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Friday, October 29, 2021  9:30 a.m.

CHAIR TURNER:  Good morning, and welcome to our day 3 of our Visualization Meeting for the California Redistricting Commission. I am acting chair, Trena Turner, and excited for what we will accomplish today.

We left off yesterday having conversation in regards to our visualizations for the Congressional maps. We were in the Central Valley, just about to move into Los Angeles. And we did receive more public comment on last evening. I was really excited to hear.

And so before we move, we are going to stay just a bit longer in the Central Valley. We had a couple of commissioners that had some comments that they'd like to make, and we're going to start with Commissioner Sadhwani this morning.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI:  Oh. Okay.

CHAIR TURNER:  Oh, oh.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI:  Do we need to do roll call, or?

CHAIR TURNER:  I did not do roll call. Is everybody here? No, I'm just playing. Okay. I forgot roll call. I'm trying to get on with this business. But yes, please, let's do roll call.

FEMALE SPEAKER:  Thank you.
MR. SINGH: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Here, for the first time.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Presente.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Le Mons.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I am present.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Toledo.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.
MR. SINGH: And Commissioner Turner.
CHAIR TURNER: I am here.
MR. SINGH: Roll call is complete, Madam Chair.
CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. I tell you, it's hard to pull anything over on these commissioners. They are sharp and ready. We are all present and accounted for.
We will now go, as indicated -- thank you for all of your comments. I'd like for you to -- I'd like to encourage you to keep comments coming. Please continue to utilize -- please continue to utilize the tools that we have on our website. We are receiving them real time, as they come in.
As we continue through this process today, we are looking at our Congressional visualizations. And we will begin with Commissioner Sadhwani, and Commissioners, I'll take hands after her.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Great. Thank you so much.
So we had left off, before we went to public comment, talking about the Central Valley, and so I wanted to just come back to that region. We had kicked off these several days with some maps from our VRA council about some of our VRA obligations throughout the state. And I want us to be really mindful about those as we think about these maps.
I'm not certain that we're hitting all those obligations yet, and in particular, there was some -- there was actually some testimony last night that resonated with me. We got a lot of testimony last night. A lot of the concern is that we're going very long throughout the Central Valley. We're taking a north-south approach. And so I really wanted to think about the architecture of the Central Valley and our approach there. In particular, and by my count, it was caller number 34, who identified themselves as Cathy (ph.), and Cathy had suggested that, you know, from Bakersfield all the way up to the Stanislaus County border is a very long, long region, and is there a way to make it more compact? And so I want us to take a closer look.

One of the other things David Becker had talked about with us is having anchor points, and I think this -- as I've been thinking about the map in general, I think the Central Valley, while I think we've generally thought about Los Angeles as being a place where we have to, like, untie the knot, so to speak, and we've used that language, I've been thinking, actually, that the Central Valley is perhaps one of those areas where we need to be spending a little bit more time and focus.

And that so much stems from the Central Valley, right? It stems down into the Los Angeles, Southern California
region, as well as up into Sacramento and the Bay Area.

So my direction here is really around this Bakersfield area, and I'd like to think about ways in which we can make that VRA district, and I understand we do have an obligation there, and making it more compact. In particular, my thought here is that around Bakersfield, that becomes our anchor, right, and other things are going to flow from it. And in particular, rather than having that huge north-south flow, can we pull in those portions of Bakersfield with portions of Kings and Tulare Counties?

I'm also really interested in finding out more about Latino CVAP in Bakersfield. I'd love to take a closer look at what those regions actually look like. I think this "curl", as it's been referred to, I think that was a term coming out of 2010. I'm curious if that's really still our obligation, or if it's a slightly different shape. When we look at the maps that were presented as options and ideas for us from some advocacy groups, it looks slightly different. Not so much of a rounded curve or curl, but instead, almost more like a scoop, kind of coming in through Bakersfield, and so I would be really curious to take a closer look at that region, and thinking about concentrating there, and then further going up.
So if Bakersfield were that anchor, so to speak, with that center point around those three counties, we are no longer having that north-south stretch, and we're opening ourselves up to additional districts, particularly in the Fresno area. And we've received quite a bit of testimony asking us, while, yes, we do have VRA obligations for the protected Latino community in that area, also keeping together some of the AAPI and AMEMSA communities, in particular, the Hmong, the Arabic speaking, as well as Punjabi Sikhs in the Fresno area. I have some specific regions, if that's helpful. So I think anchoring in Bakersfield, rethinking how our approach to Fresno.

We also received a lot of testimony yesterday with the concern of that other portion of Bakersfield going all the way up, that green region there, all the way up to, is it Tuolumne? Yep. All the way up here. I hear that. I want to be responsive to those folks that were calling in there, but I think this is going to become one of the decision points for the Commission is, do we take that region and continue that north-south divide, or do we end up breaking it up and going further down into the Antelope Valley? I'm not crazy about that idea. We heard so much testimony from the Antelope Valley. I'm really liking how that Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita
district is generally looking, and I think we're being
to me, that's the trade-off. I don't have a strong
opinion yet on it, but I'd be curious to hear thoughts
from others, so I'll stop. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Seeing no other hands, I'll also chime in. We also
heard on last evening quite a few callers that called in
in regards to Mountain House, Tracy, Manteca, and the
desire to not split that from San Joaquin County, and
that particularly in Mountain House, there is a satellite
college there, and I knew that, I forgot that, for Delta.
Delta College has a satellite, and they talked about
their connections with San Joaquin County, and the
importance of not having them split over the Altamont,
and so I would like to give direction that we put
Mountain House, Tracy, but also going down, looking
further at Manteca -- oh, Manteca's there, yeah, but just
adding in Mountain House and Tracy.

But also, back on the Assembly map, when we go back
and look at that again, we heard -- you covered Fresno,
that we do need to look at that area a little bit more as
well. And so I won't repeat that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you for this
whole conversation. I really do appreciate the fact that we are looking at, what does anchor the entire maps, and I completely agree that these VRA districts right through the center of the Central Valley, they are an item that we have to address, and they do cause other issues in other areas, but I also wanted to include San Benito County. It isn't just -- it's San Benito and the portion of Monterey County, and with that in mind, and I hear what Commissioner Sadhwani is saying about the, you know, we're stretching north and south. Now, it does make sense still in many, many areas, because that's the only way, you know, there's the 101, there's the 5, there's the 99, and they go north and south.

But there are the local areas spreading out, and we were talking about the, you know, Fresno County, per se, you know, there are areas -- and also Madera County. These are, you know, those areas, they, you know, while they're -- yes, they're the hills, some people want to be separated from the valley, there is a lot to be said for going in the county itself, in that kind of -- try and be a little more compact area. And it does keep specifically, like the, you know, the Mariposa, Tuolumne, you know, those are areas that have -- they have a lot in common, and do they have a lot in common with Bakersfield? No, they don't.
So what I'd kind of like to do is just do an -- this is an overview, and as I'm seeing a certain counties that have been continuously saying, most of the public comments have been saying, please keep our areas together. And if we could go just a little bit further north, I think the issues that we're grappling with are, the Siskiyou get cut up or not, where there's the tribal lands up there, and then, you know, there's the postal, maybe Trinity, it might be an issue back and forth.

Coming further down, we have Sierra and Nevada Counties, who have repeatedly say they'd like to stay together. We have Placer and El Dorado Counties that continuously say they'd like to stay together. Then we have Butte, Yuba, and Sutter who also say they'd like to stay together. And all of these, when I -- I'm just doing a very quick listing here, but the reasons are, you know, for fire issues, for, you know, economic issues, they have central things in common.

Then we're also hearing about Yolo, Solano, and how those two counties really want to stay together. That also affects the entire Sacramento County, and parts of San Joaquin. And then we have -- we've talked about the postal many times. We have the wine countries of Eastern Sonoma, Lake, Napa, little bit of Yolo, those are areas we've talked about quite a bit.
And the reason I'm going through this is in terms of I hope the line drawers for priority of -- these seem to be what the commissioners and the public are saying. These are areas that we'd like to keep together.

The Yolo, Solano, Sacramento, San Joaquin area, and the delta portion of Contra Costa County are all areas where we're trying to do some playing around with. And I see, going down then, into the Central Valley, because Merced is essentially the beginning of, like, essentially the north end of our VRA areas, that puts Stanislaus, San Joaquin, north as the areas we can play with.

Then, Amador, Calaveras, Tuolumne, and Mariposa are all another -- those four counties are really, they want to stay together. They are the heart of gold country. They have cattle, as well as economic interests, which -- mostly recreation. Then going Alpine, Mono, and Inyo, also all three want to stay together. They have many interests; they have self-government groups that are the three counties.

We've already kind of talked about the Bay Area. Going through that, which we'll shift -- that's like L.A., you know, you shift that back and forth. The San Benito/Monterey area, though, I think we really need to discuss a little more because, you know, do we -- we've heard Gilroy, Watsonville are part of that triangle with
Hollister, and that's, I think, an essential portion of the VRA district there, and so it causes things to go up and down.

I just brought all this up because I think those are -- that's what I've been hearing from most of the commissioners and most of the public, and I'd appreciate anyone who says, no, no, no, that's really not what I'm hearing. But I think that would help the line drawers a little bit, in terms of that sort of quick summary of, these are areas we'd like to keep together that we're caring about, and then we can have areas where we know that we'll probably shift around. So I hope that is successful, and I hope that also brings further conversation one way or the other. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Fornaciari, please?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Thanks. Let's see. So yeah. This is a challenge, clearly, right? We've got some obligations in the Central Valley that we have to meet and treat those and anchors. You know, we're treating some groupings of counties as kind of sacred cows at this point, and I think we have to kind of get comfortable maybe not doing that.

You know, when we talk about regrouping counties, we're talking about moving 50,000 people at a time,
know? And that's basically, rearchitecting the whole
Central Valley when we do stuff like that, and we have to
recognize and realize when we ask to move things, how
that's going to roll out. And so I'm just really going
to support Commissioner Sadhwani's comments that we need
to start with an anchor that we can agree on and move out
from there, and be comfortable with how the dominoes fall
from there, because we have VRA obligations that we have
to meet.

A couple of comments specifically related to
yesterday. I'll just echo Commissioner Turner's
comments. We really heard from Tracy, finally. The
mayor got on the phone, and a number of folks, and so,
you know, I've been trying to be pretty neutral about it,
even though I'm from Tracy, and what's best, but we're
hearing from Tracy what the city would like, and so I'm
hoping we can try to honor that, you know? It's a very
complex problem.

The other thing I want to get a little deeper on,
too, is Fresno. Interesting comments from Fresno. I
believe we have, in our Assembly map, we have Fresno as
just one Assembly district, but I thought there were some
interesting comments that I'd like to see if we can pull
the thread on regarding a VRA district sort of starting
in Fresno and emanating out from there, too. It seems
like there's a significant chunk of population in the City of Fresno, and I imagine you all have looked at it, but I'd just like to understand better, you know, what the, you know, what the trade-offs might be in looking at maybe Fresno, also, as kind of a -- South and East Fresno -- or West Fresno -- I'm sorry -- as sort of a starting point for a VRA district. So thanks.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Fernandez, please?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair, and I will try to be quick.

Yes, thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani, for starting this discussion.

In terms of the north-south layout, and Kennedy, this is you, right? Okay. And as we get to the Senate districts, there's more of this north-south, and you've got counties from Yolo all the way up to the Oregon border, and they really do not have anything in common, so we really do need to relook at how we're doing that. I realize we have anchors, but I also feel that we really need to respect and try to work with as much as we can in terms of those communities that are related, do have commonalities.

Thank you very much for Yolo and Solano for calling yesterday. It made me very happy, and I know I've given
direction in the past that we need to keep Yolo and Solano together, and I'm going to probably amend my direction to ensure -- I was trying carve pieces of Yolo out, and it's like, no, keep them together. Keep Yolo and Solano.

If we have to increase, we go to Napa or Colusa, and the reason I say that is, those are farming and agriculture lands. I call it our flatlands. The only thing that's not flat is when you get on the freeway. You get a little bit of elevation there. But then once you move past Colusa, you're talking about mountains in completely different areas, so I'm saying it now. So that's my new direction is to please do as much as we can to keep Yolo and Solano together, and to rethink this north-south configuration for the northern part of California, because you're talking hundreds of miles and completely different territories and completely different priorities that each county has. And I realize the numbers are lower, but we also need to do the best we can to respect these communities and do the best we can.

Unfortunately, we can't please everyone, but let's try to please as many as we can, and try to make it as fair as possible. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.
Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, everyone. Thank you, Sara, for slowing us down and taking us back to the Central Valley, and this is really what we're supposed to do, is keep slowing each other down, and remember that our obligations is, you know, number 2 is VRA. Communities of interest falls down to number 4, and even though we're human, and we're hearing humans, and so therefore, we want to go in that direction, we do need to start.

And that's kind of been my frustration from the very, very, very beginning when we started this is, for me, I wanted to anchor all the maps starting with VRA, having a better feel. And I still don't -- even though we saw those maps, sorry David, but they didn't have the county names of them. You got to kind of take three maps and figure it all out. I still don't feel like we have all the tools we need to be really good at this, and to be able to anchor it in VRA and where the, you know -- I'm still circling things and -- anyway.

So what I would like to suggest is that, David, please go back and put the county names on the maps that you sent us. I'm not sure if those are public now. I know when I looked at them -- looked for them when you were presenting them, we hadn't posted them publicly, and they do need to be public documents, since we shared
MR. LARSON: Commissioner Sinay, they are posted --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

MR. LARSON: -- and are the handouts for today.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. Yeah. They weren't posted when I looked for them. That's why I hadn't gone back. So thank you that they are posted.

But I think it's important, anything that's given to us, to please have the county names at least on it. I mean, that's the bare.

And then the other piece I wanted to say is, and I've been saying this, also, from the beginning, is when we hear from the communities, it's usually Humboldt to Marin. If you actually read the stuff from Del Norte, Del Norte is okay going with Siskiyou and Trinity. And Trinity, Shasta, and Tehama have school districts and college districts together, so we've created this artificial north-south because we've gotten a lot of call-ins. We know some of that is politically motivated. Some of it is true, that they are a coastal area, but there is some moving around that we can do from the very north, because that's kind of started the whole north-south thing, so I do want us to be a little flexible.

I know I've heard a lot of you say, hey, but Del Norte has to go up to Oregon. They called in yesterday
saying that the 101 isn't even working for them right
now. People have to go from Siskiyou to Humboldt to Del
Norte. And going up to Oregon, I live on a border, on
the other side, and so many of my friends, their life is
in Mexico, you know, so just crossing over to Mexico to
go to the doctor's and everything else. So I just wanted
to make the -- that some of the things that we're making
huge priorities are doable.

And so just to keep, you know, when the woman --
when we spoke to one woman from Modoc, because I used to
do outreach in Modoc, Commissioner Yee and I, and she had
just gotten back from shopping in Oregon. She's like,
no, we don't even have supermarkets in our area. You
know, those borders, remember a lot of borders are
artificially made. We need to keep these borders,
because it's the State of California and we're doing
redistricting, but.

So I would like to go back to what I thought we
would be doing when we do redistricting, and is actually
highlighting the -- starting with kind of highlighting
the area that is VRA and overlaying that on top of the
maps, and then so we could see, oh, wait. Okay. We're
not meeting our obligations. We still have some
opportunities, or something similar to that. I'm still
feeling like we're just running around in different --
you know, trying to pull different pieces and making sure we're okay.

So thank you, again, for slowing us down.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay. That was the plan, to continue in our Central Valley today. And so I appreciate your comments.

We also want to hear from Karin, and then we'll go to Commissioner Sadhwani.

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you so much, Chair Turner.

And thank you very much for all of that input.

So we have been working for a few weeks now on this particular orientation, and it sounds like you would like to change the architecture here, and I would just like to perhaps highlight a few things, and get some guidance of where you really want to go with this, because just changing the architecture there on the eastern side is going to affect your coastal counties. It's going to affect your wine region that you spent a lot of time working on just a couple of days ago.

So essentially, you can't just go, you know, east to west all of a sudden on one side of California. It's going to affect the entire northern area, and that's also why you just saw that I asked Tamina to come. Because I think we really need to talk this through right now because this is going to be a substantial change, and
just to let you know, you have seen from us visualizations of east-west that you did not want to do, and so what you're seeing on the map right now is actually all based on your direction, so we got there somehow, you know? We did get there somehow. We don't make these decisions, right? And it ripples. So I think there's perhaps certain sections that we can, you know, look at and try to figure out whether we can, you know -- just like Commissioner Andersen earlier said, you know, that we can take some pockets, and perhaps try to make some of these districts a little bit shorter or so. But again, you have public input, public testimony, and you gave direction for everything that is on this map. So we need to know the degree to which you want to move in a different direction to be able to move forward.

CHAIR TURNER: Um-hum. Thank you. Thank you, Karin.

And with that, I want to say that I think that as we move, as we get new information, things certainly are changing. We get more comment as we present the visualizations, and you all know that, and you told us that, so we appreciate it. We appreciate that you are trying to respond to what we're giving you, and we are doing some shifting.

What this will cause, and so we have Kennedy, and
Jaime, and Tamina, and line drawers prepared to, even today, show us the visualizations that they've prepared before we've given them this feedback. And so in the moment, it's not going to shift. And so at this point, we're going to take some more comments from commissioners, but recognize, even as we move forward, what they present to us will be what was before this current conversation.

So from that perspective, it'll be an interesting presentation, and I'd just like us to keep that in mind, that it won't reflect any changes today for what we said today, but they are taking notes to continue to explore.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Just, you know, a couple of thoughts. I wanted to, first of all, just acknowledge Karin's, you know, your team and all of the amazing work that you've done. And of course, this is absolutely the reflection of our direction, and I think one of the things that we're learning in this process is that we're trying to figure out how to shift, how to change, how to be responsive when new information becomes available, or once we see something and say, oh, that doesn't really work. So you know, I think that that -- and I absolutely agree that this is a reflection of what we had said two weeks ago, and I think that now we're
still asking for additional changes, and that that's okay.

On the VRA piece, you know, I just wanted to respond a little bit to Commissioner Sinay. And I think, you know, this has most certainly been a learning process for me. I can imagine, if ever I had to go through redistricting again, which I don't think I ever will, I would want to do it totally differently and have a whole different set of tools available to me. But given what we have, I just want to say, yes, VRA does serve as an anchor to our maps, but we do still have -- I think, what I'm seeing is, we still have agency over how those VRA districts are drawn. And I think that when we started this process, there was an expectation, like, they're just going to magically appear, and a lot of that has been done, and I think that that's what those maps that David Becker had shown was that analysis. Like, these are the places where we have obligations. But I think what we're seeing here is, we can think about those obligations differently.

And so I'll just reiterate, for me, that direction is using Bakersfield -- and I'll agree with Commissioner Fornaciari, if there are two anchors, it's Bakersfield and Fresno, our obligations are so very clear there. And (audio interference) really re-thinking the architecture
for those two districts in particular and flowing out
from them.

And I completely agree with Commissioner Andersen
about San Benito as well. And I didn't go there, because
I know that's more central coast-ish, but I completely
agree with all of those pieces, so thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Any other commissioners
before we move? Okay.

Karin?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. If I may, so having heard
all of that, I just wanted to say, of course you can
change the map. What I was trying to say is, there are a
lot of decision points that you feel really strongly
about that are in this map right now, so if we completely
go east-west, then all of that will go away. I mean, it
will literally go away and you will have to start from
scratch.

Commissioner Sadhwani's direction to look at that
particular, the architecture just in that area. That is
something we can do. There are some specific decision
points that we would need from you, which for example, we
heard Shafter shouldn't be split, for example.

CHAIR TURNER: Say that again?

MS. MAC DONALD: Shafter.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh.
MS. MAC DONALD: Can Shafter be split, you know, is that okay? Because if we're going to come back with something that looks completely differently, then you know, next week we're going to have this conversation when you say, well we told you not to split Shafter, but we may have to split it, so I just want to highlight that going forward. So is that going to be okay to split Shafter, for example? And then, can Sunnyside go with Southwest Fresno, for example? Or does it have to go with Southwest Fresno? Or can it go -- is it okay not to go with Southwest Fresno?

CHAIR TURNER: We're practicing with these masks, and I'm not hearing all of your words. With what? With Southwest Fresno?

MS. MAC DONALD: I'm sorry. Sunnyside.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh.

MS. MAC DONALD: Does it have to go with Southwest Fresno, for example?

CHAIR TURNER: Show it to me on the map.

MS. MAC DONALD: So there's these kinds of decision points that are going to make a difference in the rotation down there, for example.

CHAIR TURNER: I wouldn't want to answer quickly. I don't recall Sunnyside being named, so I'd have to go back to the COI testimony and see if that was part of
Southwest Fresno. I mean, I don't know if you're asking, like, specifically right now, but I'd want to go back and pull and see what was said about Sunnyside.

MS. MAC DONALD: Right.

CHAIR TURNER: I don't know if any of the other commissioners, do you remember Sunnyside in the list being named? Okay.

MS. MAC DONALD: I mean, perhaps more generally. Is the direction to do what we have to do to change the architecture down there?

CHAIR TURNER: I like that as a direction, yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

MS. MAC DONALD: That's okay?

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

MS. MAC DONALD: All right.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you, Chair, and sorry I didn't get my hand up quicker.

Just sort of in response to some of our thought processes, or at least in response to my thought process, I never looked at some of these issues as being border issues or a specific line here or there. But my thought process was always to meet community members' requests for accessibility and how accessible we're drawing these districts. I think that's something that we can and we
should have in our thought process, and something that should be consistent from district to district, and I think in answering those calls for accessibility, it's not contingent on whether or not community members always avail themselves of that. I think it's part of our duty to make this -- to seat our government in an accessible manner. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Andersen, followed by Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. Thank you. I just want to say, you know, the -- this don't go north-south. I think that's -- and also don't go east-west. I don't believe that's the entire state. It's really, in the Central Valley, we've kind of cut things that might be a little bit too long. Commissioner Sadhwani is saying, let's look at little bits east-west-ish in this area. You know, there are sections where it makes perfect sense to go north-south because, you know, we have sets of mountains, so I think, you know -- and I hope the line drawers are hearing this. There's a little discussion. The line drawers? The area to go east-west is really in the Central Valley-ish, not the entire state. So it's just a -- and we're looking at our anchor points, really, specifically. You know, how can we rearrange that?

And I understand we did, because originally, Merced
was an entire county, a solid line. And I thinks that's where we're looking at playing. And I completely agree, it's Bakersfield and Fresno. So I tried to be a little more clear there. Thank you.

So the areas would be -- in the Central Valley is the area to go a little bit more east-west. Don't go completely north-south there. It's a more subtle thing. It's not rearrange the entire architecture. There are groups of counties that want to stay together for very valid economic reasons, like Mr. (sic) Fernandez was saying. And it's all around the state. So I think it's just a little adjustment here is what we're talking about. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Karin?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes. So the reason for why I was talking about the coast was, and we're huddling here, as you can tell, because we're trying to figure out what the ripple is, so when you were talking about putting Yolo with Solano now, that's actually going to end up affecting the wine area and the East Bay. So it won't be good. So there really are significant ripples. Probably not San Francisco, but definitely, it's going to ripple around into the East Bay. So is that something you do want to explore by next week? I mean, we could see what
we could do, okay? We don't have, really, much time to
map, anyway, but --

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Fernandez, you wanted to
answer her?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. In terms of this wine
country, I wasn't necessarily in agreement with that,
because I see all of that as being agriculture and
farming, so I don't want to -- I see it more as
agriculture, not necessarily two counties of wine
country. And I know that I'm in disagreement with some
of the commissioners, but I don't want it to be a
specific product in farming that's going to group
communities together, since I'm a community that does
more than just wine. We do tomatoes, corn, and as does
Yolo, does more than just wine.

So I'm not sure what you're looking for, in terms of
direction, but my direction would be Yolo and Solano. I
don't want to say I don't care about the wine countries,
because I do. I see it as a agriculture, which is very
important to me, so I group them all together not by
product or what they're growing, if that makes sense.
It's the same type of needs. Your water needs, your
farming, agriculture, broadband issues, too. I forgot to
bring that up yesterday.

CHAIR TURNER: Karin?
MS. CLARK: May I ask a question? The Yolo and Solano or the Solano delta area? Which is your priority?

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Kennedy, did you want to respond to that specific question? Because I have some that do.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. The others can go ahead and respond to that first.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sadhwani, response to that? Okay.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I hear what Commissioner Fernandez is saying, and I think, you know, an agricultural district would make sense, that has Yolo, potentially some Calusa, potentially the rural parts of Solano County, right, the Dixon area, around there, potentially some of the delta area, with some of the Napa area makes sense to me. That's how it's traditionally been. If having a -- it's a agricultural area. It's a lot of farming community, a lot of farm workers, and Latino community, so making sure that we're keeping that together.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Two
things. First of all, rather than saying -- or rather
than focusing on shifting from north-south to east-west,
I prefer to think of it as, let's see if we can raise,
you know, our game a bit on compactness. You know, if
people are saying, you know, what sense does a district
make if it goes all the way from Bakersfield to Los
Banos, is there a way to say, okay, we'll have a
Bakersfield-based VRA district that doesn't go beyond
Kern, Kings, and Tulare, and a Fresno-based VRA district
that doesn't go beyond Fresno, Madera, and Merced? I
think we can -- I think we can tighten up a bit on
compactness, basically.

Second, as far as wine versus agriculture, you know,
I'm fine treating it all as agricultural. All I was
trying to say yesterday was, it looked to me like we were
very, very close to having a potential wine country
district-sized area at the Assembly level. And perhaps
another Assembly-sized district that wasn't quite as much
focused on wine to the east of it. So just want to make
that clear. If there's a possibility of a wine-focused
area that is just kind of naturally Assembly-sized, I
would say let's go for it, but that's not to the
exclusion of other types of agriculture. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. And
I really appreciate your bringing us back and speaking of
this in terms of compactness.

            Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI:  Yep. Actually, most of my comments were already said by Commissioner Kennedy and Andersen, so thank you for that.

            I was never suggesting switching the entire architecture of the map from north-south to east-west, but simply those anchor points in the Central Valley. Bakersfield, I think is the -- in particular, it's the visualization, VCV Merced (indiscernible), but I think it's the compactness piece that I'm looking for, and I think we can rethink this area, pulling from Kings, Tulare, and Kern. Again, I think that that curl of Bakersfield needs to be reconsidered.

            On the Yolo Solano piece, I'm open to seeing options that the line drawers can come up with. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER:  Thank you. Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ:  Yes. Thank you, Chair. They asked a question about Yolo versus delta, the piece of delta that I am recommending that be included with it is a population of, I believe, 10,000, and when we talk about the delta that I'm referring to, it's from Rio Vista north, not the other -- there's two pieces of delta. So I'm referring to the one that is not as heavily populated as your Pittsburg and all that other
area, so hopefully, that clears it up. Okay. Thank you so much.

And then also, in terms of east-west on the northern, I definitely would be open to that as well. You've actually done a pretty good job with it so far, so thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Sadhwani, did I interrupt you in the middle? Do you have more? No? Okay.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. Just going back to a point that Commissioner Sadhwani said in terms of our, you know -- in terms of how we analyze and think through the VRA issues, we do have quite a bit of -- I mean, we didn't get -- we have quite a bit of flexibility within that, as long as we're adequately meeting the needs of populations that need to be protected.

And with that, I think optimizing, you know, the number of VRA seats is important in making sure that we have districts that reflect the and allow for the communities to elect people of their choosing.

And one of the things that comes back to me is really looking at those CVAPs, right? And the percentage of -- the percentages there, I mean, some of the community input was to go lower on those CVAPs, even
though -- I mean, there's lots of options, lots of flexibility. Want to make sure that communities have an opportunity to effectively elect candidates of their choice, but we do have some discretion, and I mean, these are maps for ten years, and I want it to show that individuals are fairly represented and choose whoever they want to elect to office. So just bringing that back up in terms of the CVAP numbers and thinking through the Central Valley a little bit more. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Jaime?

MR. CLARK: Thank you. And thank you, everybody, for this discussion.

A question that I have based on some of this conversation around the Central Valley, and this is specifically about Assembly size visualizations. So I guess, a question around changing -- basically, if we're calling the current area a curl, it's like, changing the direction of the curl, right, from like a C to U, kind of, is basically what the -- is being proposed. That potentially, and we'd maybe do a little bit more mapping on it, but that potentially would sort of split Antelope Valley, and in Congressional as well, would potentially split Antelope Valley, and in some instances, depending on what other changes would want to be in L.A., could also potentially split Antelope Valley and Victor Valley.
So just sort of flagging that.

And I guess, additionally, and some -- excuse me -- and some questions also could be, like, including coastal areas with Central Valley areas, like central coast and Central Valley areas, so that's, I guess, also a question that we have, if that's, like, a hard line for you or not?

CHAIR TURNER: We will discuss it.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. You know, I had mentioned this in my opening remarks. I think that this is going to be one of those decision points for the Commission to make. I don't know that we're prepared to make it now. The way that we currently are visualizing L.A. County with Antelope Valley, I really like, but that being said, I also heard a ton of testimony yesterday from folks calling in saying they don't like the idea of parts of Kern going all the way up to Tuolumne. So for me, I'm open to seeing what the options are, and I think that -- that's for me, like, if Bakersfield becomes that anchor point for us, then we can make some decisions around what happens to the Antelope Valley, or the rest of Kern with other places, right? I mean, we have, just on the Assembly level, visualizations linking Kern to San Bernadino. I mean, I'm not suggesting that that's what I
want to see. I'm saying I'm open to seeing what those options are, if we took Bakersfield as that anchor.

I think, you know, from what I've seen from the testimony, it looks like -- I'm just trying to come up with, like, if this is a curl, then what's this other thing? I'm looking at some of the pieces from other folks, I was looking at some of the maps around the wards of Bakersfield as well. It's almost more of like a dollop, if you will. I don't know. I know what a good word for it is, but it seems to come, like, more straight down from Tulare into Bakersfield, but again, that's where I would want to see what the CVAP is looking like in the Bakersfield area, because I don't have a -- like, this is based on elections from potentially ten years ago. I don't have a sense of how the Latino community has changed or grown over those ten years, but I think that, potentially is the piece that seems to be missing, at least from the data that I -- from what's available to commissioners.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thank you. I, too, am also interested in seeing the east-west, at least, for visualization.

I wanted to ask Jaime a question for perhaps clarification, but more for a sense of an example. You
said that if we make some of these potential changes of this east-west orientation instead of the current north-south, you said that we might be looking at splitting the Antelope Valley, perhaps splitting Victorville. Can you give us, like, can you just explain a little bit further, like, what's an example? Like, I'm just not sure what you mean by splitting the Antelope Valley.

MS. CLARK: Do you mean, like, what do I mean by the Antelope Valley, in terms of, like, a definition, or like, how it would be split?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Like, do you have a -- for example, I mean, obviously, it's not a for sure, but are you saying that if we were to do an east-west orientation, are you saying that --

MS. CLARK: Yeah. Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- like, maybe Lancaster and Palmdale will be separated from each other?

MS. CLARK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I know that's not what we're saying, but.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. Potentially, or -- and of course, it would depend on how the Commission would want to split Antelope Valley, so there's flexibility there, also, if it was, like, do more of a split along the 4, or something like that, where maybe multiple cities could be
split. It would kind of depend on how the Commission
directed that to go. Without, like, actually mapping it,
I don't have a more definitive answer than, like, at
least one city.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. No, that's what I
wanted to just get a -- I knew that you wouldn't have a
definitive answer, but I --

MS. CLARK: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- just wanted to
understand, like, are you talking about, like, you know,
big swaths, or are you talking about, like, certain
cities would be split?

MS. CLARK: Yeah. I'm sorry. I don't have -- I
don't have a more definitive answer. I don't think it
would be, like, a couple blocks or something like that.
I think it would be a little bit bigger than that, and of
course, it's something that Kennedy and I will
collaborate on together to -- since it's, like, Kern and
Los Angeles, that's sort of, like, an area we have
overlaps, so we'll work on that together to explore
exactly what it would mean.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And just one more
clarification, when you also say, you know, splitting,
you know, certain regions, are you talking about
splitting certain regions as they're currently, you know,
been presented as a visualization, or --

MS. CLARK: I mean splitting areas that have been
defined as COIs.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Got it.

MS. CLARK: So like -- yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to answer the
line drawers. When you were asking questions about lines
and such. I think I said this yesterday, so I apologize
if I am repeating (indiscernible), but in order for us to
be able to do our work, there's six criteria. Counties,
lines, and city lines fall under the community of
interest, which is number 4. And I think as a
Commission, we've kind of looked at communities of
interest being, of those different ones they have in
there, community of interest takes A over B, you know,
and it's going to depend on what the community of
interest is.

As we have said, some communities of interest, we
know have been submitted that are veiled in politics,
others veiled in racism, others veiled in whatever, and
sometimes we're going to have to just work through that.
And sometimes we're just going to have to say there might
be a veil, but let's just take it as it is.
But I go back to something that Commissioner Ahmed -- Ahmed, sorry, said to all of us a long, long, time ago, and we're not here -- I'm not here for San Diego County. I'm not even here for San Diego County and Los Angeles County or Orange County, where I've worked and lived and -- or San Francisco and San Mateo, where I've worked and lived, I'm here for the 40 million -- okay. I know it's less than 40 million now, but 40 million Californians, and I hope that everybody's happy and angry at the maps. You know, I mean, we're not going to make everybody happy, and if we did make everybody happy, then there's something we did wrong. And I'm a firm believer of that. That with 40 million people, we're not going to make them all happy.

Yes, there's going to be people who are going to be loud. We cannot, I mean, I'll say it again, we cannot -- we need to always go back and make sure we're listening to everybody, even the first person who called in, and kind of measure it all together, and not just, who was the last person to call in? Though I do appreciate what the Commissioner -- the commissioners who are, like, oh, finally, that region's called in, because I had felt that way as well. But we need to keep pulling ourselves away and being neutral about, especially regions where we live in and such, and try to look at the big picture of the 40
million, and be able to make those hard decisions.

That's why we were selected, because we can do that. And that's why there's 14 of us, because we each have to keep reminding ourselves of that and supporting each other.

So that was a really long answer to say, yes, go ahead and do splits and, you know, let's keep our 1 through 4 -- okay -- 1 through 6 criterias, but remembering, you know, what our obligations are.

And we're going to have to split, because our first obligation is equal sizes, and there's no way to do equal sizes when you look at these counties and cities and stuff.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. Returning to the VRA districts, I think I'd like to hear some combination of the line drawers and Mr. Becker give us some more concrete idea of how to proceed, then. You know, how do you exercise the flexibility we have in creating those VRA districts? You know, of course, we had to look at CVAPs and so on, but I mean, concretely, in terms of, how we're going to proceed with that, and in terms of timing, when we're going to proceed with that? I think I need to hear more.

MR. BECKER: I'll try to -- I'll try to address that as much -- as best I can. So where we've advised that
minority populations require certain districts to be
drawn to protect their voting rights under the Voting
Rights Act, you have a lot of discretion in how those
districts are drawn, so long as -- so long as you don't
sew, crack, or PAC minority voting rights so as to limit
their ability to elect candidates of choice in the number
of districts where they can have them.

That being said, I mean, what we can't tell you is,
here is the magical hypothetical district you should
draw. You'll need to draw districts, and we'll be able
to tell you, yeah, that -- based on the -- based on the
voting behavior, that looks like that's a district that
will protect minorities, consistent with the Voting
Rights Act. And we've already -- we've already given
some advice along those lines.

I'd also just add, there are areas where there are
minority concentrations where the (indiscernible) pre-
conditions don't all apply, as we discussed. And that
doesn't mean that those minorities are unprotected, it
just means they require less protection under the Voting
Rights Act, and they require -- and don't require a
particular district to be drawn.

But there are other districting principles that
apply, and it may very well be that there are districts
that are majority minority that aren't VRA districts,
just because there are communities of interest there that happen to overlap and that can be used there. So I, you know, when we're talking about the Central Valley, there are clearly Voting Rights Act considerations there, as we've indicated for Latino populations. Similar in Southern California from L.A., Orange, San Bernadino, Riverside, Imperial, and San Diego.

There's even an area where there are significant Asian -- considerations with regard to the Asian populations in Los Angeles area. That doesn't mean that there aren't -- because of more concentrations of people happen to live, that there won't be high concentrations in some districts that are not necessarily districts that had to be drawn for VRA compliance. And I just want to stress that again, because there are areas that have very significant minority populations. We've discussed this. A great example is the peninsula in the South Bay of the Bay Area, where there are very high concentrations of Asian voters, but not much racially polarized voting. There is a -- it's really a -- it's a place where the Voting Rights Act, or the promise of the Voting Rights Act is really played out, that people are not voting solely based on race.

And so there might not need to be particular districts drawn, but it might very well be that a
district drawn happens to be a majority Asian, and as long as it -- as long as it's traditional redistricting principles that have been applied, communities of interest, and other things that you have before you, that's entirely appropriate.

I don't know if that answered your question, completely, Commissioner Yee, and I'm happy to go into more detail if you had something -- some follow-up.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. That's all good. And I'm, you know, looking at the Central Valley especially, I mean, you guys, with the line drawers and with our input, did create us a visualization here that we're looking at, and discussing, and weighing, and considering altering, so I'm just trying to get a handle on, okay, how do we weight all the considerations that went into what we see now, and then at what point and how do we introduce new considerations, some of the things Commissioner Sadhwani and others have suggested to create alternate visualizations?

MR. BECKER: So I think Commissioner Sadhwani is right. You have a lot of agency here. It is not just related to the Voting Rights Act. The Voting Rights Act is actually a limitation to some degree.

I'll just also say, you've got -- what we're looking at right now is Congressional districts, correct? There
is a significant amount of deviation that's going to need to be fixed in there which gives you some ability to move. Equal population is the number one criteria in the State of California and constitutionally. And for Congressional districts, that means as close to equal as possible. That means if you need to split cities and counties and even communities of interest you can do that because equal population takes precedence over all other criteria.

So what I might do is -- I think this is where we should be right now given the instruction given to the line drawers. I think this is more of a kind of a starting or middle point, and now we should start getting to the point where if, for instance -- if for instance, you wanted to confirm whether or not the Merced Fresno area is a VRA area, which I have to go back to the maps, but my recollection is there were VRA considerations there absolutely. And whether it was possible to unpack particularly the Fresno Tulare district a little bit and create better population equality while also perhaps creating some -- that wouldn't be the only place; there might be other places -- where you might be able to satisfy Voting Rights Act considerations in that Merced Fresno area.

I think that would also be an appropriate direction.
I think there's also likely some way to move into San Benito and Monterey to the west to take in some of the population there and allow the Merced Fresno district to also creep over to the west somewhere.

I am -- but you're the commissioners. These are just some brainstorming ideas that you might want to direct the line drawers to look at.

Recognizing, also, that when you get closer to the coast, you're probably elongating a district because the coast can't go anywhere. You can't go any further west there, so you might end up having an elongated district out there. But because every decision you make has a domino effect on the rest.

But there are no significant Voting Rights Act considerations once you get beyond that San Benito Monterey area on the western coast.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right so in terms of workflow we can sit here and talk about Mountain House and Tracy let's say and think about the boundaries and think about just the raw populations.

But when it comes to talking VRA district, we have to consider a lot more things, right, and in much more detail, and I'm just not fully grasping how to manage that detail altogether right here in coming up with possible variations on the VRA districts.
MR. BECKER: I'm mean, you're still at a point where you can ask line drawers to experiment with some things. Obviously, these are not close to final because the deviations are not quite there yet, so I would use that opportunity.

What we know is that there are significant Hispanic populations in San Benito and on the kind of eastern edge of Monterey County. That may be helpful if we want to abide by Voting Rights Act considerations.

And then if we started with an anchor through the Central Valley here and then radiated out and then also a separate anchor for maybe the southern part of California which we discussed.

That will probably lead you to pretty solid compliance with the Voting Right Act while leaving you enough flexibility to take in a variety of community of interest testimony on districts that where the Voting Rights Act does not require a particular district to drawn.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you, Commissioner Yee and Mr. Becker, for that. At this point, we're going to take quick break to do some shifting. Just a quick break. Let's see. It is 10:35, we'll be back at 10:45.
Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 10:35 a.m. until 10:45 a.m.)

ACTING CHAIR TAYLOR: Okay. Thank you for that time while we shifted some things around. Commissioners and Californians, what we are going to do at this point is to move into our Los Angeles Congressional maps.

I'd like for us to recognize going in and there will be some additional shifts that I want to name. As we move, we are fluid. We are responding to comments that we're receiving, public input, and I'm excited about that that we are trying to again drawn the best visualizations to allow our public to respond to those visualizations.

So with that, the presentations that we have again, are reflective of what we've said in the past so it will not reflect the changes.

So we are going to still present the balance of the Congressional maps for Los Angeles and for Southern California to allow more responses, and at that, time we are going to get a summary only for Senate based on what the line drawers believe that they are hearing and direction.

We will not go through Senate maps because they will not reflect what we're currently thinking. They're still reflective of the old thought process so it makes no
sense to do that. So out time today we're going to
trough our Congressional maps, respond.

We will get a general thought about how to think how
we're currently thinking about Senate. The mappers will
tell us what they are hearing and then we will open up
for public comment at that point, which will conclude our
session.

So it will depend on how long it takes us to get
through the Congressional maps. And so at this point, we
are going to be in the hands of Jamie --

MS. CLARK: Just one moment, please.

Hello, thank you.

I'm going to go through the set of visualizations
for Congressional-sized visualizations for Los Angeles
county. This is page 41, and I am just going to follow
the order of the handout.

So this is page 41 of the handout. It includes the
Antelope Valley and Santa Clarita Valley, and I'm going
to zoom in. It does, for population, pick up Granada
Hills North and Porter Ranch and the San Fernando Valley.

This, again, for population. The rest of the
borders of this visualization are the county line with
Ventura, Kern, San Bernadino counties.

Then next we're going to page 42.

This visualization includes neighborhood in San
Fernando Valley, including Sylmar, the City of San Fernando, Pacoima, Foothill Trails District, Sun Valley, Pacoima, Mission Hills, North Hills, Lake Balboa, Reseda, Van Nuys, North Hollywood, Panorama City, et cetera.

Next is page 43.

This visualization includes the rest of San Fernando Valley for the most part. Granada Hills, North Ridge, Chatsworth, West Hills, Bell Canyon, Woodland Hills, Tarzana, Encino, Sherman Oaks, Studio City, also including Hollywood Hills, Bel Air, Palisades, and then in sort of this very western Los Angeles area including Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Topanga, and Malibu.

Yesterday the Commission gave Tamina direction to include Calabasas with Agoura Hills and Westlake Village. And this visualization, that is based in Ventura county, so just noting that. That balances very well and works out. Thank you.

Moving down the coast, this is page 44. This visualization includes West Hollywood, Beverly Hills, Westwood and Westside neighborhoods, Santa Monica, Venice, moving down through Marina Del Ray, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Lomita, Rolling Hills, Palos Verdes.

And next, we are going to page 45. Kind of going back up, going to zoom in.
This visualization page 45 of the Congressional district's handout. This includes Burbank, Glendale, Eagle Rock, Glassell Park, Hollywood United Neighborhood Council, Atwater, Los Feliz area, Echo Parks, Silver Lake, East Hollywood areas, Koreatown, Greater Wilshire, and Mid City West.

And next page 46. This visualization includes South Robertson, Pico, Mid City, West Adams, Palms, Mar Vista, Culver City, Del Ray, View Park, Ladera Heights, Park Mesa, Inglewood, West Monarch, West Athens, Lennox, Hawthorne, Del Aire, Lawndale areas.

And next we are going to page 47, please. This visualization we collaborated with your VRA team on. This includes Westlake areas, Downtown, and this was a community of interest that this was called like Downtown and Skid Row. It's includes this area, Pico Union. I'm going to zoom in to see the detail on this here. It's sort of eastern part of Olympic Park. No, I'm sorry. It is eastern part of Olympic Park and also this is sort of a Jefferson Park area includes South Central Neighborhood Council, Zapata-King, and then also includes Huntington Park, Florence-Firestone, and the northern part of Watts.

Next, moving down to the Harbor Gateway areas. This visualization includes San Pedro, Wilmington, Gardena, the Harbor Gateway Cities, Carson, West Carson, Compton,
West Rancho Dominguez, and East Rancho Dominguez, Willowbrook, the southern part of Watts, and these areas along the 110. This is Empowerment Congress Southeast and CANNDU Neighborhood Council areas.

Next, moving to the Long Beach area. This is page 49. Just going in page order.

This includes the entirety of the city of Long Beach, Signal Hill, Lakewood, Bellflower, Hawaiian Gardens, Cypress, Los Alamitos and Rossmoor. Cypress, Los Alamitos and Rossmoor are in Orange county, and none of those cities are split in this visualization.

And we are going to page 50 next. This is another visualization we worked with your team VRA team on. It includes Paramount, Lynwood, Southgate, Bell Gardens, Downy, Pico Rivera, West Whittier, South Whittier, East Whittier, Santa Fe Springs, La Mirada, Artesia, Cerritos, and Norwalk.

And we are going to page 51 next. This visualization, again, one that we worked with your VRA team on. It includes Highland Park area, LA-32 Neighborhood Council -- sort of El Sereno area, Lincoln Heights, Boyle Heights, East Los Angeles, Vernon, Bell, Maywood, Commerce, Montebello, South San Gabriel, San Gabriel, Rosemead, Monterey Park, Alhambra.

And next we are going to page 52. Another area that
we worked with your VRA team on. This visualization includes Azusa, Irwindale, Covina, West Covina, Baldwin Park, El Monte, North El Monte, South El Monte, Whittier, La Habra Heights, Hacienda Heights, Heart of the City of Industry, South San Jose Hills, La Puente, Valinda, these areas.

I did want to note that during our last round of visualizations, there was a comment or a request from commissioners to explore these being more of an east to west -- sort of having a more east to west structure or architecture. And I did attempt that. It did require like Zapata-King and other neighborhoods in L.A. to be with Hacienda Heights for population purposes. And when I looked sort of at changing things around balancing it out a little more it essentially was looking a lot like these two eastern and west versions. So I just wanted to name that, and let you know that I tried.

And next going to page 53, please, 210 corridor. This is my last visualization presenting today. So this includes a lot of the areas of the Angeles National Forest. It goes from Sunland-Tujunga, La Crescenta, La Canada, Altadena, all of the city of Pasadena, South Pasanda, San Mario, Arcadia, Monrovia, Bradbury Duarte, Glendora, San Dimas, all the way out to Clairmont and the county limit -- county line here of Los Angeles County.
And then in San Bernardino County includes Brightwood, Little Creek, northern parts of Rancho Cucamonga, northern parts of Upland and San Antonio Heights. This is sharing a border with a district visualization in San Bernardino County that has some VRA considerations.

ACTING CHAIR TAYLOR: And that's it, Jamie?

MS. CLARK: Yes, that's it.

ACTING CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you so much.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR TAYLOR: We appreciate it, and a reminder to those that are viewing that you can for sure also submit your feedback on these visualizations real time on our website at www.wedrawthelineca.org and so we just want to make sure that you are participating with us. Thank you so much for that.

And at this time, Commissioners will take additional feedback for Los Angeles area. Commissioner Sadhwani?

Oh, wait I'm sorry. Before we do that, we do have a scheduled required break that we need to take, so we are going to do that now, and we will be back at 11:15.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 11:15 a.m. until 11:15 a.m.)

ACTING CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you, and welcome back from break. We just heard visualizations coming from
Jamie from our line drawer in Los Angeles, and at this point, we are going to give feedback to what we've heard from the Los Angeles Congressional visualizations.

And we'll start with Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Jamie, for working on these. This is a really great starting point, and definitely, as you mentioned, the pushing things east-west in comparison of the north-south and that hourglass that had existed previously, definitely an improvement.

I have lots of thoughts here, but I actually want to start on this visualization named VCD East of LA.

This is marked as a VRA district and that bright yellow I believe according to the PDFs, this is a sixty percent Latino CVAP. So I'm really concerned here that we are overpacking this district.

In addition, a couple of pieces. One, I think we're crossing a lot of COI testimony that we've received particularly from the Asian American community in some of this San Gabriel Valley areas that are brought into this district.

Secondly, I'm just not sure that these neighborhoods belong together. So what I'd like to think -- and for me, when I look at this District and the reason I want to start here, is much like the Central Valley where for me
it feels like Bakersfield. And if we get that right a lot is going to flow from Bakersfield.

I think if we get this east L.A. area right where we clearly, very clearly, have a VRA obligation for a protected community. I think if we get this right, a lot more flows from it. And I don't think we are there quite yet.

So for me, I would want us to work on taking out parts of Alhambra, Monterey Park, the Rosemead, the San Gabriel, maybe leave in Montebello, maybe take it out. I'm not sure. I think Montebello could potentially connect like with that Pico Rivera area a little bit better, but I could also see it staying in, so I'm definitely open to playing around with that. And instead kind of anchoring east L.A., Boyle Heights further into some of these northern areas like Glassell Park. Hang on. I've got some notes here. Possibly up to Eagle Rock. Do we have Pico Union -- I think Pico Union is already included in here, isn't it? Is Pico Union in there?

ACTING CHAIR TAYLOR: No.

MS. CLARK: Pico Union is in the one next door.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. So I think extending out that way towards Pico Union perhaps could be an option for us here. Echo Park, Eagle Rock, Glassell
Park, possibly even coming up into Atwater Village like that northern way. I'm using my -- exactly, like that.

I think the big question for me if we were to reorient this east L.A. District, is we would certainly need some more population. And I think the question mark for me is does that come from Koreatown, and I'm really open to hearing other people's thoughts on this.

Certainly, we've also received a lot of testimony about keeping Koreatown with other API communities of interest. Hang on one second. I think I have them in front of me somewhere here. Chinatown, Filipinotown, Cape Town, Little Tokyo, and Thai Town, keeping those whole and together.

So I think either we include all of that within such a district or we have to think about a different solution there. But I don't think this east L.A. anchor is with Alhambra, San Gabriel, Rosemead, Monterey Park. I think that that's moving into something separate and different, and so I'd like to see this more geared towards a downtown area. And again, for me, this would be a major anchor point in which we stream out from it, and I want to be really cautious about not overpacking this district. I hope that's clear enough. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR TAYLOR: Yes, Jamie.

MS. CLARK: Thank you, and thank you Commissioner
Sadhwani for that feedback. And certainly happy to explore this option, and you know, certainly part of this area not being included is receiving previous direction to not include it with sort of Lincoln Heights, Boyle Heights, East Los Angeles area. Happy to look at that.

And also, the -- I'm just going to zoom out a little bit. And so basically talking about these four areas, maybe these five visualizations. And given that they're sort of a whole block of VRA consideration areas here, I guess sort of wondering if you have -- and if not, that's okay, and I will look at it. Wondering if you have other thoughts.

This essentially would kind of be like under populating this area in Burbank, under populating this area in the central L.A., and then moving, it sounds like, this entire area which is a higher population I think out. Yeah, I'm just sort of wondering what you are envisioning?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, I do -- I do actually. So a couple of pieces. As we move further like southeast into the VRA areas that have been identified for VRA. Again, I think, thinking about how do we -- how do we have communities work together and not against each other, right. And so we have obviously the Latino community being protected in these regions, and yet
strong testimony from this area, and we looked at this yesterday with the Assembly going out to Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar, Walnut, and can that be brought into a district that would include that -- I'm pointing to a screen that you can't see -- but the Whittier, Pico Rivera, all the way down potentially even into La Mirada, Norwalk, Cerritos. Could we look it at that direction there so that it might still be a Latino's VRA district? But it could also keep together those API COIs that we've received and heard really strongly from.

MS. CLARK: Just a clarifying question about that. So you are envisioning something kind of going like La Mirada area to Diamond Bar and then also something along 605 corridor-ish?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. I'm thinking east of the 605.

MS. CLARK: And then -- okay. So then --

COMMISSIONER 1: But probably ending around that Montebello -- is that the 110 that's flowing there?

MS. CLARK: Yeah

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yep.

MS. CLARK: So then --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- around 110.

COMMISSIONER 1: So then it would be like Downey, Paramount, South Gate; these areas with Montebello or
maybe going up here because I'm just thinking about population also.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, and I think that's where it beings to get a little bit more murky for me too.

But I think yes, most likely, and I think there's a lot of COIs from that Watts, Inglewood. It starts streaming into all the way over to the coastline. And I think there's some work to be done there too, right. We've heard I think even last night someone called in talking about Torrance and Gardena --

ACTING CHAIR TAYLOR: Gardena.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. So I think that there's some movements over in that area. And that's why I'm thinking, like if we get the east L.A. piece right like, I don't think there's any question about the fact that we have some responsibilities in the east L.A. area. If we get that right, a lot can stream from it.

And that's where I think that there's some changes in the architecture that I'd like to kind of play around with and see what our options are and just being really cautious to not overpack because right now, that east of L.A. visualization feels overpacked to me with a sixty percent Latino CVAP.

I think for example the Black Hub had offered some
testimony about communities that are connected through West Adams as well, right, so I think that could potentially go into that district that's currently Central L.A. I have more notes there, but I'll let others weigh in because I'm sure others will have some other ideas there but happy to continue this conversation as well. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani for starting here, and I appreciate and I agree with your comment about anchoring or starting here as a way to anchor and then have -- look at the way the other districts are visualizations or potential districts can eventually flow out.

I have a lot of notes on this area and I do agree with what you said about -- I'll start with the east of L.A. one.

I do agree with everything that you've said. I think that when I looked at this, there are three distinct communities of interest that are grouped into one. And they don't necessarily share common identities. And so based on what she is saying, if you were to use Highland Park, El Sereno, Arroyo Seco, Cypress Park, Lincoln Heights, East
L.A., Boyle Heights as your anchor, I would agree to with what Commissioner Sadhwani said about adding Koreatown to this visualization. I would also have us look at adding Echo Park and -- Echo Park to this visualization, as well as the portion. So if we add Koreatown, then that means we would add Westlake North, Westlake South, Boyle Heights.

MS. CLARK: Boyle Heights is in there right now.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Is it in there?

MS. CLARK: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MS. CLARK: It's his downtown area.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sorry. I'm just looking at both the Central L.A. and the east of L.A. notes that I --

MS. CLARK: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- so could you just zoom in a little bit more on that so that we can see it a little bit more clearly in that section? That corner section, yeah.

Yeah. And then I'd also like to see -- is the Historic Cultural North included?

MS. CLARK: Yes. Oh, it's with Downtown.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.
MS. CLARK: So adding --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I would --

MS. CLARK: -- in that --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah -- I would -- as I said, I would also encourage including the Historic Cultural Neighborhood Council, as well as the Historic Cultural North Neighborhood Council. What that would do is bring in some similar communities. I would also encourage that we look at is the Elysian Valley Riverside.

MS. CLARK: That's with the Burbank/Glendale area.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I would even encourage us to take a look at possibly adding that if you need more population, as well as Pico-Union, adding that to it.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And then -- I'd also then like to --

MS. CLARK: Before we move on, I apologize.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MS. CLARK: When saying adding Koreatown, we have our Koreatown neighborhood council definition, and then also COI submissions for neighbor -- or one specific COI submission for the boundaries of Koreatown. They are not the same. And the Koreatown COI submission goes into
areas that have been defined as greater Wilshire by that neighborhood council boundary and also by members of the public. Just wondering which version you would like me to be using?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think for the purposes right now -- and I guess -- I think for the purposes right now, I would just say, let's stick with the neighborhood council. I think -- yeah. Let's stick with that and see what the population numbers look like.

Okay. Can I move on to -- or I guess it's still kind of related to the same visualization of this East L.A. one, so that means we need to do something with -- I think it was Rosemead, Monterey Park, Alhambra, San Gabriel -- South San Gabriel, and Montebello. On that particular one, I think what -- I want to point us -- I want to point us to what we also discussed around the Assembly district in that region and the cities that were grouped together in the Assembly district visualization that we looked at the other day. And on that note then, I would like us to look at including San Marino, East San Gabriel, Temple City, and Arcadia, and taking them away from the foothill cities. They're less foothill, more aligned with the San Gabriel Valley.

And then if you need, then, for additional population -- and I think this gets to -- this one's kind
of all over the place. I think -- I'd also then, like us
to look at if you included -- I think this is where
Commissioner Sadhwani is right. Montebello is a mixed,
very diverse city, heavily Latino, but also with a --
with an Asian population there as well, too. I think
maybe for the sake of looking at population, we could
include them. They could also go in with the Harbor
Gateway cities like Commerce and Pico Rivera. We could
also look at including El Monte and South El Monte.
Okay. And perhaps -- I don't know if this makes sense to
also include South Pasadena, as well, too. Any
questions? Okay. Thank you. And I will stop here and
let someone else comment on others -- I have other
comments on other maps.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Are there any other comments
on the current maps? Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. Thank you. I think
Commissioner Akutagawa got most of my potential
direction. I just also wanted to say that I think
especially for this East San Gabriel Valley portion that
I do think Rowland Heights, potentially Walnut, could be
included. With respect to some of the additions with San
Marino, East San Gabriel, Temple City, Arcadia,
especially if population becomes an issue, I would maybe
use -- I guess mostly for Arcadia -- I would use the 210
as a border in Arcadia for looking at population.
I'm curious to see how something like South Pasadena impacts the western portion of this district. I'm not sure that it works there completely. Definitely, I would not include any portion of Pasadena in those visualizations. And I think -- and just lastly, I wanted to echo -- I think Montebello is probably one of the more contested San Gabriel Valley regions as to whether they go more South Bay or whether they go -- whether they're more San Gabriel Valley Proper, so I would -- that may be actually a decision point at some point as to whether it makes sense to split Montebello. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez. Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Just in terms of like that -- I think -- I'm trying to remember what Commissioner Akutagawa mentioned -- Alhambra, San Gabriel, South Pass -- taking them out somehow. So for me, if I'm understanding what you're saying, Commissioner Akutagawa, I think I disagree with that. My thought in removing Alhambra, Monterey Park, San Gabriel out of what is currently -- what we're currently looking at east of L.A., is to tie them more specifically to those foothill cities. I think we had had some interesting testimony regarding the taking kids to recreational areas in the
mountains, and using those neighborhoods as a gateway into the Angeles National Forest. So for me, it was actually having some of those connected to that larger 210 corridor district that we're seeing.

So in other words, having it dip down a little bit more. I think that can maintain some of those AAPI COIs that have been mentioned. In fact, I think there was some collaboration in some of the groups that had been presenting to connect the West San Gabriel Valley, Alhambra, Arcadia, Monterey Park, Rosemead, San Gabriel, South Pass, and Temple City along that 210 corridor.

Oh, sorry, the one other piece that I had originally raised my hand about -- can we zoom in and take a closer look at downtown L.A.? I think in all places in general, we've been trying to really maintain the neighborhood council district borders. Downtown L.A., I'm trying to wrap my head around, because we've had a lot of conflicting testimony about various portions that fall within downtown L.A., including things like Little Tokyo, Skid Row, et cetera. So to me, is downtown L.A. its own neighborhood council? I don't see it being identified on the map here as an NC.

MS. CLARK: Yep, it is.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: It is?

MS. CLARK: It's a neighborhood council area. Yeah.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

MS. CLARK: And it follows sort of where the hand is going there.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it. Got it. And Historic Cultural Neighborhood Council is like the Arts District. And is Little Tokyo included in that maybe? Oh, I --

MS. CLARK: In the Historic Cultural North, so north of --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No, Little Tokyo is in Historic Cultural Neighborhood Council, along with Chinatown, and --

MS. CLARK: --(indiscernible) with Chinatown.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- the Arts District.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: This might be the only place where I might want to entertain possibly breaking up some of those neighborhood councils. I'm sure they're not going to be pleased about that, but we have so much kind of conflicting testimony in these areas. Or maybe we just need to think creatively about them, that maybe downtown Los Angeles connects with South Central, but Historic Cultural and Historic Cultural North is connected more so into Echo Park and out all the way to Koreatown, so to speak. Keeping some of those COIs together. I think that's where I'm just trying to wrap
my head around how to connect them. And I'm pretty
familiar, actually, with all of these areas. I'm just
trying to figure those out.

MS. CLARK: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yep?

MS. CLARK: I can display the COIs for this area to
sort of -- and that might -- just, I guess, a different
framing of like what is downtown.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Okay.

MS. CLARK: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I didn't know that was an
option for us, Jaime.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. So this is a COI that's been
defined as downtown L.A.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Um-hum.

MS. CLARK: And then, this one is -- I hope you can
see it with the yellow overlay -- but this is like Skid
Row, sort of like Central Downtown Los Angeles.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it. And did we have any
of the AAPI COIs as polygons?

MS. CLARK: One moment, please.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: In that area, because I know
we've received testimony -- I think they even called in
last night, talking about Chinatown, Little Tokyo, and
keeping those together -- Filipinotown -- Thai Town is a
little further out.

MS. CLARK: I have -- yeah, I have Thai Town here.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right.

MS. CLARK: Koreatown.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right.

MS. CLARK: And this is the Greater Wilshire area, so that's sort of the area I was discussing.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Um-hum.

MS. CLARK: I do have the Filipinotown COI I added to a map I was working on more recently, and so -- not on this one, but that's -- was that Commissioner -- oh, I thought I heard -- I do have that. It's just not on this map, I apologize.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Towards like that Historic Cultural North and Echo Park kind of area -- I'm trying to think about like where the Filipino Workers Center is and stuff. I'm assuming that's kind of where the Filipinotown is -- Historic Filipinotown is.

MS. CLARK: I haven't seen that defined --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

MS. CLARK: -- geographically in Airtable. I will do another look for that.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No worries.

MS. CLARK: And I hadn't seen that like as its own shape, yet.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Perfect.

MS. CLARK: Again, I will look one more time, just to double-check, and if it is in there, then I will add it to the map absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Awesome. Thank you very much.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Can I respond to Commissioner Sadhwani?

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So Commissioner Sadhwani, I'm going to have to respectfully disagree with you about what you said about combining those San Gabriel Valley communities with the foothills. I grew up in that area and it is very different from the foothill communities. I understand what is being proposed. I guess before we go there, I would prefer to see how we can keep more of those -- I guess using some of the other terminology -- like those on the Valley floor to be grouped together versus grouped with the foothill communities. They are very different than those who live in areas -- particularly if you go south of Huntington Drive -- very different. And so I would -- and then the further north you go in towards the 210, I mean, just having grown up...
there, I would never have seen myself in alignment with any of those communities there.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: If I may, I would just say, I don't disagree with you. I think those are very different communities, but I'm basing it not on my personal perspective but on COI testimony. So I think that would be the only difference there.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think we've also received COI testimony also -- I mean, it's conflicting. I think that that's the issue here, is that it's conflicting testimony, because there's different things that we've seen.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And the hands weren't lowered, so I'm not sure about the order, but -- okay. Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. Just also wanted to respond and clarify that at least my direction was in thinking about creating a West San Gabriel Valley visualization that excluded things to the west of East L.A. that really -- how I was visualizing this is that I wanted to keep Alhambra, San Gabriel, Rosemead, with the San Gabriel Valley in some iteration and that, if necessary in drawing this new visualization of the San Gabriel Valley, West San Gabriel Valley, that if necessary, we could include San Marino, San Gabriel,
Temple City, and the southern portion of Arcadia. But that -- yeah, I don't necessarily think that that's because Alhambra has a ton in common with -- particularly at the higher income portions of Arcadia, et cetera. As you get closer to those hills and the 210 as you go more north, you get -- very quickly it becomes a much wealthier set of community. San Marino, in particular even, is a pretty high-income community as compared to, I would say, places like Alhambra and as you go into Monterrey Park, et cetera.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just staying in that area and building on what was -- and I don't know this area as well, but my question was, Azusa's kind of been pulled out of the foothills and I didn't know of that one could serve, kind of that -- I thought we got some COI testimony around Azusa. Or even it might have been Commissioner Kennedy had said it. I can't remember what we heard about Azusa, but it just felt like all of a sudden, they were pulled out of that corridor, and I was curious to see those of you who know that area better what you're thinking.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Vazquez and Andersen?
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. Very familiar with that area. It's very different from the rest of the surrounding foothill communities. High numbers of immigrants and second and third generation Latinx families. So Azusa, in particular, is pretty different than Glendora, who is right next door. So they make sense to be with more of the working-class immigrant communities in the San Gabriel Valley, in my opinion.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: And did you want to add, Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I do, actually. It was about Azusa. Yes, that's correct in terms of who lives there. However, they're a gateway community into the mountains, and they actually have -- we had COI testimony and a presentation, actually, from -- and I can't recall the group's name -- but they specialize in getting immigrants into using the San Gabriel Valley. And they specifically asked, if at all possible, can we be with the foothills? Because they have programs, they have camps that take people from the San Gabriel -- the Valley floor up into the mountains all the time. So that was my one item. I was hoping to say, can we possibly pull Azusa and put it with the 210 corridor group? And I just -- well, I had one other comment to talk about, but I can wait.
ACTING CHAIR TURNER: It's actually your turn next, followed by Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Then, my one other comment was, I also agree -- Commissioner Sadhwani mentioned -- I thought we were trying -- I don't know if there's a possibility -- this is a Congressional district, so more people -- but was there an Asian CVAP in this area? And I recall quite a few COI testimony, including Walnut, Diamond Bar, Rowland Heights, with the Hacienda Heights, Industry -- that sort of area was even possibly West Covina in terms of for expanding that area. I thought that had a lot more of Asian -- sort of a community of interest with a lot of testimony about that area. So I was sort of surprised not to see that included in any special opportunity district, at least. I'd like to see that explored, please.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you, Chair. I find Commissioner Sadhwani's take on this very interesting. She brings up one of the COIs that's very unifying in recreation and where we work. I think this community works all over the place. Montebello, Alhambra, Pasadena, Altadena -- those communities tend to live, work, and recreate throughout this region, so when we
look at it beyond just where they reside, there's a lot of unifying communities of interest that they share. I think Temple City and Montebello can be swing locations that have multiple community of interest that ties to the surrounding communities. I'm looking at the numbers of it. North of the 210 is slightly overpopulated, so it'd be ideal to take away. Over Glassell, Silver Lake -- we need to, ideally, take a small amount of population away from there. So I think some of Commissioner Sadhwani's ideas can be entertained to get more optimal numbers.

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor. With that, Jaime, do you have any other clarifying questions for the commissioners?

MS. CLARK: No. Thank you. It's a lot to work with, and again, we'll continue to work with your VRA team to create visualizations for next time.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Beautiful. Commissioner Taylor, you have more? Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. I wanted to look at the Harbor Gateway visualization. And I know they're very excited. We've got a lot of thank yous for that one. But I was wondering if -- because Watts is not included in this one, correct?

MS. CLARK: The southern part of Watts is included.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. So I wanted to see if we could, actually, make it all of Watts in here. Let me step back. Do we have a reason why we couldn't?

MS. CLARK: I believe that that was having to do with the potential VRA consideration area to the north.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. I was just asking because -- do we -- and I know -- I think -- do we know what the percentage is that we are trying to strive -- because it feels like a lot of the districts -- the VRA districts here, are packed for the -- the numbers are really high for Latinos. And it feels like we could play around a little bit more up on those and allow Watts to be together with Compton, which has come up often in that Harbor Gateway.

MR. LARSON: So I can share that -- one part that Dr. Gall is currently looking at is the appropriate CVAP percentage in various proposed visualizations here that would sufficiently give effective voting opportunity, so we can't, at this point, say what that percentage is in any one place, but we are analyzing that right now.

THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, this is the court reporter. Who was just speaking?

MR. LARSON: This is Dale Larson.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Because it just -- to me, it just feels like we have it really packed, as
others have said, and that the Harbor Gateway has a potential to be an -- right now it's an opportunity area for Latinos, but it could also be another CVAP for Latinos, as well as uniting the Watts and Compton, as we've been asked, and kind of that 110, east of the 110. So I'd like us to explore that as much as possible.

And then I wanted to go over to the Inglewood. We've heard that Inglewood and the LAX -- the airport, are really connected. And I know we took -- LAX is actually in the coastal one, but I was wondering if there was a way that -- if it could be connected with Inglewood, as the community had asked.

MS. CLARK: I apologize. If which area could be connected with Inglewood?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: LAX.

MS. CLARK: Oh, so here's something --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

MS. CLARK: -- for you all.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I knew that there was going to be something there, so that's why --

MS. CLARK: There's like a little stretch of shoreline that could --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

MS. CLARK: -- connect these sort of bay cities.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yep.
MS. CLARK: And then connect LAX itself to the east. I didn't go out on a limb and present that to you on my own, but can definitely take a look at that.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I've spent lots of hours skating that -- that was pretty rollerblades -- skating it and biking it. It's basically just the bike path and Rottweiler -- I mean, not Rottweiler Beach. But I know which beaches and stuff. They are very different even though -- I mean people do -- people on the beach side is considered South Bay and LAX is considered L.A. So it wouldn't be completely off -- I just wanted -- I was just thinking how -- that was one of the requests, so I would leave it up to my commissioners if they think that looks too funny. But it is -- it is kind of like a bridge, right?

And then the other one was we did hear -- going to Torrance, in the South Bay area. We did hear that Gardena and Torrance have kind of an -- don't kind of -- they do have an API community, and that API community there is getting stronger. And there's a lot -- there's also a strong Latino community. There's a very good Peruvian restaurant there in Gardena. So if there's a way -- so if there was a way to combine them, moving Gardena into the South Bay, and then if we can go up to the top part of that purple one.
Crossing the 405 is pushing it for a coastal community in the West L.A. area. And I know you're going to ask me, so where do you want to put them, but this is where we've had -- I know that we completely -- I think we skipped the whole Valley, didn't we? But this is kind of that whole issue again where we have gone south of Mulholland on the Valley -- and we were asked not to go free-falling there -- and it is a true boundary for that community. And Bel Air in Westwood are -- UCLA actually straddles Bel Air and Westwood, so the northern, western part of UCLA is up there in the -- and then Westwood is the frontside. So it just feels like those communities that are west of -- I mean, that are south of Mulholland and east of the 405 kind of belong more with the -- I don't know if -- the Burbank area -- but they don't belong where they're at right now, which is a terrible answer to you. Well, and --

MS. CLARK: I'm --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes?

MS. CLARK: If I may?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm not --

MS. CLARK: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, I guess I said, Mulholland and then north of Santa Monica where you had it, because I was going to leave a triangle kind of, but
go ahead. I'm sorry.

MS. CLARK: Thank you so much for all of that. And just kind of zooming out. If we move Gardena out of this Harbor Gateway-based visualization, this is going to be underpopulated. We would need to do a trade somewhere.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Watts isn't enough, right? The other half of Watts?

MS. CLARK: I do not believe so.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

MS. CLARK: I will explore that. And that could also leave this underpopulated, especially as we're sort of narrowing down to Congressional district-sized deviations.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

MS. CLARK: And then this would be overpopulated, so it's kind of moving population up to the northern part and not really pulling from anywhere to the south.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, and that's where I would say -- I was wondering if we could pull from the Gateway.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I mean, I just feel like there's a lot of overpopulated areas -- I mean, Latino -- you know -- to the -- so just as we were pushing some -- just kind of figuring out, is there -- honestly, is there a fifth CVAP? I mean, a fifth VRA district in that one
or not? I don't know if we've got the numbers, but just with the overpopulation I'm looking at.

MS. CLARK: We'll absolutely continue working with your VRA team on that. And then I guess that kind of brings us generally to San Fernando --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

MS. CLARK: -- Valley area, which we haven't talked about.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Exactly. That's --

MS. CLARK: And of course, this in mapping it is an interesting area because it's somewhat more densely populated area and it's near a lot of areas that are a lot less densely populated. So making big changes in this area would potentially cause geographically bigger changes in other areas. And I -- Commissioner Sinay, it's absolutely not -- like not trying to put you in the hot seat. It's not a question directed towards you specifically, but just if there's general feedback from anybody about this visualization. Haven't heard a lot about it, which sometimes means that people are happy with it, so just sort of wondering with a lot -- I mean, and honestly, a lot of the changes that have been requested today would eventually, certainly, impact this area.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I turned off my mic on purpose
to step back and let my colleagues step in.

    ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.
Commissioner Akutagawa, followed by Commissioner
Fernandez and Andersen?

    COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Let's see. Let me
start at the Harbor Gateway since Commissioner Sinay
brought that one up. I know you asked about maybe trying
to put all of Watts in. What about adding in all of
Lynwood, because I saw some COI testimony requesting
Lynwood to be put together with Compton, Willowbrook --
that area. And just the thought there to bring it up to
the, perhaps the deviation that you would want, which may
then also -- then going in the same direction that she
was going, there was that COI testimony about a portion
of Gardena, not necessarily needing all of Gardena, but a
portion of Gardena to be perhaps pulled in with that
shoreline visualization potentially. But we'd have to
look at the COI testimony to see. They gave some very
specific boundaries for that. And I think it was kind of
like that southern boundary of Gardena there. So that's
another thought there.

    Then moving up that shoreline towards the Malibu,
San Fernando Valley, and then Antelope Valley -- I think
that in that Malibu visualization, it includes Bel Air
which is a little odd because I think that also includes
parts of the San Fernando Valley. Is that correct, if
I'm seeing it correctly?

MS. CLARK: Yep, that's correct.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So I just wanted to
clarify that. And so we've also received a lot of
continued COI testimony about the south of Mulholland --
that that's the dividing line. I'm wondering as we
relook at Bakersfield and some of the ripple effects --
maybe relooking at this Malibu, San Fernando Valley
portion may help -- I don't know, I'm just thinking out
loud right now -- that it may help to recenter this
district so that you could make that cutoff at
Mulholland, as was requested.

I also want to note that you did include Sherman
Oaks, but it's hard to see, but we've been receiving
continued testimony -- COI testimony -- that they call
themselves POSO -- I guess part of Sherman Oaks or
something like that is I think their name -- and they
wanted to be included as part of Sherman Oaks. So
keeping that in mind, is there a way that we can try to
honor that if that's possible with some of these other
changes, potentially, if you try to keep the Valley north
of Mulholland?

I also have another question going up, then, towards
the Antelope Valley, and there is the addition of Porter
Ranch and Granada Hills to the Antelope Valley visualization there. Down in that -- yeah, that little corner -- yes, right there. Again, I'm just wondering if with some of the potential changes that we might be relooking at for the Bakersfield area, if there's a way to bring Porter Ranch and Granada Hills back into the San Fernando Valley.

MS. CLARK: I think that the way that that population change would go would be maybe moving further into San Fernando Valley.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MS. CLARK: And yeah, again, those were included for population, and there had been COI testimony and also commission direction to, if needed for population, have these areas with Santa Clarita Valley. And that's why those specific ones, and San Fernando Valley, are in there.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Got it. Okay.

MS. CLARK: But can definitely look at all of this.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. All right. Yeah, so that calculus all there. All right. Can we go to the Long Beach Harbor visualization? Just out of curiosity, I did see some COI testimony indicating that Seal Beach, Los Alamitos, Rossmoor and Cypress were fairly connected together. If you needed to bring up that standard
deviation, would Seal Beach have enough population to bring it up closer to zero?

MS. CLARK: I think it would -- we absolutely can look at that. Can absolutely look at that. Thank you. I think it could fit.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I know that there's been mixed testimony on that. I think it was just to see whether or not that made sense. And then moving to the Gateway Cities -- so if South Whittier, East Whittier, La Mirada, Norwalk, Artesia, and Cerritos were removed, possibly even West Whittier as well, too. And you added -- I don't know -- I know we got mixed testimony on this too, but I was just thinking, if you added Vernon, Maywood and Bell to this visualization, given some of the other changes that you'll be making to the east of L.A. visualization. Would that work?

MS. CLARK: I am not 100-percent sure. I have a hunch; we might be talking about removing more population from these sets of districts than we're talking about adding in. So I'm just -- sort of as an overall -- I'm not 100-percent sure.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Okay.

MS. CLARK: And by removing these areas, could you clarify what you mean?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Putting them together with
the -- with potentially the San Gabriel Valley.

MS. CLARK: Okay. I understand. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Does that -- yeah.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. I understand.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I mean -- so if you needed more population, possibly Commerce and Montebello would make sense with this grouping. They've also indicated some affinities as well, too, so. Okay.

Last comment: This is about the 210 corridor one. It's a little interesting on this one because you have Wrightwood in there. I guess it's all part of the mountain/forest areas, but Wrightwood is a ski area, and then together with some of the more hotter foothill areas, too. I think I'm just asking about this, and then if it makes more sense to -- there's not really a good place, but I --

MS. CLARK: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- was just --

MS. CLARK: Yeah. If I may, my understanding is that there's different testimony about Wrightwood -- if it goes more with that forest area, if it goes with Victor Valley, and this is -- it's not super-densely, high-population area. I think it could potentially go with either. It's just here in this visualization.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.
MS. CLARK: And I think -- yeah. And also something that the Commission could certainly explore during live line drawing and considering other changes that are being proposed.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Excuse me, Chair. Can I directly address that?

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Yes, please.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So I think -- if you look at like Wrightwood -- some of those areas are affected by L.A. County Emergency Services, so that could be a tie-in to those areas that -- who services those communities, where do they draw their services from? Yeah, so -- that's it -- just where are they drawing their services from would best serve those community members?

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And Commissioner Sinay and Akutagawa, if you'd lower your hands?

Commissioner Fernandez and Andersen following.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Very quickly -- you might have already said this -- on page 42, which is the San Fernando Valley one, it is a high Latino, so I'm wondering, is it not a VRA because of crossover voting? Just wanted to confirm whether or not that was the case.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I don't think David Becker
is with us, but if I recall, he had said, no, it wasn't.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: We have Sal with us.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Dale --

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Dale with us.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- is with us.

MR. LARSON: Sorry. I'm just checking our notes.

Hang on one second.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: He has a mask on today, so

kind of looked like Sal.

MR. LARSON: What is the existing Congressional

district there -- number?

MS. CLARK: 29th.

MR. LARSON: Yeah, so our initial analysis here is

that -- there's still an outstanding question as to the

third Gingles pre-condition. So first two are likely

met, but third is likely not met at this point.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Fernandez, you

good? Commissioner Andersen, followed by Commissioner

Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, I'd

like to just echo the sentiments of all the people who

were calling in about the San Fernando Valley. And I

understand we did go into -- if our population shifted

down, with some of the changes, though, I believe, we
will be shifting back again, because if we take Echo Park out of -- what's that -- Glen Burr, then we need more people. And I'm thinking the Bel Air or Beverly Hills -- that area could certainly go with say Hollywood and a few things like that.

I'd like to see us look at that -- to relook at that again, but also the whole idea of Malibu and how we deal with the line between Los Angeles County and Ventura County, I think we also need to look at as we're shifting population since -- remember this is all being driven by getting our VRA districts. So if we need to shift over that way, I think we should please keep that in mind.

Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. Thank you. And this certainly is an area that the Commission has seemed to have a lot of flexibility with in terms of sort of orientation.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MS. CLARK: And I absolutely will keep that in mind.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sadhwani, please?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. I want to go back southward toward the 405 corridor, Central L.A. and Harbor Gateway. I think we're missing some of that key testimony that we've received from black communities of interest in this area, and we're slicing and dicing and cutting them up. Just let me say, we've had some
competing testimony between Harbor Gateway, as well as keeping Compton, Watts, Inglewood, Hawthorne, Gardena, and other areas together.

I think that there's a strong case for that Harbor Gateway that we've heard, but going back to that east of L.A. piece, I think as we are reconsidering that as that initial anchor in Los Angeles, if we were to remove some of these -- some of these neighborhood councils -- Zapata-King, South-Central, Empowerment Congress, et cetera, I think that those could be built in with Inglewood, Lennox, Hawthorne, Lawndale, and even parts of Torrance. I think we've had competing testimony for Torrance. Some have said, keep it whole; some have said, keep portions of it whole; separate it from the coastal parts of Torrance because of a, I believe, a Pacific Islander and AAPI communities that might also be there. And I'm thinking if we can reorient here and just be a little bit more mindful of some of those black COIs testimony that we've received. In particular, I think one of the issues might be Culver City. So we currently have Culver City as a part of this 405 corridor piece. I'm wondering if we started swapping parts of Torrance for Culver City and then pulling into Zapata-King -- is Empowerment Congress in that yellow in the Central L.A., or is that -- I can't really tell which --
MS. CLARK: Yes, yeah. Again, it's one of the areas that we worked with the --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yep.

MS. CLARK: -- VRA Council on.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I'm wondering if like from -- what is this? The 10 Freeway? That's south of the 10 Freeway. If we start pulling from some of those components there. I know West Adams was also a part of some of that COI testimony that we've received. Just to maintain some of the communities of interest testimony that we've received from the African American Community. I'm going to take a look at what those options are, and I'm thinking that a part of it is that swap between Culver City and parts of Torrance in order to maintain some of these other areas. I don't know if that was entirely clear, but I hope so.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Jaime?

MS. CLARK: I understand. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Perfect. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay, and Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm glad Jaime understood. Commission Sadhwani, so are you looking at kind of going east at the top of that Gateway going east?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: At the top of Gateway?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: The blue. You were talking about swapping Culver City, and so I was just trying to figure out, are you still --


COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, I was trying to understand if you were trying to keep Inglewood, Lynwood, Watson -- Watts, sorry, and Compton together, or --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think, let's take a look at what our options are. Right?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So we've heard really strongly from the Gateway folks with the San Pedro ports that they see themselves as connecting northward. I hear that. What that does, though, is cut up some of the black COIs that we've also received. And so I think what I'm trying to play around with here is, like, some of that COI testimony has suggested keeping Gardena there with Hawthorne. And again, here I might need -- if staff can go back and take a closer look at some of that testimony -- would it make sense for Harbor Gateway to -- if we took Gardena out, would it make sense for Harbor Gateway to move further north into that Zapata-King area?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Including parts of Watts as well? Would that be enough population for us? Because
that would also help us keep together Gardena, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Inglewood, and I think even moving down into Torrance, if we swapped Torrance and Culver City. I think -- I don't know -- I don't have all the populations in front of me -- I think if we swapped Culver City and connected that with, like, the Marina del Rey sort of areas -- isn't that what they were asking for when they called in yesterday -- that they wanted to be with westside communities? That would potentially alleviate some of the Beverly Hills, Westwood areas that are currently a part of that coastal district.

MS. CLARK: Could I ask a clarifying -- this actually made me realize -- I do have a clarifying question for you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I probably have some clarifying questions, too, but yes. Go ahead.

MS. CLARK: So then if you're removing these areas from the visualization called Central L.A. --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

MS. CLARK: -- are you sort of looking at like this as one of the potential VRAs?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

MS. CLARK: That's like the population trade there.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Exactly. So if you recall, the first comment I made was about having an anchor on
East L.A., and having it go up into Echo Park, Glassell Park, possibly Capetown, et cetera. So that would be that tradeoff.

MS. CLARK: Okay. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Now -- yes, I still have a comment. Thank you, Chair. So I wanted to go back to the Valley, and I was looking --

MS. CLARK: I'm sorry; which valley, please?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm about to tell you. The Malibu/San Fernando Valley visualization. The original Valley Girls. Page 43. And I know that what I'm about to say contradicts what was told yesterday, but we were approaching it from pink to -- yeah, we were approaching it from the central -- I mean the, yeah, the central coast -- and we did receive testimony, and thinking through the fires that Malibu -- sorry -- that Malibu, Westlake, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, and Topanga, and one of those is not in -- but anyway, they do work closely with fires and they're part of the Council of Government, and I know that yesterday there was a conversation of moving Calabasas out of -- you know. But I just wanted -- just to remind us that we had heard that a few times just that those -- that area works closely together for fires and I was -- so.

MS. CLARK: Can I ask a follow-up question, please?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

MS. CLARK: For that, would you rather have -- would you rather have these areas all with this sort of like Ventura County-based area and potentially -- haven't looked at the numbers exactly, but I have a hunch -- it would maybe split the Piru to Oxnard COI?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No.

MS. CLARK: So leave it here --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

MS. CLARK: -- as opposed to --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

MS. CLARK: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And then my other question was, if we needed -- if we were moving in Westlake and Agoura Hills into the -- what I have is green -- okay, you have it as green, too -- that Bell Canyon could go to the pink. I didn't know if that was a fair trade or not.

MS. CLARK: So as is, Calabasas can go with the Ventura County-based visualization; no problem. And then Bell Canyon we can also move if you wish.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, I couldn't remember why we wanted to move Calabasas the other way, and I guess when I was studying the maps last night I was like, wait, I heard that we moved Calabasas, and I know that there was an explanation, but I just had -- I had circled it
because I kept thinking of the Council on Governments and the fire testimony we got. So maybe someone could remind me why we're moving Calabasas.

    ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay, just to note that Calabasas should be in the west when I think it was Woodland had called in last night, but I --

    COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Did --

    ACTING CHAIR TURNER: -- don't have a reason.

    COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I thought that there -- I also saw COI testimony that asked that Calabasas, Agoura Hills, and Westlake Village, they share similar, I think, Council of Government work together and --

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: The Council of Government includes Malibu, because we got that last week when they were looking at the maps, and so I was just --

    ACTING CHAIR TURNER: As well as keeping Calabasas with unincorporated Calabasas?

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was just trying to figure out -- so I could understand -- okay, if we were moving Calabasas because there's Westlake Village and Agoura Hills, and Calabasas, but then that separates the -- any reason we have Malibu there, I guess is what I'm saying. That the reason Malibu was there was to work with those communities, but those communities are going to be in another Congressional district. So Malibu doesn't make
sense there. And it might just be that I'm putting it out there in case we still need to play around with it.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: And I'm not -- I don't recall what staff we have on -- I lost my sticky telling me for this time of day -- but if staff can pull up testimony specific to Malibu to see if we have anyone that's sent in public comment about Malibu.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We have a lot from Simi Valley saying no to Malibu.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Outside of -- if we can exclude that -- we've got that -- outside of the Simi Valley comments. It will be Jose. Thank you. While we're waiting, did you want to move to something different? Okay, Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I -- just real quick, Jaime, I just realized that I wanted to perhaps ask you to look at one other thing around the Antelope Valley. I forgot to mention this when I spoke last. In the Assembly District, I believe we moved up and included California City, Mohave, and Rosamond in the Assembly. So again, I know that you're going to be relooking at that Bakersfield area. I just wanted to ask the -- what if you were to move up and include that portion similar to what is in the current Assembly District Visualization -- what would be the ripple effects from
there. Instead of going south into the San Fernando Valley, which -- we heard conflicting testimony as to whether or not some people wanted to go south versus going north, and so I wanted to ask about that since we do have an Assembly District that we did look at that visualization, and that might also serve as a basis. So that's what --

MS. CLARK: Yeah, this --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, go ahead.

MS. CLARK: I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Go ahead.

MS. CLARK: Just to clarify, I think that the population ripple would be taking some of Antelope Valley and putting that more in like a Kern County-based area, so then this purple visualization would be underpopulated, and that's why we would have to dip further. So it would be the area to the north, sort of driving that change further south.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Got it. Okay. Thank you. I guess we'll wait to see the next set of visualizations.

MS. CLARK: We'll try not to do that.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: One last thing -- and I know I'm going to --

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Before you move -- Jose, you want to respond?
MR. CHAVEZ: Hi, Chair. Hi, Commissioners. Yes, so there is COI available that would -- that are asking to support visualizations that would keep Santa Monica and Malibu in the same district, as they have long history together, sharing geography and demographic similarities. They also share school districts, as well as industry. The cities of Beverly Hills, Culver City, Malibu, Santa Monica, and West Hollywood, which is also different COIs, combined with the West Los Angeles areas, (indiscernible) overlay would create a Congressional area representing the homes of many that rely and work in the entertainment industry, and community that is large LGBTQ+ community.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Jose.

MR. CHAVEZ: Um-hum.

ACTING CHAIR TURNER: I'm sorry. Go ahead, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I'm going to contradict myself from what I just asked earlier, Jaime, and I don't know if this is going to be more to be directed to John -- on the Long Beach Harbor, I'd actually like to do something different. Instead of adding Seal Beach, I'd like to actually remove Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, and Cypress, and then to see kind of along the lines of the other -- like the L.A. Harbor Gateway
District that flows north. If we were remove from the current visualization the Long Beach Harbor one, remove Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, and Cypress, and then add Paramount, South Gate, Bell Gardens, Bell, Cudahy, and Maywood, depending on how far north you can go to achieve the population that you need. So it would be a longer district kind of adjacent to or just right next to the Harbor Gateway visualization.

As I was listening to what Commissioner Sinay was talking about, perhaps that might be also a way to keep some communities of interest together, too. And then also move communities from Orange County as we've gotten conflicting testimony, move some of those communities back into Orange County, or into an Orange County potential district. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner. Okay, Commissioners. Seeing no other comments, we are about two minutes away from lunch, I think. 15 minutes away? Oh. Cool. Well, then we're going to go ahead and get started with our visualizations for Southern California from John. And John, please take it away.

MR. O'NEILL: Sure. Just give me a moment to share my screen.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa.

MR. O'NEILL: Okay. We're going to start up in San
Bernadino, work our way south through Riverside over to Orange County, and then down into San Diego. There's going to be three jumps in the slide numbers, but other than that, we'll mostly be able to go sequentially.

So we're going to start off on page 70, I believe. So this would be this Beaumont/Victor Valley district here in blue. There was a commissioner request --

THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me.

MR. O'NEILL: Oh, go for it.

THE COURT REPORTER: This is the court reporter. Is this John O'Neill speaking?

MR. O'NEILL: Yeah. Let me turn on my video.

Sorry. Or did you have another request, or is that good?


Thank you.

MR. O'NEILL: All right. Sorry about that, and thanks for catching that. So starting off with this first district with a previous visualization in this area, we had received a commissioner request to keep the Victor Valley whole. We'd also received community of interest testimony about that, and this district does that.

We had also received from out of community of interest testimony from folks in the San Bernadino community not to be breaking this boundary going north or
west, and this district also reflects that request as well.

Moving to the south, this is going to be our first jump. This is on page 56. This is the district titled SECA for Southeastern California. This is similar in the northern -- in the San Bernadino portion to versions of a district like this that you've seen -- a visualization like this that you've seen before here in Coachella Valley.

I'll note that there had been some differing -- we had received a lot of community interest testimony requesting Imperial County be kept with southeastern Coachella Valley, but there was some disagreement about the exact order. This particular configuration does not include Indio and Indio Hills. The version you saw yesterday did include Indio/Indio Hills for the Assembly, and with the Senate, it just includes Indio but not Indio Hills. So that's one where if the commissioners have a preference, that would be good to know.

And this also reflects community of interest testimony requesting that Chula Vista, South San Diego, and Imperial County be kept together. Moving to the next page, which is page 57, is district titled for Pomona, Ontario, and Fontana. It's here in yellow, signifying that this -- a strong yellow signifying that this is one
of those areas of potential VRA considerations.

Continuing to the next page, 58, is a district titled RIASB: Rialto, San Bernadino. One thing I'll just note here is that this configuration does include Highland wholly with San Bernadino, which had been a request, a commissioner request.

Moving to the south and moving to the next page, page 59, there's a visualization here titled Riverside, Moreno Valley, Perris, RIVMORPER. There was a commissioner question, I believe, during the presentations last week about some of the public testimony we've received about keeping Riverside City, Moreno Valley, and Perris whole and together, and so this is one visualization which does do that. And again, this and the preceding district are both shaded in a strong yellow signifying that these are areas where there's potential VRA considerations.

And this is our last jump. Moving to page 69, we're going to be looking at a district which is in green. It's called MORCOA, Morongo Basin/Coachella Valley. And again, that's on page 69. And so one thing I'll just note with this district is that, for population reasons, it does reach farther south and west than some of the other configurations of a district like this that we've seen.
Moving to the preceding page, page 68, we have a district titled Southwest Riverside. And so I'll just note that we've, of course, have received requests from commissioners to not cross this boundary into Orange between Orange and Riverside.

In this particular configuration, it does, but based on the guidance I received yesterday to take a look at including Chino Hills with this Riverside portion, that might actually be a swap that would be able to eliminate that overlap right here in a pretty straightforward way.

Moving to the preceding page, page 67, there's a district for Orange County/South Inland. Commissioner direction on a prior visualization in this area was to remove portions of Santa Ana and include cities to the south, specifically Laguna Woods, Aliso Viejo, Laguna Hills, Ladera Ranch, Coto de Caza, most of which were included in this configuration. And this also satisfies some community of interest testimony that we received asking to keep Irvine and Tustin whole.

Moving again to the preceding page, so page 66. This district in blue is titled OCSBLA. This reflects a commissioner request based on a previous visualization to be splitting Anaheim between Anaheim Valley and Anaheim Hills, including Anaheim Hills with regions like Yorba Linda Placentia.
Moving to the preceding page again, page 65, this district is -- or this visualization is titled SANANAANA, Santa Ana Anaheim. And again, this also reflects some commissioner input that we received based -- I received based on the previous set of visualizations two weeks ago. So commissioners expressed concern about the number of times that Santa Ana had been split. So I reduced that to two in these Congressional-sized visualizations.

Moving again to the preceding page, this district -- page 64. This district is title North OC Coast. There was a commissioner request to modify a prior North OC Coast visualization to extend further south to include communities like Costa Mesa and Newport Beach and to exclude communities which were farther inland and north like Buena Park. And this also satisfies a commissioner request based on a previous set of visualizations to keep Garden Grove whole.

Moving again to the preceding page, this is page 63, South OC/North San Diego. This is a district which is similar to what we saw yesterday in terms of incorporating some of the southern Orange County communities and the northern San Diego communities, but this also incorporates commissioner guidance and request to include more of these San Diego coastal communities, so Carlsbad, Encinitas, Solana Beach, and Delmar.
Moving to the preceding page again. This page 62.

We have a district title for San Marcos, Escondido, Poway. Two things I'll just note here, this is -- we did receive some community of interest testimony requesting that Poway Unified School District be kept whole.

And one other thing which I'll note here is just commissioner, two weeks ago, requested that Miramar be kept whole and kept with the West Side. That's an error in this map. That would be straightforward to include Miramar with the West Side and keep it whole as it is here.

Continuing to the preceding page, this is page 61, titled SDCOAST, and it is this district here in light yellow. This is the district that Miramar base would be added to, and this also reflects commissioner requests to include Fairbanks Ranch and is it Rancho Santa Fe with a coastal district.

And then turning to the final page, this is the visualization here in green --

MS. ANDERSON: Actually, John.

MR. O'NEILL: Oh. Go ahead.

MS. ANDERSON: Quick clarification on --

MR. O'NEILL: Of course.

MS. ANDERSON: Does Imperial Beach, does that actually go to the border?
MR. O'NEILL: Oh yes. Yes. So this actually --
this does extend. This particular configuration does
extend south to include Imperial Beach.

MS. ANDERSON: So we actually have technically two
Congressional districts there at the border, then.

MR. O'NEILL: That would be the case, yes.

MS. ANDERSON: Yeah. Thank you.

MR. O'NEILL: With the final district, this is on
page 60, final visualization here. This is in green
titled SESDELC, Southeast San Diego/El Cajon. And this
similar to another district or another configuration that
you all saw yesterday with the Assembly-sized
visualizations, this incorporates a fair amount of
community of interest submissions that we had received
keeping many of these communities in Paradise Hills or
Southeast San Diego together with some of the cities to
the -- or communities to the northeast. And given that
this is a Congressional district and has a larger
population, it was able to keep together more of those
community of interest submissions.

That was, very quickly, the visualizations that I
had for Congressional districts. One thing I'll just
mention is that some of these districts also incorporated
some of the communities of interest or commissioner
guidance that I had received that were also incorporated
into the Assembly visualizations that I presented yesterday, but I figured I would skip over that since you've all heard all of those, and I didn't want to take up too much of your time.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, John. I appreciate your presentation of visualizations. At this time, we'll hear from commissioners, starting with Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you, Chair. These are questions -- first a couple of questions for John. Looking at the San Bernadino metro area, I would say. Yes, right thereabouts. I was wondering if you could share both the -- what's the deviation for that Colton, Grand Terrace, Rancho, San Bernadino, Highland? What's it currently right now, the deviation?

MR. O'NEILL: This is the RIASB?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

MR. O'NEILL: So Commissioner Fornaciari had requested to show Congressional deviations with the raw numbers.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Oh, I see.

MR. O'NEILL: So that district is 122 people below population.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Got it.

MR. O'NEILL: So I apologize. I should have clarified that. I thought the other mappers had done
that as well.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Got it. Thank you. That's very helpful. And so the district -- or the visualization to the right, the BEAVICVAL, that Big Bear piece.

MR. O'NEILL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: So that's positive, that's overpopulated by 4,500.

MR. O'NEILL: That's right.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Okay. Thank you. And then do you have the CVAP for Latino voters for that BEA district?

MR. O'NEILL: Andrew, could you check that slide? It'd be page 70.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I'm sorry. I don't have my materials in front of me.

MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you. The Latino CVAP is 35.19 percent. The Black CVAP is 8.86 percent. Asian CVAP is 3.74 percent. And indigenous CVAP is 1.18 percent. And white CVAP is 50.56 percent.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Okay.

MR. DRECHSLER: Oh. This is Andrew Drechsler. Turning on my camera. Sorry.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you. So I think my question is if -- or my direction -- and I
understand this will cause ripple effects, but I'd like
to see included in the IRRIASE visualization -- I had
requested this at some point in early iterations, but
there's a portion of Redlands, a big portion of Redlands,
that's known locally as Northside Redlands.

It's literally north side of train tracks that is
very high Latino residents. It's much more working class
and even low income. And my concern is that by including
them with the rest of Redland, they're not actually being
included with communities of interest that maybe they
should be.

You don't have freeways or anything, but it's
really -- it's like where you see it -- there we go.
That big line right there, yes, up through the airport.
So I'm hoping that that won't add too much -- too much
additional population that it won't cause too much ripple
effect. But this feels, at least for me, especially for
a Congressional district, pretty important to try to keep
that community -- that little community with folks who
maybe share more experiences with them.

MR. DRECHSLER: I'd have to check it, but I think
you're right. I don't think there's a lot of population
there, and I think that would be straightforward to add
in.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you.
CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez. Let's see. How are we doing on lunch time?

MR. MANOFF: It is lunch time, Chair.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you so much. Okay. So we will pick up with Ms. Akutagawa. Are you finished Commissioner Vazquez? With Commissioner Akutagawa, Commissioner Yee, Commissioner Toledo when we return. We will be back at 1:30.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 12:45 p.m. until 1:34 p.m.)

CHAIR TURNER: Good afternoon and welcome back. I hope you all enjoyed a wonderful lunch. When we went to lunch, we were just at the point of receiving commissioner response to the Southern California visualizations that were rendered by John, our mapper, and we do have hands up, but to set the expectation for the balance of the day for our public, I just wanted to say that once we complete the visualization comments for Southern California, we will, Commissioners, the -- what do you call them?

We will need to review and approve the posted directions that's been given over the last several days. So we'll do that. And with that, I want to announce that we will go into a time of -- we'll hear general feedback from the mappers in regards to the Senate visualizations,
and it will be generalized feedback because, of course, we know what has been prepared reflects previous sentiment.

So we'll get general feedback, have some generalized comments about what we're hoping to see with Senate, and then we do -- review and approve our posted directions to the line drawers for October 23rd, 27th, 28th, and if available, for the 29th. And at that time, we will open it up for public comment for our agenda items two and three.

And so with that, we do have hands raised. It's going to be Commissioner Akutagawa followed by Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. All right. Thank you. I'd like to ask about -- I guess I'll start with the Santa Ana and Anaheim visualization. And I'm going to ask a similar question that I asked about the Assembly district one. I know that we've gotten several COI input testimonies about the Little Arabia district in Anaheim, and I believe the COI testimony also saw that that portion also extended a little bit into Stanton as well, too. Is it possible to see that? Yeah. Thank you.

Okay. So the majority of it is in Anaheim, then.

MR. O'NEILL: Yes, that's right.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MR. O'NEILL: This very portion in Buena Park and a bit of northeastern Stanton.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I know that we also received some COI input testimony about -- and it's hard to see from these maps, but is Santa Ana whole in this visualization here?

MR. O'NEILL: Yes. In this visualization, Santa Ana is whole.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I think I'd like to ask -- I know we received several COI testimony about the Vietnamese community and other Asian --

MR. O'NEILL: Yep. I just --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- communities.

MR. O'NEILL: -- pulled it up.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MR. O'NEILL: One from a Vietnamese-American submission --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MR. O'NEILL: -- that does split Santa Ana.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And I'm looking at the standard deviation. I was going to ask if could perhaps -- and maybe this is also -- I think if I recall correctly, I don't think that this -- what is the Westminster, Garden Grove, Midway City, Fountain Valley.
area concerned a VRA district? Because I was going to
ask if we could pull in that western portion of Santa Ana
that was identified by several COI inputs as a -- more of
an Asian area, if we could also pull them in. And
then --

MR. O'NEILL: So the Santa Ana/Aнаheim district is
currently underpopulated, and the northern Orange County
Coast district is currently overpopulated.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I see.

MR. O'NEILL: So it initially contained a portion
here of Garden Grove. You'll notice that the population
figures here are very similar in opposite directions. So
I just un-split Garden Grove, which is moving 35,000
people -- was in that area that was originally split, but
add those districts, it's much closer to balanced.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MR. DRECHSLER: And to answer your question, neither
of these districts are VRA considerations.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: They are not?

MR. O'NEILL: Oh, yes. Thank you, Andrew.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Because on the
last -- one of the last visualizations I requested, I
also requested pulling back into Orange County Rossmoor,
Los Alamitos, and Cypress with the intent of moving out
Westminster, Stanton, Garden Grove, Midway City, Fountain
Valley. I don't know if -- would those cities plus those portions of Anaheim and Santa Ana, whether or not that would enable a Congressional district?

I know we also got COI testimony about Latino districts in portions of Buena Park and South Fullerton as well, too, and portions of Placentia to pick up more of the population numbers. I think right now I'm just asking.

MR. O'NEILL: Commissioner Akutagawa, I apologize. Do you mind defining exactly where you were saying this would be, what would be comprised potentially in that?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: In the north Orange -- NOCCOAST, I guess --

MR. O'NEILL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- pulling in Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, and --

MR. O'NEILL: Cypress.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- Cypress.

MR. O'NEILL: So that'd be about --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Unless it's --

MR. O'NEILL: -- 60, 70,000 --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- better --

MR. O'NEILL: -- here.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Unless it's better -- actually, it might be actually better -- I'm sorry. Now
that I'm looking at it, it might be better to go the
opposite way, maybe to pull in Rossmoor, Los Alamitos,
Cypress together with La Palma and Buena Park. I don't
know if it makes it more complicated.
I know that Los Alamitos, Rossmoor, and Seal Beach
all -- we received testimony that all three of them want
to be together. And Cypress is kind of in the middle.
It could be there; it could not be there.

John, do you need more?

MR. O'NEILL: Sorry. So is the question about
adding those communities potentially to this North OC
Coast and potentially also adding this portion of Santa
Ana?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. The small portion
that --

MR. O'NEILL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- has --

MR. O'NEILL: What would you be thinking of losing
from that community -- from this visualization, then,
because that would add quite a bit of population.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was actually thinking
them going further down the coast and creating more of a
coastal district, still. And then I know that we also --
there was testimony about Costa Mesa, Irvine, and Tustin
being closer together.
Because I'm also looking for ways to pull in more of the south Orange County cities back into Orange County instead of with San Diego, and then also separating that Inland, Orange County, Rancho Santa Margarita, Trabuco, Williams, Canyon, Silverado similar to what the discussion we had around the Assembly districts, pulling them back into Orange County, or at least separating them from Riverside because of the testimony.

And we've gotten a lot of new testimony, too, about the Cleveland National Forest being a dividing area in which they don't -- neither side, both the Riverside testimonies and the Orange County testimonies both said that they don't belong together. And so, looking for ways to restructure that part.

MR. O'NEILL: So with these communities here specifically, which are included with the Riverside --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MR. O'NEILL: -- visualization --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: John --

MR. O'NEILL: -- I do think --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- is your mic at your mouth?

MR. O'NEILL: I can get closer.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MR. O'NEILL: These communities here in Orange
County with this Cleveland National Forest, more rural area, those potentially could be added into this Orange County/Inland district or some other Orange County district if Chino Hills were added to this Riverside-based district and some population were shifted.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MR. O'NEILL: That's one way --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Perhaps we could --

MR. O'NEILL: -- to address that.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- remove Chino Hills from that, and maybe if you were to include Yorba Linda with that -- I'm also conscious that I think Santa Ana and Anaheim, I want to -- I know that the Latinos CVAP as it stands right now is at about 48 percent, which I think is potentially comfortable as a VRA district.

And I think this was also -- you said that that was not identified as a VRA district, I think.

MR. DRECHSLER: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MR. DRECHSLER: Yep.

MR. O'NEILL: One other thing that you had been asking about, Commissioner Akutagawa, was here with this district which spans southern Orange County and northern Orange -- sorry -- southern Orange County and northern San Diego County. Again, this is similar to what we saw
with the Assembly visualizations.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Uh-huh.

MR. O'NEILL: The primary constraint that's pushing this San Diego to having a district that reaches up into southern Orange County is that we have here a visualization of a district here on the eastern side which incorporates a number of the tribal areas. And so that means that once we've included three total population San Diego potential Congressional visualization -- Congressional-sized visualizations here, we wind up with not quite enough to get to a full Congressional district with this remainder. And then based on the previous guidance I'd received from the commission, I wasn't reaching up into Riverside here toward Temecula and some of these other communities, so that means that because there's this constraint here to the east, the only place to reach is into southern Orange County, so that's something which could certainly be adjusted if the Commission wanted me to take a different approach to either which tribal areas were included or including this whole tribal area in a separate district, than the Imperial County district.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay, then --

MR. O'NEILL: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Given that
constraint, then one of the other requests that I was going to make of you --

CHAIR TURNER: Is it in the same area, Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, it would --

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- it would impact south Orange County and that northern San Diego, perhaps, like yesterday, removing Rainbow and Fallbrook and Bonsall from that visualization. I think it might have been Commissioner Sinay that said yesterday maybe finding a way where maybe it's a little bit more balanced and the split is shared. In this case, I am also thinking that -- I think one of the concerns is that the south Orange County communities don't want to be, I think, consumed by a northern San Diego-driven district. Sorry to say that, but I think I'm just trying to see if --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: All of it -- all the people representing that have always been from Orange County.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, so I'm just trying to see if we could find a balance, perhaps, on that.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa, there are other hands that want to comment on what you're saying --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: -- and they have their hands up, so I
wANT TO MAKE SURE YOU --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Was it -- Commissioner Yee, are you on this same topic? Okay. Then I just want to check down, Commissioner Toledo, on this topic, on this same area discussion?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: In the area that she was just talking about.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Yes.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: If that's appropriate.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So in general, just for all of the maps, just some general guidance, even for this one, just to try to keep the, especially for the VRA areas, (indiscernible) some around where they are not to go any lower because I know we're giving a lot of comments and feedback, but to try to keep them where they're at if not a little bit higher when possible, not lower. And for the Santa Ana opportunity district that's identified here, potentially adding the City of Stanton would be a good move since it does have the area of interest that's Asian opportunity but also wouldn't change the demographics too much. And it does look like we're missing 35,000 people, so we do have to add additional areas around it, so potentially some of Fullerton and
some of the Tustin area. If that's the case and we put
those in, we may need to take some of the Orange areas
out, but that gives us some opportunities, so that's just
general guidance. Thank you very much, Chair.

CHAIR TURNER: Um-hum. And Commissioner Sinay, on
that area?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes, thank you. I really like
that district the way it is, and I like the idea of
Stanton, and for the same reasons that Commissioner
Toledo said, I think it is an opportunity district, and
we should keep opportunity districts and see when we can
grow them into VRA districts. Also, as I mentioned
earlier, Santa Ana, Orange, and Anaheim are three of the
lowest income cities in Orange County where there is a
lot of investment taking place, and they're working
collaboratively to bring up the low income communities
and living wages. They're doing a lot of different --
not necessarily living wage, but those three being in the
same district whole would actually allow them to continue
that work. So I would rather not see Santa Ana split.

CHAIR TURNER: Before we go back to the top,
Commissioner Akutagawa, did you have more on that?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm comfortable with that.
I'm also even thinking if it would be odd to -- here's
another solution. I do agree that, perhaps, then pulling
Stanton in with Anaheim and Santa Ana and Orange and Villa Park would work better, less complicated.

I just want to ask the line drawers then if, let's say, for example, Garden Grove, Westminster, maybe Fountain Valley if you connected it through Cypress to Buena Park and Fullerton sharing some similar demographics and then connected Yorba Linda and, perhaps, Placentia with that, that inland, and removing Chino Hills to Riverside. Would that be an option? That would still honor, I think, the different communities of interest in that area.

MR. O'NEILL: That might be (indiscernible). I'd have to take a look at it, though. I couldn't say off hand because there's a couple of changes there.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Are we ready to move on to a different area? Okay, I'd like to take a look at southeastern San Bernardino County. That bit that comes up from Riverside County. And I think we covered this a little bit in the Assembly plan, but I'm wondering why not continue with these Riverside border all the way to Arizona. There's a little bit of population in Needles, I know, but as it is a visualization follows Highway 62, it looks like to the border rather than the county border
itself, and then it comes up to Needles. So yeah, just wondering why we're doing that. If we shifted it to the county border itself, we would lose a little bit of population going the wrong way, but we would respect the border. So just wondering what the thought was there?

MR. O'NEILL: If I could just ask, which was the district you were wondering about?

COMMISSIONER YEE: So looking at the right side there, the part that comes up, yeah.

MR. O'NEILL: This portion right here?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So this is a request from Commissioner Kennedy. So it reaches up to Needles, and it also includes a portion of an Indian reservation here, but I believe he was saying that this encompassed, was it the Colorado River watershed potentially? I would defer to him, though, on exactly what it was that was being captured, though.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. That's fine. Thanks.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. So the line drawer had asked us two questions to help us think through -- to give us, if we wanted more flexibility, we had to answer one of two questions or ignore them both. So the two questions were do we want to still continue to keep the
tribal lands all together with the VRA district because in this area Orange County and San Diego and Imperial, there is one -- there's that bottom corner, it's a whole VRA district. So that is one question.

And then the second question that was asked was are we willing -- do we still want to say don't cross into Riverside? I would say I'm okay crossing into Riverside, and the reason being that we actually have gotten mixed testimony. Some people see that if we cross into Riverside, then I would make sure that we keep Rainbow, Pala, Bonsall, all unincorporated areas with Escondido, that whole 15 corridor. The justification would be you're keeping that whole 15 corridor together because that's the communities of interest that we've heard. I don't know if we need to go -- so I'm going to answer that one.

On the tribal lands, I think when it comes to tribal lands, I would say the Congressional district might be the most important district to have them all together versus State Senate or State Assembly, but I would be curious to hear what my colleagues say because I think when the line drawers say here's two questions, we probably should start by answering those two questions so that the line drawer -- so we all know if we have the flexibility or not. So I'm going to put the two -- I
want to make sure that before we go on to another part of
the map, we answer the two questions so we know how we
can play with the map.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. You know
the issue with going over that Riverside County line and
taking in Temecula is Temecula really is the anchor city
for that entire region of Riverside County. So if you
take Temecula, you can't just take Temecula because what
you do if you take just Temecula is you have shattered
that entire corridor. If, as Commissioner Sinay says,
you want to have a 15 corridor district and you want to
balance the population between the Riverside County
element of it and the San Diego County element of it,
then that might be something to be discussed, but you
can't just take Temecula and certainly not just a piece
of Temecula. If we put the terrain level on, you'd see
Temecula and Murrieta, French Valley, Lake Elsinore, all
of that is kind of flatlands along the 15, and then
between Temecula and Rainbow, you go up this huge hill,
so it's a very different world crossing that county line.

And as to Commissioner Yee's earlier inquiry
regarding the county line versus Highway 62, I think
where there's a small divergence I don't see that
sticking with the highway rather than the county line
would necessarily make sense. I mean if we're supposed
to try to keep counties whole, then I'd be perfectly fine
taking that small sliver of yellow between Highway 62 and
the county line and shifting it to the blue district, but
yes, the idea east of there was to have kind of the
Colorado River Valley in a single district all the way
from the Nevada line and making sure to include that
entire reservation up there at the very top all the way
down to the Mexican border.

I will repeat the comment from yesterday to John.
Please check for disadvantaged unincorporated communities
in the sphere of influence of the City of Needles and
make sure that those are included with Needles. When
we're slicing very close to cities that don't have
adjacent incorporated cities, I think we always need to
be looking for those unincorporated communities that are
formally part of the city's sphere of influence. So just
to be careful of that.

On the broader question of reservations, obviously
the number one priority is not to split any single
reservation. If we need to discuss putting a dividing
line between two reservations, we can certainly look at
that. I would prefer not to do that, but recognize that
it may be necessary in some places, as between the
Morongo Band and the Agua Caliente. As long as the
Morongo reservation is entire on one side of the line and the Agua Caliente lands are entire, complete, on the other side of the line, then so be it. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: John?

MR. O'NEILL: Commissioner Kennedy, could you, in terms of just clarification. I may have misheard. The little yellow -- the part of San Bernardino County that you want -- was it the little sliver at the bottom that you wanted with --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah.

MR. O'NEILL: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: And again, just to make sure that the disadvantaged unincorporated communities that are part of Needles sphere of influence are included with Needles, and don't cut exactly at Needles city limits because there are areas that are formally part of its sphere of influence --

MR. O'NEILL: Yes. Understood.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- that would need to be with it.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yeah, on the SCCA, I really would like to keep all the tribal lands in there, and I also like the Colorado River basin in that area because this is a Congressional district, and those
certainly have Congressional impacts. That's where they
need the representative. That's at the right level. So
I would really like to keep that.

Then also, what Commissioner Kennedy said about
let's keep the area adjacent to the direct city limits of
Needles together, I would like that to be a general
direction to all the line drawers for rural cities.
Don't cut the line right at that city border,
particularly in a rural city because there's a lot of
population that are around little rural cities that are
basically part of the rural city, but they aren't
officially in city limits. We tend to, when it's more
developed areas, once city line goes directly into the
next city line, so there isn't that that sort of
unincorporated area, but I would like us, particularly
for small cities and rural areas, to really look at where
we're drawing those boundaries, particularly when we're
getting population. Let's not lose a community around
that.

And then in terms of going into Riverside, I agree
with Commissioner Kennedy, you can't just take Temecula.
It is that whole area. And I was wondering if we don't
want San Clemente as part of the area in -- to dominate
the San Diego section of that. Can we go up -- well, I
guess there's no population essentially, unless we do
take those cities all the way up in Temecula, 15, so I
don't quite have an answer for us on that one, so.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry about that.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, just two things. So I
just wanted to hear what the trade offs are of keeping
the Native American communities, the tribal communities
as a whole and/or any of the direction that we're
currently giving up, is there, I mean certainly
flexibility, but I'm just also wondering about CVAP if we
want, because it is a VRA area, making sure that the CVAP
remains at a level that currently is and we're not
diluting it anymore.

MR. O'NEILL: With these areas specifically that
were included in the community of interest map that we
received identifying tribal area in eastern San Diego and
Riverside, these are very low population areas, so adding
or removing a portion or even a good sizable chunk of
this, these areas wouldn't have a significant effect, I
don't think, on whatever that potential VRA district
might be. So this is a low-population area.

One other thing, just to your question about trade-
offs, in the event that this portion, for example, were
not included in this district, SCCA, and were included
with some other district, this is a low-population area. This area, as well, up here in Riverside, this is low population. I think Sage is about 3,000 maybe. Hemet, San Jacinto up here, those do have a bit more population, but it's maybe 20, 30, 50,000, that sort of a thing as opposed to Temecula, 100,000 or so, and then some of these other communities. So this is much more densely populated. So if commissioners did want me to redraw the district here that reaches up into Riverside, if it were incorporating Temecula, it would probably incorporate Temecula and maybe one more city. If it were reaching farther to the east, it would need to reach up much more to incorporate more population here, as well.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Follow-up to that, would --

MR. O'NEILL: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- you be able to keep the CVAPs around the same levels, or --

MR. O'NEILL: So that would not have significant effect on this SCCA district or the CVAP levels because this population is not heavily populated.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay, and then Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. I wanted to start with San Bernardino and Riverside because just like
with Los Angeles, there are significant VRA areas, and I want to make sure that we have them right, and we're taking -- that we are doing what we need to do in those areas before we move out to Orange County and San Diego. And they felt good to me, but I just wanted us all just to take that moment to really think through, do we have the right kind of VRA anchors here, or is there any -- I know we moved some things around, but I just wanted to slow down and just take a look at that.

MR. O'NEILL: So just so I'm clear, the question on the table is are the current visualizations accurately reflecting the proper VRA solution for that area?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: It's kind of an open question, not just for legal counsel, but for my colleagues, as well, is are we -- yes, we can check the box, but it's more than can we check the box. Have we taken, I don't want to say full advantage, but are we looking at our obligations and really taking them to the full extent. If -- I'm trying to channel Commissioner Sadhwani, and I'm not doing a very good job, so whatever Commissioner Sadhwani said about Los Angeles, I want to make sure that we -- and Central Valley, that we also do it in San Bernardino and Riverside because this is one of our critical growing areas in California.

MR. LARSON: To that point, I would simply say that
these visualizations represent one potential way to handle some of the VRA considerations in this area. And I would repeat what we've told the commissioners before, that you do have some control over how to resolve a VRA consideration, and to the extent commissioners want to suggest alternatives here, we would be more than happy to go back and look at the numbers and try different ways of doing it.

MR. O'NEILL: Could I make one just very quick comment about one of these districts?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes, if you speak into the mic.

MR. O'NEILL: All right. All right. Here we go. So one thing that we heard earlier today, I believe from Commissioner Vazquez, was about potentially incorporating some of this portion of northern Redlands into this potential VRA district here. Something that we've heard in community of interest testimony and something that I believe Commissioner Kennedy has also brought up in previous meetings was about whether Grand Terrace here could potentially be included with Redlands or some of these areas to the east. If I make that adjustment here with northern Redlands, that would add some population to this district. I think this is Loma Linda, which is maybe about 25,000 people. It might be possible to move Loma Linda into the district to the east and move Grand
Terrace into the district to the east if we then pick up that population from northern Redlands. I just wanted to note that that's one -- a couple of requests from commissioners might actually come together to make them all happy and the communities, as well.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, John. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: John, would you be able to show us some of the COI testimony blocks in these areas that might help to better understand various options, I guess?

MR. O'NEILL: So with the southern district here, with Riverside, we did receive some submissions requesting Perris, Moreno Valley, and Riverside to be kept together. I'll just note it's these three cities, and those are kept together. With these communities here in San Bernardino, let me just check right now to see what I have for communities I've just currently pulled in.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think in particular we heard from some of the black communities that have been growing out here that they noted their community of interest.

CHAIR TURNER: And as a reminder to the commissioners, as well, that we have a notification from
Marcy earlier that reminds us that one of the documents that we asked for that places the COI testimony with the visualization is available for us to look at, and it's just a matter of can we get to it quick enough, but we will be able to look at that. A new column has been added.

MR. O'NEILL: So just to show a few examples of communities of interest, the first one will be a little tricky to see because it's in yellow, but you can see here this is the portion that excluded from these communities, so this Alta Loma and Rancho Cucamonga, as well as northern Upland, and so this community had requested to be -- or sorry, an individual from this community had requested to keep their community with some of the more rural areas to the north, as well as they asked to be with some areas to the east, but that wasn't entirely possible. A similar submission, a different definition of what this community is, but those are some areas that were excluded.

And then looking at this Pomona, Ontario, Fontana visualization, here was a community of interest submission we received entitled Pomona Valley. Differences between the submission and the district, of course, would be that the visualization, of course, would be that Fontana is split in the visualization, and a
portion of Upland is included in the visualization, which
is not the case with the community of interest
submission.

And there were one or two others here that I wanted
to show. One that we received quite a few submissions
about was keeping Rialto and Fontana together. That was
something that I found challenging while also meeting the
guidance I'd received from the VRA attorneys.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I just wanted to
endorse the strategic thinking about including the north
side of Redlands in with this San Bernardino VRA district
in that particularly Loma Linda may be better suited
community of interest wise with Redlands, Mentone,
Yucaipa, Oak Glen, et cetera.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Yeah,
further to that, I just wanted to remind us that the main
issue with Grand Terrace, or the main challenge with
Grand Terrace is its surrounded on three sides, all of
it's San Bernardino County's side is Colton, so the only
way to remove Grand Terrace from that without messing
with Colton is to come through that very northern strip
of Riverside County, yeah, through Highgrove, so we all
need to keep that in mind. So I'm all for linking Grand
Terrace with Loma Linda and most of Redlands, but we have to understand that that means we're going to be coming through that northern strip of Riverside County. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: That's good stuff. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was going to share some comments we got on this visualization from the public, but when I'm looking at it, well, what it says is keep San Bernardino City, Colton, Grand Terrace, and part of Rialto together, and we do have that right now. But it was kind of a concern for making sure that you're keeping communities of color together and with a voice, but I see that that has happened.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. I see no hands.

John, do you need anything else from us?

FEMALE SPEAKER: There's a hand back here.

CHAIR TURNER: I don't see any. Okay, Commissioner -- there are hands now. Magic words, say no hands. Tada, we have hands. Commissioner Akutagawa?

And then Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I just have a question. I know that we talked about this earlier, but the -- I mean, you have like Big Bear, Running Springs, I mean these are the mountainous areas of San Bernardino,
and I think it was said that there was mixed testimony
about Wrightwood, and then I also saw testimony about
keeping Wrightwood together with Phelan, and I think
it's --

MR. O'NEILL: Pinon Hills, I think.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No, yeah. Pinon Hills,
yeah. I'm wondering if it might make more sense to pull
Wrightwood in so that then at least all of the more
mountainous winter sport areas might be together. I
mean, it's an interesting mix because you have
Victorville and Apple Valley, which are the desert areas
together with the more mountain areas, but at least if
they're all together, maybe --

MR. O'NEILL: There's 4,000 people in Wrightwood.

It would be very straightforward.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MR. O'NEILL: And consistent, as you noted, with
some of the community of interest testimony that we
received.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, one last thing. I
guess just going back to what you were asking about in
terms of the tribal lands. I do agree. I mean, I think
it's important that we keep them whole as much as
possible and not split reservation land, and I appreciate
what Commissioner Kennedy said that if you had to split
two different tribal lands together, at least -- that's not great, but it's better than splitting a reservation itself. I do want to just ask, though, in terms of my request to separate out the Orange County inland, Orange County canyon area from Riverside, that particular area is going to need to pick up additional population. I just want to -- I think I just want to just circle back on that --

MR. O'NEILL: You're --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- and just understand what you understand.

MR. O'NEILL: Sure. You're referring to this area right here?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MR. O'NEILL: Okay. So that wouldn't have any sort of effects here to the south, as I would see it. What I would expect I would do is add Chino Hills, for example, right here --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MR. O'NEILL: -- to this district, potentially some other population from this more northern district. But quite frankly, Chino Hills is probably about equivalent to these areas. This district -- this visualization or some other visualization in this area would then need to reach down probably a little bit farther south to pick up
some population. So right now, I think it's just the
eastern portion of Orange that's -- trying to zoom in --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So then --

MR. O'NEILL: -- so you can see the light post.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- are you saying then that
you would reach down into perhaps Yorba Linda and Anaheim
Hills?

MR. O'NEILL: This Yorba Lina/Anaheim Hills
visualization would probably reach down to pick up this
population of Eastern Orange. And then this OC Southern
Inland, would extend over to pick up this whole area.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MR. O'NEILL: So that would be the circle.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you.

MR. O'NEILL: Yep.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to check if we
were ready to go to San Diego kind of southern Orange
and --

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. So again, I'd like to
start at the very bottom, since that's our anchor
community or VRA community. And is there a
possibility -- it is kind of surprising with the large
Latino and Asian community and -- in San Diego that we
only have one VRA and not necessarily been an opportunity Congressional districts. So is there a possibility of -- I don't know how strong the CVAP needs to be for -- well, my thought here is can we take -- let me see. I -- kind of connect Imperial Beach, San Ysidro with National City and Bonito? Is it Bonito or -- Bonita. Connect them all together kind of in the existing -- you know, in the existing green. And I'll tell you what I was thinking of taking out. But would that change the CVAP too much for the VRA community if we took --

MR. O'NEILL: I'd certainly be eager to hear if the VRA attorney had any comments on that. Well, we can take a look at it and run the numbers there and see how it looks.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

MR. BECKER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So let me just finish my idea on this one so that you have everything.

MR. O'NEILL: Sure. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So the idea here would be, you know, Imperial Beach, National City, San Ysidro. Bonita would move into the green as well. Jamul would move into the green. Sorry. I'm not doing it based on name but colors. And then El Cajon, you know, again, we may split El Cajon, the canyon, from the hills, and the hills would
move in with the blue.

MR. O'NEILL: Commissioner Sinay, could I ask a quick qualifying question -- clarifying question on that? Previously I took a look just to check where that division might be, and it seemed as though this road seemed to fairly accurately describe the -- is that correct?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: It seems right.

MR. O'NEILL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I mean, I'm --

MR. O'NEILL: Perfect.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- I would have to do some research, but I think that seems about right.

MR. O'NEILL: Look at satellite image, that seemed to be where the division was?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And then I think we've talked about this before. If we need -- you know, we're -- if we need to move things still, we've got that line between the yellow and the green that's a little flexible on that -- on the other side, the light yellow.

MR. O'NEILL: Right.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So those were kind of where I was on my thinking on that one.

MR. O'NEILL: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And the idea, again, matching
what Commissioner Toledo said, we want to keep the VRA, but I'm just trying to see if there is an opportunity create another opportunity district.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay. Do you have more?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I do, but I was trying to step back in case others had something.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Right now it's just you. Go for it.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, okay. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And then if we could go up to the north now? So here I still think that Rainbow, Bonsall, Fallbrook do better being with Escondido and Vista and all the unincorporated areas in that area. You know, the idea of kind of a representative representing Encinitas and representing Rainbow is kind of -- would be very different. One is very rural and one is very high affluent coastal. So if it's possible to move those into -- with Escondido, that would be great. And then if we need to move -- if there is as possibility, you know, I agree with Commissioner Akutagawa.

And I misspoke. There has been representative on the State Assembly side, but on Congressional -- and Congressional as well, where it flip flops between San
Diego and Orange County in this area. Keeping it equal numbers kind of on the coast with Camp Pendleton in the middle, would -- is always -- is best. If we do figure out how to move more south, then I would just continue to go -- instead of moving straight south, I would go from Del Mar, go inland on the 56th, kind of that little triangle that's sticking up there. I would take parts of that.

And then the other comment we got, I'm not sure -- it was the San Diego Country Estate if that can be with -- with Ramona. That fits. And we got one today that just asked, you know, Jamul is the rural area, but Jamul feels like it's more associated with El Cajon in that area or Spring Valley. So there is an opportunity, if we have the space, to -- to move. I know that one won't change the CVAP, I don't believe.

MR. O'NEILL: Yeah, these are all low population areas?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

MR. O'NEILL: It's still possible.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I thank you for letting me chat, everybody.

CHAIR TURNER: Well, we appreciate you chatting.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Can -- I want to ask
Commissioner Sinay a question. In terms of that south OC North San Diego, you said something about a triangle. Are you talking about moving Del Mar into the SD Coast visualization? Is that what you're saying?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I believe they're already in there. Del Mar's already in there. But if the San -- if the Orange County parts keeps -- if we need to go further south, because Orange County is going further south, then we can go inland.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I think Del Mar is part of the South Orange County North San Diego -- are you trying to say --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. I'm sorry. No, that was -- my -- the conversation I was having -- thank you, sorry -- was to expand north -- if we need to go further south from the north, then don't go south, but go inland at that point.

MR. O'NEILL: One --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: But Del Mar can go either way.

MR. O'NEILL: One clarifying question I would just have is in this visualization, Vista is split between these two just visualizations --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes, thank you for reminding me.

MR. O'NEILL: -- we've -- have gotten different
testimony on where Vista ought to go. But if you have a
preference about keeping it more with one or the other.
Could you --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: You know, that's a great
question. I would almost -- I think we -- if we asked
everybody in Vista, we'd probably get a 50/50 response.
They're very connected to Oceanside and then parts are
very connected to Carlsbad and San Marcos. I tend to
want to say connect them with Oceanside, just to give --
Oceanside's kind of different from Carlsbad and
Encinitas, and so that would allow -- that would kind of
balance the district a little bit. So that would -- it's
just my guess, but I'm sure we'll get some calls.

MR. O'NEILL: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I guess -- yeah. And
that's why I wanted to ask the question. So I'd like to
suggest to your point, Commissioner Sinay, I was going to
ask if we can move -- originally, I was going to ask if
we can move Encinitas down going south to the San Diego
coast visualization, because the South OC North San Diego
has more to give, in terms of its overpopulation, and the
San Diego coast has a little bit less population. But I
do hear what you're saying.

Carlsbad, to me, is kind of like that middle ground,
where it's kind of Camp Pendleton, but not Camp
Pendleton, and it's more San Diego, but it's not really San Diego. It's very north county.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So what I would say is if you're going to -- well, Del Mar, Solana Beach, Ranchero, Santa Fe, Encinitas, and Carlsbad are all one school district, and there is a lot of moving between all of them, especially along the coast; Del Mar, Solana Beach, Encinitas, and South Carlsbad. So South Carlsbad is different than North Carlsbad. If you were going to add anything, I would start with Del Mar. I mean the closer you are to the City of San Diego, the more connection you have with the city of San Diego. If you were to put Solana Beach or Encinitas with the city of San Diego, they would say we would move -- we moved, appear to be, away from the city if Encinitas. I mean from the city of San Diego.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Kind of like what we see in Orange County.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. So Del Mar is kind of the -- right next to Del Mar is still the city of San Diego, but -- so I would start from the southern tip going up, if I'm answering your question.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So -- all right. John, is that enough? I was -- because I was going to suggest -- and if you took Carlsbad to Del Mar, then you
could add all of Vista to Oceanside, and I think the population numbers wouldn't be -- it would still kind of be close to balancing out. So John, are we good enough for you to move forward?

MR. O'NEILL: Yep. I feel good.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Chair, one last -- the last one. This is about the Brea area. Again, I just want to note, again, we continue to get testimony about the inclusion of Hacienda Heights with Rowland Heights, and I don't see them included in this particular visualization. Sorry. I'm just trying to get to that page. So I wanted to just note if we could look at that. I know that we also talked about restructuring some of those visualizations in the San Gabriel Valley, but I know that people were very clear that Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, and Diamond Bar are all interconnected together and that they wanted to stay together.

And with that said, if it helps La Habra Heights, which is that little pink corner there down, yeah, between Hacienda Heights and Rowland Heights, I don't know if it helps to include them or if it's -- I think they're also one of those that can kind of go either way. But I just want to just note that we received quite a bit of testimony around Hacienda Heights being together with
Rowland Heights and Diamond Bar. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Very helpful. Thank you. Thank you for that. So where we are currently -- thank you, John. Where we are currently, is we're going to move now for a general overview of the Senate. And I keep stretching -- or stressing general overview. The line drawers at this point, they've heard a lot of -- not me. Not me. The line drawers or mappers have heard a lot of feedback from us, some of which has shifted, based on what we've previously said, therefore, is not in alignment with the current visualizations, even for our Senate. And for sure, our mappers will need to go back and work together. John will not be able to do his work outside of Jamie, outside of Jamie working with Kennedy, outside of Kennedy working with Tamina. They're going to try and put together what we've said for our One California to make it match together like the perfect puzzle that it will be.

So at this time, for the Senate Area Commissioners, the mappers are going to give us general overview of what they've heard. We will not be able to see it. They're going to tell us what they're going to be attempting for the Senate in each of the areas. And if there's something drastically different that we want a name for them, we can do that so that they can start this process
of changing the visualization so that we'll have
something viable and something that's solid -- a little
more solid for next week.

And so we can start -- we'll start with Tamina. I
see black pants. We'll start with Tamina and work our
way down. So commissioners, we're listening and taking
notes at this point. Thank you.

MS. ALON: Good afternoon, commissioners. For the
court reporter, I am Tamina Alon, not Karin Mac Donald,
but I'm now putting up my screen, so I appear on Zoom as
Karin right now. I'm going to review the -- a couple of
themes that I'll be looking at for the Senate -- for the
north -- for the coastal areas, that you have given me
direction in your feedback during Congress and Assembly.

So I'm going to be looking at keeping the Humboldt,
Karaoke, and Siskiyou Karaoke tribal lands together and
using the Humboldt square instead of taking half of
Siskiyou County. I'm going to be looking at keeping the
north coast together from Del North south through Sonoma
and/or Marin, but not including Lake, keeping Lake
together with Napa and the wine and agricultural areas,
reducing the Santa Rosa split, keeping Yolo with East
Solano and the delta areas.

For the East Bay, I will be looking at keeping
Oakland whole, looking at the Sacramento Delta area and
the Tri-Valley up to San Ramon. I will be -- not -- I
will be looking at not crossing the Oakland Hills. I
will be looking at keeping San Mateo with -- San Mateo
cities within San Mateo County, instead of going down the
coastline, Santa Cruz with the city of Los Gatos and to
take that trade moving the line near Redwood City a
little bit to north to accommodate for that population.
I'll be looking at moving Arroyo Grande north with San
Luis Obispo County and moving Montecito with Santa
Barbara County and trading Moorpark and Somis if that is
required. I'll be looking at keeping Calabasas with the
Ventura area and keeping Santa Barbara and Ventura
Islands together.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Tamina. Karin, were you
going to add something?

MS. MAC DONALD: No.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Thank you. Are there
reactions to what we've just heard before we move to the
next section or something that we believe at a high level
was -- is off or different or missed? We just have two
hands, Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

Tamina, I think you said -- and I did change it this
morning, so I'm going to apologize for that. I think you
mentioned Yolo with East Solano, and my new direction
today was Yolo with all of Solano. And it's needed for
numbers and to include the delta areas, the northern
delta areas and to go into Napa and/or Calusa, yeah, in
terms of numbers needed.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you. In terms
of -- now this is Senate considerations; is that correct?

CHAIR TURNER: That's right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. And the Sonoma Wine
Country, the Lake -- you know, the Wine Country of
Sonoma, Wine Country of Lake, Napa, and the little
portion of the Wine County of Yolo we were talking about,
that remains the other -- the -- and then that fits in
with what Commissioner Fernandez was saying about the
Yolo, Solano, and the Delta. I think though Vallejo has
to be cut out of Solano just because of population for a
Senate district. And I think that could go up into the
portion of the Napa Sonoma or more -- it might go down
with the -- out to Bay Point area.

Then for Senate districts, it was a long -- you did
mention following the hills -- the East Bay hills
respecting the ridge there. Yeah. And then so going
along the bay there. But then I don't believe I heard
the other area would be the Tri-City.

CHAIR TURNER: She mentioned it.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I did.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, okay. And -- I missed that one. Great. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, in the Tri-Valley area, I think you mentioned, Tamina, going up to San Ramon. If at all possible, it would be good to go all the way up to Danville, I think. That's usually considered part of the Tri-Valley. But I know population may not allow.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Yee. Tamina, thank you.

MS. ALON: Thank you, Commissioner.

CHAIR TURNER: Kennedy? Okay. And at this time, Kennedy will give us a high level of what she's heard from us for Senate -- what she will attempt based on new direction that we gave for Senate. Thank you.

MS. WILSON: Thank you, Chair. So I will start in the north. We have Tamina going over Siskiyou and taking Humboldt instead of slicing Siskiyou, removing Yolo from the north and making sure to keep Butte, Sutter, and Yuba together, working to keep -- this is now moving over to the eastern side. We would work to keep Sierra Nevada, Placer, El Dorado together, keeping Calaveras, Tuolumne,
possibly Mariposa together. And then moving into
Sacramento, moving Folsom, Rancho Murrieta out over to
the eastern side, removing West Sacramento from
Sacramento, if necessary. Keeping out Grove with parts
of Sacramento. Keeping Stockton whole, moving Mountain
House and Tracy back into San Joaquin area, keeping those
more inland than going out. Moving down working to keep
Merced whole, moving into Fresno, trying to minimize
splits in the city of Fresno and the country of Fresno,
keeping together -- trying to keep together neighborhoods
of Sunnyside, West Park, Southwest Fresno, Northwest
Fresno, Old Fig Gardena and then keeping Northeast and
Clovis together. Then working with the VRA lawyers to
try to reconfigure what we can in this area, as well.
I -- trying to get rid of the curl.

CHAIR TURNER: I'll just comment. I love that
direction and what you're going to attempt, and
hopefully, you're successful with it. Beautiful. Seeing
no hands, we're going to move to Jamie.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry. Could I -- before
that, the idea of keeping Merced whole, I don't believe
that it was looked at going those VRA districts, keeping
them compact where possible. It doesn't necessarily mean
that you had to keep Merced whole if -- just in terms of
compactness. Thank you.
CHAIR TURNER: Thank you for that addition. We're ready, Jamie, thank you.

MS. CLARK: Thank you. For Assembly, there really wasn't a ton of big direction, and so just sort of based on today, sort of continuing the direction to keep the Boyle Heights, Lincoln Heights, El Sereno, East Los Angeles area together in the San Gabriel Valley, seems like the direction is now to look at more north to south orientations for districts. Of course, continue to work with the VRA team on that area specifically, as well as other areas of L.A. and to, of course, look at Latino populations, as well as respecting Asian COIs and COIs from black communities in Los Angeles counties, as well.

CHAIR TURNER: Sorry, I hit the wrong button, and lost -- almost lost my -- Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And just for clarification, are you just talking about just the L.A. area or are you also speaking about the entirety that includes like Antelope Valley and some of those other areas and the South Bay?

MS. CLARK: I was -- that was sort of a general overview for L.A. County. Those are really big changes. And in terms of like Antelope Valley, yeah, I can definitely look at trying to not include areas of San Fernando Valley. And South Bay, it was like movement --
different direction with movement, in terms of like
gardena and hawthorne or englewood, gardena, and
Torrance, potentially splitting Torrance. I think a lot
of that would maybe be driven by potential VRA areas, so
going to definitely try and iron those out first, and
then move on to other areas of los angeles county.

Commissioner Akutagawa: Okay. I -- Okay. Thank
you. I -- I'm -- two things. One, can I just also say
that as you're looking at some of these Senate districts,
there were some odd combinations, like, for example,
there was say -- it says SDNELA, which is -- it looks
like it includes some of the more affluent parts of L.A.,
along with like all the way down to Bell, which was a
little odd. And you already acknowledged the one in the
Antelope Valley. It just kind of dips down into the San
Fernando Valley, which was also weird. Clarification
question for you. This -- the South Robertson
neighborhood council, because it's hard to see on the
map, does that include Century City?

Ms. Clark: So just to clarify, for the Senate
visualization, it's Antelope Valley and Victor Valley
together, which was a request from the commission from
last time and that it doesn't -- no part of Corrin County
like dips into --

Commissioner Akutagawa: Oh, I'm sorry.
MS. CLARK: -- Antelope Valley.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: My mistake. I mean the Santa Clarita Valley; it dips into the San Fernando Valley. It's SC -- VS --

MS. CLARK: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And that's the one that you're talking about that you would --

MS. CLARK: This was -- I guess I was just talking about general direction that I received --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, so --

MS. CLARK: -- today so far.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And we -- and yes. And we do recognize that a lot of this is new information that's received, and so we're wanting to give general. But what you're doing, Commissioner Akutagawa is to make sure in the new generalization that that's not missed, right?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. I just --

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I just want to also point -- ask that question. Is South -- does South Robertson neighborhood council include Century City?

CHAIR TURNER: Or just say if you want it included, just name that for them.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Actually, I would prefer to exclude the Westside Neighborhood Council. And if South Robertson does include Century City, I would like to see that removed. I think it does not -- it does not align with the remainder of that west of 110 visualization.

MS. CLARK: And you would rather have it go with --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think it would be better suited with the L.A. Bay --


COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: The L.A. Bay Area is what I think is what it's called. And I think the other conversations you already heard about the San Gabriel Valley and East L.A., so thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you. I just wanted to make sure, as you're looking at the potential VRA districts, that we also have a consideration of the historically African American district -- historic districts in terms of making sure can they be opportunity districts in that area -- in that section.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

MS. CLARK: And I guess I -- just a general point of clarification is that last week the San Fran -- San Gabriel Valley area, I did receive direction to have the
districts more oriented east to west, and today that was very different, and the direction I got was north to south. So just I guess, wondering if -- what the thoughts are on that.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I don't -- I wasn't going to speak to that one.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Vasquez, were you going to speak to that or Commissioner Vasquez, and we'll come back to you, Sinay?

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yes. Today I think there was some north-south in discussing East L.A. as an anchor, but that it -- East L.A. -- that was because East L.A. and the areas and it that we were asking to be included in East L.A. as an anchor are not considered part of the San Gabriel Valley. And so the east -- I think the east to west version of a San Gabriel Valley district that starts really at Alhambra and goes east potentially, again, picking up some of the foothill communities but not all of the foothill communities for population, I think it's directing -- I think the feedback today was attempting to direct what is currently visualized as San Gabriel Valley directing that east.

So picking up also then Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar, et cetera what we -- we just would
like, at least what I understood, is that we'd like really that whole visualization move shifted east as what we consider the San Gabriel Valley. Is that helpful?

Does that answer your question?

MS. CLARK: Kind of.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: MS. CLARK: So I guess last week there seemed to be interest in having those visualizations be more like very east to west. Right now they're sort of next -- right next to each other. And last week there was interest in like a very -- two very east to west districts. And that was -- that is not the direction I received today. So just wondering for Senate to explore -- keep exploring it east to west. That's how this visualization is. It's very east to west oriented visualizations today, and I guess, wondering if I should make that north to south instead.

MS. CLARK: I would -- if I'm trying -- if I'm synthesizing in my brain, everything I've heard about the San Gabriel Valley, it may be that it is the VRA considerations are so fine-tuned, when it comes to Assembly districts that, we may have sort of different but much differently oriented maps in the same area for Senate and Congressional, just because those have to have more population.

So I would bifurcate sort of the feedback that we
have given around Assembly and sort of set that aside for those particular maps and then move forward with Senate and Congressional districts as another set of feedback, if that's helpful.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Right. Thank you. Yes.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Trying to see where the hands were normalized. There we go. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. I ask this every time, but I'm going to ask it again. Regarding Long Beach. We haven't even talked about Long Beach today, but it has come up in a lot of the -- some of the comments that we received. Keeping Long Beach whole, is that keeping us from exploring additional opportunity districts or VRA districts?

MS. CLARK: I think the short answer is no, not really. No.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: What's that?

MS. CLARK: Yeah, and we can take a look, of course.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sorry. Wanted to just respond to your question, Jamie. And I would agree with what Commissioner Vasquez said about the bifurcation. In terms of the Assembly districts being smaller, we could make a much more easily created east-west district. So
you have the East San Gabriel Valley and the West San
Gabriel Valley. And I think that that worked in that
east-west kind of direction.

I think given the numbers, she as has also stated,
it does become a little bit more complicated. I think
looking at -- I guess, looking at some of the -- both the
COI testimony as well as just also, you know, just
understanding the cities that are together -- and we've
heard that cities like Alhambra, Monterey Park, San
Gabriel, Rosemead, in particular, should be kept together
or we've heard -- we've seen testimony around that. I
would also -- and I think this is where it gets tricky.
And Commissioner Vasquez also brought this up too. Areas
like San Marino and Arcadia are much more affluent than
say the areas like Alhambra or Monterey Park or even San
Gabriel and most definitely Rosemead. And so -- yet
there are some common interests in term of the shops and
the shopping that goes on, the eating places, the kind of
cultural activities that also go on in some of those
areas.

So I think there's a visualization for foothill
districts, and I think pulling some of those not right at
the foothills cities maybe into this visualization may
help. I would also say that cities that go east of the
605, as you get further north, like Irwin Gale, Azusa,
Glendora, San Dimas, are fairly different, but I think as you look at having to expand, I would actually recommend that you look not as far as the 210, but perhaps in -- up to the Valley Boulevard in that area and then you -- and you look further south.

Because along that San Gabriel Valley District, as you get into like La Puente, as you get into Valinda, West Covina, those are also all areas that have a lot of alignment with that larger community, so I don't know if -- it's kind of like a more of a big rectangle, I guess. So you're kind of expanding up and down and then also to the side. So it looks more like a -- yeah, a big rectangle. I don't know if that helps you.

But stopping at Hacienda Heights, because, again, referring to the COI testimony, I think that's where there's a request to then keep that more to the east with Rowland Heights and Diamond Bar.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just want to say -- first of all, I want to thank the public, because they are submitting a lot of really good thinking around the visualizations, and some of the areas that we've been struggling with a little bit, they have been submitting input. So I hope that we -- all of us commissioners can find nooks of time to read though them. But also, line
drawers are stuck, there are some more communities of
interest that some visualization comments are really
strong.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you for that. And I just
wanted to add, beyond finding time at the end to read
through, they are actually popping up right as you're
submitting them. So we are seeing them live in real time
and making adjustments and comments based on what we're
seeing. So I did want to name that as well.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So I want to say to
the mappers -- to the line drawers, I'm excited to see
what you're going to do with -- missed John. John?

MR. O'NEILL: Based on all the commission guidance,
you love my districts. You don't want any changes to the
State Senate? So we could just skip this.

CHAIR TURNER: No.

MR. O'NEILL: No, no, no. I can, of course talk
about the State Senate visualizations. Starting off --
oh, I need to start my video. Starting off just to the
north, Jamie touched on this, but there was an Antelope
Valley, Victor Valley, potential configuration. That's
something where it would just be good to know from the
commission if in broad terms that's something that you
would like of if you'd prefer that we go back to not
having something like that.

Some general guidance I received from the commissioner, which you asked to share with the rest of the map drawers was to make sure that in drawing boundaries around the rural cities to be going in and out farther to try and take in some of the surrounding unincorporated areas that are associated with those cities, shifting to the south with some of the potential VRA area districts with the -- there's one area around San Bernadino Riverside and some of the communities to the south there which continues to include Grand Terrace.

This would be another question for the commissioners. I could have a go at excluding Grand Terrace from that based on some of the community of interest requests and Commissioner Kennedy's requests for some of the other districts. But that would make for a very, very narrow neck between the Riverside and San Bernardino portions following the western portion of Colton.

In terms of some of the areas farther to the south, this configuration also features a southern Orange County, northern San Diego district, which is heavily weighted to the San Diego portion. Commissioners generally expressed a preference to take a look there in terms of whether it would be possible to either have a
district that's more balanced between the San Diego and Orange County portions or to be maintaining a bit of a harder line there between San Diego and Orange County. In this case just given the populations of State Senate Districts, I imagine a hard line would probably make more sense than trying to balance that.

With San Diego City specifically, I had a district there where it takes in a good portion of the coast and the majority of San Diego city, but then just based on some of the guidance I'd previously received from the commission, and this is something that we heard similarly today, some of the commissioners suggested that it wouldn't necessarily make sense to continue north to include areas like Solano Beach or Encinitas. And so, I wound up going inland and north. But goes fairly far north, so I would just want to get some confirmation there that commissioners agree with that particular decision.

And then with Orange County and the Riverside border, this is a series of visualizations, where happily, I was able to incorporate the commissioner's guidance to not be jumping across there. So I'll do my best to try and continue to maintain that and protect them. Just one more thing that I would note in the Orange County area that might -- some of the -- could be
inconsistent with some of the community of interest
testimony we received, or some of the commissioners might
have a concern there with just in splitting Garden Grove
and West Minsters. So that would be one thing to take a
look at in them of whether it's possible to be keeping
those together, since that's been a request with some
other districts.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, John. Appreciate it.
Commissioner Sinay has a few responses.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: A response. Just to answer
your question about the city of San Diego, you bring up a
really good point. I hadn't even looked at how many
times we've split up the city of San Diego, how many
districts. So as much as when going north capturing as
much of the city of San Diego, and then grabbing other
cities, as needed, but just trying to -- or balance the
splits within the city of San Diego, I guess. So if it
ends up being in two different Congressional districts,
as much as possible, have some of the city of San -- you
know, the same amount of the city of San Diego. Is that
clear?

MR. O'NEILL: Yes, I follow. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Get out. Is that all you have
really?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. All right. Commissioner Vasquez?

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yes, just wanted to affirm to John that I am warming to the idea of the Antelope Valley and Victor Valley being paired together. So I'm comfortable with moving forward with that visualization, unless other commissioners feel strongly otherwise.

MR. O'NEILL: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: We do not feel strongly otherwise. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just because you asked.

CHAIR TURNER: Come on with it.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Vasquez, to answer your question, I think a lot of the feedback we're getting is that people like that visualization of the Antelope Valley with Victor -- yeah. So I'm good with that one. I just wanted to put that -- but I -- yes, go ahead and answer.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: So here's something we didn't really address. But this takes us back to those Congressional visualizations, which are -- which keep the Antelope Valley with Santa Clarita. And I know that throws -- that potentially throws a wrench in a lot of things but was dare I open the door to that conversation.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, I don't want it opened, but how do you feel about it?

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Part of me feels like on some ways -- I'm weighing importance. I don't know. Especially if we're getting community feedback that the pairing of the Victor Valley and the Antelope Valley makes sense to them, this -- that feels -- I'm not sure -- I -- I'm not sure what the strong justification would be for having a very different Congressional map would be. So maybe if there's a strong -- other than like this is how it worked out, or this is how we started, if there's another strong, compelling justification for a Congressional map looking different from -- very different from the Senate and Assembly, I'd be willing to entertain that, but I'm wondering if maybe we have to go back to that Congressional map.

CHAIR TURNER: Well, our line draws hurt you, and they will respond to it appropriately.

MS. SINAY: Okay. Now I'm ready.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay?

MS. SINAY: And I think this builds on what you were saying, Commissioner Vasquez. And I think it's for the whole -- we -- yeah, Commissioner Tulouch said it earlier, and Commissioner Akutakawa said it. I think we've all said it is that one of our priorities is really
looking at the strength of representation for communities and making sure that they feel heard. So if there are -- if there is a new opportunity district or, you know, if it's between an opportunity district or not, or, you know, opportunity districts plus community of interest is good. Let's leave -- just leave it at that. But it kind of went with San Diego. I -- John, I'm sorry if you said, and I didn't hear you. But I need another cup of coffee. I just want to make sure that with the Saint districts, I know they're huge, but if there is an opportunity to have another -- or a Latino opportunity, you know, just exploring the South Bay Area and the tribal.

MR. O'NEILL: I haven't said anything about that, but I can certainly talk to the VRA attorneys about that.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. We will go to break in three minutes. Commissioner Akutakawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAKAWA: Thank you. I just-- I guess I wanted to just go back to Jamie. And I was thinking about what I said about the big rectangle for that San Gabriel Valley area. I was just quickly looking through some additional communities of interest testimony. I think the one thing -- and this aligns with what I think Commissioner Sadhwani said this morning. On the one hand, I think what I -- I guess, attempting to
describe this to at least have somewhat of a semblance to what I'll call an Asian opportunity district.

However, there was something that, both in terms of -- I think it was the -- it was one of the community presentations that we had, and in it, they talked about being able to align various other communities that go deeper past the foothill communities, to that they have access to the mountains and others. And I know that there's been a number of community testimony from the same organization, but if it helps, and it gives you that flexibility to think about grouping further into the San Gabriel Valley that includes Alhambra, Monterrey Park, Rosemead, San Gabriel and going northward and combining it with some of the foothill communities.

I thought I'd just say that out loud to you as well, too. So if that gives you more flexibility, in terms of creating the Senate district, and, I guess, the Congressional district.

CHAIR TURNER: What -- thank you. Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. So thinking back on that, I think, you know, the community groups last week gave really good input on some of their thoughts from their community engagement efforts on how the VRA districts might be able to look with both from the Asian
American community and from the Latino Community. So going back to those -- taking a look and saying that there's anything that might help us in crafting these things, of course, with our VRA attorneys would be, I think helpful, because there's some good points in there. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And with that, as we prepare to go to our break, I'd just like to say to our line drawers, thank you so much for your flexibility in hearing from our commissioners and being responsive to the public input that we're receiving. And as you go back now and try and incorporate everything that we said, everything that we implied, and because of the wizards you are, everything that we meant, the expectation is that you'll comeback with perfect renditions, our next level of visualizations. And I'm just excited, in all honesty, to see what you come up with.

We recognize that every shift has implication ripple effects for a different area, so this is why we are excited for the team. I mentioned earlier, John, what you do will impact Jamie. Jamie will impact Kennedy, Tamina, and, of course it flows the other way. So I'm glad that the four of you are working together on your maps to ensure that, as you make whatever tradeoffs and in actually applying what you heard, that you'll be the
right ones to do it, and we're looking forward to receive it. So we're excited about it.

Commissioners, thank you for just really doing your best to give the direction and keep it high enough -- high enough level, but deep enough so that they'll know what to do with it. We're going to go to break now for 15 minutes, and when we come back, what we will do is to take a vote on our directions that was given for the line drawers for 10/23, 10/27, 10/28 and 10/29.

For the public, a couple of things. I want you to know that you, like we've been saying, can continue to engage with we draw the law CA -- always get that wrong. Wedrawthelinesca.org. You can continue to submit there. But we are also going to open for public comment today. Now recognizing that short time period, our intent is to ensure that we allow you ample time for public comment. So once we open for public comment, we are willing to stay and hear as many as we can. And depending on who's calling in and how many calls we have, if we need to do a continuance, we are prepared even to do that.

We want you to know that we want to hear from each and every one of you. It's a balance that we have to do between hearing from our public and being able to actually get the job done. And if we open public comment too soon, we won't get to our business at all. The line
drawers won't be able to receive from us and draw lines, and we'll be stuck in a place of hearing and not doing any of the work. So we thank you for your patience, and looking forward to public comment today. So at this time, we're going to go to break. We will be back at 3:20. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 3:07 p.m. until 3:20 p.m.)

CHAIR TURNER: Welcome back. I hope you all enjoyed your break. And thank you so much for all of the wonderful exchange that we've had, commissioners and for our staff and for our public that is patiently waiting. At this point, what we're going to do -- I see so many hands, I'm excited that I'll be able to share. We're going to go straight into public comment for our agenda item number two. And so, Katie, if you are ready --

MR. MANOFF: I'm here to help you with that.

CHAIR TURNER: You're here to help -- Oh, we got Kristian. Okay. So we are ready to go into public comment on our agenda item number two. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: So it's good Chair. In order to maximize transparency and public participating 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 on the livestream feed. It is 83289935025 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press #.

Once you've dialed in, you'll be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star 9. This will raise your hand for the comment moderator.

When it's your turn to speak, you'll hear a message that says, "The host would like you to talk." Press star 6 to speak. If you'd like to give your name, please state and spell it for the record. You're 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're waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak. And, again, please turn down the livestream volume. We will be enforcing a time limit of two minutes with a warning at 30 seconds and 15 seconds remaining.

All right. We have a plethora of callers today. First up, we have caller with the last four digits, 0619. And on deck, we have caller 0260. Caller 0619, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute at this time. The floor is yours.

RICHARD: Hello?

MR. MANOFF: Go ahead.
RICHARD: Thank you. This is Richard, and I'm calling as a resident of the Santa Clarita Valley. If you look at the geographic map of this area, you will see a Santa Susana Mountains that run east and west that separate the San Fernando Valley to the south from the Santa Clarita Valley to the north. If you go further west, along that mountain range, you also separate the San Fernando Valley to the south from the Simi Valley area to the north at Rocky Peak. The mountain range creates a natural boundary that separates the San Fernando Valley area from the sister cities of Santa Clarita and Simi Valley that have many things in common, which do not align with the San Fernando Valley. At the present, including any parts of the San Fernando Valley into the Simi and Santa Clarita Valleys does not keep our area whole, which is what we would like to see. It makes no sense to separate the Porter Ranch and Granada Hills areas from the San Fernando Valley, which those residents don't want. And also have nothing in common with the communities to the north. Furthermore, the communities of Porter Ranch and Granada Hills are part of the city of Los Angeles, which have council districts which they belong to. So the Summarize

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.
RICHARD: -- needs to remain whole and the sister cities of Simi Valley and Santa Clarita also need remain whole and to continue to be joined together as was the -- with the present district --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

RICHARD: -- the number lost in these district of porter Ranch and Granada Hills could easily be made up by continuing to having Simi Valley a part of the district to the north. Using geographic boundaries that separate the districts make sense, and should be considered.

Commissioners --

MR. MANOFF: Time. Thank you. Next up, we have the caller with the last four 0260. And after that will be 0703. 0260, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute.

(Pause.)

MR. MANOFF: Caller with the last four digits of the phone, 0260, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.

(Pause.)

MR. MANOFF: All right. It seems like there might be some connectivity issue there. We're going to come back to you. Next up, we have caller 0703. If you will please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

MR. STRATTON: Can you hear me?
MR. MANOFF: We can hear you. Go ahead, please.

MR. STRATTON: Hello. My name is Scott Stratton. Last name is spelled S-T-R-A-T-T-O-N. I've been a 31-year resident of Santa Clarita. I agree with the comments from the previous caller regarding keeping Santa Clarita and the Antelope Valley's together but also recognizing that we have a lot in common with the Simi Valley community, not only geographically, but we share resources of fire, and police. We are -- we have similar -- very similar demographics, and it's as short drive between the two communities. We have much less in common with Porter Ranch and Northern Granada Hills areas. But even though this crosses a county line, which I know has been kind of guideline on the current visualization, for me, it makes a lot of sense to keep communities with similar identities similar demographics, similar diversity together, as they are currently drawn in the 25th Congressional District map. Thank you for all you're doing to get this right. We know this is a great deal of work. Appreciate your -- your time.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much.

Next up, we'll have caller with the last four, 8458 and after that will be caller 0057.

Caller 8458, if you'd please follow prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.
MS. GALLEGOS: Thank you.

Hello, my name is Luz Gallegos Executive Director of TODEC Legal Center, a 35-year-old immigrant justice regional community organization founded in the city of Perris, California.

Working and organizing at the grass root level with the population that we serve, we are well aware of the realities and challenges Latino residence in these communities face on the daily basis. That is why it is our responsibility to elevate our local realities as you are making decisions for our communities that my impact our VRA districts.

Perris and neighboring cities that -- and communities that connect to what we locals call the Perris Latino 215 corridor, we all connect not only by the 215 freeway but by ethnicity, culture, community, work, shop, school, economy, family, and immigrant integrations, composed by Perris, Moreno Valley, Mead Valley, Good Hope, Romoland, Nuevo, Lakeview, Homeland, Winchester, Santa Jacinto, and a small portion of Riverside.

I am calling in reference of two of your visualization from the Assembly and Senate districts. I will start with the Assembly visualization, page number 95, V-A-D-M-O-R-P-O-R-A-T-M-1-0-2-7. Our community
members have noticed that you have included the cities of Hemet and East Hemet to the -- to our proposed Assembly district.

Although, little by little, these communities continue to grow and diversify, Latino community (sic) that live in this community know the reality and have the memory as to the back sentiments of the City of Hemet dating back in time.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. GALLEGOS: An example I pose, we are asking for you to please exclude Hemet and East Hemet from our -- from our Assembly district and consider including Good Hope in lieu of Hemet. In addition to visualization page 55, we are --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. GALLEGOS: -- we are asking you to remove Temecula, Corona, Coronita, Wildomar, Menifee, Murrieta, to this Senate district. And include the communities of Riverside, Jurupa Valley, Lake Marino Valley, Perris, neighborhood area, Santa Jacinto, Good Hope --

MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much.

Next up, we have caller 0057, and after that, will be caller 3966.

Caller 0057, if you could follow the prompts to unmute, please. The floor is yours.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is Alana (ph.) and I'm calling regarding the visualization, page 95, number V-A-C (indiscernible) 10/27. The way the mapping was done was not the best of interest for us Latinos to make. As part of our community -- as part of daily lives where we live, work, and engage, it does not show the best interest for our community.

Hemet has a history of racism within Latino community (indiscernible) environment. Coming from a community of color, it's important that we shape together and not divided. I ask you to exclude Hemet and East Hemet of district Assembly. And instead, add Good Hope.

Thank you and have a great day.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Next up, we've got caller 3966, and after that will be caller 4145.

Caller 3966, if you'd please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi my name is Noemi (ph.). I am calling in regards to the visualization page 95. And for the MORPERHAM1027. The way our community is (audio interference) shows our interest as Latino, Hemet is not part of our community interest due to the amount of racism that we have gotten in the past. Please exclude Hemet from our district, and add Good Hope to our
district. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Next up, we've got caller 4145, and after that, will be caller 9217.

Caller 4145, please follow the prompts to unmute.

The floor is yours.

MS. TAVOULARIS: Thank you. My name is Kathy Tavoularis. I'm a councilwoman from the City of Orange in Orange County. Parts of San Bernardino in Orange County and Riverside County have become commuter counties the last decade. And our area has gained population, of course, which includes housing with prices that have been soaring.

I believe our city is more like Yorba Linda and Anaheim Hills. We have the same challenges and my colleagues in these cities have similar concerns. Currently, my city of Orange is split between two Congressional districts, two Senate districts, and one Assembly district, all with different issues that make no sense.

It's a hodgepodge.

In addition, the City of Orange is divided into districts. So my colleagues and I have to work with two different Congress office (sic), two different Senate offices, and an Assembly person, which can get very
confusing. We need a representative, especially a Congressional representative that understands the issues of Orange. We're a city of 150,000 people.

There's no need to divide us up and put us with cities that we have nothing in common with and can't fight for the issues that -- that concern us, which is housing and traffic, and all that great stuff. We need somebody that can advocate for us and be there for us.

Thank you so much for letting me speak today.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Next up, we've got caller 9217, and after that, will be caller 9879.

Caller 9217, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

MS. MEAMBOR: Thank you. My name is Ulah Meambor (ph.) and I live in the northernmost part of this -- this state, Siskiyou County, near the Oregon border. I think it may be known as region B. But this -- I've already had submitted a comment. But I needed clarification and I wanted to know if today's meeting will be on audio or -- or I can access it later just to receive some clarification on like the Senate district in Siskiyou County, as well as the Assembly district.

And I don't know if this is possible at this time. Was there someone there could tell me -- from what I
understand, that Siskiyou County in the Senate district 
has remained whole and in the Assembly district, that it 
pretty much remains as is? So I just need clarification 
and -- and where to go, and get that information.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Siskiyou County is 
whole -- well, in our current visualizations. And this 
recording -- it -- the sessions are all recorded and will 
be available on our website for you to go back and 
review.

MR. MANOFF: Next up, we've got caller 9879, and 
after that, will be caller 2435.

Caller 9879, if you could please follow the prompts 
to unmute. The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is Jimena 
(ph.), and I'm calling regarding visualization page 95, 
V-A-D MORPERHAM1027 because I feel like the mapping done 
wouldn't benefit the Latino communities. But the City of 
Hemet is not part of our interest community and has been 
known to negatively affect Latinas because of racism. 
Please exclude Hemet and East Hemet from our district and 
consider adding Good Hope instead. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Next up, we've got caller 2435, and after that, will 
be caller 3700.
Caller 2435, if you could please follow the prompts.
The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Good afternoon, Commissioners. I'd like to thank you for your hard work on this. I know it's a difficult problem. Over the last several days, we've heard comments from the commissioners about keeping communities of interest based on industry together, such as farming, logging, and the wine industry.

And I would like to submit to you that aerospace and defense is also a critical industry to Californians. And in that vein, I would like to see if we could keep the Congressional district containing Simi Valley, Santa Clarita, and the Antelope Valley together because that is an access of a -- a defense and aerospace industries.

Further, I'm concerned about the San Fernando Valley being ripped of thunder both -- both and Congressional and State Senate districts.

It seems that the San Fernando Valley is the community of interest and they have a lot of common interests such as water -- all getting their water from the Department of Water and Power and the Los Angeles City Council. So I'd like you to take these under consideration. Thank you for your time.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Next up, we've got caller 3700, 3-7-0-0, and after
that, will be caller 5696.

       Caller 3700, please follow the prompts to unmute.

       Go ahead; the floor is yours.

       MS. WILSON: Hi. My name is Betty Wilson (ph.), and
I wanted to comment on zone as San Joaquin County. We
are asking the commission to seriously consider our
submitted map, Congressional submitted by V1006202112,
senatorial map, 10062021123, and two Assembly districts
submitted ID, 10072021124.

       We were very careful to listen to the citizens that
live and work in San Joaquin regarding their wishes to
keep the county together. The message was very clear.
They were asking for one Senate, one Congressional, and
two Assembly districts. We heard that importance of
 equitable representation at the state and federal level
to be sure our unique challenges are understood.

       We paid attention to our communities of interest and
our diverse population, while complying with the
commission's criteria. The districts we have presented
are compact, populations areas are not bypassed, and
census blocks are not split.

       Physical barriers are respected, and we believe we
have supported Voting Rights Act based on our
demographics. We ask the commission to support the
wishes of the people to keep our county strong, together,
and to seriously consider the maps we have referenced above. Thank you very much for your time.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And as a reminder to all of our callers, your comments today are being interpreted and transcribed in real time. So please speak at a steady pace and slow down on those numbers and names so we can get everything interpreted please.

Next up, we've got caller 5696, and after that, will be caller 2948.

Caller 5696, if you could please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MS. MARIQUENS: Hello. My name is Maribel Mariquens (ph.), and I live in Congressional District 46. My district has a proud Hispanic community. And I know that the commission has the best interest of our district. Therefore, if our district needs a larger population, we should add additional Hispanic communities like those in Fullerton by drawing them into our community.

Given our similar interest, values, and priorities, I believe that this the best decision because our voices need to be heard. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 2948, and after that, will be caller 3838.

Caller 2948, if you could please follow the prompts.
1 The floor is yours.
2 
3 MR. MOORE: Hi. My name is Thomas Moore. I'm a
4 Seal Beach council member and former 2019 Mayor of Seal
5 Beach. I've also spoken with the current Mayor, Joe
6 Kalmick, who's in full support of an OC Beach cities
7 district, which we saw a visualization about a week ago,
8 that includes all the Orange County beach cities.
9 
10 First, I want to thank all the commissioners for
11 spending so much time on this redistricting effort. I
12 realize it's a long and difficult process. And I
13 appreciate all the hard work that you are doing.
14 
15 I'd like to voice my support for the map that showed
16 Seal Beach and a district called OC coast, from San
17 Clemente to Seal Beach, which was shown in the southern
18 California Congressional visualization, State Senate
19 visualization, that was available when we looked a few
20 days ago.
21 
22 We have many common interests with small beach
23 cities in Orange County from cleaning up polluted
24 beaches, sand replenishment, how to deal with traffic,
25 and along the Pacific Coast Highway, impacts of parking,
26 and ocean, and coastline perseveration. The issues that
27 Seal Beach deals with on a regular basis are many of the
28 same issues that these other Orange County beach cities
29 deal with. And most recently our life guards and staff
work closely with Huntington Beach, Newport Beach, and
Laguna Beach on the oil spill issue and clean up.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. MOORE: Seal -- Seal Beach residents would like
our representatives to understand the issues of being a
small beach city and problems of our area. And it's
important to understand the unique issues that Orange
County beach cities have to deal with, impacting issues
on our community and how to deal, and work together
address -- to address these concerns.

And both myself and the Mayor of Seal Beach, support
the OC beach cities district. Thank you for your time
today.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 3838, and after that, will
be caller 1868.

Caller 3838, if you could please follow the prompts
to unmute. Go ahead; the floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I'm commenting on
the Congressional north coast map, 10/27. As a resident
of the north coast, it is overwhelmingly important for
the coastline to remain together, including Del Norte,
Humboldt, Trinity, Mendocino, Sonoma, and Marin Counties.
That's keeping a continuous and contiguous coastline from
the Oregon border to the Golden Gate Bridge.
This is the current Congressional configuration, which has worked well for the past ten years. Our culture is one of resource conservation. Our industries require environmental conservation. Major coastal industries are fishing and tourism.

These industries need healthy waters, both ocean and rivers. The culture of our conservation is common. It's common to all of us locals who value the health of an environment that determines our financial success and our lifestyle. Our common legislature of protection is paramount.

Additionally, these counties are linked together by Highway 101 and Highway 1, which travel north and south as should the linking of the counties in our district. We are rural communities asking the commission to, please, help us maintain our current Congressional configuration. Please keep Marin with its coastal neighbors to the north. Thank you, and thank you for all the work you're doing.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we will have caller 1868, and after that, will be caller 9629.

Caller 1868, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute. Go ahead; the floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you. I live in Tracy,
California. And I want to speak against the attempt to divide San Joaquin County into three Congressional districts. We currently have two Congressional districts that serve the county.

And to try to break us up into a third Congressional district will only further divide the people of San Joaquin County and the efforts on the national level of providing the support that we need for the issues that are critical to our area that have very little in common with the East Bay and the South Bay.

We are primarily an agricultural county. We have a high rate of unemployment that is coupled with a very low rate of college graduates. So this is not anything we have in common with or neighbors to the west. I think it's very important to the people in San Joaquin County to be a cohesive unit, to feel a sense that we're all working together. And dividing us into three Congressional districts is not going to do that very well.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you for your time.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 9629, and after that, will be caller 5308.

Caller 9629, if you could please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time. The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Hello. Can you hear me okay?

MR. MANOFF: We can hear you.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay, fantastic. Hey, I'm calling from central California, specifically Fresno. And I'm -- I'm concerned with some of the proposed changes for these visualizations. I personally feel like you are dividing up our Hispanic community too much in the area, specifically for southern Fresno.

I think this is a really big opportunity to make sure we have a really strong voice for our area. But these proposed changes would really divide that far too much. And I think it would really hinder our -- our -- our chance for -- for proper representation.

So I would really urge that the commission to rethink the way they have Fresno divided up at this time and really make sure that it's along the lines of making sure that we have a strong Hispanic voice for our area. And thank you very much for the opportunity to speak and your work on the major project. Thank you. Bye.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much.

Up now, we've got caller 0495, and after that, will be caller 5308.

Caller 0495, if you could follow the prompts to unmute. Go ahead; the floor is yours.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes. Good afternoon. Can you hear me?

MR. MANOFF: We can hear you. Go ahead.

MS. HOWARD: Great. Respected -- respected council members -- commission members -- I'm so sorry -- thank for your time and dedication to the efforts on this redistricting process. I'm calling from Temecula. My name is Martha Howard and I'm Latina Association of Riverside County founder.

I want to bring my support for the maps that you have presented under the visualization. And there are three, on the Assembly, of State, of Congress. I'm going to start with the Assembly, VAD (indiscernible) area, 12027, page 109. I strongly support that.

The State, V-S-D-S-W-R-I-D-1-0-2-7 on page 55, I strongly support that visualization. And for the Congress districts, V-C-D-S-W-R-I-Z-1-0-2-7, on page 68, I strongly support that.

We in our community are supporting the visualizations that you have presented for that. And we can no longer remain isolated from our communities of interest, nor from our sister cities. And thank you so much for taking in consideration our comments, our maps, and thank you so much for the work you have done.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.
Next, we got caller 5308, and after that, we'll have caller 5858.

Caller 5308, please follow the prompts to unmute.

Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MR. TORRES: Hello. Good afternoon. My name is Eddie Torres. I am with the Inland Coalition for Immigrant Justice. And I am calling on behalf the visualization map, Assembly district, High Desert, 10/27. And specifically, I wanted to mention that the Latino communities within this district will be better served with being coupled with the black and Latino communities, reaching the across the Antelope Valley.

We have seen previous iterations of these communities coupled together and with the Antelope Valley, they created a VRA compliant district. The current map that we have, the visualizations attempts only seven (indiscernible) is very concerning.

Please consider adopting the VRA compliant district.

Thank you for your time.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Next up, we've got caller 5858, and after that, will be caller 9218.

Caller 5858, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute. Caller with the last four digits 5858, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing
star 6 at this time. All right. Caller 5858 we are
going to come back to you.

Next up, we've got caller 9218. If you could please
follow the prompts to unmute. Go ahead, the floor is
yours.

MR. KNOBLOCK: Hello. My name is Steve Knoblock,
K-N-O-B-L-O-C-K. I'm a city council member in the City
of San Clemente. And I'd like the commission to consider
having an Orange County beach cities Congressional
district.

Our beach cities from Seal Beach to San Clemente
have a huge commonality in terms of our common issues
with traffic along PCH, local beach sand replenishment
issues, tourism, and traffic, particularly along the
Pacific Coast Highway.

This district is really a -- a natural district
because it's divided from other -- if you allow this,
it's divided from other Congressional districts by
natural boundaries such as the county boundary of San
Diego and the county boundary of Los Angeles.

We're also divided from our neighboring counties by
two major military bases and international port
facilities. Currently, Camp Pendleton to the south is
twenty mile wide, twenty mile deep, and completely
separates us from San Diego. People in Orange County
have really no community connection to the people in San
Diego County.

    I've lived in Orange County forty years and -- and
San Diego twelve years. And I got to tell you, the
citizens of each really don't consider us a -- a -- with
commonality of interest. Not only are we bounded by
military base on the south but north, the City of Seal
Beach is separated from Los Angeles County by the -- by
the (indiscernible) Naval Weapons Station --

    MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

    MR. KNOBLOCK: -- and the international --
international port. So I'd like to have (indiscernible)
to have one beach cities Congressional district, Laguna
Beach, Dana Pointe, San Clemente, ideally don't belong in
a -- in -- in a San Diego county district.

    MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

    MR. KNOBLOCK: And Huntington Beach does not belong
in Los Angeles. So I'd like to have one Congressional
beach districts with our -- with our Orange County beach
cities. Thank you very much for your consideration.

Appreciate it.

    MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much.

    Next up, we've got caller 0919, and after that,
we'll have caller 6058.

    Caller 0919, if you could please follow the prompts
to unmute. Caller with the last four digits, 0919, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. Go ahead, the floor is yours.

MR. MULDOON: Hello. Am I on?
MR. MANOFF: You're on.
MR. MULDOON: Great, thank you. Hi. My name is Kevin Muldoon. I'm the Mayor Pro Tem of Newport Beach. I appreciate all the time you commissioners are giving to us on a Friday afternoon. I know you do very important work.

I'm calling on behalf of about 90,000 residents of Newport. You know, you're probably familiar with the oil spill and we have a lot of common needs and issues that we face with our neighboring coastal cities. And I'm calling to advocate for one unified Congressional seat here in Orange County.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you very much.
Next up, we've got caller 6058, and after that, we'll have caller 2261.
Caller 6058, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute at this time. Go ahead, the floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello?
MR. MANOFF: Yeah. We can hear you.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello, yes. Can you hear me?
MR. MANOFF: We sure can. Go ahead.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay, very good. Yes. I live in -- I'm a -- I'm a resident of -- of Cypress for over thirty years. And this is regarding VCD Harbor Gateway. I am calling to request to please keep the cities of Cypress, Los Alamitos, and Rossmoor to not to be redistricted into Long Beach and L.A. county.

And see actually in Orange County, we need our own Orange County representatives to deal with issues that are Orange County based. We have schools that are part of -- part of Orange County school system. Our utility companies are different from Long Beach and L.A. County.

Our law enforcement has a mutual aid agreement between the neighbor -- neighboring Orange County cities, where they cross city lines and help one another. No such agreement existed with Long Beach or L.A. County. We are part of Orange County transit authority. And we work with Orange County community to address issues of homelessness, healthcare, education.

So we have a very strong connection to southern border cities, culturally and economically. So we partake in community events like in the cites of Orange County, not with L.A. County or in our school district, cross over Cypress, Los Alamitos, Rossmoor, Seal Beach, Westminster, as well as our churches, temples, grocery stores. They are all down south, like Los Alamitos,
Huntington Beach, Westminster, Garden Grove.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay. We also celebrate holidays and festivals in Huntington beach, Garden Grove, Westminster, not with Long Beach, Grand Prix, or boat racing. So I implore you to leave the cities of Cypress, Los Alamitos --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

FEMALE SPEAKER: -- Rossmoor, as part of Orange County, Congressional, Senate, and Assembly districts so that we can have representation that speaks our needs and concerns. Thank you very much for your time. And thank you for all your -- all your hard work.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

I'd like to remind and just make an announcement for all of our callers to please stay connected in the queue. We will close the lines at 4:30 for public comment. The lines will be closed, but we will address those of you that are waiting in the queue. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you for that reminder, Chair.

Up next, we've got caller 2261 and after that, we'll have caller 7693.

Caller 2261, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute at this time. Again, caller 2261, if you could
please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.
One more time.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Just for some of those people that might be missing it, the prompt doesn't actually come up. So go ahead a repeat that every single time you unmute somebody.

But thank you all so much for taking public comments. My name is Amanda Hernandez (ph.). And I'm a lifelong resident of Apple Valley, California here in the High Desert. I also serve on the Apple Valley Fire Protection District. I just wanted to call in to say thank you to the commission for the work that they're doing and that the visualizations that were put out reflecting the community.

The Congressional and Assembly visualizations that keeps the greater High Desert mostly connected and tie us with other rural communities in our region is -- it looks great. And I just wanted to say that I also signed on to a letter with over a dozen elected officials out here from the Victor Valley, including mayors and council members asking to not be with L.A. County or the Antelope Valley.

And I just appreciate that the -- the committee
honored those at the Assembly and Congressional levels.

So I just want to say if the final map ended up being close to these visualizations, our community would be very happy. So I just wanted to express my gratitude for your work and thank you for your time.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 7693, and after that, will be caller 4828.

Caller 7693, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6 at this time. Go ahead; the floor is yours. Caller 7693, you are unmuted. Please make sure that your phone isn't muted.

MS. ROW: Hello. This Christine Row (ph.) and my phone was muted. I'm a resident of West Hills, CA, which is the far end of the West Fernando Valley. I'm looking at both the Assembly and the Congressional districts.

Our boundaries for the -- it's important to keep the San Fernando Valley whole, the boundaries being Mulholland and -- on the south in the Santa Monica mountains and the Santa Susana mountain peek to the top, as referred to by other people.

Bell Canyon, which is in Ventura County is landlocked. It -- no one can access there. So they must go through West Hills to get out. So they should be included in the Assembly district and the Congressional
district. It's important that you not draw the districts
below Mulholland highway.

For example, we should be -- the San Fernando Valley
should be divided. For example, you've taken and created
a block where you've put Reseda, Lake Balboa, North Hills
in with the areas to the east of the 405. They should
remain in the San Fernando Valley. Absolutely, do not
take Porter Ranch and Granada Hills and put them into the
larger San Gabriel, Antelope Valley, Santa Cruz area. We
deal with fires and other issues.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. ROW: And -- and the bottom line is -- so we
need to keep our -- our northern area is impacted by
fires and the -- the Aliso Canyon issues, the West Sand
Fernando Valley is impacted by --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. ROW: -- the Santa Susana Field Lab. And so
please keep our Congressional districts and stuff whole.
And keep the area of Calabasas, Agoura Hills, and
Westlake Village with the --

MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much.

Up next, we've got caller 4828, and after that, will
be caller 9316.

Caller 4828, if you could please follow the prompts
to unmute by pressing star 6. It looks like you got it.
The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Hi. Good afternoon, Commission. My name is Jeremiah (ph.). I'm an Eagle Rock resident, Highland Park. I just want to say, these are some of the observations that I've seen on your first -- on this visualization -- I'm sorry.

So Eagle Rock has always been a part of Northeast Los Angeles community and is not a part of the Glendale -- Northeast Los Angeles community is not part of the San Fernando Valley, Glendale, or the San Gabriel Valley.

Northeast Los Angeles is a community of interest that's always been part of the City of Los Angeles and the current map splits our community into the Valley and the San Gabriel Valley. This is not what we need and this is not what we want. Thank you and have a good day.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 9316, and after that, will caller 2211.

Caller 9316, if you could please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Hi. How's it going? I'm a long-time resident of Northeast Los Angeles, specifically Eagle Rock and the Highland Park area, the previous caller stated. I noticed that the map is trying to split up
Eagle Rock and Highland Park and put some of the northeast communities within the valleys, San Gabriel and the San Fernando Valley.

Eagle Rock and Highland Park are a long-time community of the Northeast Los Angeles region. And we would like it to remain. Just as many of other people have been calling saying that their communities share similar cultural -- and now, for Highland Park and Eagle Rock economic similarities, we would like to keep our communities together.

Northeast Los Angeles, as like, you know, the previous caller was saying, has been a part of the community of Northeast Los Angeles for many years. And we would not like to see our communities split up. And Northeast L.A. area boundaries have been between the 134 Freeway, the 2 Freeway, and the 5 Freeway, and the enclave that reside within those communities are Northeast Los Angeles, not valley or San Gabriel Valley.

Please keep our communities intact and let's keep Northeast Los Angeles the way it is. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 2211, and after that, will be caller 0565.

Caller 2211, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute. Go ahead; the floor is yours.
MALE SPEAKER: Hello. I'm calling in on behalf of Pat West. I'll be reading a letter that Mr. West submitted into the record today.

"My name is Patrick West, and I'm a long-time resident of Cypress. We love our city and our community. My family and I have been civically engaged across the region for decades. I've been following with interest the redistricting process, and I wanted to share a thought with you about your Assembly presentation this week.

In your Congressional maps, you place us with our neighbors in Long Beach and Los Alamitos. As a former city manager of Long Beach, this is fantastic. Cypress and Long Beach border each other and are part of each other's larger community. In your Assembly presentation, there was direction by Commissioner Akutagawa to move Cypress out of the Little Saigon district, which makes sense.

I would recommend and request that you also include Cypress with Long Beach and our neighbor Los Alamitos to the south. If you need to move population out of the Long Beach based Assembly district, perhaps Lakewood can continue to be grouped with other cities in southeast Los Angeles.

That would still keep Lakewood and North Long Beach
together and keep Lakewood with Long Beach in Senate and Congress. These changes may serve Voting Rights Act considerations more appropriately as well. I hope you will consider adding Cypress to the Assembly plan with Los Alamitos and Long Beach. Thank you."

And again, that was on behalf of Pat West of Cypress.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Next up, we will have caller 0565, and after that, we will have caller 6252. And for those who are calling in to give comments, just a reminder, if you could please press star 9 to raise your hand. We see a lot of hands. But we just want anybody who has recently called in. Just a reminder, please press star 9 to raise your hand.

Again, we've got caller 0565, and after that, will be 6252.

Caller 0565, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MS. JONES: Yeah. Hi. Can you hear me?

MR. MANOFF: We sure can, go ahead.

MS. JONES: Hi. My name is Jennifer Jones (ph.) and I am a resident of Simi Valley. Commissioners, first off, thank you very much for all of the time, energy, and effort you have put in to trying to do the right thing and accommodate with the map drawing and make sure
everybody's voice is heard.

So I do appreciate that. The reason I'm calling is, one, I would like to keep Simi Valley whole. Right now, we have a sliver of Simi Valley that is not part of Congressional district. So we would like all of Simi Valley in one district.

And I would also like to have us with Santa Clarita Valley. We have a lot in common with Santa Clarita Valley; the aerospace, film industry, first responders. We share resources in regards to any wildfires that may be happening in both cities, on top of Magic Mountain. Every single student in Simi Valley has a season pass to go to Magic Mountain. I even have a season pass to go to Magic Mountain. So a lot of community members in Simi Valley actually travel to Santa Clarita and send money there in the community because it's very similar to Simi Valley.

So I hope that you can keep Simi Valley whole, Santa Clarita whole, and keep Simi Valley and Santa Clarita together. Thank you very much.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much.

Next up, we'll have caller 6252, and after that, will be caller 3898.

Caller 6252, if you could follow the prompts to unmute. If you could please press star 6. Go ahead; the
floor is yours.

MS. HUTCHINSON: Thank you very much. This is Helen Hutchinson with the League of Women Voters of California. I'm calling in about a letter that was submitted earlier today from the league and from Common Cause, California. It deals with opportunities for meaningful public comments during your meetings. The details are in the letter.

But please be consistent about when and how you take public comment in all of your meetings. And in multi-day meetings, please allow for public comment at least once per day. We really appreciate the fact that that happened these last two days.

And in your business meetings, please allow for public comments for each substantive topic or discussion. Thanks again, very much.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got 3898, and after that, will be caller 5819.

Caller 3898, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute. Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MS. SCHOEN: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Casey Schoen (ph.) and I am calling from Long Beach. I've been watching your Congressional visualization discussion today, and I just want thank you for keeping
our community together, not just for the Congressional
line but for the State Senate and mostly in the Assembly
as well.

As you know for my neighbors who've already called
in, Long Beach is a special place. We are a diverse and
inclusive community and supportive of so many cultures.
So thank you for keeping us together.

As a major city of the L.A., OC border, Long Beach
has historically been a great neighbor to our boarding
L.A. County cities to our north and our Orange County
neighbors to the east and south.

Earlier today, we heard a commissioner voice
direction to add more cites to our north to the current
visualization, including Paramount and South Gate. We
completely agree that Paramount is a city that is much
more connected with us, Bellflower, Lakewood, Signal
Hill, and Hawaiian Gardens, the cities we are currently
grouped with.

However, Southgate is much more of a southeast L.A.
community than a community that organizes with us. I
expect that residents from South Gate will also make this
case in the future. We also heard earlier today,
direction given to remove Rossmoor, Los Al, and Cypress
from our current district visualization.

We have traditionally been in federal district with
these Orange County neighbors, and we love working with these cities. We share very similar coastal community experiences --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

FEMALE SPEAKER: -- with these cities and believe we belong together in one Congressional district. If population is a concern, we ask the commission to consider keeping Rossmoor, Los Al, and Cypress in the North Long Beach area visualization and going as far north as Paramount.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

FEMALE SPEAKER: But we know that there are many options you have to consider. Ultimately, we want to be supportive of you all and thank you for ideas. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 5819, and after that, will be caller 7296.

Caller 5819, you can now unmute by pressing star 6. Again, that's caller 5819, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MR. PERRY: Thank you. Michael Perry (ph.) here from Big Bear Lake, California, thirty-eight-year resident, and I appreciate all of the council's hard
work. We are -- as the council's commented, we are a rural community here in Big Bear Lake. And we do support the Congressional visualization, B-E-A-V-I-C-V-A-L, and the Assembly visualization, V-I-C-V-A-L-H-I-G-D-E-F, which keeps our rural Big Bear Valley united with the rural desert communities in the High Desert around us.

And this is very important for our community to stay connected to other small communities and rural communities that have the same common interest that we do in our resources and our economy. Too often, our small communities feels left out.

And in this case, the commission is really showing that they have listened to our concerns and that they are responding to our concerns. So thank you so much for all of your efforts on behalf of our small rural communities.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 7296, and after that, will be caller 6886.

Caller 7296, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MS. KITAMURA: Thank you for your hard work, Commissioners. It's good to hear some of the changes that you're making during the visualization process. This is Deanna Kitamura, calling again from Asian
Americans Advancing Justice, Asian Law caucus, calling on behalf of the AAPI and AMEMSA State Redistricting Collaborative.

You had questions about Gardena and Torrance and where it might be cut. The community would prefer the two cities kept whole and together if possible. But they would prefer you prioritize keeping the COI whole over having the two cities whole.

And if you're talking about where to cut, the community lives just -- starts in Gardena in the southern part -- portion of Gardena just above Moraine (ph.) and they live in Torrance. The bulk lived east of Hawthorne. So if you have to cut, that is where the community would prefer the cuts to happen in those cities.

And hopefully, one or the other and both of the -- those cuts in the cities. And with the time I have remaining, I just wanted to add that in our Assembly in Southern California Congressional proposals, we drew more Latino opportunity districts in the visualizations tab. And I urge you to assess whether you need to draw additional districts in order to comply with the voting rights act. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 6886, and after that, will be caller 0331.
Caller 6886, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute. Again, that's caller with the last four digits, 6886, you can now unmute by pressing star 6. Go ahead; the floor -- oh. It looks like you muted again. Try it one more time, caller 6886 please press -- go ahead; the floor is yours.

MR. GALE: Thank you, Commissioners and staff for the opportunity to address you today. My name is Darin Gale. I live Sutter County. I'm the former deputy city manager for the City of Yuba City. I want to express, first, my appreciation to the commission for your service to the state and for taking in the consideration the feedback to receive for myself and many others from the north state as part as your process.

As you know, there's a deep desire up here in the northern Sacramento Valley communities to stay together, the counties of Butte, Yuba, and Sutter, as well as Tehama, Glen (ph.) Colusa, make up our bowl-shaped valley. Unlike other parts of the state, our population is really spread out across large land masses.

Chico and Redding are the only two cities in our regions with populations greater than 100,000. We truly are the definition of a small-town America. And we really take great pride in that. Many of us often feel ignored by government in California, not because of the
quality of our representative but because we are so vastly outnumbered by other parts of the state.

We feel our voice just isn't heard in the state with 40 million people. That's why it's important for us not to be drawn into districts that includes large urban areas. I understand that some of the commissions districts would attach us with Yolo, even Solano Counties. And I that you will try to avoid that.

If you're form L.A. or San Francisco, Yolo may seem like a large farming community but to us, Yolo County is really an urban area. And -- and we do not share a lot in common with both Davis and West Sacramento. They're on the I-80 corridor and it makes much more sense to connect them with the Delta or the Sacra varia (ph.)

Once again, I appreciate you listening to our comments. And thank you for you for serving on the commission.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 0331, and after that, will be caller 3422.

Caller 0331, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star 6. Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you very much. My name is Wayne (ph.) calling from Fresno. The city of Fresno is a
majority of Latino city. And our Latino community is important. We have similar interests and needs. And I think we should be together in Congress, Assembly, and Senate. As the commission draws anchor district in the central valley, they should include the majority of the City of Fresno in this anchor district to ensure the Latino community is not being separated from each other.

There is an ability to draw an anchor district that includes most of Fresno, with the exception of northeast Fresno. The current maps skip over Latino precincts in Fresno, which I do not think is the intention of the commission and should not be done.

This would harm the ability of the Latino community to elect a representative of their choice. So I urge the commission to reconsider separating the Latino community in Fresno. Thank you very much for your time.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 3422, and after that, will be caller 1447.

Caller 3422, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute. Caller 3422, go ahead. The floor is yours.

MS. SALAS: Hi. Can you hear me?

MR. MANOFF: We sure can. Please go ahead.

MS. SALAS: Okay. Hi. My name is Juanita Salas (ph.). I called the commission in the past. I want to
thank you for taking our testimony seriously and making sure that the Imperial County is drawn in with East Coachella. We want to encourage you to continue mapping Imperial County with Coachella at the Assembly, Senate, and Congressional seats. We especially want to make sure the commission conserve the Voting Rights Act on the Senate seat. Again, thank you for your hard work. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 1447, and after that, will be caller 4165.

Caller 1447, if you could please press star 6 to unmute. Go ahead. The floor is yours.

MR. CARSON: Thank you. Hi. My name is Dan Carson. I'm a councilmember from Davis, California. I'm very much concerned about the proposed Senate and Congressional maps, the visualizations, and how they would move Davis and Yolo County into a -- districts that would stretch all the way to the Oregon border, about 250 miles.

We believe the Assembly map that affects us is generally reasonable but could be improved. As I mentioned in terms of the Senate and Congressional maps, it -- it would join our pretty urban area with a vast array of sparsely populated rural areas.
It divorces our city and county from adjoining urban and suburban areas in the Sacramento metropolitan area, map of Solano, East Bay, and Northern Sacramento Valley. All of these things are a much better fit for us. So we view this as a radical and unfortunate departure from the existing boundary lines we have.

Right now, we're in a much more compact geographic area comprised of mid-sized urban/suburban communities that have a coherent community of interest. The new Congressional and Senate lines are contrary we believe to the principles upon which the state commission is supposed to operate. And it would greatly hinder and effect of representation of residents in the city of Davis and Yolo County.

The other concern we have, on a whole on the Assembly district, as I said, we think is a reasonable one.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. CARSON: But we are concerned -- we are concerned that the draft map excludes El Macero from the redrawn Assembly district, which is an unincorporated -- they're right next to the (indiscernible) Davis. We're also concerned it inappropriately excludes Winters.

Our county --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.
MR. CARSON: -- serves as a model of interjurisdictional collaboration and with this, is a great partner with us. Don't divorce us, please.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much.

Up next, we've caller 4165, and on deck, we've got caller 2915.

Caller 4165, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute. Please press star 6. Again, caller 4165, you can now unmute by pressing star 6. Caller 4165, one more time, you can now unmute by pressing star 6.

All right. We will come back to you, 4165.

Up next, we've got caller 2915, and after that, will be caller 4340.

Caller 2915, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. Go ahead; the floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Good afternoon, Commissioners, and happy Friday. My name is Maritza (ph.). I'm with the organization Power California. I am calling on behalf of visualizations in the San Joaquin Valley. I, myself, being born and raised in the San Joaquin Valley, I'll specifically be talking about Assembly visualization, page 45, 10/27. A lot of these comments though can also relate to visualization -- visualizations at the other levels. So to start off with the Merced County, that's
on page 45, just want to take into consideration that we would like the commission to, instead of going north and south, pull west to include most of -- to include the rest of Merced County, and then also include communities in West Fresno County, such as Los Banos, Firebaugh, Mendota, and Dos Palos.

And moving to the Fresno map that's presented here, so knowing the City of Fresno will need to be split. Do want to also echo comments around having electing a VRAC in Fresno, and so taking into consideration that there is a north-south divide in the City of Fresno. Typically, Shaw and -- Shaw as the dividing line, and so this map should include South Fresno and West Fresno together, and exclude North Fresno and Clovis, and rather have North Fresno --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

FEMALE SPEAKER: -- and Clovis in the map with Madera, specifically those areas of Madera Rancho, and Bonadelle Ranchos as well.

There is a long history of redlining and racism in Fresno, and disinvestment (ph.) in South and West Fresno --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

FEMALE SPEAKER: -- but we cannot -- so I want to take into consideration the historic discrimination, and
make sure that we have proper representation and fairness
in these maps. Thank you for your time.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And just a time check. Our
lines are closing in one minute. For those who have
called in, we are going to get to your calls, so please
stay connected with your hands raised. Again, if you
called in to give comment, please press star 9, to raise
your hand; that will raise your hand for the comment
moderator. And those liens are closed. Again, please
stay connected.

Up next we've got caller 4340, and after that, we'll
have caller 7474. Caller 4340, if you could please
follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6; go
ahead; the floor is yours.

MS. LADDISH: Thank you. My name is Kate Laddish,
of Winters, which is on the Yolo-Solano Line just down
the road from Napa, and where the Coast Range and Central
Valley meet. We're connected to Bay Delta system by
Putah Creek, which has been restored, and now it's
(indiscernible) Chinook Salmon, and forms the wadeable
boundary between Yolo and Solano.

The area with the highest rate of wildfire ignitions
in the state is in the Greater Winters area where Yolo,
Solano, and Napa meet, and shared representation to
facilitate wildfire preparation, response, and recovery.

Recreation at Lake Berryessa located in Napa, at the Yolo-Solano Napa line, is the major drive of Winters' economy, and management decisions there impact our city; children in Yolo and Solano attend Winters Joint Unified School District schools.

I urge you to unify Yolo and Solano counties and districts, and to keep those counties whole. Yolo and Solano are particularly closely intertwined, that share economic, infrastructure, transportation, cultural, educational, agricultural, and resource ties. We're the connectors between the Bay Area and the Sacramento regions.

Grouping Yolo and Solano in the northern end of the Delta with Napa would reflect the shared communities of interest between these counties. I'm deeply concerned that the visualizations for this week have most or all of Yolo and Congressional and Senate districts that stretch far north to the Oregon border and Northeastern Nevada. Counties as different as Yolo, Siskiyou, and Modoc would not be well served by these groupings. Districts 300 miles long would decrease access to representatives by people with disabilities, and other access and functional needs. I appreciate your discussion today,
MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. LADDISH: -- grouping Yolo and Solano, and keeping these counties whole.

We refer to The Yolo Way. We collaborate county-wide to seek innovative, equitable solutions to challenges. The three-way split and the current Assembly visualizations would significantly decrease our ability to have appropriate representation, and to advocate for assistance.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. LADDISH: Carving Winters, part of Davis, West Sacramento, and Clarksburg out of the rest of the county does not reflect our county's cohesion. Thank you again, so much for your work.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And as a reminder to our callers, your comments are being interpreted today, if you could please speak at a steady pace, and take your time with county names and numbers as they are being interpreted by both ASL and our live captioners.

All right; up next, we've got callers 7474, and after that, will be caller 0405. Caller 7474, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. That's for the caller with last four digits, 7474, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. I see you there. Go ahead; the floor is yours.
MALE SPEAKER: Thank you. Good afternoon. On behalf of our community in Bellflower, we thank you for now including us in the LB Harbor Visualization for Congressional Maps in L.A. County. We share so much with Long Beach, and we can be -- even be hard to tell where our city ends and theirs begins.

A lot of our friends live in Long Beach, and it's common for us to visit them and for them to come to us too. It's our strong position that our community is best served by being in the same Congressional district as our neighbors in Long Beach and Lakewood. We share the same roads, parks, and hospitals of these cities, and we even share the same daily newspaper, the Long Beach Press-Telegram.

As you move forward through this process, please continue to align Bellflower with these regional partners, and similar communities, in the LB Harbor Congressional Visualization -- Visualization. It is incredibly important to us. Thank you for your service, and for your time.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 0405, and after that, will be caller 1323. Caller 0405, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6? Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you, Commissioners for
your time and your service. And my comments are in regards to Congressional district Southwest Riverside 10/27. I am glad to see that all of you have seen that keeping the Orange County cities with Riverside County is literally a mountain. There is a mountain of difference between us and them, as far as our socio-economical, and the way they're organized; and of course, the way that we on the Riverside side do our things, where it's very suburban.

And I also want to recognize and thank Commissioner Kennedy for pointing out that if you remove Temecula City from our area, that is an anchor city for us. That it makes no sense to remove Temecula from us. They have been largely without representation for the last ten years because they are the only city in that current Congressional district in Riverside County; and so to do -- to do that that would be an injustice to them, and to us, because we see them as our -- part of our COI.

I also want to comment on the Senate district, Southwest Riverside County 10/27. I don't know if you can explore combining two Assembly districts to make up one Senate district, since it's essentially, they're half and half. And so if that's possible, that --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MALE SPEAKER: -- might make things here -- things a
lot easier instead of cutting everything up.

And of course we would also like to keep one or the other, and that's (indiscernible) with this map is that the City of Riverside County is being cut up into two different districts.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MALE SPEAKER: So if it's possible to put it back together, that we would appreciate that, and maybe if we can pick up cities to the east.

And so for that I just want express gratitude for your time -- the time that you're putting into this, and considering all of our options. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 1323, and after that, we'll have caller 8566. Caller 1323, if you could please follow the prompts by pressing star 6 at this time. Again, for the caller with the last four digits 1323, you can now unmute by pressing star 6. One more time; caller 1323, please press star 6 to unmute. All right, we're going to come back to you.

Up next we've got caller 8566, and after that, it will be caller 5701. If caller 8566 could please unmute by pressing star 6.

MR. ZUCKER: Hi. Can you hear me?

MR. MANOFF: We sure can, go ahead.

MR. ZUCKER: This is Lucas Zucker with CAUSE, for
Community Org representing farm workers in the Central Coast. I think Commission and staff did a great job with overall architecture of districts in our region. We'd strongly recommend a couple key tweaks particularly in the Assembly around the margins that are most pressing for voting rights.

First the Latino VRA Assembly District called Denzel (ph.) now splits the farm worker towns of the Salinas Valley, which are -- a very cohesive community of interest, Soledad, Greenfield, and King City are extremely similar connected to Gonzales in Salinas, and farm workers in these towns travel and work at farms all throughout the agricultural Salinas Valley which has shared issues of groundwater pesticides, immigrant farm worker rights. If you need to make some room, we'd recommend removing Morgan Hill because that's more connected with suburban Silicon Valley.

And second, the majority of people of color coalition Assembly district called Ventura, now stretches a little bit into southern Santa Barbara County, in particular Montecito is literally one of the wealthiest communities in the entire world. It's where Oprah, Ellen DeGeneres, and now the British Royal Family live, and so this is an incredibly inappropriate to put in the district primarily made up of farm-worker communities.
So we'd recommend cutting out those parts of Santa Barbara County, and maybe putting in some -- some or all of Camarillo, which is more middle-class and part of the same agricultural plain as Oxnard. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 5701, and after them, will be caller 7791. Caller 5701, would you please press star 6 to unmute at this time. Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you. Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Nathan. I am calling from the Fresno area, and I am calling to express some concern over the way that our current visualizations are drawn. At the Assembly, State Senate, and Congressional levels, historically Fresno has had a majority Latino Congressional, State Senate, and State Assembly seat, with the further current visualization of Latino communities all over the major Metro Fresno area are disenfranchised and are split up into a number of legislative seats.

We feel that this greatly disservices our community, and makes it tougher for the Latino community to be able to elect a representative that best serves their needs. I draw particular attention to the commissioner's comments on it being in the Northwest Fresno, together with other parts of Fresno.
I think that you've heard a number of public comments being made around keeping all of northwest, or northwest and northeast together with the City of Clovis as a community of interest; and then keeping South Fresno together with other parts of unincorporated Fresno County, and other rural communities into a district of itself.

So the community has been abundantly clear in what we believe our communities of interest are, and how we identify ourselves. We would ask this commission and those making these decisions to be able to listen to us, and take our feedback as we go forward in drawing these lines. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 7791, and after that, it will be caller 2240. Caller 7791, will you please press star 6 to unmute? Caller with the last four digits 7791, will you, please, follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6? Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Yes. As has already been stated, it's important to recognize the enormous responsibility that you guys have, and the work that you've been doing. I'm a long-time resident of Simi Valley, and the major issue that the commissioners have talked about, as well as the public, is the importance of keeping communities
intact to ensure that their collective voices are heard, and that each receives the representation that understands the needs and concerns of their communities.

And with that, I would ask that you keep Simi and Moorpark together, along with Santa Clarita, in the same district as we have many shared values, needs, and concerns. And again, thank you very much for your hard work.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we have caller 2240, and after that, will be caller 9652. Caller 2240, please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star 6. That's caller with the last four digits 2240, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. One more time, caller 2240, please press star 6 to unmute. All right, we will come back to you.

Up next, we've got caller 9652, and after that, we will have caller 5592. Caller 9652 please press star 6 to unmute.

MS. ALLEN: Hello?

MR. MANOFF: Go ahead, the floor is yours.

MS. ALLEN: Okay. Thank you so much. Good afternoon, Commissioners. This is Sky Allen again, from IE United. Thank you for releasing these visualizations and trying to balance out all of our thoughts about the
We do have some concerns, and I want to encourage you all to take another look at the proposals that we submitted. For Assembly, I want to uplift that our proposal created seven VRA districts listed in the two counties, and this one only has five, two of which are right about 50 percent.

This is a big region. There are a lot of COIs that we all want to keep whole, or as whole as possible, but we also have large and growing communities of color with distinct voting preferences, as your own (indiscernible) analysis shows.

We worry that your new configuration of the High Desert had a ripple effect that adversely impacted all of the other VRA districts in the region, and that isn't tradeoff we saw entirely gone to the west. Some of your previous visualizations were closer to our Assembly preferences. We would urge you to find ways not take away any VRA Assembly districts.

With respect to Senate, we really oppose the San Bernardino Riverside combined districts. We appreciate your time to make the VRA district there, but there are ways to do it that there's a VRA district in San Bernardino and a VRA district in Riverside that more reasonably respects those COIs.
Lastly, on Congressional map, Loma Linda, Grand Terrace of Highland, we don't think should be included in the San Bernardino District, having those cities included severely weakens that VRA district, and we would prefer you honor the COIs to the west, and group them more with like Rialto and Fulton.

Also, in northwestern Riverside County, we'd like to see that portion of Riverside south of the 60 --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. ALLEN: -- and east of the 91, swapped with Latino communities in Corona in order to strengthen that VRA district.

So in short, we see all of your hard work, and we thank you for it. But we also worked really hard on balancing VRA and COI considerations, and we encourage you to --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. ALLEN: -- continue to review our proposal as you do your redistricting in Inland Empire. Thank you so much.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 5592, and after that, will be caller 1036. Caller 5592, you can now unmute by pressing star 6. Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Hi, Good afternoon. Well, thank you
for the opportunity to speak, Commissioners. I'm calling
to express my support for a district here in Central
Valley that would include the majority of the City of
Fresno that encompasses the large Hispanic and Latino
community here. Our Hispanic-Latino community is an
important demographic here in Fresno, and we share unique
education, housing, and employment needs, and should be
represented together in Congress, the Assembly, and the
Senate, not divided up.

I know it's not the intent of the commission, but
the current map I see overlooks these important Latino
precincts. In order to provide an opportunity for our
Latino community to be fairly and adequately represented,
I encourage further consideration for a district that
includes most of Fresno, with the exception of Northeast
Fresno, in order to avoid separating the community in
Fresno, and maintaining a strong Latino voice. Thank
you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And with that, I --

MR. MANOFF: It looks like we've got time for one
more caller, before we break.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Let's try it.

MR. MANOFF: All right. Here we go. And again,
during the break, if you could please all stay connected.
We will be getting to your calls after the break.

Next up, we've got caller 1036, if you could follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MS. VARGAS: Thank you. I got right before the break, awesome. Good afternoon, distinguished Commissioners. My name is Analisa Vargas, and I'm the lead community organizer with Communities for a New California, also known as CNC. I'm a resident of the City of Indio, and I grew up in the community of Thermal located in the Eastern Coachella Valley. CNC is a member of the IE redistricting hub, so this is general comment in reference to the Assembly visualization.

CNC would like to provide input and say that the IE hub redistricting maps meet the qualifications of our VRA district and CVAP, and we recommended that you accept the hub maps, as they demonstrate more VRA districts and a stronger Latino CVAP in several communities that have experienced decades of political disenfranchisement, environmental, racism, and many forms of socioeconomic inequities.

So the visualization seems to have a cascading effect, and would result in the loss of two VRA districts in the High Desert and Moreno Valley. And these -- our maps have seven VRA districts which we think is very
strong. So we do believe the previous visualizations honored these communities while the newest iterations do not.

And lastly, in reference to the Assembly, Senate, and Congressional visualization, and that they split up the Coachella Valley, while the current visualizations aren't a deal breaker, but the IE redistricting --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. VARGAS: -- hub map, better reflect our overall preferences. Thank you so much for your time.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And with that, I'd like to just announce to those that are in queue that we do have a hard stop today at 6:30 p.m., and with the number of people in queue, there is a likelihood that we will not get to everyone in the queue by 6:30. I am issuing a continuance of meeting for tomorrow morning which is October 30th, that will run from 9 a.m. until 1 p.m., or close of business.

And so for anyone that we do not get to, I would like to invite you to call back tomorrow morning, where we will be concentrating on public comment at that time.

At this point, we do have to go to our required break. And we will be back at 6:05 -- at 5:05. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 4:50 p.m.)
until 5:05 p.m.)

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you very much, and thank you all for your patience. We are ready with our next caller.

Kristian?

MR. MANOFF: All right. And as a reminder to our callers, your comments today are being interpreted, and live-transcribed, so please use a steady pace, and take your time with those county names and numbers.

Coming up next, we've got caller 7856, and after that, will be caller 2765. Caller 7856, if you could follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. That's for a caller with the last four digits 7856, you can now unmute by pressing star 6. All right, caller 7856, one more time, if you could please press star 6 to unmute. All right, we will come back to you.

Up next -- up next, we've got caller 2765, and after that, will be caller 6620. Caller 2765, you can now unmute by pressing star 6. Thank you so much. Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MR. ZOSKY: My name Joe Zosky (ph.). I'm an elected director at Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency. Commissioners, thank you for your work and for extending the public comment to tomorrow.

I would like for you to keep Santa Clarita Valley
and San Fernando Valley separate when considering State, Assembly, and Congressional districts. Both communities have different needs in terms of water, and most recently, brush fire issues. And it would be beneficial to both counties if they have their own representation. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 6620, and after that, will be caller 1724. Caller 6620, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star -6. Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MR. RODRIQUEZ: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Jose Rodriguez. I am the Vice Mayor of National City. Thank you so much for holding -- hosting this meeting, and thank you so much for extending the public comment period to tomorrow. It's truly appreciated.

I represent National City, which is around 65,000 people, 60 percent of which are Latino, 20 percent Filipino, and 20 percent a mix of other ethnicity. It is the largest percentage of Filipinos than any other city in the state, and Filipinos are part of our fabric within our city. So we are very diverse. We're very unique, and we want to simply thank you for keeping National City together, in both the Assembly, the Senate seats, that keeps us with the South Bay, that is Chula Vista, as well as San Ysidro.
However, the Congressional seat has moved us to Central San Diego. That is alongside La Mesa, Del Cerro, and the College area, all of which are neighborhoods that we share very little cultural ties with.

So we have a very rich cultural history and economic ties to the South Bay more than anybody else in our region. And we would really appreciate keeping us together with our South Bay families here in South San Diego. Thank you so much for your time.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 1724, and after that, will be caller 7930. Caller 1724, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MR. VAN DORN: Good afternoon, and I guess it's good evening now. Commissioners, thank you for all your hard work. My name Steve Van Dorn. I'm the president and CEO of the Pleasanton Chamber of Commerce. I'm a long-time Tri-Valley resident of over thirty years.

We certainly appreciate the commission has recognized the Tri-Valley as a community of interest. Your COI map of the Tri-Valley from your October 4th meeting labeled Diablo 1007, is the most accurate depiction of the Tri-Valley. Please refer to this map when you consider what communities are included in the Tri-Valley.
As you adjust your maps, please keep the Tri-Valley whole for at least one state district and one federal district. The Tri-Valley has over 400,000 residents, and can and should be a core of at least one or two districts.

For example, you can keep the Tri-Valley together in an Assembly map if you combine the Tri-Valley with Castro Valley, and Fairview, as one of your prior maps did. Or combine the Tri-Valley with communities to the east and to the northeast of us, like Brentwood, Byron, Discovery Bay, Knightsen, maybe even Oakley. Those communities have asked to be kept together. They share similar suburban interests, and have similar housing, transportation, water, and wildlife priorities to the Tri-Valley.

We also have similar rural, and semi-rural boundaries with Mount Diablo and as the Tri-Valley --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. VAN DORN: -- and share the -- and share the same government. An example of Congressional district would be to combine us with Walnut Creek and Clayton to the north; again, similar suburban communities, and with Brentwood, Byron, Oakley, Discovery Bay to the northeast --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.
MR. VAN DORN: -- perhaps Mountain House and Tracy. This would make total sense and would also combine communities that share priorities.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my comments. Have a good evening.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 7930, and after that, will be caller 5682. Caller 7930, please press star 6 to unmute. Again, that's caller with the last four digits 7930, you can unmute at this time by pressing star 6. One more time to caller 7930, if you could please unmute by pressing star 6. All right, we will come back to you.

Up next we've got caller 5682, and after that, will be caller 2270. Caller 5682?

MS. JOHNSON: Good evening.

MR. MANOFF: Go ahead.

MS. JOHNSON: Good evening. This is Theodora Johnson. I'm a rancher from Etna, in Siskiyou County, and a long time -- our family's been here for many generations, doing this. And I'm very concerned looking at the Congressional District, the way it's been visualized. Splitting Siskiyou County in half, it appears. Really, we need to keep our county whole. And you know, we're a real agricultural county, and we really belong on the cowboy side, I would say, of the state. We
go to -- all of our business dealings go north-south, or
to the east. You know, getting to the coast is really
difficult. It takes a lot of time and dangerous travel
to get to the coast. They're very different climate and
different types of business over there. You know, we go
to rodeos, bull sales, horse sales, in places like Red
Bluff, McArthur. Again, it's down -- up and down the I-5
corridor and towards the east. We look for cow feed,
mostly to the south and to the east. We ship our calves
to Orland, when we sell calves. So you know, I think
it's really important that the other boundary lines we're
looking at in the visualizations don't do what this
Congressional line does. And I -- and I think it's
really concerning that this proposal would cut us off
from --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. JOHNSON: -- the other rural/agricultural
communities that are sis -- you know, are our sister
communities. And so I appreciate your efforts on this,
and thank you for listening to our concerns.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've caller 2270,
and after that, will be caller 3140. Caller 2270, you
can unmute at this time by pressing star 6. Again,
that's caller with the last four 2270. If you could
please unmute by pressing star 6? One more time. Caller
2270, you can unmute by pressing star 6.

All right. We will come back to you. Up next, we've got caller 3140, and after that, will be caller 0514. Caller 3140, you can unmute at this time by pressing star 6. Go ahead; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. Hi. I want to thank the commission for everything that you've been doing so far. This is an incredible undertaking, and I don't envy you. So I'm a long-time resident of Santa Clarita, and I'm calling to advocate for Senate District map, North L.A. County, from set A of the original visualization, instead of the most recent visualization, which I believe is labeled VSD-SCSFB-1027. This map most closely resembles the likely Congressional map and makes sense from a regional perspective. Santa Clarita doesn't share anything in common with North Hollywood and Van Nuys, and the Congressional -- and Assembly maps recognize this, so should the State Senate seat.

I also want to advocate that the commission should not try and bring Simi Valley back into the same Congressional District as Santa Clarita. Having long standing with -- connections with both communities, I can say with confidence that there is almost nothing that connects these two valleys. Simi residents know Santa Clarita only for our theme park. And Santa Clarita
residents know Simi Valley for the Rodney King trial. Simi Valley would be much better served being connected with the surrounding communities in the Conejo Valley, where they share common interests in a suburban area.

Thank you for your time.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 0514, and after that, will be caller 4667. Caller 0514, if you could please press star 6 to unmute? Go ahead.

The floor's yours.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Good afternoon, Commissioners. This is Lori Shellenberger, calling on behalf of California Common Cause. And I'm not calling about visualization, but instead to flag another important issue related to accessibility to the commission's policies, and want to -- want to lift up a letter that we sent earlier this week on that topic. And of course, thank you again for all your hard work and your willingness to consider the feedback we've submitted on various process-issues today.

The commission has voted on several important policies, but unfortunately the policies adopted by the commission are often not accessible to the public unless the person knows the date upon which a final version of the policy was posted in the hand-outs for the meeting at which it was adopted. And in some instances, policies
are adopted after considerable discussion and with
ambiguous amendments, and it's difficult to locate a
final amended version on the website. Leaving the public
to wonder about the details of what was ultimately
decided.

This is also true, not just of your policies, but of some of the great resources you've developed for
yourself; such as the 2020 ready-reference guide, and the mapping playbook. Those are things that, you know, would be of interest and helpful to the public, but are, again, only available to those who follow your meetings and catch them among the hand-outs for a particular meeting.

In our letter, from earlier this week, we raised a number of recommendations to address this issue. But inshort, please ensure that your policies are written clearly and eliminate or address ambiguities before adoption. And please dedicate a section of your website to commission policies and critical resources you've developed and relying upon with links to those policies and resources. And a search function on the website would be a bonus --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: -- and really helpful.

Lastly, I just want to flag that, earlier this month, we along with League of Women voters sent you a
letter asking you about your use of closed session; and
in particular in relation to the RANRPP discussions
you're having.

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: That letter's not posted on your
website that we could find. Which raised concerns that
it -- it wasn't received or that other submissions are
not being posted. So we urge you to check on that. And
thank you, again, for all you're doing.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller
4667, followed by caller 8561. Caller 4667, can you
please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6?
Go ahead, the floor's yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you. This is Tom. I'm calling
to talk about the Districts from Tuol -- the Tuolumne to
Kern visualizations, from 10/27. My issues are, the
District is spread out from north to south, hundreds and
hundreds of miles, with no community of interest, and
very diverse interests from each community. What I'd
like to see is the northern portion of district, which
includes Sonora, Twain Harte, be matched up more closely
with where they receive their medical care, their health
care, and their media, into -- into Modesto.

Then as you move further south, into Mariposa
County, and Madera County, that portion district should
move, then, west as well. That would then -- where they
receive their health care, in either Merced and Madera,
depending on which community. That's where the community
interest is there. As we move further into northeast
Fresno and Clovis, they should not be with Kern. As well
as, you know, going all the way east down into Boron and
California City. It has no community interest with
Fresno -- northeast Fresno and Clovis. They should be
paired with Shaver Lake.

And then as you go down to Tulare County, you have
Three Rivers that should be paired into Tulare and
Visalia. These changes would be minor changes for every
district, because they would encompass the districts that
are west of the current Tuolumne to Kern County District,
and make the Kern portion of this district much more
compact, as it could come north into Tulare County, and
possibly take in some of King's, or Eastvale --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MALE SPEAKER: -- eastern Tulare county, or wherever
it needs to go.

The reality is these districts -- this one district
is too far from north to south. There's no community
interest. There's no way to travel within the District.
There's -- the medical care is separated --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.
MALE SPEAKER: -- and there's -- there's just no
continuity to this District. It needs to tightened up
for Voting Rights Act issues. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And at this time, I'm going
to go to caller 4165.

MR. MCOSKER: Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Go ahead, caller 4165.

MR. MCOSKER: Thank you, very much. This is Tim
McOsker. I really appreciate you coming back to me. I
want -- I live in the harbor area of San Pedro, and I and
my neighbors and friends and professional associates want
to thank you very much, commission, for recognizing the
public comment that came from our area, San Pedro, Harbor
City, Wilmington, the Gateway. We were very worried when
we saw the maps that put us in with Long Beach, a few
weeks ago, and we immediately wanted to share our
concerns with you. And we know how much you have on your
plate, and we want to thank you for not losing track of
us. We really appreciate the visualizations for the week
of October 27th. They really captured the spirit of San
Pedro. They captured the spirit of Wilmington and this
harbor area, and reflect in how we are. We really
connect with our cities -- to our communities to the
north. And Long Beach is great, but I think Long Beach
residents would agree, please continue to keep us
separate from Long Beach when you finish these lines,

straight -- statewide.

We know there might be some shifts here and there. Please don't put us back in with Long Beach. Please keep the lines north-south as they are. And I just want to say that I and my neighbors strongly support the maps for the San Pedro and Harbor/Gateway regions, as you have recently presented them. And again, thank you very much for your service.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And again, to those who have called in, if you want to give comment today, please press star 9. That will raise your hand for the moderator, and that goes for people who we tried earlier and they were unable to get through. If you're hearing me now, press star 9. I will come back to you.

Up next, I've got caller 8561, and then after that, will be caller 2252. Caller 8561, please follow the prompts to unmute. That's caller with the last four digits 8561. Thank you so much. The floor is yours.

MR. FLORES: Hi there. My name's Alejandro Flores. I'm a member of the Latino community here in Fresno, and I'm asking if the commission, please, could reconsider the current visualizations for Fresno. The way it is currently set up, it will divide the voice and the power of the Latino community here in the valley. If you guys
wouldn't mind considering drawing up Fresno with Anchor
City and dividing us by north -- using the dividing line
of northeast Fresno, north Fresno, by Shaw. This will
ensure that us Latinos have -- our voice stays -- our
voice is still heard within the federal and state levels
of the government. Thank you so much.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller
2252, and after that, we'll have caller 8006. Caller
2252, please follow the prompts to unmute. Go ahead; the
floor's yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (In Spanish, not translated).

MR. MANOFF: (Spanish spoken). Up next, we've got
caller 8006, and after that, will be caller 0040. Caller
8006, if you could please press star 6 to unmute? Go
ahead; the floor's yours.

MR. SMITH: Hi. My name's Adam Smith, and I'm
calling from Bakersfield. Today -- and what I wanted to
talk about is the Congressional District currently. For
the last 50-years, Lancaster has been a part of the
Bakersfield Congressional seat in Kern County. We share
many of the same economic interests, transportation
corridors, and climate, and should remain that way moving
forward.

Additionally, this can be achieved, as well as being
compliant with the Voter's (sic) Rights Act, by returning
Clovis to a Fresno seat. A community that's two hours away from Bakersfield, where Lancaster's down the street.

So Lancaster should stay in the Kern County, the Bakersfield seat, as it has since 1970, at least. And Clovis should return to a Fresno Congressional seat, a community that's vastly different than ours. An economic interest vastly different, an environment, and two hours away from the seat here in Bakersville.

Thank you very much for your time and your service.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 0040, and after that, will be caller 2998. Caller 0040, if you could please press star 6 to unmute. Caller with the last four digits, 0040, you can now unmute by pressing star 6, please. One more time for the caller with the last four digits 0040, can you please press star 6 to unmute? Okay. We will be coming back to you.

Up next, we've got caller 2998, and after that, will be caller 1566. Caller 2998, please press star 6 to unmute. Go ahead; the floor's yours.

MS. JOHNSON: Hi. I am Sally Johnson, a resident of Scott Valley in Siskiyou County. The draft Congressional map shows the line dividing Siskiyou County in two, and attaching half of the county to the coastal range. Siskiyou County has little in common with the communities along the coast. Siskiyou County is an agriculture-based
county. Siskiyou County has established agriculture as a priority use on productive agricultural lands. There is not mention of agriculture on either Del Norte or Humboldt County's planning department websites.

Siskiyou County farmers and ranchers do little business within the coastal range. Most business is done to the east and south to Orland. The Congressional District lines should reflect this. Siskiyou County has a small, but effective, public transportation system it shares throughout the entire county, including transporting college students from Happy Camp and Scott Valley, to College of the Siskiyous in Weed. The only college in the entire county.

Our county's supervisor would be serving in two separate Congressional Districts. By dividing Siskiyou County, and moving the agricultural community of Scott Valley to a district with little agriculture, completely takes our voices away, and lets it be trampled by communities we have nothing in common with.

Thank you for your time.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And up next, we've got caller 1566, and after that, will be caller 7205. Caller 1566, if you'd please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6? Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay. Basically, you know, the here
in -- here in Fresno -- the state of Fresno, and we don't want, you know, to -- to -- to split the Latino votes, because we have a big majority of Latino here in the Fresno area. So we don't want to split that, because we don't -- we want -- want them to have the same Congressional -- stand at the same Assembly. And that also goes with the -- the Hispanics, and also with the Asian community. We also have a big community -- so we want to keep -- keep the -- everyone together, so. That's basically what I have to say. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 7205, and after that, would be caller 9290. Caller 7205, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6, at this time? Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MS. BRIDGEWATER: Hi. My name is Tamika Bridgewater, and I live in Simi Valley. One of your callers said something to the effect of Santa Clarita and Simi Valley don't have anything in common, but I have children ages nineteen, sixteen, and thirteen, that all play sports. And their entire time of playing sports, whether it was through the school or a separate entity, no matter what sport it is, all of our leagues are connected to Santa Clarita. So at any given time, people from Santa Clarita are in Simi, and vice versa.
Additionally, most people may not be aware, we don't have a great deal of senior care in Simi Valley. Which they are changing. They're building more, but a lot of us have elderly family members in Santa Clarita in senior care homes. And so it's very helpful to be able to communicate with the same Congress-people and Assembly-people when you need help. So I -- I -- I appreciate so much what you guys have done because I've watched when -- when you aren't taking calls and you were just drawing lines, and trying to make sure you had enough people, and trying to honor the wishes of the callers and --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. BRIDGEWATER: -- dear God. I mean, God bless you. God bless you, so much. Thank you so much. I mean, I know this is like -- I mean, oh my God. God bless you. Thank you. That's all.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much for those kind words.

MS. TURNER: Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Up next, we've got caller 9290, and after that, will be caller 9399. Caller 9290, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. Go ahead; the floor's yours.

MS. ORR: Hi. Thank you so much for your continued hard work with these visualizations and for the chance to speak. My name is Adria Orr, and I'm calling from
Advancing Justice Asian Law Caucus, on behalf of the AAPI and AMEMSA State Redistricting Collaborative. I just wanted to call in to raise some concerns on behalf of the Hmong community in the Fresno area, which is one of the largest Hmong communities in the nation.

So currently, all three levels of visualization divide the Hmong community and Fresno into three different districts. The various Hmong communities of interest in Fresno share a lot of common concerns and should be kept together in one district to the extent that it's possible.

Of particular concern is the Hmong community in and around Sunnyside. This COI is cut into three districts at the Assembly and Congressional level, and into two districts at the Senate level. Additionally, to the -- just to the east of Sunnyside is a growing community of southeast Asian farmers who have shared interest and they should be kept whole and together with Sunnyside, at all levels of government.

The Sanger area, a little bit further to the east, also has a growing number of Hmong farmers, whose community and interests increasing overlap with the Hmong community of interests in and around Sunnyside. These areas -- the Hmong community of interest in and around the Sanger area is currently individualizations divided
into two districts in each level of government. It should be kept whole and in a district together with the Hmong COI in and around Sunnyside.

It also should be kept in a Fresno County focused district, rather than drawn into the large district that stretches down to San Bernardino County, the state border with Nevada as it's currently seen in the Assembly visualization.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. ORR: We sent a map that shows just how our various Fresno COIs have been cut in the Assembly visualization. Uploaded it through the Airtable feedback form. And you can also see Appendix B of our mapping proposal for community testimony on behalf of the Fresno communities of interest, as well as our mapping proposal for an alternative suggestion for an Assembly district --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

MS. ORR: -- configuration in this area. Thank you so much for the opportunity to call in tonight.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 9399, and after that, will be caller 9045. Caller 9399, please follow those prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. Go ahead; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hey. How are you guys?

Thank you. Listen, I'm calling. I want to stress
strongly that you consider the maps that the Black/Brown Redistricting Alliance submitted, particularly for the area of the high desert of San Bernardino County, Assembly District 33. We changed it to look more compatible with -- or rather more commonalities between the communities that we've selected, or that they selected, and excluding the mountain-region of multi-million-dollar homes, ski-resorts, and mountain resorts. Taking that portion out of the district, and adding more desert communities to our district, to make it more -- having more common issues and our concerns about things that are occurring here in the desert.

So please, consider that. The Black/Brown Redistricting Alliance maps that they've submitted for the AD, and for the Senate District, and for the Congressional District. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 9045, and after that, will be caller 3392. Caller 9045, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute? Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Hello, everyone. First of all, thank you for -- for the time and the opportunity to provide public input. My name is (indiscernible) Hernandez (ph.), calling from the Coachella Valley.

First of all, I'm calling regarding the Inland Empire
Redistricting Hub submitted maps that have 7B or A complying districts that span the IE. And the new visualizations only allow for 5B or A compliant districts, and two of those districts are barely above fifty percent. We do believe the previous visualizations honor these communities, while these new iterations do not.

Also, regarding the Coachella Valley, it is important to keep the Coachella Valley together. There is an exceptional strong community of Spanish-speaking Latinos -- folks, in this area. Communities in the eastern Coachella Valley, they have lack of investment in areas of housing, roads, sidewalks, street-lining, and parks. The Coachella Valley must be kept together as a whole so residents can properly advocate for their needs and priorities as a community.

Thank you for the time and the opportunity.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 3392, and after that, will be caller 5335. Caller 3392, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6? That's caller with the last four digits 3392, you can now unmute, by pressing -- go ahead; the floor is yours.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: Hi. Good evening, commissioners. My name is Alejandra Ponce de Leon, with
Advancement Project California. Thank you so much for
the continued leadership, and in creating an inclusive
process of really trying to engage as many community
members as possible throughout this whole time. And
being here and adding an additional public comment period
for tomorrow.

I was calling just to uplift the letter that we
submitted along with various partners, providing just
general recommendations, as you continue to move forward
in your visualization process. I just wanted to
highlight four key recommendations that are in the letter
that we submitted today, this afternoon.

One, we just want to continue to ask, you know, that
you continue to lean into the community-based experts
that have submitted both statewide and regional district
maps. That you will continue to gather valuable insights
from their process. Including how they've drawn VRA
districts, the overall architectures, of how they
captured each communities of interest, and the kind of
community of interest data that they are considering.

These are going to give you more insights in terms
of just, like, how to, like -- how to balance so many
different community needs and interests, and so
definitely want you to -- encourage you to continue to
lean into that community-based experts that have
submitted maps.

Secondly, just wanted to uplift, also -- you know, to respect the communities of interest and city boundaries equally. There's a lot of conversation about keeping cities whole, but definitely, it's a lot more complex. And I think that there are a lot of different issues that -- diversity of communities of interest within cities, and recognizing that communities of interest are very --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: -- fluid and connect and have similar interests with adjacent neighborhoods. And so just keeping that in mind.

Third, you know, just to recognize that the VRA compliance often requires splitting cities.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: And so again, there's a lot of issues there. Definitely we wanted to uplift that point, and you know, continue to, like, balance all of these different desires and needs.

And then lastly, to make block-equivalency files public, as well, for all the --

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 5335, and after that, will be caller 9133. Caller 5335, if you could please follow those prompts to unmute by
pressing star 6? Go ahead; the floor's yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. I'm calling because I'm concerned about how Fresno's being split. The Latino community is being split in quite a few different districts now, and I feel like that's going to minimize their -- their ethnic vote on the matter. I also feel like to the west of Fresno, I noticed that they -- there's still a good portion of the San Joaquin River communities that extend into another district; that goes all the way south of Bakersfield. And I feel like that takes away from that community's representation. And I'm asking the commission to consider adding a few communities south of the San Joaquin River, and keeping Fresno together, so they can have the same minority farm-working community vote, and have their say in Congress. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 9133, and after that, will be caller 6420. Caller 9133, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute at this time? Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MS. DOWLING: Thank you. My name's Debra Lee Dowling (ph.). I also live in Siskiyou County, and our family is part of the farming and ranching business here. We have a geographically large county, pretty much all committed to the agricultural business, in one way or
another. And although we're big, we're tightly knit. A hardworking people who don't always have their ears to the ground for things like what are happening, the redistricting. As I understand it, even the mayor of our county seat was taken by surprise, I guess, for whatever reason that people are working as hard and fast as they can.

And I think it's fair to say that those who are just now hearing about it are horrified by the idea of splitting our county and sending half of us to be with the coast where we have -- I mean, difficult access, physically, transportation-wise. The I-5 corridor is our transportation. Our business, our economy, our culture, are not so much in common with the coast. We don't even want to be in common with the dope-growing interest. And we just don't want to see this split of Siskiyou County happen. I'm asking if you would please try to fix that, because --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. DOWLING: I'd like to also mention that our climate issues are different. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Yeah.

MS. DOWLING: Good night.

MR. MANOFF: You -- you have twenty seconds remaining. Very good. Thank you so much.
MS. DOWLING: Oh. Okay.

MR. MANOFF: Have -- have a good night.

All right. Up next, we've got caller 6420, and then caller 1956, after that. Caller 6420, if you could follow the prompts to unmute, please. Caller 6420, if you could please follow the -- go ahead; the floor is yours. Caller 6420, you are unmuted. Can you hear me? Make sure your phone isn't muted.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. I can hear you.

MR. MANOFF: Oh. There you are. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I'm a Coachella Valley lifelong resident. I'm calling regarding the Senate District that you have drawn between San Bernardino and Imperial, Riverside, San Diego County. So essentially the last southeast Senate seats that you've drawn. If you pull up google maps to-date, and you type in the directions between Needles, California and Sunny Seaville, California, that is a five-and-a-half-hour drive. That is a Senate District that the demographers have drawn up for you all to consider. It is extremely upsetting to see that district be so large. When we started having conversations with the redistricting commission about the Senate seat out here, in our region, we were letting you know that a district between Blythe to Temecula was too large.
Now, you have somehow managed to double the geographic size of our Senate District. My request is that the commission work with the demographers to draw lines that encompass only Riverside and Imperial County, and exclude any territories within San Diego and San Bernardino County. And this really -- this -- my request does not only sit for the State Senate seat, but it also sits for the State Assembly seat. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And just a reminder to those who have called in to give comment today, please press star 9. That will raise your hand. For those who we tried to go earlier, and we were unable to unmute, if you could please press star 9. We see you, and we will come back to you.

Up next, I've got caller 1956, and after that, will be caller 3948. Caller 1956, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6? Go ahead; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, first of all, God bless you all for all the hard work that you're doing. I say that as somebody who is the daughter of an almost 94-year-old Holocaust survivor. My parents moved to Orange County in 1956, and we are long-time residents since then. Since the Track of Rossmoor opened in 1960. My parents are original home owners. My dad passed away,
but my mom's still here, sitting right next to me, as is my son. And we're really calling to say that we would, you know, respectfully ask that Rossmoor, that's always been unincorporated, along with Phila Park. We are the two that, you know, people come from all over. They move here because of the wonderful community that we are. That we maintain the representation with our Orange County cities. My dad started Palm Harbor Hospital, Anaheim General, Fountain Valley Hospitals, that still service the communities out here. I'm the former associate director of the Anti-Defamation League of Orange County, as well as the former deputy city attorney of Garden Grove. My dad opened his practice in Westminster. My sisters and I all went to all of the Los Alamitos Unified School District, and before that, we were part of Anaheim Union School District.

All our news, Orange County Magazine, Orange County Register, Orange County Weekly; all of our utilities, the Los Alamitos Naval Air Station, the Huntington Beach Air Show --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We basically -- my husband is buried in Harbor Mount Olive, and I know I'll be there someday with him in Costa Mesa. And again, I just think with our sheriff, with everything that, you know, we work
with here in Orange County --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. DOWLING: -- our values. You know, we like Long Beach, but you know, our values and our culture, everything, the fabric of who we are, is here in Orange County. So I want to thank you so much for that.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And up next, we've got caller 3948, and after that, we have caller 0180. Caller 3948, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Hello. I just want to say, thank you, for allowing this public comment to happen. My name is Justin. I'm from the city of Fresno. And I just want to say that Fresno's -- the City of Fresno has a huge Latino community that is very important to us, with similar interests and needs, and should be together in Congress, Assembly, and Senate. So as the commission draws anchor districts in Central Valley, they should include the majority of the City of Fresno in this anchor district to ensure the Latino community isn't being separated from each other. And the reason why I say this is because the current map -- the current maps skip over the Latino precincts in Fresno. Which I don't think is the intention of the commission, and shouldn't be done. There is no ability to -- or there is an ability to draw
an anchor district that includes most of Fresno, with the
exception of northeast Fresno. I feel that with the
current maps, this would harm the -- the ability of the
Latino community to elect a representative of their
choice.

So I urge the commission to reconsider -- I'm sorry.
To reconsider separating the Latino community in Fresno.
And thank you so much.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And we are at about forty
minutes left in our time here together. I want to let
the people with their hands raised know that I see them,
and to let you know that there is hope in sight. We
are -- up next, we'll have caller 0180. Then will be
1153, then 1270, then 2769, and then caller 4201. And
those are all the raised hands that I have. If you did
not hear the last four digits of your number, please
press star 9 to get in the queue.

Up next, we've got 0180. If you could go ahead and
press star 6 to unmute? That's caller with the last four
00 -- I'm sorry. 0180. If you could please press star 6
to unmute. One more time. Caller with the last four
0180, if you could please press star 6 to unmute?

All right. We will come back to you. Up next,
we've got caller 1153, and after that, will be 1270.
Caller 1153, if you could please press star 6 to unmute.
Again, that's caller with the last four 1153, you can
unmute at this time by pressing star 6, please? Go
ahead; the floor is yours.

MS. SWANSON: Thank you. My name is Rebekah
Swanson. I am a teacher, a mom, community member, and
city council member in Hesperia. And I want to thank the
commissioners for their time and what they've been able
to do, and for being there to hear from our community.
We -- certainly in Congressional visualizations that
kept -- keep our San Bernardino County high desert
intact. I appreciate that they see that. Keeping us
with other rural communities to whom we're tied. It
really means a lot to me to have the commission take our
public input seriously, and it's reflected in the
visualization. I want to say thank you for that, but
also, I wanted to say too that we have really benefited
from having representation from State Senator Scott Will.
And part of our desire to be placed with others in the
high desert area -- he made it his focus to build a
bridge between our communities, but as he will come out,
we don't have (indiscernible) and leadership is going to
be continued. So we -- we really, really appreciate that
the commission is listening to us. And I want to thank
you again.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And this time, I'm going to
go back to caller 0040, they've raised their hand.
Again, this is caller 0040, if you could try again, star
6 to unmute. Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MR. SHARMA: Thank you. I appreciate your time. My
name is Rischi Paul Sharma. I'm a councilman down in
Laguna Niguel, California. I certainly appreciate the
large -- large task at hand here. Laguna Niguel sits on
the south end of Congressional District Number 48. As
electeds, our ability to act effectively necessitates an
intimate understanding with many things. Amongst those,
the history, geography, social issues, and values of the
people we represent. Geographically, the separation
presented by Camp Pendleton Marine Corps, does in fact
dramatically distinguish the communities north of
Pendleton from those south of Camp Pendleton. Now
looking at San Clemente north to Huntington Beach,
collectively, we're all threaded together with a unique
set of social issues, connecting the infrastructure such
as Pacific Coast Highway, road management, tourism,
police and fire services, and environmental concerns.
We are uniquely a community of interest and
respectfully request to be a united district of Orange
County beach cities. Thank you for your time and
consideration. I yield the phone.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Glad we were able to
reconnect with you. Next up, is caller 1270, and after
that, will be caller 2769. Caller 1270, if you could
please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6?
Again, that's caller with the last four -- go ahead; the
floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. One second,
please. Yes. Thank you so much for all the work that's
been done so far. This has been amazing, and it's been
incredibly difficult. I'm calling in support of
visualization east Contra Costa 10/27. This Assembly
district map fulfills the community interest, and brings
some of the agricultural islands in (indiscernible) areas
of east Contra Costa County together.

East Contra Costa heavily relies on having a healthy
San Joaquin Delta to provide fresh water to farm. We
have amazing year-round farmers market as a result.
Also, much entertainment and sporting events takes place
on the delta. The City of Oakley sponsors a really hard-
fought fishing tournament. You guys should come out and
try it sometime.

We also share transportation routes, and Highway 4,
and Vasco Road, to get to various other highways. To get
from as far -- as far as Stockton, all the way to Oakland
in San Francisco. We need a strong, cohesive
representation to keep -- to ensure that the San Joaquin
Delta gets funding to shore up, clean up, and reinforce its channels and tributaries.

We've seen several maps that kind of chop the San Joaquin Delta in half, and we can't have the top of the San Joaquin Delta with one representation and the bottom with another. The biggest threat to the health of the entire San Joaquin Delta is intrusion of sea water salinating the fresh farm water that is -- is needed by all who participate --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. SHARMA: -- in -- in -- in the delta and also all of the tributaries. So I -- I strongly support this visualization map east Contra Costa 10/27. Thank you so much for all of your work, and I appreciate your time.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And up next, we've got caller 2769, and then after that, it'll be caller 4201.

And again, if you want to speak tonight, press star 9.

Up next, caller 2769, if you could please press star 6 to unmute? Again, that's caller with the last four digits 2769, if you could please press star 6 to unmute?

One more time. Caller with the last four digits 2769.

Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Hi. Thank you. My name is Robert. I am a lifelong Kern County resident, and I want to reiterate on a point that was made earlier. The -- the
areas of Clovis and Fresno don't share a community of
interest, in my eyes, with Bakersfield. It's -- it's a
distance of 120, 130 miles. It's a two-hour drive.
It's -- you would be doing -- in my mind, you would be
nothing but quieting the voices that stand out.
They're -- I mean, they're two beautiful, separate
communities, and they should stay as such, in my opinion.

Thank you for your time.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And our last hand of the
night is caller 4201. Again, if you have called in to
give comment tonight, and you have not yet spoken, and
you wish to speak, please press star 9 to raise your
hand. And we will come back to you.

Caller 4201, if you could please follow the prompts
to unmute? Again, this is for the caller with the last
four digits 4201, if you could please press star 6 to
unmute? Go ahead; the floor is yours.

MR. WALDMAN: Thank you. The prompt doesn't show
up, by the way. I just happened to hit it. Well I --
I'm the only thing standing between you and finishing.
This is Stuart Waldman, from the San Fernando Valley
Redistricting Coalition. I apologize, I had called in
earlier and apparently missed my time slot. We -- the
visualizations regarding the San Fernando Valley are
great. We appreciate them. You listened after A and B.
I do have concerns that all the changes that are going to push districts down may have a negative impact on the San Fernando Valley. We are hoping that we will have districts wholly contained in the valley -- San Fernando Valley. Or districts that are majority San Fernando Valley.

We also ask that -- there are 760,000 Latinos in the San Fernando Valley. I don't understand why your attorney is telling you, you don't have to have a Congressional seat. We never had a Congressional seat before that was Latino until the independent redistricting commission. It -- we should have one again. We should have a Senate seat, and we should also have two Assembly seats.

Let's see. Mulholland, we continue to ask that that -- that you not go south of Mulholland. That you go east, west, or north, if you have to leave the valley. And we hope that the lack of comments from the commissioners are evidence that you also like the districts as well.

So I want to thank you for your hard work, and I'm sure I'll talk to you soon.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much. And again, for those who have called in tonight who have not spoken and given comment, if you could please press star 9, that
will raise your hand. Again, that's star 9, on your telephone keypad. Well, we can only hope that you are content to listen.

Chair, we have no raised hands at this time.

MS. TURNER: Okay. Wonderful. Thank you, Kristian. Job well done. And thank you to all the callers that have dialed in to speak and give us public comment, feedback, input.

MR. MANOFF: Oh. We do have a hand now.

MS. TURNER: We certainly do appreciate you. And one --

MR. MANOFF: Chair, would you like to take the caller that --

MS. TURNER: I --

MR. MANOFF: -- raised their hand?

MS. TURNER: I do hear you. One second.

MR. MANOFF: Okay.

MS. TURNER: And I'd just like to say, I appreciate all of you for listening this time period. We have one hand that wanted to be the last. The very last, after Mr. Stuart. So we are going to invite you to share at this time. Yes, Kristian.

MR. MANOFF: Sounds good. And this is going to be caller 8029; we see your hand. If you could please press star 6 to unmute? The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (In Spanish, not translated).

MR. MANOFF: (Spanish spoken).

MS. TURNER: (Spanish spoken). Thank you so much.

And just to let everyone know that we will have the comments that come in non-English translated. And they will be posted. We will get those comments, and we appreciate you for calling in. And with that, we have one more hand. We have our, we have our final hand for the evening. Our final-final.

MR. MANOFF: And that's caller 9244, if you could please press star 6 to unmute.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Spanish spoken).

MR. MANOFF: The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (In Spanish, not translated).

MR. MANOFF: (Spanish spoken).

MS. TURNER: (Spanish spoken). Okay. And everyone else in queue, looks like, have spoken. Yeah. We will be available tomorrow for public comment. We start at 9 a.m. tomorrow morning. And so we are going to adjourn. The agenda is posted, and so we are going to adjourn until that time. Tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. And we do hope you'll join us, or encouraging others for public comment tomorrow. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the public meeting adjourned at 6:08 p.m.)
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