was but it -- it ends up being very odd to have -- I mean, what I was saying was, if there was a
need to cut going into the Coachella Valley that, yes,
White Water was a good place to cut. But by extending
the visualization up and around, and then back down to
include Banning and Beaumont, it ends up being very
awkward for White Water and Cabazon.
And so you know, my main concern right there was,
let's not split the Morongo Band lands as happened in
2011 at the Senate level. If we can keep the Morongo
Band lands whole, then I think it would make better sense
to include Cabazon and White Water in the Morongo Band
lands in that lower seaway visualization.

And I do realize that you might end up having to pull some population from elsewhere, but we can -- we can look at that once you figure out what the impact of including Cabazon, White Water, and Morongo lands would make to that.

I think I had one more. Can we go to Los Alamitos?

MR. O'NEILL: Commissioner Kennedy, I apologize. I'm blanking on where that is. Where would you like me to go?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Los Alamitos, I think it's in Western Orange County. Commissioner Akutagawa, help.

MR. O'NEILL: Oh. Los Alamitos, I'm so sorry. I was thinking Los Flores. All right, we're good.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Again, if there's been COI input asking that Cypress and Los Alamitos be together, and the Harbor Gateway visualization is over, and Garden Grove West is under, and I looked up the population of Los Alamitos. It looks to me like we could shift Los Alamitos from the Harbor Gateway visualization to the Garden Grove West visualization.

MR. O'NEILL: Yeah. That's certainly a possibility, there's not a lot of population in Los Alamitos and Rossmoor.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right, right. Okay. Thank
CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. Commissioner Fernández, followed by Commissioner Akutagawa, please?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And you did address this, John, in terms of 96 and 112 -- no, not 112, I forgot where I was.

Anyway, Lemon Grove and National City, there were quite a few communities of interest to keep those together, but you did explain that because of VRA right now they're split. But I did notice from the congressional that you've combined them. So thank you. I didn't want to -- I wanted to make sure we let everybody know that.

And then my other question was on page 103, and this is probably more for David Becker. I notice right now, it's not a VRA consideration, and I'm just wondering if it's because of the Gingles, because it is -- the Latino CVAP is fifty-six percent.

MR. BECKER: John, Can you put the Field Assembly Districts overlaid on this, please?

MR. O'NEILL: Yeah. Give me just one moment. So the Assembly district 69 is what the former district virtually was.

MR. BECKER: Yeah. It does look like -- it does
look like White crossover is quite high in this area.
And can you -- can you just confirm what the Latino CVAP is?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: 56.1.

MR. BECKER: 56.1? Okay. I mean, it's -- again, if it's 56.1, regardless of whether it's a VRA district or not, it's -- you know, it's a very strong, obviously, Latino and community of interest district, yeah. It just might not be required to be drawn by that way by the Voting Rights Act.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: All right. I have several -- I'll start with some questions, and then also some direction. Just starting, I guess we could just stay on what we were just on, which is the Santa Ana, Anaheim, I'd just like some clarification.

John, I think you mentioned that you did take note of the COI testimony from the -- particularly the Arab-American community. There is a Little Arabia in the Anaheim area. I thought I heard you say, though, you had to split it. Did I hear you correctly?

MR. O'NEILL: Yeah. And I'm just putting those on, just very quickly. Just a couple examples, so you can see here in purple and green, and I'll zoom in, it
largely comprises Anaheim, most of it's in Anaheim City.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MR. O'NEILL: So looking here, just looking at the
one in green. But there are portions that go into
Stanton, and then looking at this, in purple again, this
comprises a different portion of Anaheim, but it does
include the same portion of Stanton. And this one
includes Buena Park, but that wasn't included in this
particular district.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I think I ask
because I know that as a community in Orange County,
there are oftentimes, they're a growing community, but
they're oftentimes also marginalized, as well, too. Is
there a way that we can include them, at least the area
in its entirety without throwing off everything?

MR. O'NEILL: Certainly, there's other populations
and adjustments that could be made, if the Commissioners
would like me to keep those, Little Arabia, and
communities of interest whole, that would be certainly
something I could take a look at, and I imagine that
could be done. This was purely just a -- I'd received
prior direction to keep Stanton whole with Garden Grove,
so.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, yes. I think, right,
we've tried to take care of other communities of
interest. I think this is one that we should, at least try, to see if there's flexibility to be able to ensure that they stay in one district. I think that that would -- I think that that would be good.

I think, could we go to then, since we're at the Garden Grove, Westminster, the Little Saigon area. I know that -- I've read through some of the testimony that we received about Little Saigon. I think what is reflected is reflective of the core of the Little Saigon, Vietnamese community. I do acknowledge that there are small pockets where the community has grown further out.

I do want to ask, though, in terms of the placement of Cypress, it sounded like you took in Cypress for population numbers. I know we also got some community of interest testimony about Costa Mesa, also being an area in which there's a diverse Asian community, most likely also inclusive of some of the expansion of the Vietnamese community.

If we were to swap out Cypress and instead insert Costa Mesa would that throw -- one, is that a VRA kind of district that we're looking at in terms of the Little Saigon area? And then would it impact the VRA if any -- if at all? And would it also throw off the numbers? Because right now I see that we're -- that district is about 2.53 percent under the deviation.
MR. O'NEILL: From a population standpoint, Cypress is about 50,000, where Costa Mesa is about 112,000.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh.

MR. O'NEILL: So you would have that --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: What if we were to split it? I think that there was also in the COI testimony we received about Costa Mesa, there were some boundaries that were also noted as well, too.

MR. O'NEILL: Just continuing from a purely population perspective, I can certainly take a look at Costa Mesa, and check. I don't know off hand what the populations would be of a split Costa Mesa, but I could certainly take a look at that. But actually that's a good point.

Costa Mesa is one of those other areas where it is a fairly central location at the center of a number of different potential districts or configurations, coastal Irvine, Tustin, Santa Ana, and then as you're noting here, a potential Little Saigon area. So that's another area where it prevents -- presents a bit of a challenge. But I'll take a look at what community of interest testimony we have regarding splitting Costa Mesa, and which of those potential other districts Costa Mesa might want to go with.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, because Costa Mesa is
kind of in an interesting place, it is a -- it is a very
mixed kind of area. The closer you get to Newport Beach
there are, I would call it more affluent pockets, where
you may not -- and you may not realize that you're moving
from Newport Beach into Costa Mesa, or vice versa. So I
think perhaps looking at some of that COI testimony, plus
other COI testimony might be helpful on that.

And I know that that, also I want to acknowledge
that that does conflict with what Commissioner Kennedy
also suggested about perhaps moving Los Alamitos into
this district with Cypress. I would be of the
perspective that it would be better to actually move
Cypress out of the district, and move in that portion of
Costa Mesa, and so speaking about --

MR. O'NEILL: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MR. O'NEILL: I'll just say one thing, a quick
comment.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, yes.

MR. O'NEILL: So one potential, and I'll have to
take a look at all the ripples, but one potential effect
there is, if this Little Saigon takes from Costa Mesa,
and splits that, this coastal district needs a bit more
population which would potentially mean, I could include
Laguna Woods and Laguna Hills with it, which would
resolve that.

And then this Irvine District would potentially be able to move more, or take in more, of Tustin, both North Tustin include that.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. And actually that --

MR. O'NEILL: And this would wind up, Placentia would potentially be able to get there. So you may have spotted the trick to fixing many of the challenges I was running into there.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: That is great. Because that was going to be one of my next directions, is to see if there's some way to include all of Tustin with all of Irvine; and that Laguna -- Laguna Hills with Laguna Niguel together being as part of that coastal district.

So okay, great. I'm glad that I was able to help out in that way; and that, you could move Placentia also into that district Yorba Linda because that would nr better.

MR. O'NEILL: Yeah, yeah. That's about 50,000, so that would be -- it's about 50,000 that we're moving in each spot.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MR. O'NEILL: It's not going to be perfect, but I think that might actually --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: That is awesome.
MR. O'NEILL: It's a problem I was grappling with. So thank you for solving it.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. All right, well, great.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, before we solve it. Can I just ask a clarifying question about your justification for removing Cypress?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I mean, for me, I guess one is I think about the populations that are in the -- that Garden Grove, Westminster community. The Cypress community, one, I think there is a social economic difference. I think there's also -- they tend to be more single-family homes. There are mixed incomes in that area, but I think Garden Grove and Westminster tend to be definitely much more immigrant-based, also much more of a mix of renters, as well as working-class communities.

And then also because of the affinity of Cypress and Los Alamitos, and also Rossmoor, so Rossmoor and Los Alamitos do need to go together I believe. I know that we've also gotten a lot of communities of interest testimony, really, on both sides, being included with Long Beach, but also being included with Orange County, you know, it's going to be -- I think that's going to be a really interesting place.

I mean, there's very passionate COI testimony on
that. So that was my logic for that, Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Where was it that you think Cypress would go, with Buena Park?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: If it's possible I think it would be better --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Recommended (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- it would either -- I mean, it's like -- my belief is that they're better aligned with Los Alamitos and Rossmoor, but then that would throw off I think the Long Beach numbers. It could go with Buena Park, I mean, I'm not like, oh, it must be this way, but I'm just going by one COI testimony that I've read, but also what I understand of those cities, too.

I also want to comment on the South Orange County areas. And this gets to that other particular area that you were mentioning. You had said, and I want to make sure that I understood, or I heard you correct on this. You had said that if that South Orange County district that includes Camp Pendleton, if you were to remove, I think like Rainbow, Fallbrook, Bonsall, it would impact the tribal lands in the other sections?

MR. O'NEILL: No. No, I apologize. I must have
been unclear. Let me, if I could just restate that. So what I was noting was, we have here to the East a very large potential VRA district, which includes Imperial, and a number of tribal lands in Riverside and San Diego. And so because we have that on the East side here in San Diego County, and to the West we have the pacific ocean, and to the South we have the border with Mexico.

That means that we have a population here within San Diego, which needs to be drawn into some number of districts, and so we with, let's say, one, two, three, four, five, six, whole districts here, but then we have a partial district which needs to go somewhere.

And so based on the direction I'd received from the Commission to now go out into Riverside. I was just noting that that meant that this district winds up going into Southern Orange County, and so this border to the East with this VRA district, incorporating these tribal lands, if the Commissioners wanted some different configuration here.

For example, for a district that didn't cross into Southern Orange County, then that would just likely involve some sort of reconfiguration here, of this potential VRA district to enable reaching up into Riverside County further to the East; or just the Commissioners offering some other direction in terms of
including Temecula or some of these other areas in Southwest Riverside.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I see. Okay. That's helpful. Okay then, I'd like to maybe offer a couple of suggestions then, or direction. I know that based on the testimony, COI input testimony, Fallbrook is desired to stay with Pendleton. I know that we also have heard and have received testimony that South Orange County did not want to cross over into San Diego, but I hear what you're saying. So these are the hard choices.

I am wondering if Bonsall is better removed and put with Vista, and Rainbow removed and put with Temecula.

Commissioner Sinay is disagreeing. Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I have some thoughts on that area as well.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. All right then, let me just finish one last thing, and this is on the North Orange County area, which is the area that includes Brea, Yorba Linda, all of that area there. Okay, on that one, it is on page 106, and it says LAOC SB.

On that one is it -- tell me about Hacienda Heights? Because we did receive quite a bit of testimony stating that Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar, Brea, all have very close relationships together. And if we were to add Hacienda Heights could we then remove
Chino Hills? I don't see it as a bright yellow district, so it's not a VRA district, so is there flexibility there?

MR. O'NEILL: So I am -- I have the district shaded for my region. I don't have the districts that Jaime had drawn shaded, but we'd have to defer to her, or if David is on the nose, which are the VRA districts. I believe that that this district here to the left, this SSGV, I think that that's a VRA area, but I'm not sure offhand.

So if there were possibilities I'd have to defer to Jaime, or the VRA attorneys on whether Hacienda Heights is needed for that particular district.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I'm wondering if Hacienda Heights makes a difference in terms of the VRA? I guess that's a question for David. Yeah.

MR. O'NEILL: One question that I would have is, if we did do that, if Chino Hills were not included with this particular district here, where would you like Chino Hill to be included with?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Could you put that into a Riverside district?

MR. O'NEILL: Right here with Norco and Corona?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Or wherever you feel that it would best belong.

MR. O'NEILL: Potentially. Assuming that this -- if
change were possible that's something that I could potentially do.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Because I do know that you have some VRA districts in the Riverside/San Bernardino area.

CHAIR TURNER: Mr. Becker is on now, if it will help Commissioner Akutagawa.

MR. BECKER: Yeah. You can go ahead and give those instructions. I mean, I think this is likely to be an area with a lot of cascading dominos that could affect districts. So if you want to do that, note that the -- that district, that Riverside District with Norco in it is, if I'm not mistaken, not a district that is designed for protection of minorities under VRA.

So increasing Latino voting, the citizen voting age population in that district, likely doesn't increase Latinos' opportunity to elect, and could conceivably decrease it in other areas that are protected under the VRA, so just something to be attentive to.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Yeah. Yeah, I'm not completely opposed to it. I think I'm just also trying to think about the VRA -- or not the VRA, the COI testimony that we've received about Hacienda Heights being together with Rowland Heights. And I know that they're a cohesive community in that direction.
One last one, I want to use -- this is about the South Orange County inland areas that -- but the Cleveland National Forest, and have seen very passionate, also testimony about being separate from Riverside County. And is there a way that we can separate that portion of the Orange County, the -- all of that inland portion, and adding it, you know, between the Irvine, also that South County, OC, with the, I guess, Camp Pendleton areas, so they could be incorporated into an OC district instead of being as part of the Riverside District?

MR. O'NEILL: So that'd be rather challenging, just because there is -- there's so much population there. So we had spoken previously about San Diego and the population constraints coming up here.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MR. O'NEILL: With Orange County then we wind up with, I'd received direction here on the coastal district in Anaheim, Santa Ana, Little Saigon, and then potentially, this sort of Irvine District, so that's one, two, three, four districts that we're looking at.

And then we wind up with this population here along the Northern border, where we're abutting the number of Los Angeles County VRA districts. And then this portion here to the Northeast where we're abutting several, San
Bernardino, Riverside County, VRA districts, and so these communities (audio interference).

But if for example, we have a district here, a district here, in some configuration, we wind up with about, let's say, fifty to sixty percent of the district here in Riverside, and then maybe -- actually might be -- may be thirty to forty percent down here.

So this population could either be included with somehow here in Riverside, but we'd wind up splitting along -- they might be splitting along the 15 to get there. But it just winds up with some odd configurations here, just in terms of we have these harder boundaries of the VRA districts. And there are potential, you know, ways to move those boundaries, but it's still going to wind up being about the same amount of population in those areas.

So this is an area which is fairly challenging, and I certainly did see all the same community of interest testimony, and I certainly heard from the Commissioners asking and expressing your concerns rather strongly at the last meeting about this -- jumping over this border, and preferring not to do that.

But that's an area where I think just given the population constraints it's tricky figuring out where to go.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, because I think we're looking at mountains like that.

MR. O'NEILL: Right.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: That really also -- I mean, it's some of the same kind of -- similar testimony to what we're hearing around, you know, the Eastern Sierras as well too, and access to an elected official.

If you were to incorporate that portion that is on the other side of the Cleveland National Forest, would it impact VRA numbers if they were to be incorporated into some of those districts in the Riverside area?

MR. O'NEILL: Are you saying, like, Jurupa, Riverside City, or --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MR. O'NEILL: Yes, that would -- I would not be able to meet the guidelines I'd received from the --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I see.

MR. O'NEILL: -- VRA attorneys, while also incorporating those areas.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I see. Okay. I'm also wondering then in terms, if you were to incorporate in Chino -- Chino Hills, would that also throw off your numbers as well, too?

MR. O'NEILL: So Chino is about 100,000 people. You know, that might actually work well. I would need to
check the numbers exactly because I need to confirm how much population here. I think we'd still wind up with maybe about 100,000 people here, because Mission Viejo alone I think is about 93,000.

But incorporating Chino Hills, for example, into this Riverside District would, for example, free up Mission Viejo. There are these other communities but they're much, much less populated. So it might be between 50- and 100,000 people still.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And could they perhaps be incorporated in with the Anaheim Hills, Orangevale, Valinda districts?

MR. O'NEILL: Yes. Yeah, so if I were making that sort -- that's why we'd be including it. That's the other direction I received from the Commissioner. Certainly.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, because I'm seeing that the Irvine District is already about two-and-a-half percent over deviation, so it doesn't look like you could add there.

MR. O'NEILL: Right. But I mean, those will all be shifting around as we're making other changes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So maybe they could also incorporate in some of those smaller communities along the inland South county?
MR. O'NEILL: Yeah, I get -- so incorporating Chino Hills into this green Riverside District would certainly get us about half to two-thirds of the way there.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MR. O'NEILL: I mean, if I went up North into -- if I went up North into this Diamond Bar, Rowland Heights area, that would potentially get us all the way there, but I think that's something the Commissioners have previously seen, previously weren't such a fan of.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Thank you.

MR. O'NEILL: Certainly.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay, beautiful. We have up next Commissioner Sinay, but the moment would be lost if we did not acknowledge Commissioner Akutagawa's -- reaction from the mapper, and for sure she's due a: make your mapper merit medallion, because I think it's the first time we've heard on the mapper, say yes, they love that, let's do it. So we don't want to miss this moment of celebration.

Commissioner Sinay, followed by Commissioner Kennedy, and Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. So I would like us to start with our anchor community in San Diego, which is our VRA community at the bottom. And just a reminder to all of us that our VRA communities are our
anchor communities in all counties, and that we can move things around, maybe, but that there is a -- that VRA is the second. I think that one looks good, and especially since it's zero percent deviation with only fourteen people, so kudos to you, John.

And I wanted to go -- from there I did have a question to my colleagues where I wanted to just check in on how we're feeling about the tribal lands. You know, I personally am very excited that we're -- we are, you know, being aware of the tribal lands, and keeping them together, especially in an area like San Diego, and Riverside, and Imperial County, San Bernardino, where there are so many.

But since that is one of the area -- one of the elements that we have given to John that's constraining him, I just wanted to check in with my colleagues to see how we all are feeling about the tribal lands.

So anybody has thoughts on that one?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes, Commissioner Kennedy has thoughts.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That was a thumbs-up. I have another issue, but I didn't want to interrupt. I just want to give my thumbs up.

CHAIR TURNER: Thumbs up from Commissioner Anderson
to you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thumbs up from Commissioner Anderson as well. Anyone else on tribal lands? I feel lucky.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: What does the thumbs up mean though?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, just that it's not a vote, it's just that we should continue with that recommendation to the line drawers that we want to keep the tribal lands together.

CHAIR TURNER: We are in agreement. And it was just a general consensus, yes, we like that. And Commissioner Fernández, though, before you move on, had her hand as well.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, just quickly. And especially with the tribal lands, the populations are not that high.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So I would offer to keep them together, because if you split them it's not -- I wouldn't see it having a significant impact to a different district, versus them being together. That's how I'm looking at it. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I mean them being together is something that they -- gives them a voice, collectively, and to be able to say that it's one of the
anchors of this district, gives them strength, VRA and tribal.

I did have a question, and you're in the right spot for my question. John, did we -- I know that that's Palm Springs in that little L-shaped in the pink, right there, yeah. Did we cut up some tribal lands there because of other COIs, right?

MR. O'NEILL: Right. So in this area, the border here follows Palm Springs. These highlighted in brown are presumably reservation land or tribal areas. They weren't included in that -- that COI submission that the Commission directed me to take a look at for potential tribal lands. They also weren't included in the direction to go up to --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right.

MR. O'NEILL: -- here, to I think the Morongo reservation.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, and I think Commissioner Kennedy -- I mean, my understanding from that area is, it's Palm Springs -- some of the tribal areas there are more in the urban parts -- in the city parts of that area and have -- so I don't know if it would make sense to move in to include those or not.

So I just wanted to make sure that you got your direction you wanted on the tribal lands. And then, can
we -- I also see Camp Pendleton as one of the anchors of San Diego, so if we could go to Camp Pendleton.

The way this is set up right now, Dana Point, San Clemente have nothing in common with Fallbrook, Rainbow, and Bonsai. The way the districts has usually run has been going along the coast -- you know, going down to Carlsbad and Encinitas. If we could move for -- yeah, I don't know, with all the moving that happened in Orange County, if Dana Point and San Clemente can be absorbed into Orange County. If not, I do want to put it -- remind everyone that we did receive input about Rainbow, Fallbrook, Bonsai, Oceanside with Camp Pendleton, but that was -- as CalMatters brought up, that was a political -- it started with a political candidate, and it continued that same day with others. On the whole, a lot of the feedback we have got is that Fallbrook, Rainbow, Bonsai does feel connected with Escondido, Valley Center, and Vista.

So I've got a few changes now. Now, I've got to -- I've been trying -- it's hard, because you jump around -- the numbers jump around, so I apologize.

So here's where I was thinking, was Camp Pendleton, Oceanside, Carlsbad, Encinitas, Solana Beach, and Rancho Santa Fe. And those are all costal, because Camp Pendleton is costal. Carlsbad, Encinitas, Solana Beach,
and Rancho Santa Fe -- well, okay, let's not put Rancho Santa Fe in there, because I think you have it in a good way. Well, okay, it can be there, with -- they're all in the same school district, along with the other purple one that's right underneath Rancho Santa Fe.

MR. O'NEILL: Fairbanks Ranch. Commissioner Sinay, could I just --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

MR. O'NEILL: -- respond to that? So two things. One is just just with a few of the subsequent visualizations with Congressional or State Senate, where this is a larger district, I -- I was able to incorporate --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

MR. O'NEILL: -- some of the guidance that you'd previously provided about including some of those coastal communities with this particular district --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, up here.

MR. O'NEILL: -- with Fallbrook -- Fallbrook, rains -- Rainbow, this area -- those are heavily populated --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

MR. O'NEILL: -- so that could potentially be included with other districts fairly easily. But up here, this portion that's included in Orange County -- if
you prefer or Commissioners prefer to remove portions of
this district or some San Diego district that's in Orange
or -- or in another county, that's perfectly fine, but
that population would need to be made up from either
Orange County or from Riverside County, just --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I would say that Dana Point,
San Clemente have more in common with Encinitas,
Carlsbad, and Oceanside than they do with -- so, I'm okay
keeping that North part. I was thinking to the COI
testimony that we had heard from Orange County. Again,
as the CalMatters article -- some of that testimony along
the coast is political as well, but as we know, there's a
lot.

So I'm okay either way. I also know that we did,
you know, wherever possible, just grab the unincorporated
land as well.

So do you feel like you have enough for that area?

MR. O'NEILL: So here with -- with Rainbow,
Fallbrook, this -- this area? That's perfectly fine. I
could -- I could make those changes. With the other
changes that you'd requested, though, for Assembly
specifically, I -- I wouldn't be able to make those
changes --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Go all the way down.

MR. O'NEILL: -- to this district --
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

MR. O'NEILL: -- right?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, that makes sense.

MR. O'NEILL: Because this is heavily populated.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

MR. O'NEILL: I would need to be giving it population from somewhere else in San Diego, and this is -- this is not heavily populated.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right.

MR. O'NEILL: If you wanted changes up here with Orange County, we'd either need to make adjustments here to the East, which shifts around the population in all the San Diego area to take population -- more population from Riverside, for example. Or for -- in this cluster of cites, if we gave up a particular city to then take in some other Orange County cities or to move into Riverside County and take some -- some population from --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. Okay, so let's not worry about all of that. I mean, can we just go further? If we could go down to the page 99, West San Diego Vity, which is really East San Diego -- how did you -- how was -- El Cajon has been split, and it looks like La Mesa has been split as -- oh. Yeah. So El Cajon has been split. So one of the complaints we're getting is that La Mesa's been split three times.
MR. O'NEILL: Right. So the -- the boundaries here -- this was just defined by a number of community of interest submissions that we had received, so this was a number of folks in Southeast San Diego city or Paradise Hills or La Mesa submitting -- or actually, I think also some City Heights submissions.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

MR. O'NEILL: So this was just the overlay of a number of different community of interest submissions, which were equivalent in size to an Assembly district.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Could I suggest that, as much as possible, we keep La Mesa together, and then shrink out El Cajon?

MR. O'NEILL: Yep. That'd be certain as to (audio interference).

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just because La Mesa's a really small town. I mean, the -- city, sorry. The former mayor used to give me -- when I first moved here, he would give me a business card that was, like, really tiny, to remind us of how tiny his city was. But I want to just respect La Mesa and Lemon Grove, just kind of -- so that's what I would recommend. I understand that the immigrant -- the refugee community -- immigrant community is moving further and further East, and we do have a strong immigrant -- Middle Eastern immigrant community in
El Cajon, but just to kind of balance it out for the Assembly. That would be great.

MR. O'NEILL: Yeah. With -- with these borders that are wholly contained within San Diego, there's a fair amount of flexibility there, and I can certainly keep an eye more on the -- the city boundaries there with that particular --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

MR. O'NEILL: -- visualization.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. And then, I wanted to fly over now to the West side, to Coronado. So this is another visualization we can't move around too much, right, because of the Northern -- this whole coastal part, or --

MR. O'NEILL: So the constraints here would essentially be these potential VRA districts in yellow.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

MR. O'NEILL: And then, to the North, just that there is some sort of a Northern district that's going to extend into another county, just because we need to do that, because we need to draw --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right.

MR. O'NEILL: -- equal population districts. But these -- these district -- or these visualizations here within San Diego County proper, I did certainly make an
1  effort to try and reflect Commission direction I had
2  received or -- or communities of interest, but --
3    COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.
4  MR. O'NEILL: -- you would have a tremendous amount
5  of flexibility here if -- if you had a different
6  conception or if the Commission had a different
7  conception of how these districts' visualizations should
8  be organized. So as long as it's within, for example,
9  these five, or affecting a little bit of this one, but
10  trading equivalent population, that wouldn't have a
11  significant ripple effect elsewhere, and that wouldn't
12  conflict with these potential VRA districts here to the
13  South or to the East.
14  COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. And then, did we -- I
15  know you said this to me three times. Bonsai and
16  Fallbrook are still staying with Camp Pendleton, or did
17  we -- can we move them in with Escondido?
18  MR. O'NEILL: If the Commissioners would like that
19  to be included in this district here to the South, that
20  would be straightforward.
21  COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.
22  MR. O'NEILL: This district would then need to take
23  up just a little bit more population from -- it would
24  probably come either from Vista or from Carlsbad, and it
25  would likely involve splitting them, just because those
two cities are much larger in population --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right.

MR. O'NEILL: -- than these communities.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I would probably go into Carlsbad over Vista.

MR. O'NEILL: Okay. That would be fine.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And I'm sure we'll hear from Carlsbad --

MR. O'NEILL: Yep.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- but -- and then, on Coronado, I'm just trying to -- this one's felt a little strange looking at it. I mean, I think you did a great job in listening. This was what we said, kind of a whole coastal, but Coronado usually likes to be -- I was just trying to figure out an anchor with downtown San Diego and the West San Diego City, and Coronado usually considers themselves kind of anchored to downtown San Diego. There is -- the Coronado bridge connects them. So I don't know. If we connected Coronado to downtown San Diego, I would then move -- because I know it's -- I wrote it down somewhere, how much Coronado -- Coronado's 20,000 people, so we're still over. I get that. And then, we're under on that coastal.

My thought on the coastal was you can move -- continue to move East on the 50 -- along the 56. You
know, just --

MR. O'NEILL: Just to -- just to clarify. So you're --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

MR. O'NEILL: -- thinking here, this Northern portion?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. You could take --

MR. O'NEILL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- that --

MR. O'NEILL: Yep.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- yeah, to make up for --

MR. O'NEILL: Yep.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- for that other --

MR. O'NEILL: Yep. That's right.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- that other piece.

MR. O'NEILL: And then -- so just to clarify. So here, down in the South, we have Coronado, which would be potentially about 20,000. You're asking also that a downtown area here would be included in this SD City. Do you -- it -- which would be necessary, just to make sure the district's contiguous, as well.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right.

MR. O'NEILL: Do you have a Western boundary here or -- or a dividing line that you would particularly think would be effective or --
COMMISSIONER SINAY: That's a great question, since I didn't even notice that -- I thought it was already part of that. That district's over, right?

MR. O'NEILL: But I mean, don't worry about the population deviations. It's that -- that will be adjusted with the --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I mean --

MR. O'NEILL: -- with making the changes that you're requesting.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- I kind of feel like if that whole boundary could move to the West, you know, and take the whole bay, the North Bay area.

MR. O'NEILL: You're saying this?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: All the way over to the coast.

MR. O'NEILL: Just to clarify -- so you're saying --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So from the 8 to the --

MR. O'NEILL: -- with SD City, specifically?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. If SD City -- because right now, all this is part of the coast, right?


COMMISSIONER SINAY: So if you just kind of took the 8 all the way over.

MR. O'NEILL: Okay. Yep. I can certainly take a look at that. And then, in the North, you're thinking the costal district would extend East to pick up this
Northern portion?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. And you could even, I mean -- just total creativity here.

MR. O'NEILL: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: You can go the 50 -- you know, kind of stop at the -- go down the 52, and I'll figure out what makes that City of San Diego district, and then take what you need going East from the 56. Does that make sense?


COMMISSIONER SINAY: All right. I think that is it for me. Thank you very much for your patience.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

We're at 2:00. We have a lunch break coming up, and Commissioner Kennedy, you have an option of starting now or until we come back, whatever you desire.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Chair, I think I can do this quickly, so I'll go ahead.

Thank you. First of all, thanks to Commissioner Sinay for noticing the issue with the Agua Caliente lands South of the Palm Springs city limits. I have checked the Agua Caliente tribe's GIS page, and those are tribal lands, so those would need to be in the same district as Palm Springs.

Second of all, just asking John and Andrew Amorao to
check for any community of interest input about the possibility of splitting Chino Hills. I recall that there are some -- I mean, it's not an entirely homogenous community, and you know, if there is any community of interest input that would support splitting Chino Hills, I would say, you know, let's look at it. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Ray, did you -- I'm sorry. Commissioner Kennedy, did you say you wanted to keep the Agua Calientes with Palm Springs, or move them in the other direction?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: They would have to be kept with Palm Springs, because most of Palm Springs sits on Agua Caliente lands. I mean, if you're coming in Highway 111 from the 10, you see a big sign that says now entering Agua Caliente Indian Reservation, so you know, we would have to take, essentially, all of Palm Springs out. And that's a nonstarter.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: That's what I thought.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. So that's a nonstarter. We'd need to bring those tribal lands -- Agua Caliente tribal lands in to that visualization, the MORCOA. And if you need to check on the tribal lands, just go aguacaliente.org/GIS.

MR. O'NEILL: Just very quickly on that, there's 27,000 people here in the Palm Springs/Cathedral City
portion of that, and there's 200 people here in this portion in yellow.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right. Perfect.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Make it work, John.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thanks.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Make it work. Andrew, are you there? Andrew Amorao?

MR. AMORAO: Yeah, I'm here.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Did you have --

MR. AMORAO: Yeah --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- information about -- go ahead.

MR. AMORAO: Yeah, so, I just identified one COI mentioning Chino Hills, that there are vast physical barriers in regards to Chino Hills State Park where the Tres Hermanos acreage is. So it sounds like this particular COI that was submitted, that that would a natural boundary, if Chino's -- if Chino Hills were to be split up. But for the most part, the COI that we have received have set -- you know, it appears that Chino Hills would like to be together, whole, if -- you know, to the extent possible.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. We are up against a lunch break, Commissioners, and yesterday we had a thirty-minute lunch break. Did that work for you, or do
we need longer? Beautiful.

Okay, so it is now 2:24, because we have options, always, and we will be back at 2:54, after lunch. Thank you. We're at lunch.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 2:24 p.m. until 2:54 p.m.)

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you so much, and welcome back from lunch. We're, at this point, wrapping up our comments in regards to Southern California, and we have Commissioners Toledo and Sadhwani up next. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you, Chair. With that, I was giving a little bit of thought about the tribal entity in Palm Springs area. And I'm just thinking, I absolutely support keeping the tribe together, and I believe in this district, we were trying to keep all of the tribes together -- all of the various tribes together. But I'm also just -- for me, it would be more important to keep that specific tribe together and not split it up, and if we needed to put the tribal land that is split into the non-VRA area, rather than potentially impact and dilute the Latino vote in the VRA district.

So that would be -- I mean, just balancing all these things out, I think that would be something that I would be supportive of as well, if we need to do it.
can do more of what we want to do in the larger districts
with the State Senate and the Congressional district, but
I think we're really constrained by population and other
issues, so I wouldn't want to constrain the line-drawers
in the VRA district. But we definitely want to keep the
tribe together -- that specific tribe together. Thank
you.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Very helpful. Thank you.

MR. O'NEILL: Can I ask just a clarifying question,
just very quickly?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Oh, sure.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Certainly.

MR. O'NEILL: So I just wanted to state my
understanding of what the Commissioners have asked me to
do, which is, I believe, consistent with Commissioner
Toledo in this specific area. So right here, we have a
tribal, which crosses into Palm Springs, and what I'll be
doing is incorporating it with this district or a
district that includes Palm Springs, so this area is not
split.

To the North here, we have some other tribal lands,
which were previously split in the visualization, and
Commissioners had asked me to keep it whole in this
particular visualization with the district to the South.
What I've been hearing today, and this is what I just
wanted to confirm, is yes, do keep this area whole, but now be keeping it whole potentially with the district to the North or this, you know, Beaumont, Banning, to Desert Springs -- Desert Hot Springs sort of area.

And then in terms of -- with this SECA district, it's going to continue to incorporate a number of tribal areas, particularly down in San Diego and here along the border of Riverside and San Diego, but that border will likely be closer to what it was in previous visualizations on the -- on the Western side, as opposed to reaching farther North to incorporate some of those populations?

I just wanted to state that, just in case there were any Commissioners who -- who disagreed with anything that I had said in my interpretation of the Commissions' instructions, if that's all right.

CHAIR TURNER: Do you want to respond, Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I do want to -- I just want to clarify. So the tribal area around the Palm Springs will go with the Palm Springs. And then the line will be drawn essentially, correct, just -- then the -- by Cabazon and I can't remember the other town -- that area, essentially just short of that, will then go North. And the line will be drawn essentially right there; is that
correct? You're not going to draw the line further --

further South?

MR. O'NEILL: So the -- the previous visualization
had the district line -- the -- the line further South
about here?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.

MR. O'NEILL: If the Commission would prefer that
that line is, say, here?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. That -- that was my
understanding is -- and Commissioner Kennedy, I'm not --
oh, there's Commissioner Kennedy -- I'm -- I'm --

MR. O'NEILL: So --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- getting nods yes.

MR. O'NEILL: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.

MR. O'NEILL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

MR. O'NEILL: And just very quickly just to give a
little bit of context for the Commission, in terms of
population, there's not a lot of population here, so
population-wise that is probably fine. The only spot
where that might introduce a constraint is just if we
have -- continue to have this potential VRA district
abutting another VRA district, all these districts in
yellow, means that we'll just have this -- this area in
population, which we'll then need to make sure it's balanced with whatever is in Los Angeles. And then this area here, North -- Northern Riverside and -- and San Bernardino. But --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.

MR. O'NEILL: -- I think that should be fine.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.

MR. O'NEILL: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So it just be the small, essentially adding the back tribal area North and also a little amount of -- of the tribal area into those two areas into the more -- MORCOA.

MR. O'NEILL: Yes, thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. Thank you. I initially raised my hand in response to some of the direction that Commissioner Akutagawa was giving around Costa Mesa. She had suggested removing Cyprus from a -- a -- a community with -- or a district with that Garden Grove, Westminster neighborhood and instead adding Costa -- Costa Mesa. I just really -- I -- that's -- didn't work for me. It didn't work based on most of the COI input testimony that we've heard.
And -- and so I'm -- I'm certainly open to looking at other options for the -- I mean -- I -- I think in particular it's that Little Saigon region. I don't think Costa Mesa is it. We've heard a lot of testimony that links Costa Mesa with Irvine and Testa.

I specifically remember a mom calling in over the summer talking about, like, driving her kids to -- between school and soccer practice and the -- the connectivity between those -- those areas. So I -- it really didn't feel like the right move.

And I think in general, you know, as I was thinking about it, there's a lot of places where I'm hearing potential direction being given and in what seems like pulling out neighborhoods that may be a little bit more Asian from potential VRA districts. And I -- I -- I wanted to just name that, as Commissioner Turner often refers to, I want to name that, because I don't think that we need to think about Asian and Latino communities as being in opposition to one another.

And I think we've heard -- heard similar things around Cerritos and Artesia as well as Hacienda Heights.

And I'm going to point out perhaps my -- and my direction on this piece is, are there other ways to think about the VRA districts that don't cut up some of the Asian-American coin testimony that we've received.
And thinking further, this goes back to Los Angeles county to some extent but -- but still fairly related -- sorry, John, I know this isn't your area, but right on the cusp of your area here -- we had received some ideas last week when we were getting map, you know, map ideas from folks about a VRA district that would maintain -- that would be a Latino VRA district but that could still maintain the Asian-American communities of interest testimony that we received. And we received a lot of it from that Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar area including Walnut. So I wanted to point the mappers to that. That was specifically testimony that had come from Asian-Americans advancing justice in API AMEMSA testimony that we received last week. They -- it's what they refer to as district 57, East San Gabriel Valley. And just thinking about whether or not that could be an option for us so that we can meet our requirements under the VRA without splitting some of this key community of interest testimony that we've received. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you for that, Commissioner Sadhwani.

John, do you have any reaction? And if not, we'll move to Commissioner Toledo.

MR. O'NEILL: I would have trouble reacting just to -- to those specific recommendations because just
as -- as Commissioner Sadhwani did note that it does apply to a number districts in Los Angeles, which I'm much less familiar with than the specific VRA requirements in those areas, which I'm also much less familiar with them, unfortunately.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think -- but this is something we can look into and --

MR. O'NEILL: Of course.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- and talk with VRA attorneys about.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, and I think -- I -- if I may, I think in this area in particular, this South Los Angeles County region, I understand that from a process perspective we have mappers that are in different regions. But this is a region that's ultimately connected. And I think we're getting to that point whereas we're putting together and stitching together the map, I think we're going to need greater connectivity for -- between the mappers to -- to really think through these areas.

CHAIR TURNER: Absolutely.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I -- I wanted to concur with Commissioner Sadhwani and -- and -- and bring up -- highlight also the -- the MALDEF map. The MALDEF map is
map number 38 that also references this area as very similar to the Asian-American map put forward. And just to take a look and see how -- and I recognize it's two different line drawers doing this, but how do -- how do -- if -- if there's a possibility to -- to create a -- a district that does promote the VRA and -- and secures the Asian-American communities together while also advancing Latino and -- and hopefully coalition opportunities for those two communities to work together that would be -- that would be -- I think that would be excellent. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And I -- and I certainly think as we move forward that we'll have -- I know the mappers are working in close conjunction with each other. And I think as we move forward, we'll be able to have them in the same place, kind of like, we started out with Kennedy and Tamina and I think Kim is not too far. You know, they're all accessible and right here, so they're hearing the information. And we will continue to have them work together as -- as we work on one map.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just building on that, I don't want us to forget the regional -- the regional -- the group -- the regional groups that submitted maps as well. So for Orange County they -- they -- they worked really
hard on creating a coalition map in Orange County with a lot of the -- so I just don't want us to put all the weight on the state groups, but also remember that there are some regional groups in, you know, in Orange County, Inland Empire, as well in the Central Coast that submitted.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Okay. We're going to -- believe it or not, if there aren't any other comments in general for Assembly, we're going to move to our Congressional maps. I'm sorry -- yes, to our Congressional maps. And I just told the line drawers we're ready for Senate maps, but actually -- won't go on record as saying I lied, but I just was mistaken -- Senate maps.

MR. DRECHSLER: Okay. We will just need a couple minutes to change over to -- we'll -- and Chair, you want the Senate maps?

CHAIR TURNER: No, I keep doubling -- I wonder if I really want that, because I mean -- I mean Congressional and I've said Senate twice. I wonder what I really mean. I mean Congressional.

MR. DRECHSLER: Congressional.

CHAIR TURNER: Congressional. We want --

MR. DRECHSLER: Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: -- Congressional maps.
MR. DRECHSLER: Great. We will just need a couple
minutes to transition to the Congressional maps.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Chair, quick question. Are we starting in the South? With the --

CHAIR TURNER: We're starting in same order. So we're starting with ACE. So we all have visualizations that was received.

And so if we'll pull those out and start looking through, recognizing that there are some changes that we've recently made through our Assembly districts, some things that we promised we'd probably be able to address in Congressional maps that we could not address with the Assembly. So we look forward to that conversation now as we move into this next area.

MR. MANOFF: Chair, would you like to go to break for five minutes?

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Yes. We'll take --

MR. MANOFF: All right.

CHAIR TURNER: -- a five-minute break.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 3:13 p.m. until 3:25 p.m.)

CHAIR TURNER: So good afternoon, and welcome back from our lunch break. I'd like thank you all for -- all
the Commissioners and for all of the Californians that
are continuing to call in and give us live feedback real-
time, we appreciate that.

And I'm excited to announce that we're going to move
now to our Congressional maps. We're starting back at
the top of the state.

And Commissioners, I just want to remind you that
for the discussions that we've had for the Assembly
districts, if we were not able to accomplish something in
the Assembly, our mappers have already taken that into
consideration and placed it where they need it or where
they could in either Senate or Congressional districts.
So you'll see some of that. So where we've given
direction before we don't -- they -- they have assured us
and assured me that they have it, so we don't have to go
into great detail that we've already shared, we still
have that information.

So we're going to go now into our Congressional
district starting with Tamina.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Good afternoon, Commission.

Welcome to Congress.

We are starting with NORTHCOAS, which is page 9.
The visualizations for this section are actually
correctly numbered in pages. So we're going to be going
from page 9 to page 22 in this section.
Starting with page 9 is NORTHCOAS. NORTHCOAS takes Del Norte County, Humboldt County, Trinity County, Mendocino County, and Lake County.

Siskiyou County is split to take in the Karuk tribal lands and unite them with their lands in Humboldt County.

Sonoma County is split at its Southern end for population. And it does not include Petalume -- Petaluma or Temelec. Petalume (sic).

The next visualization is page 10, YOLOLAKE. YOLOLAKE encompasses all of Marin County and all of Napa County, the cities of Petaluma and Temelec and the 35 corridor for Sonoma County.

And in Solano County, the cities of Dixon, Allendale, Hartley, Vacaville, Fairfield, Green Valley, Suisun, and unincorporated areas to the South, the district -- to the South of the county, sorry. This visualization does not include Benicia and Vallejo.

Going to page 11, this is OAKLAMORI. Starts in the North with Contra Costa County at Rodeo. Comes down the 80 Freeway through Hercules, Bayview, Tara Hills, Montalvin Manor, El Sobrante, Richmond, North Richmond, San Pablo, Rollingwood, East Richmond Heights, and El Cerrito. Does not include Kensington. Includes Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville West of Oakland, Piedmont, and Alameda City. Oakland is split, and is the only city
split in this visualization.

We'll go to page 12. Page 12 is NORTHCONT -- or North Contra Costa. And this visualization starts in the North in Solano County with Vallejo and Benicia, and then crosses the bridge to unite them with Martinez and Contra Costa County, takes the top of the four corridor in Vine Hill and Clyde, takes Concord and Clayton. Then comes South through the 680 corridor through Pleasant Hill and Reliez Valley and Saranap, keeps Lafayette, Orinda, and Moraga together. And then comes into Alameda County taking the hillside area of Alameda County and the Eastern section and hillside of Oakland.

Next one is page 13. CONCORDTR, which is so named because it used to include Concord, does not anymore. This visualization starts at Baypoint and follows the Highway 4 through Pittsburg, Antioch, Oakley and Bethel Island to the Northern and Eastern borders of the county. Going down through Oakley, Knightsen, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, and Byron. The 680 corridor is also continued here with Walnut Creek, Shell Ridge, Castle Hill, Alamo, Diablo, Blackhawk, Danville, Camino Tassajara, San Ramon, and Norris Canyon. Includes all the other unincorporated areas to the East of Contra Costa County. And then comes South into some unincorporated areas of Alameda County to take the City
of Dublin, Pleasanton, and the unincorporated Hill area
of Alameda County above Oakland.

Next is page 15. And this is GREATERED, or Greater
Eden. And this visualization has San Leandro, Castro
Valley, Ashland, Cherryland, San Lorenzo, Fairview, Union
City, a small area of unincorporated Alameda County over
here, Fremont, and Newark. And there are no city splits
in this visualization.

Next page is page 16. This is CUPERTINO, which does
have Cupertino; Sunnyvale; and Santa Clara; parts of San
Jose, including the downtown, various neighborhoods; East
Foothills and Alum Rock, and Milpitas. San Jose is the
only city split.

Next is page 17. SANTACLAAR starts in Redwood City,
comes down through Fair Oaks, Menlo Park, East Palo Alto,
Atherton, Woodside, West Menlo Park, Portola, Palo Alto,
Stanford, Mountain View, Los Altos, and Los Altos Hills,
and Loyola. And then South to Saratoga, Campbell,
Fruitdale and Burbank, Cambrian Park, Los Gatos, Monte
Sereno, and Lexington Hills. And there are also no city
splits in this realization.

Going to page 18. This is GREATERSA and Mateo. And
this starts in San Francisco. So I will put on the San
Francisco neighborhood layer. So the areas of San
Francisco which is -- are part of this visualization are

In Santa Cruz County this visualization includes Boulder Creek, Brookdale, Lompico, Zayante, Ben Lomond, Bonny Doon, Davenport, Felton, Scotts Valley, Pasatiempo, and Santa Cruz. And there no city splits in this visualization.

Page 19 -- well, aside from San Francisco, I should say. I'm sorry. San Francisco is split in this visualization.

Page 19 is NORTHSANEM, which used to be San Mateo, and now is the remainder of San Francisco with the exclusion of Parkside, Lakeshore, and Oceanview neighborhoods and the Southern half of Twin Peaks neighborhood.

Page 20 is MIDCOAST. We'll zoom out just so you can see the whole thing for a minute. This is the MIDCOAST visualization.

So we'll start North in Santa Cruz County. In Santa
Cruz County we have Capitola, Pleasure Point, Live Oak, Soquel, Seacliff, Aptos, Day Valley, Corralitos, Rio del Mar, La Salva Beach, Aptos Hills-Larkin Valley, Amesti, Interlaken, Freedom, and Watsonville, and Pajaro Dunes. This visualization then encompasses all of San Benito County whole. In Monterey County we have Potrero, Las Lomas, the other half of Aromas that is in Monterey County, Prunedale, Elkhorn, Castroville, Moss Landing, Salinas, Marina and Seaside, Beronda (ph.), Del Rey Oaks, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Del Monte Forest, Carmel-By-The-Sea, Carmel Valley Village. Down the 101 corridor from Prunedale, Salinas, Spreckels, Trawler (ph.), Gonzalez, Soledad, Greenfield, King City, and Pine Canyon, San Lucas, San Ardo, and Bradley, Fort Hunter Liggett, and Lockwood.

In San Luis Obispo County this visualization incorporates Cambria, San Simeon, Oak Shores, Lake Nacimiento, San Miguel, Paso Robles, Templeton, Atascadero, Garden Farms, Santa Margarita, Creston, Wesley Gardens, and Shandon. And there are no city splits in this visualization.

Page 21 is SOUTHCOAS. SOUTHCOAS starts in San Luis Obispo County at Cayucos through Morro Bay and Los Osos -- Los Osos, California Polytechnic State.
University, San Luis Obispo, Los Ranchos, Avila Beach, Pismo Beach, Arroyo Grande, Oceano, Grover Beach, Los Berros, Blacklake, Callender, Woodlands, and Nipomo. And continues Eastward to the county line and Southern -- South to the county line.

The visualization then incorporates all of Santa Barbara County.

The visualization also includes the islands South of Santa Barbara County and -- and the islands that are associated with Ventura County.

And then in Ventura County the visualization takes Ojai, Meiners Oaks, Mira Monte, Oak View, and Ventura. And there are no city splits in this visualization.

And lastly is page 22. This visualization takes the Northern half of Ventura to the county lines and the West and East. Keeps together the Port Hueneme, Oxnard, El Rio, Saticoy, Santa Paula, Fillmore, and Piru. This visualization also includes Camarillo, Somis, Moorpark, and Simi Valley, Santa Susana, Santa Rosa Valley, Thousand Oaks, Casa Conejo, Oak Park, and Lake Sherwood. This visualization does not include Bell Canyon, but does include Agoura Hills and Westlake Village in LA County. And there are no city splits in this visualization.

That concludes this set.

CHAIR TURNER: All right, Tamina. Thank you so
much. Okay. Commissioners, waiting on the hands to go up. I see a couple. Okay.

Commissioner Fernandez followed by Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.

Tamina, did you go over page 14? That one's the SCALRATRACY, or is that not part of this one?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: I completely missed that one.

CHAIR TURNER: I don't think she did.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Nope, I might have missed that one too. Let's do that one right. I apologize.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: SCALRATRACY starts in Alameda County with Sunol and Livermore, and the unincorporated areas East and South to the county line. Then takes Mountain House and Tracy in San Joaquin County. Come South into Santa Clara County taking the Southern half of San Jose -- sorry, San Jose City, and including Morgan Hill, San Martin, and Gilroy, and all unincorporated areas to the South and East county lines. The city split in this visualization is in San Jose.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Tamina. If you could just -- you're -- it was perfect where you were at the bottom of that.

And I do -- because I'm going to forget to say this,
I want to thank all of the line drawers. Absolutely wonderful job. I love the visualizations in terms of including the extra information on the side, which is so helpful. So thank you so much. I know it was a lot of work and I just really appreciate it.

My only comment on this one and the bottom one is Gilroy. Gilroy's more of a farming-type community and I was wondering -- but I also think it's -- what was the population on that one, like 50,000 or something like that. 59 -- oh, almost 60,000. I wasn't sure if we could include that with the one below because that's kind of -- yeah, with Hollister. Again, it's going to -- has the ripples effects, but that was my only comment for this one. That was good.

Pardon?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I agree.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. And Commissioner Sinay apparently agrees as well, so.

And I just wanted to go to number -- page 10 and again, I think this one is one that I might wait until Kennedy, or if Kennedy's going to take my comments from the Assembly and maybe implement it to -- do I need repeat everything or --

CHAIR TURNER: No, we don't need to repeat everything.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: Focus.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So can we just see -- can I just see that one really quick, on 10? Yeah, the yellow -- can you zoom in on the Yolo County? I was trying to see what parts were included for Yolo. It was a little bit small for my glasses.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yolo County is actually not included in this visualization.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: It used to be.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think that's what --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- threw off. Okay.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: I apologize. It used to be. It is no longer included --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: -- in this visualization.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'll just wait for -- Kennedy, I'm coming and you knew it, but that's okay. I just love you guys. You're doing great. Thanks.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Toledo.

VICE CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, thank you, and I also appreciate the architecture. I think it's getting there. For the North coast region, starting with the Humboldt,
going all the way down. I think the question comes back
to Lake County. I think Lake County would be better
served with Napa, and that's what the community of
interest is coming in if it's possible. And potentially
adding Marin to -- instead of, like, adding Marin into
the North coast region -- or portions of Marin,
especially the coastal portions. And if we need
population moving some of the wine region out of the
North coast district and putting it in with this wine
district that we've been trying to create. Does that
make sense?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes. I also have a Senate
visualization that has almost exactly the configuration
you described. So you can -- we'll see that later on
today --

VICE CHAIR TOLEDO: I think that would be helpful.
I think if --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: -- or tomorrow.

VICE CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes, yes.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Whenever we see that, but yes,
noted. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR TOLEDO: Appreciate it.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Fernandez, I'm sorry,
were you finished? You had more?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, I'm sorry. Is that a
dollar? I left my hand on -- all right.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Commissioner Toledo read my mind. So we need not dwell on Lake County.

Let's take a look at Oakland. So looking at -- let's take a look at page 12, so NORTHCONT. So we have Vallejo, Solano -- I'm sorry. Vallejo, Benicia, and then into Contra Costa County, Lafayette, Orinda, Moraga, and then into West Oakland. That just seems like an odd mix to me, and I'm wondering what would happen if we rotated it counter-clockwise. And so take out Oakland -- West -- East Oakland there and then add Western Contra Costa County down to San Pablo. So Rodeo, Hercules, so on down to San Pablo. That would make somewhat more sense to me.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Maybe. One other comment, so I think the Oakland -- the boundary you're using I think from Berkeley down is this city boundary, and we had a comment about this earlier. Actually, I'm wondering if it might be better if we actually used the county boundary there, which is a little bit to the East of the city boundary. And go through Redwood Regional Park and so -- and so forth. The county boundary between Alameda and Contra Costa.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: This does use the county boundary.
COMMISSIONER YEE: This --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: This is the county boundary.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. Okay.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: This little red line over here.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I couldn't quite see. Okay. And that is it.

Oh, I did have one more general question. So for the Congressional districts -- of course, we'll have to get more -- much closer to a zero deviation. I'm just wondering if the line drawers could give us a little sketch on that's going to look later in the process? How we're going to do that shaving to get down close to zero?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: It's going to be picking is what it's going to be. Maybe picking more than shaving. So you know, as we get closer, obviosity, we'll -- we can narrow down the deviation before we start live line drawing. Hopefully, quite a bit, but that's what we're doing, live line drawing, right? It's just get closer and closer and then it -- you know, I don't know.

We'll have to confer with your council to see whether you're drafts have to be perfectly populated or whether it's okay to have some level of deviation for the Congress. But it's a pretty time consuming process because you're essentially -- really -- literally picking census blocks, having the calculator out sometimes, and
figuring out, you know, what adds up to deviations of just a few people.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I will need a really detailed sense of neighborhoods, even street by street.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Unfortunately, this is the problem with equal population, you know. This is a real trade off because that's where your neighborhoods and communities of interest go -- you know, take the back seat, because equal populations is your first criteria.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa followed Commissioner Anderson.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I'd like to just ask some questions. Starting with the North coast map, I noticed that Siskiyou -- it looks like it's split; is that correct?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes, Siskiyou is split to take the Karuk Tribal lands and unite them with Karuk Tribal lands in Humboldt.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I see. Okay. All right. Okay. So clarification on that. Thank you. I was originally going to suggest, I guess, putting all of the -- like we did with the Assembly map. Putting all of Siskiyou together with that corner from Humboldt and then perhaps, you know, would it make sense to add
back all of Sonoma so that it's also all in one district, and I don't know if that alone, or is that too many -- does that throw off the population numbers?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: I could definitely try it to take out this part of Siskiyou and the part of Humboldt County which as the Karuk lands, and then since I'll taking Lake County out of here, to take in the rest of -- oh, then there's Marin. I'll take a look at it. I'll figure it out.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think I only ask because I think some of the community of interest testimony also talked about some of the challenges of getting from Del Norte and Humboldt into Siskiyou and so just being conscious of that. But I also want to respect the -- you know, keeping the tribal lands together, but it seem like in the Assembly visualization it had less impact, I guess, to just take a portion of that. That small quarter of Humboldt, or they may also disagree too, so.

Okay. There's one other one. This is the one that's Concord. You know, I know that these are the tradeoffs that you need to make. It's just interesting because I notice that Concord was included with the Contra Costa -- Delta communities in the Assembly visualizations, but in this particular one, Concord -- I'm assuming for population -- was removed from the Delta
district in this particular case. And then also all of
the -- I guess communities in Contra Costa, which
includes Danville, San Ramon, Dublin, and Pleasanton.

And perhaps Commissioner Yee or Commissioner
Anderson may be able to speak more to this, but my sense
was that Concord is very much aligned with the -- kind of
that -- you know, that, kind of, group of cities from
Walnut Creek down to San Ramon, Danville, Dublin,
Pleasanton.

And does that just throw off the numbers? Because
it looks like it's minus 4.99, so --

CHAIR TURNER: If the Commissioners from that area
want to comment, because I notice Concord is in within
Martinez, and Chilcoot and some of those areas, Pleasant
Hill.

Thoughts?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah, I'll jump in. Yeah,
Concord, Walnut Creek, Pleasant Hill, those are all the
same. Martinez is sometimes separate because a little
further North and more -- it's hillier. It isn't as built
up. It isn't as -- it's a little more rural. The
Concord, Pleasant Hill -- actually, La Mirada, that whole
area, Walnut Creek -- I would actually draw the line --
Alamo, Danville, is the line that I would come separate
those. Alamo, Danville, San Ramon, Dublin, Pleasanton,
Livermore that's more of the tri-valley.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So perhaps --
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Tri- --
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Walnut Creek should go with -- I mean, it's already an odd mix already, because you've got the very affluent La Mirada, you know, Moraga, Orinda --
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Walnut Creek.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- Walnut Creek areas and then you have it also with, you know, communities like Martinez or -- I mean, Vallejo, Benicia --
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- Martinez, yeah, they're very much industrial. Probably more working class, so it's -- I know these districts are really big, so these are the, you know, interesting accommodations that we'll probably be seeing more of, but -- okay. I just wanted to comment on that.
I have one more that I wanted to ask about. I'm sorry? Oh, yes.
CHAIR TURNER: Are you moving on, Commissioner Akutagawa?
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I'm moving on, but it looks like -- I'm sure.
CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Right before you move -- sure.

Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: One of the -- just sticking to that one. I'm sorry can't figure out if I have to wear my glasses or not wear my glasses.

We did get some good visualizations from the community maps that were shared with us, and it was more going -- you know, circling around the bay versus going North and South. And I know that we've got that -- the hill that we want to respect.

Is that what you call it, Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Respect it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Respect it. Was it the hill? But we don't want to cross that certain line, but if it's possible now to go, you know, to, kind of, take that middle -- the Concord -- Concord, Clayton, Walnut Creek going South towards Orinda. And then Martinez and Pittsburg, Antioch, Benicia, you know, all of -- going around up there so it's kinda of taking -- hopefully I'm making sense. But it's going along the water to the more -- the more industrial parts and working class neighborhoods and then keeping the more affluent, middle class neighborhoods together -- front and center.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Where would I add population from up here? Yeah, so when we did this before the population
you'd have to do is split Stockton.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah, because Concord doesn't have enough population, right? If you move Concord South and then you move the rest of the community around --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: If you move Concord South you would lose Dublin and Pleasanton from here. And then you would have to change 1, 2, 3.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I mean, I'm not -- can I --

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Concord's a 150,000.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Oh, so you're saying if you move Concord and -- well, okay. Move Concord into the blue, but then take the blue at the top and keep following the bay towards to Crockett. To the left.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Until Vallejo, or all the way toward -- you'd like to create a Highway 4 coming across this way?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah. Thank you. I forgot about the 4.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay, are you suggesting that we split -- no, not a city, maybe separate Pinole, El Cerrito, Albany, all going that direction?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Hmm.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: That was like one of the --
yeah, when we were looking at -- we had all of the
community maps that was one of the ones that both
Commissioner Yee and I were like you know, they took a
creative way of looking at that whole area.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: I'll see if I can find it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah, but I think
Commissioner Fornaciari wanted to build on what I was
saying.

MS. MAC DONALD: Okay. May I just ask?

CHAIR TURNER: One moment. Oh, go ahead, a line
drawer --

MS. MAC DONALD: May I just please ask if they're --
if you can point us to that visualization, because we're
just kind of counting up numbers and it doesn't really
work in our heads right now.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. And staying on this same area
with hands, we do have Commissioner Anderson also that
wanted to comment on this area, and maybe others. And
then we'll also get to Commissioner -- whoever you were
referring too. Who'd you say?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Fornaciari.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Anderson, did you want
to comment on this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes. Yes, I do. I do see
we need to reconstruction of the architecture of the
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plans in this -- in East Bay, because what we in the
green area -- I don't know what that one's called.
Basically there is the West Contra Costa School District
and that consists of El Cerrito, Richmond, San Pablo,
Pinole, Hercules, and a bunch of unincorporated areas,
which are El Sobrante, Tara Hills South. So that area
and Kensington. That is a school district, so I'd like
to keep that area together.

And then North of that I would like to do with what
Mr. Sinay (sic) was talking about. So if we look back at
the map, essentially just above Pinole, we would cut that
and go across the 4. Martinez -- don't put Concord in
it. Bay Point, Pittsburg, Antioch, all the way out to be
Bryon, Discovery Bay that whole area. If you want to
include Vallejo and Benicia in that to make population I
would do that.

So coming down in the green, Kensington goes back
in. We cut some population out. I think we need to
actually -- if we want to keep the City of Oakland
together we cut -- well, Alameda -- it's a little tricky
in there in terms of population dropping this down a
little bit, because you can't put Oakland with Orinda,
Moraga, Layfette, they have nothing in common. School
districts are different. Where they shop, you know,
there's a whole ridge of mountains there and you can only
go up and over a few times, but you certainly don't do
that for shopping. You certainly don't do that for
schools, for where you get your groceries, none of that
sort of thing.

And then I would -- since you've chopped a bunch of
the blue area, then continue down gathering from Concord,
Pleasant Hill, La Mirada, probably down -- I don't know
population wise down to Alamo to get enough of what
you've gotten. And then from -- if you have to cut, you
know, from Danville going South to include Livermore to
grab more population in that area. So I would do a total
reconstruction there.

And if you need to cut into the GREATER -- GREATERED
to get population, I would do that and it would shifting
around the Bay. Because I think we've broken up a lot
of -- it -- while this looks nice, it sort fits -- we've
broken up a lot of communities and who are similar
interests, similar economic status. We've kind of mixed
up them all up here, and I really think we need to do
some reconstruction. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Are there any other comments on this
particular area? Commissioner Fornaciari, Commissioner
Toledo.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: My comments would be
fairly similar to Commissioner Anderson's comments. My
thought was to just shift things North along the East Bay and in trying to keep -- you know, trying to respect that ridgeline as best you can. I think this -- you know, I'm huge not a fan of this SCALRATRACY thing. You know, not a fan.

And I know that, you know, you've got population issues, but I'm, kind of, hoping if you can shift everything to the North then you can mess around from Contra Costa County down through Eastern Alameda County and hopefully make it work.

I just want to point out one thing. We heard an awful lot of testimony from the tri-valley as a community of interest. And we do not respect the community of interest in of any of our maps at this point. So I'd like to see us -- see if we can work on that. The tri-valley is Livermore, Pleasanton, Dublin, San Ramon, and Danville, and the unincorporated areas.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Toledo, you wanted to comment on that same area?

VICE CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes, same area.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Uh-huh.

VICE CHAIR TOLEDO: Just I had serious concerns about splitting Oakland, especially with the feedback we received from the Black Census and Redistricting Hub.

And they did provide some visualizations that might be
helpful in thinking through some of these issues, as well
as equity California -- Equality California rather.
Especially around the East Bay area and the LGBT
interests as well. So those are -- you know, think --
thinking through those things as well. Then I concur
with Commissioner Fornaciari and Anderson on their
comments as well. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Isra, are you going in the same area?
Yes, please. I mean, Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah. Thank you, Chair.

What was the phrase used, additive, but not
repetitive.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Agreed with Commissioner
Toledo's comments.

CHAIR TURNER: Awesome. Commissioner Akutagawa,
were back to you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. Wow. I just
wanted to comment on how that looked. Okay.

Actually, Commissioner Fornaciari mentioned it, the
SCALRATRACY, I wanted to just clarify or question on that
one. I mean, you know, going from Livermore, Tracy, all
the way down to Santa Clara does seem rather odd, and I
do want to, I guess, clarify or ask, you know, why -- I
know that we've gotten mixed testimony around San
Joaquin, but there has been quite a bit of testimony about trying to -- with the exception of Mountain House and Tracy that did not receive any love -- you know, to keep San Joaquin together as much as possible. I guess, is there a reason why instead of going South down to Santa Clara why we couldn't go East into San Joaquin and/or -- I know, Stanislaus has also really asked to be kept together as much possible, so.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: The reasoning was that Mountain House and Tracy actually did get a lot of love from Livermore, and they said to go East along the 580 and keep them together with that -- this area of Eastern Alameda County. Second reason is that this visualization goes all the way down -- there's no one who lives here. This entire area. So if you want to take any more Southern population then you are coming into San Benito County.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: We can't just go East -- or do we have to go too far East to get the population that's needed?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: If you were trade out Mountain House?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No, if you were to take out -- even if you're -- well, I don't know. Would some of the changes that were just suggested that may just
really, you know, reframe the calculus that you have to look at in terms of the population numbers for this SCALRATRACY visualization. But I am just wondering -- I mean, I know that you got love from Livermore on this, but can you go Eastward instead of going Southward? Because going Eastward seems like it would make more sense than going South.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: They're very different communities, and I guess to use Commissioner Anderson's words, you know, you're mixing up a lot of different communities that don't necessarily go together, so.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think the line drawers want to make a comment.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes, Karin.

MS. MACDONALD: Thank you so much for all of that input. We have some clarifications, please. So we made need to -- some prioritization here because we heard some things that may not all work together. So if we could just ask those, that'd be great.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: Yes, thank you for all of your ideas, and I would love to use as many of them as possible, and so I want to repeat them to make sure that I got them. And I would love a -- your ideas about what priorities to keep together first. So for example, the Livermore, Pleasanton, Dublin, up to San Ramon tri-valley
area was one that was discussed, which this area can
started there if that is your priority.

   Keeping Oakland whole was also discussed, which can
be started there if that is your priority. Another idea
was to rotate out this section of Oakland on the East and
take Western Contra Costa County, which was a third. And
then another was to create a visualization that goes
along Highway 4 but does not take Concord into Pittsburg,
Bethel Island, and may require either some of Stockton or
some of Solano to make that population.

   So if I could get a priority, like, Tamina start
with this -- try this one, then I'd appreciate it. Thank
you.

   CHAIR TURNER:  So Tamina, I'll interject. Let your
last priority be splitting Stockton into that area we've
received, so start there and work backwards. And then
also I wanted to -- as you're trying to get clarification
I wanted to understand too, the -- when you talked about
Oakland I think that was pivoting Oakland -- I forget
who --

   VICE CHAIR TOLEDO:  Commissioner Yee.

   CHAIR TURNER:  Commissioner Yee. So Hercules,
Pinole -- can you name the cities, what that pivot looks
like?

   COMMISSIONER YEE:  I suggested going down to the
border of San Pablo, but it just depends on population. But I'm also mindful of Commissioner Anderson's comment about the school district there, which is a big deal, too, so not sure how to untangle that knot.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I do have an idea if I --

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: -- can speak up? I would like to start with Western Contra Costas School District and go South respecting the ridgeline, and which -- and until -- and usually -- unfortunately, that does tend to cause a split in Oakland. And then from there continue South respecting the ridgeline. Because usually you have parts of San Leandro, Castro Valley, because those are areas -- you really can't tell when you're going from one area to the next area. And it also has a lot of different -- you know, different populations of immigrants who are all very -- well, they shop in each other's areas and it's all sort of continuous.

I would go that way first, and then going -- so that would -- I would say following -- respecting the ridgeline. That will enable you to do the tri-city, and going across the top of 4 I would also keep, but again, not including the Western Contra Costa School District, and going across that way. And then when you're saying where do we get the population from if we take out
Livermore and Tracy, Gilroy.

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: So another one to put into the priority list would be great. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Kennedy, are you weighing in on this conversation? Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I -- I think what I was imagining in my mind's eye was that Pittsburg, Antioch, Bethel Island, Discovery Bay, Byron, et cetera would be in a more Delta-focused district and that Walnut Creek to Sunol, and Pleasanton to Tracy would be in a district just kind of as far as communities of interest would make more sense to me. Just wanted to toss that in there. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: I'll be your plus one there.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Can I move onto the next --

CHAIR TURNER: Before we move, Tamina, I don't -- I'm -- I'm not certain I heard priorities. Are you good with that?

MS. RAMOS ALLEN: I heard no priorities, Chair. If you would please restate them, I'd appreciate it.

CHAIR TURNER: Exactly. Commissioner Kennedy, and then we'll go back around again.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: You wanted me to restate what
I said?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes. And then have Commissioners respond to that because there was a couple of head nods but not certain if we got it all the way around.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. So what -- what I was imagining in my mind's eye was something that would start in Pittsburg or Antioch and go to Bethel Island, Discovery Bay, Byron, and then cross the San Joaquin County line, Sacramento County line, Yolo County line just to come up with a -- a Delta-focused district.

And then would have from Walnut Creek to Sunol or wherever on that corridor along with Pleasanton to Tracy on that corridor together in a district. So basically splitting what is currently the Concord TR -- the blue district -- and -- and taking that in two different directions, one being a Delta-focused community of interest and one being the -- the Tracy to Pleasanton and Walnut Creek to Sunol and wherever.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: For me, I think my first priority -- and it's diff -- maybe similar -- is to keep the Oakland area whole --

CHAIR TURNER: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- and then it would be this -- secondarily, this what I see as a Richmond --
like, really, it's Vallejo across to the Delta, the Northern area that Commissioner Kennedy is talking about, and then keeping the Tri-City community whole as was presented by the community of interest area. So one, two, three. I'm not sure if my colleagues agree, but I just wanted to throw that out there.

CHAIR TURNER: I like it. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I -- I would also support those priorities as well, too, and -- and I --- hopefully, some of the other suggestions.

Perhaps it would be that East Bay kind of urban/suburban/rural/semi-rural kind of -- I think the talked about equestrian pursuits and other things like that could include, you know, that other remainder of maybe Concord to Walnut Creek. I don't know if it's going to be too much, but I trust that the line drawers will do it.

CHAIR TURNER: So before you move, let me just do a quick poll. Commissioners Sadhwani, Yee, were you still wanting to comment on this area, or you have other areas?

Okay. Yes, Commissioner Yee, I hear. I didn't see Sadhwani or even Anderson. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, I support Commissioner Toledo's priorities. Also, it's a Tri-City -- I think tri -- I mean, Tri-Valley.
CHAIR TURNER: Tri-Valley.

COMMISSIONER YEE: That is the Tri-Valley area.

Tri-City I think is Fremont, Newark, Union City.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Akutagawa, you want to finish or go to your next area?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I don't know if Commissioner Anderson and Commissioner Sadhwani also wanted to --

CHAIR TURNER: I asked. They did not respond.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No. Mine is for this area.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh, it is? Okay. I didn't see your head nod or move or anything different. Commissioner Anderson, you, too? Okay. Then you're ahead of Commissioner Sadhwani. So Commissioner Anderson, Commissioner Sadhwani, I apologize. Please go.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you. I, unfortunately, don't quite agree with Commissioner Toledo. And while yes, I like to keep -- I like the idea of keeping Oakland whole, because of where it is, then you have created other districts that don't fit.

Western Contra Costa School District is not at all like Eastern Con -- Eastern Con -- Eastern Contra Costa. And if you put that area, and if you cut, like, say -- you know, say Emeryville, Oakland, then Berkley, Albany, Kensington up North goes where? You know, it doesn't.
Where we usually had -- you know, again, this is historically, you tend to go from the western Contra Costa respecting the East Bay hills going South. It does put a line usually somewhere in South Oakland or East Oakland that goes with San Leandro and San Lorenzo. And that's something where it's often been.

And the reason -- the reason why these areas have a lot in common in because of it's all the -- the water issues. You also have your East Bay MUD goes up and down this -- this district. It's the transportation corridor all the way because the I -- you know, I-80 goes through Emeryville. You know, that's where they call it the Five Lanes from Hell. It starts from Concord and goes -- not Concord -- from Pinole all down -- on down into Oakland, Emeryville and Oakland.

And if we separate those, so then you're going to start to put parts of -- it -- it -- it -- then -- then you're going over the hill. You're going over the East Bay hills, which a completely -- and if we've heard anything from parts of the public testimony, it's Arenda Moraga (ph.) has nothing to do with Berkeley and Emeryville and Oakland.

So I'd really -- I -- I think we could do as I -- the priority would be respect the hills going South across western Contra Costa South. And then I do like
Commissioner Kennedy's idea. If we want to go Martinez -- Vallejo, Venetia, Martinez, and Antioch going out for a Del -- for a Delta area. And then I also agree with Commissioner Kennedy going South from the Concord/Pleasant -- Pleasant Hill all the way down to Sunol. I -- I totally agree with that. I'd like to see that as the -- the priorities. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So you have two different priorities to explore. Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. This is in support of Commissioner Toledo's comments, and I actually don't think they're completely opposed to what Commissioner Anderson is saying unless I'm misunderstanding the area.

But I think having Oakland serve as that anchor and heading Northwards towards Berkeley and Emeryville as -- as kind of an anchoring district for this bay area region in East Bay, and then pulling out Richmond, Vallejo, and Veracruz (ph.) I know the line drawers had asked for a -- an example or a page number. Black Census and Districting Hub had considered something similar to this on page 126 of their report, so just wanted to offer that as something that we can think through. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay? Oh. I'm sorry. Commissioner Fornaciari then Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I was going to say what
Commissioner Sadhwani said, so thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh. Perfect. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And I support the two priors and Commissioner Toledo.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I -- next map I'd like to move onto is the greater -- I think it's the San Mateo one. I think this one also poses a similar challenge.

The inclusion of Santa Cruz in this is just a little -- I mean, I see that it's a coastal district, but you also have included again very different communities in the Northern part -- well, South -- the Southern part of -- of San Francisco, into Daly City, Burlingame, San Mateo, you know, all of those cities up at that Northern tip, and then you go down into Santa Cruz. And again, along the coastline, some very different communities.

I think if you were -- one way to look at it is if it excluded the South San Francisco and San Mateo County areas then it might make sense, but right now, again, very different communities, and -- and I think I'm just trying to understand, you know, what some other options might be in this, whether or not it's to remove Santa Cruz, although, you know, I know it's going to throw off
the populations, but I'm just -- wanted to point that out. I don't know if others wanted to comment on that.

I just have --

CHAIR TURNER: I -- I do. Can you drill down? And where's Harbor Dunes? Is that it right with Santa Cruz in this district?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. When she presented it, it included all of Santa Cruz.

MS. RAMOS-ALLEN: Harbor Dunes is in the pink area over here. This is the Santa Cruz County line.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh. I'm sorry. I meant the City of Santa Cruz, not the county.

MS. RAMOS-ALLEN: Sorry. City of Santa Cruz is up here, and is all in the blue area.

CHAIR TURNER: Could you go back up towards the San Mateo area of where it's red with city?

I guess the question I would have is -- I mean, it's not going to be ideal and -- and, you know, we can discuss other alternatives, but I do wonder if we were to -- if we were to take that Northern area that included the San Mateo County, go into Redwood City, Menlo Park, East Palo Alto, would that -- would that give enough population to -- to -- to have the -- the -- the right -- to meet the standard deviation that would be needed for a Congressional district, or would -- or if needed, could
we pick up more of the cities up in that area like Atherton, for example. It's not ideal, but you know, even, like --

MS. RAMOS-ALLEN: I can definitely try that. And then Santa Cruz, you would like to put with this area?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes, because I think they have more -- at least I -- I know that 17 corr -- you know, Highway 17, I know that there's a lot of traveling between. I know some of the -- the tech folks that work in the valley also live at least, you know -- some might live in that Scotts Valley area, too, so it -- it just seems like it just makes more sense to group that together than that entire -- I -- I know the coastline issue, too, but I don't think it makes sense given that Northern part.

And I guess I would just say maybe use your discretion as to where you would cut off, you know, that -- that -- that Northern coastline part. Does that make sense or is that clear?

MS. RAMOS-ALLEN: Yes. I'm not exactly sure where that line would be, but I will take a look.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, because you would know the number -- the population numbers, so I don't want to just say it should be this. Okay. Chair?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Should I move on or --

CHAIR TURNER: Please.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Last one. I just want to comment about Ventura. And on that particular one, I -- I -- I did see community of interest testimony that spoke to West Lake Village, Agoura Hills, and Calabasas all being very intertwined cities and regions, and so that would be my only -- that would be my only ask is -- is if we were to add Calabasas, given that it's a minus 3.48 percent deviation, would it tip it over too much? I tried to look up a population number. I don't think I found it unless I missed -- wasn't looking correctly. Oh. It's 23,000. Yeah. So it actually would bring it closer to the right number. Calabasas is 23,280, population. So my direction is I'd like to see that added. I -- yeah.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR TURNER: You're welcome. Thank you.

Commissioners, I don't see any other hands. We're going to prepare -- we have five minutes to transition to Kennedy for our next region, and we are scheduled for a fifteen-minute break at 4:30, required break.
MR. MANOFF: Would you like to take your fifteen now, Chair?

CHAIR TURNER: Absolutely. If we can do that, if we can take a --

MR. MANOFF: Sure. Sounds good.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So back at 4:40.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 4:26 p.m. until 4:40 p.m.)

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you so much, and thank you to -- again, to all of Californians that are calling in and participating with us in this process.

I do want to let you know I am hearing those that have elected not to use the -- the system and the tool that is available and want to let you know that we are going to open today for public comment in the middle of this agenda item just for those that is waiting to get through and -- and have comment on it.

So we're going to continue this conversation around Congressional lines through 5:30, at which time we're going to stop and open it up for public comment. And we will close lines at 6:00, so if you get into the queue before 6:00, we will take your public comment tonight. So we will take your public through -- and answer everyone that's in the queue that we can get to. So lines will open.
Oh. I was being a mysterious caller without my -- my video on. Sorry. So we are going to open for public comment. We're going to talk about Congressional lines just a little bit more, and hopefully, maybe -- maybe it can happen, we can get through the end of them by 5:30. But at 5:30, we will start taking public comment.

Okay. So at this point, we are now in the hands of Kennedy.

MS. WILSON: One moment as we get those page numbers so we make sure everyone's on track. Okay. Hello, Commission. Day two. We are going to be starting on page 26 of the handout with the NorCal visualization. This is not loading.

So to begin in the North, we do have this part of Siskiyou cut off at about Eureka. I'll zoom in so that -- Eureka -- so you can see there, keeping the Karuk Tribe together.

Last time, we were told to -- that's why you're seeing different variations to either have this portion of Humboldt taken out to keep the Karuk Tribe together, and we were just exploring the possibilities, and this one worked, splitting Siskiyou in half here. And that is why we did it that way, to keep the deviations at a good place.

So here we have this part of Siskiyou, Modoc,
Shasta, Lassen, Plumas, Butte, Tehama, Glen Colusa, down into Yolo without West Sacramento. This does separate Sutter and Yuba from Butte, but given feedback from yesterday, that is also something that you would like to see.

Now, we will be moving on to page 28, this ECA, Eastern California visualization. So here we do -- starting in the North, we have Sutter and Yuba kept together. We have Sierra Nevada, Plaser, and El Dorado kept together as well. Plaser does have a split within the county separating Lincoln, Sheridan, Granite Bay, Loomis, Newcastle, Auburn, and North Auburn from Roseville and Rocklin.

And then moving down, we have Mono and Inyo kept together and being populated by these counties in the North rather than to the South. And the counties -- those counties would be Nevada, Plaser, and El Dorado giving population down this way to Mono and Inyo.

Now, we will be moving on to page 30 into West Plaser and Sacramento. Here we have Rocklin and Roseville kept together in Plaser, and then coming into Sacramento, we have Folsom, Gold River, Fair Oaks, Orangevale, Citrus Heights, Arden-Arcade, Carmichael, McClellan Park, North Highlands, Foothill Farms, Antelope, and Rio Linda.
Now, we will be moving onto page 31, which is this WESTSAC Sacramento visualization. Starting at the top, we have Elverta. We add West Sacramento, the entirety of West Sacramento. And the entirety of Sacramento is in this visualization. It has no splits.

We also have Rancho Cordova, Mather, La Riviera, Rosemont, Fruitridge Pocket, Lemon Hill, Parkway, and Florin.

Now, we have page 32, South Sacramento/North San Joaquin. So here we have Elk Grove in Sacramento, Ann Vineyard, Wilton, Rancho Murieta, Galt, down to Lodi. We keep Stockton whole as well as incorporating the Rio -- the delta community and the school district although it does not go into Yolo to take Clarksburg but keeps down in this tail of Sacramento, Walnut Grove, Isleton, and Rio Vista.

Now, we are moving on to page 34, moving into Stanislas, which is kept whole and then includes Lathrop, Manteca from San Joaquin, Ripon, Escalon. Moving North, we have the Eastern San Joaquin farming cities as well -- Farmington up to Dogtown.

Now, we are moving onto page 35, Merced to Fresno. We have a split in Merced, however, we keep Merced whole, again, Atwater, Chowchilla, Madera. And then moving into Fresno, I'll zoom in so you can see that Old Fig Garden
West of 99 to the North in Fresno is kept together.

Now, we're moving into page 36, and we have Merced to Curran. So this takes this western part of Merced with Los Banos and Dos Palos. Then we have from Firebaugh, Mendota, Viola, to Kerman are within this Merced to Kern visualization. We keep Kings County whole, and then we go down into West Bakersfield, not splitting Shafter, keeping towns of La Cresta, Benton Park, Cottonwood, Hillcrest, Potomac Park, Fairfax, down to Arvin together. And these in yellow are the VRA consideration districts. And so this one that I just went over, Merced to Kern, is a VRA consideration district.

Now, we will be moving on to page 37, which is Fresno to Tulare. We'll move in here to see West Park, Southwest Fresno, and Sunnyside down to Selma are kept together as well as other farming towns of Caruthers, Kingsburg, Fowler, Del Rey, Sanger and Reedley, and Orange Code -- Orange Cove, these are all kept together in this visualization, and into Tulare, it is split, but it keeps Visalia, Tulare, Portville whole.

And our final one is on page 38, and this is Tulare to Kern. I mean, my apologies. Tuolumne to Kern. And this, I went back and forth of having it in this Eastern California one or having it in this one, Tulare to --
Tuolumne to Kern.

I did find that we have Yosemite National Park being kept together when these two counties are together in this corner of Tuolumne and Mariposa to the Eastern corner. There are parts of Yosemite in there as well. So keeping that together is my reason for having Tuolumne in this one that has Tuolumne down to Kern.

And then we have population from -- I'll zoom into Fresno -- population from Northeast Fresno and Clovis, and then populate -- population from what is in Bakersfield, in this area. The Lake Isabella, Ridgecrest, and this part of Kern that is not with the VRA district whole. And that is all.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Kennedy. Commissioners, now we'll have an opportunity to comment on the Congressional maps that Kennedy just presented. I see Commissioners Fernandez and Anderson.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So on 26, Kennedy, that is the NORCA. If you can please drill down to the Yolo end of it, please. I wanted to look at it a little bit closer.

Okay. So I've already given these comments, so I don't know -- for the Assembly, so I'm not sure if you're going to take them. But I -- I want that blue area to go all the way down to Rio Vista and include Dixon, and that
population isn't that much, but it -- it'll probably be
enough to throw you over.

So again, want it more with the rural -- rural
agricultural areas. And again, Rio Vista is part of
Solano as well, so I'd like to kind of keep that --
yeah -- there to Rubeson (ph.), then I can't remember
what you had, so you're going to go into the purple as
well all the way from Rio to Clarksburg, into the blue.

That's my only comm -- so that's going to affect
other maps, so I'm not going to talk about the other
maps. Is that okay, Kennedy? Cool. Okay. So then the
next one would be 28, and that is the ECA -- ECA. And I
just need to look at it a little bit closer because it --
where's that one? Can you drill into that one for me,
please?

MS. WILSON: Yes. Would you like it in the nor --
drill --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, wait.

MS. WILSON: -- closer to the North?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Which one is this one? I'm
sorry.

MS. WILSON: In ECA?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh yes. Yes. I'm sorry.

So similar to the comments with Assembly from Sierra all
the way to the end of Inyo is a six-hour drive. And I
realize there's other considerations with mountain
ranges, and I'm just trying to figure out how to not make
it so long.

I was thinking maybe East -- maybe go Tuolumne and
Mariposa, but then you'd have to do Inyo with Tulare and
Fresno. I -- I would really appreciate if you could try
to work with that. That's probably not enough
information, but it's kind of a guidance. Okay. Thank
you.

And then number 30. I may need to look at that one
real quick, too. That one is WPLASERSAC. Okay. So I'm
looking -- let me see. What was I saying here? I had my
notes here.

What I was thinking possibly is trying to rework
this -- this visualization with -- is it the next one? I
can't remember. But I was thinking of the Folsom and
then Rancho Murieta, which is right below it. If that
could go with the El Dorado Hills. And yes. And so we
would take that out and then we would bring in -- let me
think.

Can you move back up a little bit? Thank you.

Sorry about that. It'd be Granite Bay. Yeah, I think
I'm okay with that. And if you move -- I'm sorry. Can
you move down real quick? I'm thinking all over the
place. And so this takes it all the way -- I think I'm
okay with the rest of it.

And then I -- I'm warming up. Is that what -- is that the new thing we're saying -- to 31. That's your WESTSAC to SAC. And I'm warming up to that idea because it does include West Sac but it also includes all of -- the rest of Sacramento, right? Okay. So I'm -- I'm warming up to that.

I'm a little concerned with Vineyard and Elk Grove. Elk Grove, I -- I did want to be included with Sacramento. There is a high Asian-American community that also is linked to, like, the Green Haven/Lemon Hill area, so I'm going to see what the numbers look like once you make those changes or work with it. And I think that was it because 32 would be impacted by my very first comments, so I'm not going to repeat that.

MS. WILSON: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Kennedy, any clarifying questions?

MS. WILSON: No, those were good. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Beautiful. Commissioner Anderson.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Oh. Thank you. Yeah. I'm look at that ECA, and specifically right at the top, actually. I still want to put Lincoln in with Rocklin and -- which would take it out of the ECA. There's about 70,000 people or so in -- 72 or so. If you take Lincoln out and put it with the Plaser, and considering how
Commissioner Fernandez is trying to rework a bit of that, it might fit.

And then go down because then you've taken 70,000 or so out of ECA. If you pop down to -- I'd like to add in Tuolumne and Mariposa County, and that's -- that's 70,000 people. So let's -- show us the difference here one city versus two counties.

And the reason why I want to put those in is because Calaveras and Tuolumne are -- and then Mariposa, but Calaveras of Tuolumne are the heart of the gold country. They have newspapers together. They have radio stations together. Their tourist board is back and forth, Senora, Angel's Camp, you know, all of these cities and towns work together -- they are the same community, and to separate that would really be -- it would cause a lot of problems for them.

The only issue I see here now is then the Tulare/Kern then would need about 50,000 more people, and I don't know if we could get that out of our little VRA or, like, somewhere -- you know, I don't know how -- how those numbers are. You know, sometimes it sounds 50,000 is huge, and sometimes 50,000 is not that many. So I -- I'd very open to where, you know, we get a little bit more to make that happen. As I said, Tuolumne, Mariposa, and up -- up to Amador -- Calaveras and Amador,
they're -- they're all sister counties.

MS. WILSON: I have a clar -- just a question for you. Is it imperative to you that Tuolumne and Mariposa stay -- stay together, or is it more Calaveras and Tuolumne, if

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well --

MS. WILSON: -- there was a choice?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: -- it's Calaveras and Tuolumne, but then Mariposa's only 17,000. So Tuolumne is the bigger county, so I -- I think you have the same problem either way. And so -- but Calaveras and Tuolumne, absolutely. I'd prefer all -- you know, with Mariposa as well. And as I said, it's only 17,000. So if you're able to solve the 50,000 with Tuolumne, you -- you probably -- you know, that's -- you're probably okay. But yes. Calaveras and Tuolumne definitely need to be together, please. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. On the same district, I just wanted to comment that although the North-South orientation is, of course, a crazy amount of difference -- distance -- crazy amount of distance from Sierra all the way down to the bottom of Inyo, the testimony we heard was that at least that is accessible, whereas East-West is not even -- is not accessible at all
during the winter months. So even though it looks shorter on the map, it's even worse. So that's one point in favor of keeping the North-South orientation.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Good afternoon. If I can ask the fellow Commissioners a favor so you can drag me along, when we're making some of our choices and changes, can we provide a little bit more context as to why so it doesn't seem like it's a capricious decision or a personal preference, but rather it's based on a criteria, a population, something of the sort so that we know why the changes are being made or what your line of reasoning is. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor. And to help with that, again, we have staff that's standing by. Occasionally we're hear something, and we're like, no, I want to hold onto this, and there's something I remember and not quite. I remember reading in some of the 6,000 testimonies that we hear.

If that's the case, let's just ask staff to give us a high-level overview of what they've heard to see if that helps us know why we're trying to hold onto something. And if not, then perhaps we can begin to make some concession based on what's needed for our maps and...
our numbers.

I just wanted to make a general -- I put my hand up
to make a general comment, and -- and it's one of those
things that's noise in my mind, so I'll say out loud.
When we are trying to create districts from a geography
standpoint of what is accessible, I just want to name
aloud that my experience is the greater number of
Californians do not drive to their elected official's
office.

And so I almost feel like that's a fallacy that we
keep operating behind. They -- they don't. They don't
drive to the places. Very few, actually -- people
actually show up. And when they do, it's only for
certain occasions a couple of times a year.

So it seems like a lot of our conversation is being
decided around what's easily accessible to elected
officials, and some of that is a -- a elected official
issue as to whether or not they make themselves, whoever
they may be, accessible to the people that repre -- that
they represent and showing up in their areas.

So I just wanted to name that as a general
conversation for our last few days and as we go forward
to consider is that really something that should be a
priority as we're trying to design these districts.

Something certainly to be aware of.
I've mentioned it another way by stating that something that has long mileage is not necessarily synonymous with time because there are short distances that also take a long time to get there. So just -- just wanting to name that for the good of the echo system for everyone all the way around, my thoughts.

Commissioner Taylor, do you have more?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh. Almost pushed the wrong button there again. I -- I -- I think I just want -- I -- I mean, I guess this is one of those I don't know if there's anything that could be done about it.

You know, Sutter, Yuba, and Butte have been very clear about, you know, their -- their regional cooperation, and it's a little odd to have them in this kind of what I guess what I would call the Eastern Sierra -- excuse me -- COI. Or not COI, but this visualization.

I was trying to look at some of the other maps, like, if you were to move that out, like, what would be then the impacts to it. Unfortunately, not as much flexibility, I saw, so I just wanted to ask this question. Given what Commissioner Fernandez just also asked about, would that rework your population numbers in
a different way, or does that increase the numbers?

Like, I'm thinking, like, if you were to remove Yolo Coun -- Yolo County and -- and if you added in, I think, Yuba and Butte. And I do understand that Butte is rather large. I was really surprised to see how large it was. I thought it was -- but it has quite a bit of population, I know, and it's probably not going to make up for Yolo. I mean, it would probably way overtake Yolo.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They're about the same.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: They're about the same?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. Yolo and Butte are about the same.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: About the same?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Population.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) County.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I -- I -- I was trying to think about that. And I do agree with what Commissioner Turner said about, you know, the -- you know, most people not driving to their elected officials' offices, but there are people who do want to see them, and you know, unfortunately, sometimes maybe some of them don't get out quite as much as their -- their constituents would like to see, and I think that's what we've been hearing a lot is that there's a belief that if -- if the -- if the --
their -- their -- their districts were a little bit more concentrated, they might perhaps see their elected officials a little bit more, but I don't know. You know, I think it ultimately depends on who they choose to elect.

But -- but with that said, I -- I also want to support what Commissioner Anderson was asking about with the inclusion of Mariposa and Tuolumne, and -- and I think they all see themselves in fairly, you know, cohesive ways, although probably there's still somewhat of a split between these Southern Eastern Sierra counties and the Northern Eastern Sierra counties, but I think because of the access issues, I think they all want to be together. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. I was hoping you could ask staff to look at what we have regarding Trinity. I was just reading one of the comments we received, and they made us aware that Trinity, Shasta, and -- Tehama -- Tehama? Thank you. Are all in the same community college district, and it would be -- and I wanted to -- I felt like we have gotten different -- anyway, if you could just ask staff what we know about Trinity that would be great.
CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Jose? Is it you?

MR. EDUARDO: Hi, Commissioners. Yes, I can -- I can see what input Trinity has given. That's not my area that I covered, but I will do my best to look up.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. And while you're -- just flag us when you are ready, Jose. I'll move on. Do you have others, Commissioner Akutaga -- was that Commissioner Akutagawa? Okay.

Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah. Thank you. Yeah, it was about back -- you know, the -- the reasons why I might have -- maybe I was a little quick on why I was saying the items that I was talking about. And when I was talking about removing Rocklin, then it occurred back to me with -- this is from the ECA.

I do agree that -- with Commissioner Akutagawa, Yuba and Sutter are a little unusual to have because those -- while they do also have water issues and into the mountains, they are more rural and farming with -- and with Butte. And I was thinking if those were removed and did some -- little bit partial of Yolo went down to the delta community we're trying to draw, if we added -- rather than taking Lincoln out, if we added all of Placer County, and I think population-wise that might be a trade-off.
And the reason there -- and so that's what I was thinking, or you know, one, to keep the county -- the entire county together. But then what I wanted to say about this because it keeps on coming up about distance, Mono, Inyo, up to the gold country, and it's actually -- it's not distance that's their issue. It is a -- it's the Sierras. It's they have the fire issues. They have the water issues in terms of -- also, it's a recreational area. It's a soc -- it's the economic driver of this area.

And the reason why Inyo and Mono have more in common and want to go up with Alpine as opposed to over the crest is because Fresno and Tulare, while they also have some, you know, mountainous areas and things, they also have large sections of the valley, and the people who tend to run everything with Fresno and Tulare are more valley-focused where Inyo, Mono -- and that's why they really have a lot in common with Mariposa, Tuolumne, Calaveras going North.

And it -- it is a -- it's the fire district area. It has -- it's an economic interest. And particularly again, most of these areas have huge numbers of land in their county which does not belong to the county. And so that's -- that's an item that, at a Congressional level, is big. And that's why I'd kind of like to see these
counties be together in a Congressional district, for
their economic reasons. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So just a process thought
I would like to offer. Our mappers are working real hard
here and have -- have brought us something that, you
know, and this is a challenging problem. But you know,
I'm going to pick on Commissioner Anderson here a little
bit.

You just -- you just suggested adding 100,000 to the
red district without a way to map through probably six
districts to get back to, you know, even, and --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: You know what? I did take
out the same -- about the same amount that I
(indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, you -- you suggested
adding all of Placer County and Tuolumne and --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: And taking out Yuba and
Sutter.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh. I guess I missed -- I
guess I missed that part. I apologize. But I mean, in
general, that was one example. I missed. I apologize.
But -- but there have been other examples, and I just --
you know, I think we need to -- at the -- you know, I
know we're still at a high level her, but I just -- I
hope this helps, but if we can kind of try to close the
loop as we're taking people out, we're going to get those
people back.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you. I -- I am going
to respond because that is something I am trying --
trying to do. Again, I took areas out, put areas in, and
I know again then where is the area -- where do we take
areas out of the NORCA, and it would be from Yolo.

So we can rearrange -- we're still trying to draw
that delta area so it can re -- it can grab some -- a
little rearranging in the Sacramento area Mr. Fernandez
was also hoping to maybe do a little rearranging in, and
so that's where -- that was the only nebulous thing I
wasn't specifically say, okay, take it out from here and
rearrange that, but I oft -- I try to do that because I
know how hard it is for the poor line drawers. And so I
thank you.

MR. EDUARDO: Commission -- Chair?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes. You have it?

MR. EDUARDO: Yes. I am --

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MR. EDUARDO: I have some input available for you --
you all. And so -- and Ashleigh is here to jump in, too,
but the communities of Shasta, Trinity Glen, Tahama, and
Lake, we received a handful of input where they would
want to be placed together for -- and one of their
concern is the coastal natural resources, higher
education, farming, fishing, sustainable forestry, and
they consider it -- themselves small, independent
communities. And they are very -- they follow -- they
respect the boundaries of the Trinity River, which --
which is brought up in a handful of community input.
Ashleigh, do you want to jump in?

MS. HOWICK: Yes. I will just add that I have also
seen some COI input suggesting to put Trinity with Shasta
and Tehama because they share a community college
district. However, we've also gotten COI input that
watersheds from Trinity lead into Del Norte and Humboldt
County, so I've seen both.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And I forget, that was
you, Commissioner Sinay? Okay. Thank you. I just have
questions. Can you just name for me -- I was trying to
keep up with hands -- how many splits are there in Fresno
County, and where are they?

MS. WILSON: So here we have four splits in Fresno.
The first one is in the VRA district, which on this
line -- I'll follow it here -- does not include Raisin
City but takes in Kerman and Biola to the West.

And then we have our second one that goes into
Tulare keeping the Southwest of Fresno, West Park over to
Selma and these farming communities of Reedley, Sanger, Del Rey, Fowler, Easton, Caruthers over to Orange Cove together into Tulare.

And then we have our third one moving into the City of Fresno, which includes Old Fig Garden Northwest of the 99 and keeps that community together and separate from our last split, the fourth, which keeps Northeast Fresno and Clovis together with the Eastern part of Fresno going out to the mountains.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So there's a four-way split for the county and Fresno itself. Fresno City is whole?

MS. WILSON: Yes.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Great. I don't have any direction. I wanted to see that, and I'll follow up with it later. Also can you show me San Joaquin County and show me how many splits are in San Joaquin County? And wait. Before you pass it, I think Merced is still -- is Merced still split?

MS. WILSON: Yes, Merced is split in two. No city splits, but the county is split.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. And then keep going up, please.

MS. WILSON: And then in San Joaquin, we have three. We have this upper western corner keeping Stockton, Lodi together. Then we have this third one that makes kind of
a backwards "L" shape keeping Lathrop, Manteca, and the Eastern farming communities together. And then the third comes from taking Mountain House and Tracy out of San Joaquin and districting it to the West.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Kennedy, do we currently have any of the Central Valley counties whole, or in with --

MS. WILSON: Stanislaus is whole.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Once we get into live line-drawing, I'll -- I'll -- I'd like to come back to some of these areas and see what we can do to not have them split so many different times. Thank you. Commissioner Sinay and then Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I asked about Trinity just because staff kind of -- kind of confirmed what I was feeling is that Trinity -- if we -- it's only 16,000. I understand that. But if you need some wiggle room at some place, Trinity can either go with the coast or go inland, depending. I still believe that as much as -- that Siskiyou, if we could keep it all together it would be ideal.

And then on the splits, this is something I've been thinking about for a long time. It's been really easy for us to say keep counties together, keep big -- you know, keep little cities together and stuff, but we are going to have to do splits at some time, and ideally, in
my mind, sometimes a 50/50 split is -- you know, a county -- you know, instead of just taking some for population, it feels better if two counties kind of are 50/50, you know, they're sharing that.

And so I know you have loved to hear this last -- two weeks ago versus hearing it now, but we're learning. So I just wanted us to think about we are going to have to split. There's no way around -- around splitting it because the sizes, the different -- and so -- and -- and we may want to start thinking more how do we creatively want to move lines so the splits are shared among two counties.

I agree. I think -- well, San Diego County is split so many county, but it's a huge county so it's never really occurred to me that it wouldn't be split. But -- but just that idea of if it's going to be between Orange County and San Diego, how do we make it so it's 50/50? You know, so just thinking about that. Others may have other ideas, but just it's time for us to stop -- you know, we were saying don't split, don't split, and that was great for visualization, but now we're getting closer and closer to reality, so now we need to think, okay, if we split, this is what I'd like to see.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay, which is exactly why I just lifted that in the air because what
I don't want is by the time we get to the central California area, we're splitting counties three, four, and five times to keep other surrounding counties whole. And so I named that. Don't have a specific direction now, but I will want to come back to this as we move forward. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I -- I -- and -- and I guess on that note speaking about the Central Valley, I -- if I can ask everyone, I'd like to go to page 38, which is the Tuolumne/Kern visualization.

And I know we spoke about this in relation to the Assembly map, and I know that it was going to be challenging to do because of the numbers. But I -- I -- first off, I want to just ask a question maybe for clarification and understanding. That is a -- a potential VRA district. I see that it's in bright yellow. But we do have significant COI testimony, you know, really saying that Three Rivers is part of Visalia. If -- if we were to try to grab that in -- I know we're -- we're -- we're kind of slightly over, you know, is there other adjustments, you know, that can be made? And I -- and I'm asking this only because it's a VRA district and I'm -- I'm a little concerned about saying, can we just take this part away?

But if we were to grab Three Rivers, and I think I
tried to look up the -- the actual city numbers on that one, but I don't see it showing up. One, would it throw off the standard deviation so much that we would have to have find somewhere else to perhaps move? Secondly, would it throw off the VRA -- the potential VRA consideration? Okay. All right.

MS. WILSON: And I was, you know, in those meetings, and I heard everyone from Three Rivers, and it hurts to split that COI. And that's why, in the Senate, you know, they are kept together. It is -- it does drop the CVAP.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Okay. That -- I just wanted to ask that for clarification because, yeah, when I read those, I'm like, can we find a way? Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Yee and Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. Just a quick note about Fresno. I believe the current visualization actually does split the City of Fresno a little bit. The North -- in the Northeastern part of it a little bit to the right of Highway 41 to Clovis. I think that's part of Fresno also, so that part is split.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Okay. We are going to go to public comment at -- in seven minutes.

Commissioners -- Commissioner Akutagawa, you have
more? Commission -- okay. Anything else on this map before we move to our Los Angeles area?

Okay. Jaime? Commissioner -- Commissioner Sadhwani --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

CHAIR TURNER: -- quickly.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No, I know we're about to go to public comment. I feel like it would be helpful maybe to do that rather than moving on and kind of leave Los Angeles for tomorrow. And I think it would -- mentally, I think, be a better break for me. I -- I -- I feel like I have additional thoughts on the -- the Central Valley region, and I'm looking forward to the public comment on it.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So we'll take -- okay. So we'll get ready to go to public comment. Please, we want to remind the community that our lines will close at 6:00, but indeed, we will take everyone that is in queue before 6:00. I do see hands up and people lined up and prepared. Excited about that. We have a natural break we'll let you know that we are required to take, and I'm not being a good steward over the break times, Kristian, so if you're remind me.

MR. MANOFF: Our next break is at 6:10, Chair.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So yep. It'll be after the
line are closed, but we will still get to everyone that
is in the queue that we can.

MR. MANOFF: And give us just a moment. We are
joined by our comment moderator, and we will get ready to
take comments. Just a moment here.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So while we're waiting for the
comment moderator, I guess what I want to say is we'll
take everyone that we can. I can't promise that I'll get
to everyone because I don't know if I'll fall asleep on
you at some point, and I want to be alert and ready to
hear your comments. We'll take as many as we can. And
keep in mind that --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I am here --

CHAIR TURNER: -- you can continue --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- Chair, I apologize.

CHAIR TURNER: -- to give us public comment on our
tool at any point, and we will be taking additional
public comment at the end of our session.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Am I -- can you hear me,
Chair? This is --

MR. MANOFF: Yes, we can.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- Katy.

MR. MANOFF: Yes, we can.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Awesome. All right.

Kristian, the one thing I do not have is the new meeting
I'm resourceful. Here I am. We are ready? You're just waiting on me, correct?

MR. MANOFF: Yes. Go ahead with the instructions, please.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Got it. In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed. It is 83289935025 for this meeting.

When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound key. Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star nine. This will raise your hand for the moderator.

When it is your turn to speak, you will hear a message that says, the host would like you to talk and to press star six to speak. If you would like to give your name, please state and spell it for the record. You are not required to provide your name to give public comment.

Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream
audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call. Once you are waiting in the queue, the alert for when it is your turn to speak, and again, please turn down the livestream volume.

And we will be having two-minute increments, a warning at one minute and -- and thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We'll do a warning at thirty seconds and --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: thirty seconds --
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- and fifteen seconds.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- and fifteen seconds.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And that warning will sound something like this: thirty seconds, fifteen seconds.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And right now, we will have caller 8818. One moment. Sorry. 818, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MS. KING-TINGLE: Good evening. My name is Bernice King-Tingle. That's T as in Tommy, I--N-G-L-E. I'm on the Board of Directors at Mountain House Community Services District, and my comment is brief. Mountain House must be written in with Stockton, Lathrop, Brentwood, and other communities that rely on delta for their water source like here in Mountain House. We get our water from Clifton Forebay, and we would like to be
zoned in with communities that are in the delta communities. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 1251. And up next after that will be caller 266. Right now, we will have caller 1251. If you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MR. HALLDIN: Thank you. Thank you. My name is Phil Halldin, H-A-L-L-D-I-N. I serve on the Rocklin City Council in Placer County and was calling in to urge you, and I've -- I've heard your comments about splitting counties, and I understand that you -- you're going to face some tough decision, but you know, Placer County is a county with about 400,000 people, and when it comes to Senate Assembly and Congressional districts, if at all possible, to keep our county together.

 Particularly what -- what we refer to as South Placer, Rosehill, Rocklin, Lincoln, Granite Bay, that area. We do just about everything together, and we are a distinct economic area from the Sacramento County region. We share school districts, a community college district. We have a independent water agency that serves these areas. And -- and the Placer County area is definitely a distinct community of interest that we would urge you to keep -- keep together in the maps for the various seats
that you're going to be drawing maps for -- for.

Our council, on Tuesday, voted to send a letter, so you'll be receiving an official letter from the city with our -- our encouragement in that direction. I appreciate all the work you folks are doing and the difficult task that you have. And again, if at all possible, to keep Placer County, and we are untied in many things in the county. But if -- if that's not completely possible, keep the western part of the county where most of the population is together. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And now we'll be going to caller 2668. And up next after that will be caller 2887. Caller 2668, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. So my name's Isaiah. I'm a first-generation college student from Cal State Bakersfield, and I know how it's important that we keep communities of interest unified, and I'm concerned that the Commissions' current visualization of the Assembly lines are dividing Bakersfield that's not really unifying our community interests, which especially for our farming and agricultural communities. And I just don't think it's a very, you know, logical way to exclude the City of Shafter in the Southern Bakersfield section.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Up next, we will have caller 2887, and after that will be caller 3196. Caller 2887, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MS. KERR: Thank you so much. Thank you, Commissioners, for your continued hard work and good service in support of --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: You are unmuted --

MS. KERR: -- all of our --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- and the floor --

MS. KERR: -- communities.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- is yours. You may want to make sure that your phone is not on mute.

MR. MANOFF: We can here you. It's okay. We can here you, caller.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: You are now unmuted again.

MS. KERR: Okay. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: You may want to double-check that your --

MS. KERR: Thank you, Commissioners --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- phone isn't on mute.

MS. KERR: -- for your hard work. My name is Megan Kerr. I'm on the Board of Education, the Vice President
of Board of Education for the Long Beach Unified School District, and I'd like to read a letter from our --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I'm sorry. Caller --

MS. KERR: -- superintendent of schools.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- 2887, we are not hearing you. You are --

CHAIR TURNER: Katy --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- unmuted in --

CHAIR TURNER: -- Katy, we hear her.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- the meeting. Oh.

Well, never mind.

MR. MANOFF: We are hearing you, caller. We're going to restart your time.

MS. KERR: Thank you so much. My name's Megan Kerr. I am the Vice President of the Board of Education in the Long Beach Unified School District, and I'd like to read a letter from our Superintendent of Schools.

Dear Commissioners, on behalf on the Long Beach Unified School District, we write to say thank you for keeping our school district whole in your map visualization. Earlier this year, we wrote to express how important to us to keep LBUSD together, and we thank you for taking our feedback into account with these visualizations this week.

LBUSD supports nearly 70,000 students from Avalon,
Long Beach, Signal Hill, and Lakewood with education from pre-K to high school. Our students are diverse with 58 percent identifying as Hispanic, 12.6 percent African-American, 12.5 percent white, 7.4 percent Asian, 4.3 percent two or more races, 3.2 percent Filipino, 1.2 percent Pacific Islander. We also have 14 percent of our students who are English language learners and 63 percent who come from families that are socioeconomically disadvantaged and need specialized support.

We know you'll hear a lot of feedback in the coming weeks about visualizations statewide, but as you do, please keep the Long Beach Unified School District as together as possible. We need to have representative elected by our community so that they can be responsive to the children and young adults we serve. Having access to local lawmakers who will be responsive to our needs for funding and support is critical to us.

Thank you again for all of your time, and congratulations on your release of your statewide visu -- visualizations that support students in our region.

Sincerely, Dr. Jill Baker, Superintendent of Schools of Long Beach Unified. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. I apologize for my own own malfunction. Up next will be
calling 3196, and after that will be caller 3220.

Caller 3196, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor
is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you so much. My name
is Christian, and I just want to thank you for this
opportunity to night to give public testimony. I'm also
a resident of Long Beach like the caller before me, and I
know you've been hearing a lot from our community, but I
want to thank you for listening to our feedback, and I
think it's really important and reflected in the maps
that you've been discussing this week.

I think these updated visualizations are such an
improvement for our city over what this Commission has
been looking at previously, and I'm really grateful that
you and your staff and the line drawers have really taken
our input to heart.

First and most importantly, these maps for Congress,
Assembly, and Senate all keep Long Beach largely
together, but to my mind, they also place us with
neighboring communities and cities that really makes
sense and really reflect how we think about our greater
area. Communities like Bellflower, Signal Hill, Los
Alamitos, these are all places that I drive through on a
daily basis, that I think about when I'm going out to
eat, to go see a movie back in the before times, and also
to just shop and spend time with friends and family.

I know that we've only had the chance to hear your
discussion for the Assembly districts in my area, and
there's some variation between the three maps in
different districts, but my community really supports
what you're looking for our area, and I hope you'll end
up adopting lines that are really similar to what's
before you this week. I also want to appreciate that you
have a number of considerations and different variables
and voting rights considerations --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- that make this such a
challenging and difficult process, but I know that you've
been listening to our feedback, and it's been reflected
in the work you've -- you've done so far, and we're just
so, so grateful that you've been hearing us and it's
reflected in what you're doing. Thank you so much for
all of your hard work and for the chance to speak to you
this evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we will have caller 3220. And up next after
that will be caller 5178. Caller 3220, if you will
please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by
pressing star six.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. The floor is yours.

MR. SABLER: Very good. My name is Don Sabler (ph.). I'm a 35-year resident of Yolo County and a member of the Yolo County Board of Supervisors. I'm very heartened by the conversations that I've heard at the last meeting and during the course of your conversations today.

However, the visualizations, I think, have failed to capture the community of interest that I know to be in place in Yolo County. Eighty-six percent of the population of Yolo County lives in the four incorporated cities. We are indeed a rural county with a strong agricultural economy. That economy is linked far more to Solano County than to Plumas County or Alpine or up in Shasta and Tehama.

So we are very disturbed and concerned to see a Congressional district that has Yolo County as an appendage attached to the Southern tip of a district for Congress that would -- that would really exclude much of our community of interest.

We share an air quality basin with Solano County. We work actively on transportation corridors along Interstate 80. I chair the Capital Corridor Passenger
Rail Service that provides a rail from Auburn to San Jose. That's the -- we are much -- we're part of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments in the six-county capital region. We are in the community college district that served by Solano County in Winters.

There's just no way that the community of interest Yolo County has would go all the way up into that area. The delta, if you live in Clarksburg, you look across the river and you see Sacramento County. You don't look across the river and see the City of Reading. We are a part of the area --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. SABLER: -- in the Sacramento region. We're not a part of that other area.

The Assembly district, by the way, is really disturbing. You split the Winters School District, and it splits the Davis School District by excluding El Macero and Winters from the Assembly --

MR. MANOFF: Time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. All right. Now, we will have caller 5178. And up next after that will be caller 5597. Caller 5178, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MR. WONG: Hi. My name is Jon Wong. That's J-O-N.
And W-O-N-G. I am a resident of Oakland, but I'm from San Diego, California.

First, I want to agree with Commissioner Toledo and Commissioner Yee's directions in terms of a Congressional map for the East Bay. I have some good news. I was poking around today with a districting app and it seems like we can have a district that goes along the I-4 -- sorry -- the State Route 4 corridor all the way from San Pablo to Discovery Bay and including Vallejo and Valencia, a second Congressional district that goes from Concord to the Tri-Valley, and then another district that goes -- keeps Oakland intact and goes up to Richmond. Richmond may need to be divided, but I really support direction.

I also wanted to briefly mention from my own hometown to please keep North inland San Diego City as whole as possible including Rancho Bernardo, Rancho (indiscernible) Ranch, and Sabre Springs. And in particular, in the Congressional district visualization for the district, it seems like my home birth community in Rancho Bernastino (ph.) is split. That's ZIP code --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. WONG: -- 93129. If you can make sure that that community is kept whole by going South of the 56 and keeping Rancho Bernastino intact, that would be great.
Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 5597. And up next after that will be caller 5944. Caller 5597, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm calling from the San Pedro/Wilmington area, and I just wanted to say thank you so much. You've hit a home run with our neighborhood. A huge congrats to your staff and the line drawers for all this hard work. I know it must be intense. The State of California is one big puzzle to piece together, and at least for my region and my neighborhood, you've got it right.

The San Pedro and L.A. Gateway area are super tight-knit communities. We feel connected to the cities that are North of us. We've spent decades building relationships with our neighbors along that 110 corridor, and again, I just want to thank you for creating a district that goes from San Pedro and heads North.

We absolutely should remain in the districts with our cities like Carson, West Carson, and those L.A. communities. I'm in love with this current map. Please, please continue to keep this configuration and support our communities. Thank you very much.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: All right. Right now we will have caller 5944. And up next after that will be caller 7199. Caller 5944, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right. Yeah. I'm a Bakersfield resident. Just wanted to comment on the -- the current county map that extends North through the mountains. It seems pretty unwieldy, not very representative of this area at all. And especially If you look at the Bakersfield area and how the lines have moved from the previous Congressional district maps, they actually moved the line quite a bit North to Stockdale Highway, which cuts West Bakersfield in half.

That really is one whole community. It's -- it's much more similar to itself than it is to the neighboring district which -- which just picked it up in the latest visualization. So I would say if you guys could look at that and kind of reset the line to where it was and not split up West Bakersfield.

That Cal State Bakersfield is a university there that is right on the border of that line, and you're kind of splitting up a really big university community, and just culturally, it just doesn't make a lot of sense. Also, I'm not really sure it makes sense to have
Bakersfield or any part of Bakersfield connected to all these mountain communities, foothill communities. We really -- and especially to have it go into Clovis or West Fresno, we really have no connection to those areas at all.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And they -- they probably feel the same way about this area. I know that there's VRA considerations with the neighboring district, but if there's some way to --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- you know, accommodate that, I think that would really be best because the lines, especially in Bakersfield, just really don't make any sense right now. Also I'd like you to consider, too, that Bakersfield and East Kern are not --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 7199. And up next after that will be caller 4047.

Caller 7199, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MR. MURRAY: Hi. Thank you so much for hearing me tonight. My name's Mike Murray (ph.). I'm from Rocklin, and I apologize if there's any background noise. I'm at
my daughter's soccer practice right now. And on her soccer team, there's actually girls from all over Plaser County. They play games in Roseville, Rocklin, Lincoln, Loomis, Granite Bay. Our hope is clear, please keep Plaser together when it comes to the redistricting. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 4047. And up next after that will be caller 5820.

Caller 5047, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you so much. My name is Anne. I live in Acton, California, and I wanted to start by thanking you for what appears to be a hard-won generosity of spirit with one another, that you know different parts of the state need very different testimony, and yet it has been a pleasure to listen to you try and find a way forward that works for most of the people most of the time.

That said, in the Assembly district, the Antelope map is amazing. We feel very heard that Acton is a tiny rural town just South of Palmdale, and you have included us with the other rural communities around us and with the Emerald Valley, and we appreciate that so much.
The other observation that I had that may just be appropriate for not just our area, is it appears sometimes you get conflicting testimony where one group of people say, yes, we must be with these others, and then the others say, well, no, we don't want to be with them.

And I would just encourage you to look at both geography and socioeconomic status when you try and work your way through those. As part of a community that has very poor services and very poor education, I really feel we're better served when we're grouped with other communities like that than with some of our wealthier --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- neighbors. So so thank you so much. I -- I want to encourage the line drawers and -- and the Commissioners in your task. We appreciate you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we have caller 5820. And up next after that will be caller 7296.

Caller 5820, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. Hi. My name is Josh. Born and raised and currently live in the Central
Valley, specifically the City of Fresno.

I wanted to call and say while we in our community are very appreciative that you guys mention the importance of VRA districts in the Central Valley, a lot of us still think it's lacking in the valley and how far you guys are doing it, specifically in the City of Fresno.

A lot of the community in the City of Fresno really believe there should be a Congressional seat that is mostly Latino in the City of Fresno. The fear is that the current Congressional visualization separates the Latino communities in Fresno, specifically South of Shaw, which goes East to West. South of Shaw is currently separated into multiple districts.

Splitting up the Latino communities is harmful to their interests, and really makes it difficult for them to elect a member of Congress that represents them and their values. And there really is a big opportunity for this Commission to draw really an anchor -- an anchor district that mostly is Latino in the City of Fresno, again, South of Shaw that unites them, and I really believe the Commission should do that.

Right now, the City of Fresno is drawn into too many seats, and like I have said and I will reiterate, that does kind of hurt the Latino vote, and you guys have the
opportunity to make a VRA seat that's an anchor in the valley in the City of Fresno. Not only the Hispanic community, but additionally, a lot of those African-American communities in South Fresno are being broken up. So --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- just to finalize, I appreciate what you guys are doing, but we ask that the City of Fresno South of Shaw is kept united as a VRA district to represent the communities of color of there so their voice can be heard. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we have caller 7296. And up next after that will be caller 0405.

Caller 7296, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MS. KITAMURA: Hi. This is Deeana Kitamura, senior staff attorney with Asian Law Caucus. I'm also part of the AAPI and AMEMSA (ph.) Redistricting Collaborative. I think you for taking public comment today. I have some comments about LA and Fresno. I'll start with Fresno.

Nearly all of our COIs are split in Fresno at every level of government, but particularly at the Assembly level. And at the Assembly level, a large portion of our
COIs are in a district with Clovis, which not where they want to be because much of our COIs are from low income, immigrant, and refugee communities.

Now, on to L.A. As a director of Little Tokyo Service Center testified, there is a historic Japanese-American COI that extends from Gardena, Torrance, and the area just East of Torrance. The visualization split them at the Senate and Congressional level. Regarding West San Gabriel Valley, the core of the AAPI COI includes Monterey Park, Alhambra, Rose Meade, San Gabriel, and extends to Temple City and other areas of West San Gabriel Valley.

At all levels, they should be in West San Gabriel Valley-based district, and that is not the case at the Senate and Congressional levels. At the Senate level, they are split. And at the Congressional level, the core is with Gateway cities, not with other West San Gabriel Valley cities.

And I know you've heard that the core of the AAPI COI in East San Gabriel Valley is in Rolling Heights, Hacienda Heights, Diamond Bar, and Walnut. Hacienda Heights is separated out at every level of government, or at least all three levels of government that I've seen. And the Senate configuration connects Walnut, Rolling Heights --
MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. KITAMURA: -- and Diamond Bar to South Orange County, an area that has very little to do with East San Gabriel Valley. And with Chinatown, the community's definition of L.A. Chinatown is different than what you have drawn, and we've provided a shape file to you.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. KITAMURA: It extends just West of the 110, and it's cut at the Assembly and Congressional visualization. And that's it for today. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we will have caller 0405. And up next after that will be caller 4111.

Caller 0405, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you so much. First, I'd like to thank everybody there, the Commissioners for doing the job -- for serving, and for the support staff which is very valuable.

I'm calling in regards to the visualization AD Menifee area 1027. We -- we do feel like -- like you have been listening to us. In the past, the makeup had been -- the last ten years have been attached to San Diego County, which basically left it without
representation.

And with -- with -- with over 100,000 in population, we thought it was kind of an injustice for them. So I'm glad to see that you have brought it up to Riverside County again. And we really like this visualization, so we hope that you don't change it, specifically because we feel like a whole community now.

In regards to the -- the -- the Cleveland National Forest 1027, also, visualization, I do agree with some of the Commissioners there that were suggesting that Ranch Santa Margarita and areas of Orange County do not belong in this area. With the mountain, not only does -- not only does the mountain separate us, but the -- the only way to reach them is through a toll road, which basically means that anyone -- or we have to go through Ortega Highway, which is kind of a --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- risky -- very risky highway, so if -- if -- if at all possible, I would like us -- I would like you to consider possibly spread -- spreading that AD towards the East, if possible, but I do understand that we need to make some concessions somewhere. So first and -- and lastly, I would just like to iterate -- reiterate that we appreciate you listening to us and please understand that. Thank you.
CHAIR TURNER: And just a quick reminder, our line, the queue, will close in four minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much, Chair. Up next we have Caller 4111, and after that will be Caller 2931.

Caller 4111, please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MILES: Thank you. My name is Miles, and I am also from Long Beach. I am a member of our local LGTBQ+ community, and I wanted to specifically thank Equality California for their involvement in this process, and also their presentation to the Commission last week. In the visuals that they submitted, they identified Long Beach as an LGTBQ+ community of interest. That's important to protect in this process, and I really agree with them.

Long Beach has a large, diverse, and vibrant LGTBQ+ community. It's both historically significant and an important group when it comes to political representation today. We also have a large impact in LGTBQ+ history. We were one of the first cities to offer trans-inclusive public benefits, people partnership rights, and we have a perfect 100 score from the Human Rights Campaign as an inclusive LGTBQ+ community.

I personally thank you for listening to these
concerns and keeping our community whole and the maps that you are reviewing this week. We're so grateful to see these visualizations that keep Long Beach together and place us in districts with similar cities on our borders. Most importantly, I wanted to thank you for ensuring that LGTBQ+ voices and people are protected. We're looking forward to seeing our community continue to be protected as the Commission moves forward with the maps in the coming week, and again, I just want to thank you for the opportunity to speak and for all your support. Good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Up next, we have Caller 2931, and after that will be Caller 1940.

Caller 2931, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MS. KAI: Hello, my name is Flora Kai. I'm concerned with the way my community of Little Saigon has been drawn. First, you pitch a minority community against another by moving Little Saigon into Anaheim and Santa Ana, and now you want to be Costa Mesa, Tustin, Buena Park allowed into our area. Not only are this far away as listen to us, and in some areas, you jump over a city to give us one of -- of both. They are social -- social
economy different from us. The district has now crossed over with our school.

We don't travel to this area for any type of culture celebration, and we actual are much farther away for us to drive to school district in Garden Grove, Westminster, Huntington Beach, West -- West Center and Los Alamitos have been crossed over, which is all the city. Our chil -- our children -- our children play together in (indiscernible) Park. We have star and celebrations that we share the city battery and a library next door to each other. Also so -- also so economy is similar, so I don't understand why the continued push to draw no community of interest toward us.

What is the hidden agenda? I thought you said you would listen, but it's not looking like it at all.

Please don't split our Committee and what would be the last forty years --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. KAI: -- together at the park. Thank you for let us speak and thank you for all your listen.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much, and up next, we have Call -- Caller 1940, and after that will be Caller 6311.

Caller 1940, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor
is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi, my name is Patricia, and I've lived in Marin County for fifty-two years. The visualizations as they appeared yesterday for the AD and the CD, the Senate district were -- looked good. They looked like, you know, similar to what -- what we have now.

Where things went off the rail a little was the visualizations for the Congressional district. I have not heard any testimony in the hours and hours that I've attended meetings of people in Marin County say they wanted to be moved Eastward. I don't even -- I don't understand what kind of community of interest you're seeing with that East -- Eastward movement. All along -- all the testimony I've heard from Marin residents is that we need to remain with the coastal North coast as a continuous coastline and protecting that coast.

We need good federal and we need good state representation. We have the Golden Gate National Recreation Area here, the Point Reyes Seashore. These need to be protected, and they will -- will be best served by staying with the coastline. There is absolutely no community of interest, as I say, going East.
And then yesterday at the end of the AD discussions, I heard it mentioned again by two Commissioners that, well, if we need to, let's move Marin down into San Francisco. Marin is not an urban commune -- community.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: We are mostly rural. We have eighty percent open space. We have all of this national recreation area, and the Highway 37 that was also discussed as a corridor is very low-population, and to nip part of us off just to --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- create that kind of visualizations just doesn't make any sense. Please keep us in a coastal region. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And up next --

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, and our lines are now closed just so that we know. Thank you. Go ahead, Katie.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Oh, I apologize. Thank you, Chair.

All right now, we have Caller 6311, and up next after that will be Caller 0469.

Caller 6311, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor
is yours.

MS. COLE: Thank you. My name is Robin Cole. I am a resident of Tracy, California. My family has lived here for over 40 years.

In the past, we have been part of the Bay Area district, which is the current drawing that puts us with two other counties, San Joaquin, Livermore -- San Joaquin, Alameda, and San Jose -- or Santa Clara. We've been part of the Bay Area district before, and we've always felt as an afterthought. The Altamont Pass is a dividing line between the Bay Area and Tracy, Mountain House, Manteca, and points East. It makes a difference.

Our community of Tracy, Mountain House, Manteca has created a strong, cohesive, blended, suburban, rural, and agricultural community. We share common values. We share water resources, which we do not with the Bay Area. We share South County Fire Authority as our fire district. Those are not shared with the Bay Area. We have worked together to create a shared economic development plan, and we have a shared transportation development plan with ACE and Valley Link.

It does not make sense to pull Tracy and Mountain House into a Bay Area district when our values and our community is in San Joaquin County. Please put our community back into a San Joaquin County district. Thank
you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And now we have Caller 0469, and up next after that will be Caller 1647.

Caller 0469, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello, my name is Fahjd, and I'm calling from the Santa Clarita Valley area, and again, wanted to thank, like, everyone else, all of your hard work that you're putting in -- into this very difficult task of -- of redistricting. One thing we -- I did notice is that Santa Clarita's both state of Santa Ana Assembly district as well as Congressional districts have shifted quite a bit with -- with these changes, and the lines have moved South where traditionally we've been lumped in with communities to our North and East, which are more reflective of our population density, our common interests, and with cities that we normally collaborate with on a lot of issues, you know, for example, schools, economic issues, and fire hazards and distance from the Basin in terms of -- in terms of transportation, and it -- mixing us with communities South of the Newhall Pass, which are closer to the LA Basin and San Fernando Valley or Sun Valley, will make us less represented in -- in government, and I
urge you to please keep us -- keep Santa Clarita Valley
and its surrounding cities further mixed in with other
communities to the North and East where we've
traditionally been part of and we continue to
collaborate. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right
now, we will have Caller 1647. If you'll please follow
the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.
The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, thank you. I didn't
think I'd get called.

I waited all day to see the Los Angeles
presentation, and I guess that's going to tomorrow. I'm
a 36-year resident of Culver City, and I believe it's
time to move Culver City to the Westside cities, and that
was in earlier maps, and it's changed recently.

We've -- I've never felt represented, myself, and
neither have my neighbors in our Congressional district
or our Senate district. We are kind of the outcasts of
the area. We have more in common with the Westside
cities job-wise, commercial interests, more common --
more in common with their -- with the Westside cities.
We're also a member of the Westside city councils -- city
governments, so I hope you reconsider the current maps, there, and move us to the Westside cities. I would like to feel represented someday, so I hope you take this into consideration. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have Caller 5701. If you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

Caller 5701, you are unmuted.

ALEXANDER: Hi, good evening, Commissioner Turner and other Commissioners. My name is Alexander. I am calling from the City of Fresno, and I'm calling to express some grave concerns over the current visualizations for the -- these visualizations at the Assembly, Senate, and Congressional levels.

These visualizations do not take into consideration our large Latino population, and there's been a lot of talk of respecting the VRA districts and trying to do something to ensure that Latinos are adequately represented up and down California's Central Valley, and we feel that these visualizations totally ignore that, and they also ignore large Asian and African-American populations within the City of Fresno, and they have not taken into consideration of -- of the advocacy and opinions that have come forth about ensuring that North
Fresno and Clovis remain communities of interest. It seems that all of the community of Fresno, much of the City of Clovis and other areas that were supposed to be their own communities of interest have been lumped together and therefore have ensured that Latinos are not the majority in any one of the local districts, so we would urge you to reconsider the way the current visualizations are drawn. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And Chair, we are at 6:10.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Katie. I appreciate that. So then we do need to take our required break. I'm going to ask those that are in the queue to please not hang up. Please stay there. We will get to as many as we can in the time that we have left, and we will be back at 6:26. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 6:10 p.m. until 6:25 p.m.)

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you and welcome back for break. We are going to con -- and thank you for hanging in there with us. We are waiting with bated breath to hear exactly what you have to tell us that will help us draw these lines appropriately, and so Katie, we are right back into our public comment, please.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Wonderful, Chair. Thank
you so much. Right now, we will have Caller 4606, and up next after that will be Caller 8277.

Caller 4606, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

ROBIN: Hi, thank you, and thank you for your service. My name is Robin, and I live in Bakersfield, California, and I wanted to talk about the latest visualization that I saw.

They really split our town almost in half. Bakersfield is in itself a community of interest. We're con -- we share the same superintendent of schools, for example. We share the same postal service. We share the same university and schools, and yet, the latest visualization basically cut the university area almost in half and really split the town of Bakersfield itself.

We are a community of interest with Shafter, McFarland, Delano, Arvin, Lamonte. We share industries of oil and agriculture. We share, as I indicated, the superintendent of schools.

Right now, the concern is that my neighbors across the street, across College Avenue in Bakersfield, California are part of CD 21 and I am part of CD 23. That should not be the case when we share the same schools, the same postal service, the same water service,
and essentially everything. I shouldn't walk across the street and be in a different district, so I would encourage you to keep Bakersfield and its surrounding communities together. We have absolutely nothing in common with areas of San Bernardino County and areas of the other side of --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

ROBIN: -- the Tehachapi Mountains. We don't -- at the end of the day, Bakersfield and the other communities, we share even Costco. We do not travel or shop or share anything on the other side of the Tehachapi Mountains, so I would --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

ROBIN: -- encourage you to keep Bakersfield together. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have Caller 8277, and up next after that will be Caller 4051.

Caller 8277, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

DAVID: Hello, this is David calling in from Fresno, and I have some concerns about the way the map for the Assembly and Congressional districts are for my neighborhood, all the way East Fresno are drawn.
Well, you know, our area of Fresno is more linked to Clovis than any other part of Fresno, to be honest. It's just easier to do shopping there, and we're right on the border, the area of Fresno that's really East of the airport, but yet in the Congressional and Assembly district, we are not combined with Clovis. In fact, the most troubling, the Assembly district goes all the way to the state line with Nevada and includes Barstow, and really, we don't share anything in common with Barstow, not that I'm aware of.

I think a better split would be to combine with the areas East of the airport in Fresno with Clovis, and the Highway 180 to the South is --is a better natural cutoff. I think that applies to both the Assembly district and the Congressional district, and I hope when the lines are updated that you consider that because that's really a big Assembly district to represent, you know, just that portion of Fresno combined to go all the way to the Nevada border, includes San Bernardino County, (indiscernible) County, and everything in between. That doesn't sound like we get much representation. Plus, you'd really be taking the -- the Assembly district and the Congressional district we are currently represented and changing our neighborhood, and I believe one of the considerations is try to have as least disruption as
possible, and to have two different representatives, I think that sounds very disruptive.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

DAVID: Thank you so much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have Caller 4051, and up next after that will be Caller 9399.

Caller 4051, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MS. UNYIST: Hello, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. UNYIST: Hi, my name is Maribelle Unyist (ph.), and I'm with the Brown and Black Redistricting Alliance, and I live in Riverside, and this is in reference to visual state Senate district Southwest Riverside, 10/27, PDF page 55, and we are not in support of the -- of the map.

We do appreciate including Temecula in the state Senate, but I don't recommend that Temecula be in the state Senate that Riverside and River Valley and Perris. Just looking at the tally for this district, it's 49.81. It doesn't hit, like, the -- the majority of people of color, particularly Latino, so just the voting-age population, so we're not in agreement. TODEC, LULAC,
Planned Parent, various groups are nonsupportive of this map the way it is, so we would like Riverside City, Hoopa Valley, Millville, Perris, San Jacinto, good level -- I'm sorry, Good Hope and Revel (ph.), (indiscernible), Lakeview, Woodcrest, Highgrove, Mead Valley, Homeland, and Green Acres, and if there's room, we could definitely support Lake Elsinore. It's similar to, like, Perris, but we want those communities together.

We're not similar to Temecula or Murrieta or Menifee. We are different, and so what brings us together is, you know, the -- the Freeway 215, 210 -- I'm sorry, 215 and 60. It's the universities, the school districts. We're connected to the California Baptist University, you know, communities connected to the 91, and we have cultural events as people of color, African-Americans, some Latino concentration within both cities, same cultural centers, all we get the good stuff, but yeah, please --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. UNYIST: -- we -- we also see that there's a commonality in the Millville/Perris areas, too, in regards to warehouse issues, environmental justice issues --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. UNYIST: -- cultural centers, malls. We all --
you know, are connected, Millville Perris, San Jacinto, and Riverside. They all need to be together on the state Senate. Please take our recommendation, and thank you so much for your -- and it's a Voting Rights Act violation if we don't --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. All right, now, we have Caller 9399, and up next after that will be Caller 5173.

Caller 9399, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

Caller 9399, you are unmuted, and the floor is yours.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay, can you hear me now? Hello?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. HERNANDEZ: All right. My name is Fernando. I'm Fernando Hernandez. I live up here in the high desert, San Bernardino County. The area is actually on the North end of the county. I -- we're supporting the Black/Brown Redistricting Alliance map that they came up with, the vis -- visualization for AD 33. The number is 1027.

I want to give you an idea of what our area's like and how we want it to look like. Most of you have driven to Las Vegas at one time or another, so you're coming up...
the 15 Freeway. You can see the change as you come up
the pass, up the Cajon Pass. You go from the urban area
now into a more rural area. You come into Victorville,
and off to the left, you have Apple Valley and the
Hesperian Lucerne Valley, all rural areas, and then to
the right, Westerly, going along Highway 18 and 138, you
have communities of -- the communities of Phelan, Pinon
Hills, Wrightwood, Llano. These communities here are all
connected in the rural lifestyle of sorts, and of course,
we live in the desert, and we have our own particular
issues out here.

What we're trying to do now is to take out a portion
of our district, which now encompasses the mountain
region, the resort of Big Bear, Lake Arrowhead,
Crestline. That community up there has very little in
common with the desert folks. The mountain region is --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. HERNANDEZ: -- more of a -- they -- they hold
multi-million-dollar homes versus the blue-collar workers
that we have down here in the desert. We really hope
that you'll support and look at closely that map for AD
33 that was submitted --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. HERNANDEZ: -- by the Black/Brown Redistricting
Alliance. Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have Caller 5173, and up next after that will be Caller 0029.

Caller 5173, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

SUSAN: Yes, my name is Susan. I live in the Eastern Sierra foothills of Madera County in the Town of Coarsegold.

I'm concerned about the Assembly district map that has split my rural county in two, and we are really a part of the -- Madera County is partly in the foothills, partly in the -- the Valley area, but we're really together, you know.

We're -- the way the map, the current map visualization -- excuse me -- that was presented has us with Mono County, Inyo County, and San Bernardino. San Bernardino is very Southern California. The demographic is all different. We don't share anything with them. If I was to drive to San Bernardino from where I live, it would take me anywhere between eight to ten hours one way, and I would probably be driving through Los Angeles County to get there.

There is really no connections with anything past the river and the -- the other side of the mountains with
us, with Mono, so Madera County, I would really
appreciate if you'd keep it whole. We have lots of
commuters that commute to work to Fresno daily --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

SUSAN: -- so we have more in common with the County
of Fresno and the County of Merced, and in my area, we
also have communities of interest --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

SUSAN: -- with Mariposa County, and a lot of people
in Mariposa County commute to Merced. We have a lot --
you -- they've kind of split up some of our tribal lands.
We have one tribe in --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we will have Caller 0029, and up next after
that will be Caller 5505.

Caller 0029, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor
is yours.

GEORGE: Thank you so much. Good evening,
Commissioners. Really appreciate you taking the time to
hear our input this evening. My name is George. I live
in Clovis, California, and I wanted to comment on, I
guess, the Assembly, Senate, and Congressional proposed
visualizations this evening.

Really appreciate that North Fresno and Clovis were
kept together in -- in one community of interest;
however, I just wanted to note to the Commission,
respectfully, that I think that certain areas of Fresno
were included and certain rural areas were included,
as -- as particularly in the Congressional and Senate
seats that I think would be disenfranchised by having
North Fresno and Clovis, particularly Latino populations
and minority groups.
I think they would -- they don't have too much in
common with North Fresno and Clovis in terms of shopping,
school districts, representation traditionally over the
past many decades, and I would really advocate to the
Commission that North Fresno and Clovis, as it has
t raditionally been kept with Eastern Sierra communities,
such as Eastern Madera County, Mariposa County, and the
foothill regions in Fresno County --
MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.
GEORGE: -- so I really appreciate your -- your time
this evening. Thank you so much.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Right now we
have Caller 5505, and up next after that will be Caller
4328.
Caller 5505, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor
is yours.
NANCY: Hi, thank you. My name is Nancy, and I'm the mayor for the City of Tracy, and I am actually calling in just to let you know we have submitted comments, as well, from the City of Tracy, but it's just important to note that the City of Tracy mostly is actually opposed to the proposed Congressional redistricting map that separates Tracy and Mountain House in San Joaquin County, and places these communities within the same voting district as Santa Clara County or Alameda County.

This is of great concern because Tracy's voice for federal funding will be overshadowed by the competing needs of Santa Clara County or Alameda County. We do not see a direct correlation between the economic development, transportation, or housing needs of Tracy enveloped in either of those counties what would justify combining the two regions.

Our regional challenges and opportunities mirror that of the cities within our county, including Manteca, Lathrop, and Mountain House. We work diligently with communities in the South San Joaquin regions to boost our economic security and economy and overcome deficits that arise in rapidly growing communities where housing often outnumber jobs.

Should the proposed Congressional redistricting...
lines be approved, there is concern that these communities, these other communities, will receive greater attention and representation than Tracy and Mountain House. We will actually fall short, and so we do ask strongly that we keep our county together because we share a lot of the same regional challenges and benefits.

As people continue to escape the high cost of living in these other counties, the populations of Tracy, Mountain House, and Manteca will continue to grow as will the needs specific to our region, so we thank you for allowing us to respond and hope that you would truly consider keeping us as one region and one county. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have Caller 4328, and up next after that will be Caller 3520.

Caller 4328, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor --

MR. KANOTE: Am I --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- is yours.

MR. KANOTE: -- (indiscernible, simultaneous speech). Thank you. My name is Danny Kanote (ph.), and I'm research director of the Orange County Civic
Engagement Table and work to support the People's Redistricting Alliance. We -- we really appreciate all the hard work that's gone into these district visualizations, you know, recognizing the -- the diverse interests the Commission is working to balance. We thought it'd be a good idea to reiterate communities of interest that our member organizations have noted in public testimony to Commissions since there -- there seem to be some divisions of the COI in the visualizations.

I want to start with the Arab, Middle Eastern, Muslim, and South Asian community of interest that crosses county lines. In Orange County, that includes Buena Park, South of the 5 Freeway, La Palma, and Cypress, and in LA County, it includes Cerritos and Artesia, and this community of interest should be kept whole in an Orange County based district, but it was divided in nearly all the visualizations we saw, sometimes cut into three different districts.

As part of their daily lives, the mix of communities in Orange County cross into Los Angeles County to shop at Epic Markets, dine in restaurants, worship, and maybe most importantly, access social services in Artesia and Cerritos.

Second, Vietnamese-American communities in West Garden Grove, Westminster, West Santa Ana, which is West
of Harbor Boulevard, and North Fountain Valley, North of
the 405 Freeway, share common refugee experiences and
both social service and affordable housing needs, and
they should be kept together. None of the community
organizations who we engage as part of our process saw --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. KANOTE: -- Costa Mesa as part of that community
of interest.

And then finally, immigrant and low-income
communities in Irvine, Costa Mesa, and Tustin have
certain needs and are aligned as a community of interest.
So Costa Mesa and Irvine should not be considered as part
of the coastal community --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. KANOTE: -- of interest and should be drawn
together in adjacent districts not with Santa Ana, not
with Garden Grove or Westminster. Thanks for your
consideration. We ask that if you consider the public
map submission we provided --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we, have Caller 3520, and up next after that
will be Caller 8087.

Caller 3520, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor
is yours.
MS. SANDERS: Hello. My name is Karen Sanders, and I'm calling from Del Norte County, and I just want to thank you for your time, hard work, and consideration.

Del Norte County has been forgotten for the last ten years and has a very small voice being with coastal counties. I am respectfully asking that the Commission consider Del Norte County's rural significance and that it outweighs the coastal significance because Del Norte is a rural generational county.

We share many -- many different things with our Eastern counties, including timber, logging, forest protection management, healthcare education, conservation, crisis emergency services collaboration, and transportation and farming. We don't with our -- the Southern -- our urban North Bay counties of Sonoma and Marin and ask that they would not be included.

The only STA transportation corridor that delivers goods and services to Del Norte is via the East/West corridor of State Route 299, which runs from the I-5 in Shasta County to U.S. 101 in Humboldt County and then travels up to Del Norte. There is a discontinuity on U.S. 101 about South -- Southern Humboldt County, and that's called Richardson's (sic) Grove and so no goods and services can get through there. It'd need to be rerouted to the I-5.
Our transportation and infrastructure needs are rural in nature and very different than counties South of Mendocino. Our healthcare is rural. Erode healthcare county --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. SANDERS: -- and strategies -- and discussions are with the Eastern counties. The California Department of Fish and Game, North region, doesn't include any county South of Mendocino, and they go to the East.

Also, population-wise, we have --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. SANDERS: -- 25,000 Del Nortes and Marin has 233, and 150,000, not including Santa Rosa, so a terrible time for Del Norte (indiscernible) those Southern counties is six-plus --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. At this time, we will have Caller 8087, and up next after that will be Caller 2782.

Caller 8087, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MS. LOREN: Hi. Hi, my name is Jesse Loren. I serve on Winters' city council. I'm greatly concerned by the proposed visualization maps for Assembly, Senate, and Congressional districts presented for Winters and Yolo
County. I believe the current configuration is
detrimental to Winters and to our county.

Our greatest concerns are that the proposed maps
shift much of or all of Yolo County to a new inland North
state district that stretches all the way from Yolo
County to the Oregon border through sparsely populated
rural areas, and it divorces Winter from adjoining urban
and suburban areas in Sacra -- in the Sacramento
metropolitan area, the Northern Sac Valley and Yolo
County itself. It radically excises Winters out of its
home county for the Assembly district.

This is a radical and unfortunate departure from our
existing boundary lines. The new Congressional and
Senate lines are contrary to the principles upon which
the state Commission is supposed to operate. It would
greatly hinder effective representation of residents of
the City of Winters and Yolo County.

The proposed Solano Assembly district representative
is unlikely to put -- be focused on our community's
critical needs for help on such concerns as Yolo County
transportation district, Yolo climate goals, social
services --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. LAUREN: -- Yolo fire response and safety, our
common aquifer for sustained ground water management, our
farming zone, our envi -- environmental justice, our
social equity concerns, our high Latino community makeup,
our education concerns, and our regional --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. LAUREN: -- interests themselves.

The proposed new districts are a poor fit for
Winters. We urge a return to Assembly, Senate, and
Congressional boundaries much more similar to those we
now have.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. All
right now, we'll have Caller 2782, and up next after that
will be Caller 5735.

Caller 2782, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor
is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, I'm from Yolo County, and
I follow up on what Jesse Loren said. I agree with her
on both the Senate and Assembly districts, but I want to
particularly address my comments to the Congressional
district.

I can't imagine any justification for carving one
city, which is Davis, out of the county and linking that
city with a community that would stretch all the way to
the Eastern border of the California-Nevada state line,
and with which it has nothing in common.
Davis is part of Yolo County. Yolo County has a long agricultural history. We have a long history with our tribes. We are a Delta-based community. We are -- we share water source and river systems and levee systems within the county and with immediately adjacent counties.

These are really important issues to us, and carving Davis out of -- this one city out of this entirely tightly knit community of Yolo and putting that one city into a Congressional district that literally goes up to the Oregon border and over to the Nevada state line doesn't make any sense and guarantees that the City of Davis will never be served, that -- that the interests that matter to it will never be served, and in no way gives them representation, and I urge you to --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- reevaluate that map so that the City of Davis is not carved out of the ability to be represented or the ability to participate in what the rest of the county participates in. Thank you and thank you for your --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have Caller 5735, and up next after that will be Caller 0866.

Caller 5735, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor
is yours.

MR. ENDEJAS: Good evening. My name is Steven Endejas. I'm a life-long resident of Tracy, California here in San Joaquin County. I also work in Stockton, also in San Joaquin County.

I'm calling today to express my concerns with the redistricting proposals. I know you all have a difficult task before you, but I wanted to note that residents of Tracy have significantly more in common with Manteca than with San Jose, and it doesn't make a whole lot of sense to push our community towards San Jose.

You recently heard from our mayor, and while our mayor and I have significant policy disagreements, we are united on this -- this front of keeping our communities together, and one of the many reasons why our communities are so close-knit is that our water sources, they come from the Delta.

So I implore you to keep our communities together, and just with that, I yield the remainder of my time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we'll have Caller 0866, and up next after that will be Caller 1287.

Caller 0866, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.
CATHY: Thank you. This is Cathy, and I am from Kings County. I'm a life-long resident of San Joaquin Valley. I am really disturbed and troubled by the Assembly district map that I have seen.

We've asked that Kings County be held whole, and in one of the maps, actually, you've taken one little bite out of a little, teeny town of Corcoran, which doesn't make any sense, but the larger problem is the pairing of Kings County that goes up all the way to Los Banos and into Merced. We have no community of interest with this area at all.

You know, Kings County would be better served to be paired right next door to Tulare County. If you -- if you cut out the Visalia area and just took the rural area, you would have a wonderful voter rights district. It would be a community of interest. It would be -- it's close together. Driving from the bottom of Kings -- South of Kings County all the way up to Merced would take us -- it would take us as long to get there because of the roads as it would to be get -- getting to Sacramento. This would be a very awkward and hard-to-serve district, and it had -- we have no -- we have no community of interest with that area, so I -- please, I ask you to please look at that Assembly district again. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. At
this time, it'll be Caller 1287, and up next after that
will be Caller 1717.

Caller 1287, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor
is yours.

MR. VERDUZCO: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My
name is Jose Verduzco. I'm a resident of Tulare County
and was recently a Commissioner on the Tulare County
redistricting Commission, so I understand how difficult
your job could be at the state level, but I'd like to
bring in some of the input I got from my experience on my
local Commission, and two things in particular.

The Central Valley currently has two Latino state
Senate districts. The visualizations on your website
that the Commission has provided currently dropped that
to one, and in particular, the Visalia current county
Yolo state Senate district has communities of Woodlake,
Dinuba, Lindsay, Porterville, and an Assembly district
that goes far North into Tuolumne County. Those
communities have nothing -- no interest shared. They
don't do business together, anything like that, so I'd
recommend that we at least get two strong Latino CVAP
districts for the state Senate districts in the Central
Valley.

My other issue was with the Congressional district,
that encompasses all the way from Lamonte, California to
Los Banos, California. That's about a two-hour-and-
fourty-minute drive, and those communities share no
interest.

And that is it. Thank you for your time and
service, and wish you the best of luck and take the
Valley's needs into consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now, we will have Caller 1717, and then, up next
after that will be Caller 4049.

Caller 1717, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

And one more time, caller with the last four 1717,
if you wish to give comment this evening, please press
star six to unmute your telephone keypad.

Caller 1717, if you do wish to give comment this
evening before we get through the rest of our callers,
please press star nine to raise your hand, and there I
will know it's not a connectivity issue. I will come
back to you.

At this time, we'll go to Caller 4049. If you will
please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by
pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MS. WRIGHT: Thank you. Thank you so much for the
difficult work that you're doing. I first became alarmed
when I saw the maps before the recent maps. My name is Francesca Wright. I live in Davis, California, Yolo County. Sorry I skipped that part.

And now it's even worse. My city is divided in the Senate, Congressional, and Assembly districts. My county is divided. Our county in no way identifies with the — the Sacramento River Valley going all the way up beyond Redding up to Oregon border. We are a county that is linked between the Sacramento region and the San Francisco region by a cul -- by culture, by transportation, by the Highway 80 corridor, by advanced technology, ec -- economics. Our agriculture here is very specialized due to the influence of UC Davis, a land grant college that -- that has really transformed the Solano and Yolo County areas. Our air quality is linked to Solano.

I ask that you reconsider. It's very disturbing to see us identified with an area that we have so little in common with, and I would ask that you join Yolo and Solano Counties since we have the most in common that we are definitely connected around the —

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. WRIGHT: -- the I-80 corridor, not -- not the I-5 corridor. Thanks so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Right now, we will be
going to Caller 4201, and up next after that will be Caller 5455.

Caller 4201, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MR. WALDMAN: Good evening, Commissioners. My name's Stuart Waldman. I'm from the San Fernando Valley redistricting coalition. I want to thank you so much for all your hard work and -- and listening to Valley residents who contacted you.

The first visualizations were problematic, but the new visualizations, if you told me that these were the districts, we would be pretty happy. There -- however, you're still a work in progress, so there are some small changes that we'd like to see.

You did a great job on the Valley Congressional seats. We want to make sure that Calabasas is with unincorporated Calabasas, and we believe that belongs in -- in the West Valley in a seat that's a West Valley seat.

We did notice that, while we asked to not go South of Mulholland, in each of the maps, Assembly, Senate, and Congress, there are districts that do go South of Mulholland. We'd like to see if there's a way to make some changes there to address that.
The Senate seat, SCSSV, is forty-eight percent Latino CVAP. We think that a few changes can be made. It's overpopulated by 30,000 people. We think the changes can be made to get it to a fifty percent-plus Latino CVAP, and we'd like to see that --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty.

MR. WALDMAN: -- happen, and let's see what else.

I mean, it looks -- looks pretty good. You know, we really appreciate the -- the hard work that was done on -- on this. I know it's not easy.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MR. WALDMAN: You know, the -- Bel Air is with some of the Valley districts. There's not really a connection there. We'd like to try and figure out a way to kind of swap those out. We'll make some more suggestions, probably tomorrow, and -- and send notes on that.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will be going to Caller 5455.

I did want to let those in the queue know that have not spoken this evening, that would be Caller 6000, and then Caller 6680, and Caller 6917, we will be coming to you shortly and we thank you for your patience.

Caller 5455, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.
ANTONIA: Hello, my name is Antonia from Bakersfield, and thank you so much for allowing us to voice our opinions about the map. Bakersfield would be negatively impacted by this, especially transportation for many people. The way it's been divided is -- is very unusual and strange, and it will divide Bakersfield, the city, and we would not share water areas, and it would not benefit communities of interest, and it's not consistent with the way our city functions, so I -- again, I thank you very much for allowing me to state my opinion.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will be going to Caller 6000, and up next after that will be Caller 6680.

Caller 6000, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

Commissioners, thank you very much. I am Matt from Woodland Hills in the San Fernando Valley. I've lived in the Valley -- the San Fernando Valley for 39 years, including Reseda, Canoga Park, Sherman Oaks, North Hollywood, Woodland Hills, West Hills, and Calabasas. Married in Valley Village, and my son was born in Tarzana. We're one community, the Valley, all the same area code, 818. Also a member of the West Valley Jewish
Community Center in West Hills 17 years. Okay, I'm commenting on the San Fernando Valley Congressional visual -- visualizations, please.

You have done a good job keeping much of the West Valley together and much of the East Valley together.

Thank you very much. You placed Calabasas -- you have placed Calabasas with the West San Fernando Valley, and that's as it should be. Calabasas is geographically in the Valley. Woodland Hills residents are similar -- 101 Freeway exit away from Calabasas, so there are many economic, religious, and social ties between Calabasas and the LA portion of the Valley. Many West Valley residents are zoned in the Calabasas schools.

Additionally, the Las Virgenes Water District based in Calabasas serves West Valley residents.

So Commissioners, we will appreciate if you could please keep the West Valley together, including Calabasas. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. And right now, we have Caller 6680, and up next after that will be Caller 6917.

Caller 6680, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

And one more time, Caller with the last four 6680, if you wish to give comment this evening, please press
star six to unmute your telephone.

Caller 6680 -- oh, there you are. The floor is yours.

MS. FARRON: Thank you, Katie, and good evening, Commissioners. My name is Celeste Farron. I'm from Mountain House, California. It's not well-known to a lot of Californians because we are the newest community in California. I've been here almost since our inception. I've been here 17 years. I'm a former board of the met -- member of the board of directors and former president.

I'm concerned with the -- the way the map looks right now as in putting us in with the county on the other -- next to us because, if you can envision a small grapevine, our ultimate pa -- Altamont Pass separates us from the Bay Area as -- as in the grapevine does separating communities there, just on a smaller -- smaller basis.

We are also an unincorporated community of about 20,000 people, slated -- maybe more now -- slated to be about 45 to 50,000 people, and we share services with the Delta. We even have a -- a satellite college from Delta College here. We share water services with our local -- other Delta communities and policing services. Because we're not incorporated, we don't have our own police
department. We're serviced by San Joaquin County: our
ambulatory services, our fire district. And as traits of
people who have called in from Tracy earlier, that's
shared. We don't feel that this will give us effective
representation --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. FERRIN: -- to put -- thank you, thirty
seconds -- to put us in with the -- the Bay Area. As
lovely as it is, I think that we may become an
afterthought if we're put in with them as a district, and
I very much --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. FERRIN: -- as a resident of Mountain House --
please write down Mountain House because we're such an
underdog. Please remember us that we would like to stay
within our county and be represented in our county.
Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now, we will have Caller 6917, and after that I
will try Caller 1717 one last time this evening.

Caller 6917, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

And one more time, Caller 6917, if you wish to give
comment this evening, please press star six on your
telephone keypad. This will unmute you.
All right, Caller 6917, I'm going to go ahead and give Caller 1717 one more chance, and then we'll come right back to you one more time. Everybody gets two.

All right, Caller 1717, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time. If you wish to give comment, please press star six.

All right, Caller 1717, we appreciate you listening, and I apologize if you are trying to unmute and you were unable to. If you will please contact the Commission in the other ways that are available, we will love to hear from you.

And one more time for Caller 6917. If you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six if you wish to give comment this evening.

And Caller 6917, we also appreciate you listening and as the same for the previous caller, if you wish to contact the Commission, there are various other ways that are listed, and we appreciate all of you listening this evening.

And Chair, with that, that is all of our callers this evening.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you so much, Katie. You always do such an amazing job. I appreciate you. At this time --
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: You're welcome.

CHAIR TURNER: -- I -- I thought I heard someone else speaking. At this time, I just want to --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I said you're --

CHAIR TURNER: -- announce that --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- welcome, Chair.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh, ah, thanks, Katie.

At this time, I just wanted to say that we are going to prepare to recess our meeting for today. We will begin tomorrow in the same place in our inland-city-central-California-type area with our Congressional districts and take into consideration, as we always do, all of the amazing public comment and feedback we're receiving.

I'd like to remind the public please do continue to utilize our data input tools that we have available for you on the website. You can find them by drawmyca -- drawmycacomunity.org. Oh, my goodness. Oh, that's right, okay. Well, let's see. It is 7:10. Thank you, Commissioners.

It is wedrawtheline -- wedrawthelinesca.org, and if you would, then, you can choose a few different ways to submit comment to the Commission, including commenting directly onto the visualizations as we've seen.

I'd just like to say one other quick thing. Keep in
mind -- it's interesting listening to testimony and all people everywhere are the same. Everyone wants their area whole and someone else's area split, and so it's always amazing to watch. We are hearing you. Our first criteria is that we make districts as equal as possible, and that is what we're going to try and do, and then follow the rest of the criteria. So please know nothing's intentional, but we are absolutely trying to do our best for everyone. So thank you for your testimony. Thank you for hanging in there with us for a long day.

And I'd like to conclude by just saying to the most amazing ever communications director, Fredy, happy birthday, Fredy, and we are honored that he chose the bulk of his day to spend with us here, and with all of you, so he had probably the biggest birthday party ever. All right, with that, you all have a good evening, and we will recess until tomorrow morning at 9:30.

(Recessed at 7:12 p.m.)
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