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CHAIR LE MONS: Good morning, California. Good morning, commissioners, line drawers, staff. Welcome to day two of our visualization week, which will conclude tomorrow.

Ravi, if you could do roll call, please.

MR. SINGH: Yes, Chair. Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.


COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Vazquez. 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.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Here.

MR. SINGH: And Commissioner Le Mons.

CHAIR LE MONS: Here.

MR. SINGH: Thank you. Chair, you have a quorum.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Ravi.

So let me just give a quick overview of the day. So we're going to revisit Los Angeles just briefly this morning. We do have a few commissioners that want to provide some additional input, and then we will move onto Southern California for the Assembly, and then we'll begin to move into the Senate visualizations, and then we'll get as far as we get today, and then we'll move into Congressional.

So we will have -- we'll need to review the minutes and approve the minutes. So you -- hopefully commissioners have reviewed them. So we won't review them live. Hopefully, (indiscernible) will get them posted. We'll do that toward the end of the day, so please make sure that you review so if you have any comments on minute corrections, we can take care of that right before we go into our evening public comment for today.
So we will get feedback from the public. You know, I'll ask for a motion on minute approval, we'll go to public comment, and then we'll also take general public comment for the whole day at that time. So I just want to give you a heads up on that. So Commissioners, please make sure you have reviewed the minutes.

Also, I am going to step away for -- right after our first break for one hour, and my Cochair Turner will take us through to lunch, and then I'll see you guys again after lunch through the evening.

We're looking forward to a robust day. It was really exciting yesterday. I think that things went really well, I think commissioners were very engaged. So we'll try a very similar case today. Please be mindful of your direction, that it's direction and not necessarily discussion with the line drawer, but more so you giving them direction, and please listen to your fellow commissioners, too, so that you're thinking about the direction that you're going to give and we're mindful not to give contradictory direction to our line drawers as best as possible. It's going to help them do a good job for us, and I think that will help the day flow a little smoothly as well.

So without further ado, I'm going to ask Jaime to put this -- the Los Angeles map up. They have it here.
And commissioners that wanted to give some additional
direct or clarification questions, now would be the time.
Commissioner Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. On the issue
of Long Beach Congressional visualization, I wanted to
take us back to the Assembly visualization and say that
there's a small part of northern Long Beach that is in
the 710 gateway visualization. Again, this is for
Assembly, and I'm -- I would like to see a Congressional
visualization that used that same portion of Long Beach
as a -- as a bridge, as it were, to get from the SP 710
visualization down in the port of -- well, in the
Wilmington area up to Carson, and then using that same
portion of Long Beach from the 710 gateway Assembly
visualization to connect to Lynwood, South Gate, et
cetera, so -- and then exchange population. So you would
take population from the northern end of LB North and put
it into that SP 710 visualization to compensate for
moving the rest -- most of the rest of Long Beach into
the LB North visualization.

I hope that's clear, Jaime.

MS. CLARK: For Congressional?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct, correct. And what I'm
trying for is if we're able to use the -- pretty much the
exact same portion of Long Beach, then it's going to be
easier for voter education and so forth. People in that small section of Long Beach will know that they're not with the rest of Long Beach on both Assembly and Congressional.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

MS. MACDONALD: Chair Le Mons, you're muted.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that, Karin.

Thank you Commissioner Kennedy. I just wanted to remind commissioners that we're on Assembly right now. I -- I'm clear on what Commissioner Kennedy was doing there, but I want us to keep the focus on Assembly, and if you can pull your Congressional notes, and if we need to reference that to an Assembly map and service of a Congressional -- I mean, visualization and a service of a Congressional visualization, feel free to do that.

With that, let's move to Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you, Chair Le Mons.

I wanted to go back to the NELA visualization, which is on page 72. I made this comment last week, I think when we were discussing the Congressional maps, but I want to raise it again. For me, this district is a major anchor point for LA County. This is -- the VRA obligations here are so clear and obvious, and I don't think we have this right yet, and my direction to line
drawers is to see what other options are possible.

I see here that we're already over in our population deviation right, at 3.3, 3.5 percent. So I think there's a couple ways that I -- I'd like the line drawers to explore, and it is exploratory, it's not a hard and fast thing, but I don't think we have it right yet. We received quite a bit of testimony last night by Echo Park, Highland Park, and even up into Eagle Rock. I would assume that includes also Glassell Park.

This district looks and feels like it's potentially an overpacking of the Latinos in this area, and so I'm curious to find out what are our options. If we were to bring in those regions of Echo Park through Eagle Rock, including Highland Park, into that VRA district, it's going to have enormous ripple effects, right?

So first of all, we would have to lose something, and my initial thought is that we lose in two places, but I don't know what that's going to do to the population. One option is we cut off downtown Los Angeles. Let me see here. I have it all beautifully drawn on this map, which I know you all will totally follow along with me here on this.

I think we cut -- possibly cutting off downtown Los Angeles, Pico-Union northward to Rampart. One of the problems that I see here that was identified from some of
our callers in that visualizations, we're cutting off Koreatown in half, and so I -- I'm trying to find ways of keeping Koreatown whole while at the same time maintaining a VRA district, and so that's really the piece that I find exploratory. So it would be that we -- we're cutting off that southern portion of what this current district is.

Alternatively, portions of that stay and potentially reunite Koreatown because I know that this is also encompassing a whole bunch of other Asian-American COI testimony that we received from Chinatown, which I believe is -- may or may not be cut in here, Filipinotown and others as well.

Another alternative that I think we could explore -- I don't know what the population density is for East LA and Boyle Heights. I do think, and I've said before in these meetings, that I think Boyle Heights and East LA have so much connectivity that they do need to stay together, but an alternative is if we're bringing in Echo Park through Eagle Rock, could Boyle Heights and East LA be cut off from this VRA district and paired with a VRA district further south? That would, again, have a ripple effect on everything happening down below, so potentially pairing with Vernon, Montebello, Commerce. Oh, I've lost some -- okay, yeah. Commerce, if need be from a --
Vernon, I know doesn't have a big population, but if need be, pulling into the Bell, Bell Gardens, et cetera, possibly.

And I think if we were to move in that direction, it might open up possibilities further south in Los Angeles to that area we haven't explored yet, which includes Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, La Habra. Those are areas that are populated by both Latinos and Asian-Americans. We've received a whole bunch of testimony there. To me, it's the piece that we're still not fully getting right in these maps. It's that intersection between LA and OC, but I think a lot of it stems from what we do in North LA, and so across the board, I'm saying let's explore other possibilities because I don't think we're -- I think this is better. I don't think -- I don't think we're there yet. Thank you. And I'm happy to take any clarifying questions, if it's helpful.

MS. CLARK: Thank you. Actually, one clarifying question that I do have is that I have received Commission direction that East LA, Boyle Heights, Lincoln Heights, and Neighborhood Council LA 32, sort of the El Sereno area should all stay together. Just based on sort of populations and the direction you just gave, I'm understanding this direction to be that Boyle Heights and
East LA should remain together, but not necessarily with Lincoln Heights and El Sereno, LA 32 Neighborhood Council.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That's correct. I would be okay to explore what our other options might be.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: It's not that I'm opposed to keeping them with LA 32 and Lincoln Heights. I think given the testimony that we're receiving about Highland Park and Eagle Rock and Echo Park not wanting to be with places like Burbank and Glendale, I think I'm still looking to see what our options are, particularly at this Assembly district level where things are smaller.

MS. CLARK: I understand. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thanks.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, thank you. I'll just weigh in on what Commissioner Sadhwani said, and there's another intent that I had. I do agree with her. I'm just wondering also, as an alternative, and Commissioner Sadhwani, tell me if you might think this might be workable, what -- would it be possible to remove LA 32 Neighborhood Council, Lincoln Heights, put it together with Echo Park, the Elysian Valley Riverside Neighborhood
Council, the Greater Cypress Park Neighborhood Council, Arroyo Seco, Glassell Park, Eagle Rock, and Historic Highland Park into a district that would, one, be of appropriate size, and one that would also honor this district.

I don't believe it is noted as a VRA unless I'm looking at the colors on the map on the screen incorrectly. So I'm just suggesting that because it may give some flexibility then.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: May I respond to that, Chair?

CHAIR LE MONS: Sure.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And -- oh, I'm sorry. And then also possibly dipping down into -- no, that's okay. Let's just stop there.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: If I can just respond, that's exactly what I was thinking. So the NLA district, which to me is like NELA, right, which is the -- kind of the neighborhood shorthand for this area, is a VRA district. To the best of my understanding, it is, and I'm curious if we were to make that switch, if we would maintain that VRA district.

Those areas that we're identifying, Echo Park, Eagle Rock, et cetera, as the testimony we heard last night suggested, you know, those are historically Latino
communities. They are, you know, facing a lot of
gentrification and as well as issues around the unhoused.
So I think keeping them together makes a whole lot of
sense, and it -- you know, what I'm hearing is they're --
and I mean, it is true, they are a part of Los Angeles
and want to stay a part of Los Angeles, not necessarily
with these other areas.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Because then to what
you're saying, then the ripple effect is then to keep
Boyle Heights and East LA together with the historic
downtown LA core because I think they do belong together,
and then perhaps extending into Chinatown and perhaps, I
don't know if this makes sense, you know, to keep
Koreatown -- or I'm sorry, extending into Koreatown and
to keep Koreatown whole, extending into the Greater
Wilshire Neighborhood Council, too, instead of splitting
them. I know that they really did not want to be split
again.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And that would then
encompass the Wilshire corridor that stops at essentially
I think it would be like La Brea or Fairfax or somewhere
thereabouts where the neighborhood does become much more
different.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That's correct. And I think
the other piece I didn't mention there is obviously if
we're splitting up that Burbank/North LA district, and
tell me, Commissioner Akutagawa, your thoughts here, that
would leave open Los Feliz/Silver Lake areas, which were
also --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: To keep with Hollywood.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Exactly, which were --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- identified by LGBTQ

Communities. It --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: It would require rethinking

Glendale. I think you can go into up La Canada, La

Crescenta areas, South Pass might be able to go into that

East 210 corridor. So I think figuring out that North LA

Piece -- Northeast LA, it's going to have a major ripple
effect, but I think it would be a good one.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And I know that Glendale

and Burbank also asked to be put together. I know

yesterday we also talked about possibly splitting up that

210 corridor, COI, into two separate districts instead of

one very long district. So given some of these
directions that we just discussed, that may also give

some flexibility if they had to break it up.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioners.
MS. CLARK: Can I just respond just to that last piece?

CHAIR LE MONS: Yes.

MS. CLARK: I'm happy to explore all of these options. Thank you so much for this direction, and just noting that in these areas, there are areas may have VRA consideration, so do -- I'll do what I can with the 210 corridor, and the movement might be further west as opposed to further east, and, of course, just happy to explore and work on -- work on making all these directions come true to the extent possible. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Jaime.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Chair? My --

CHAIR LE MONS: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I originally wanted to comment on the San Gabriel Valley, but perhaps I can just say to Jaime, given some of these additional changes in LA, which are going to have ripple effects, I think I'm going to hold off on my comments around the San -- the South San Gabriel Valley specifically. I'll just hold off until I see the new set of visualizations.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. Thank you. I'd like to -- I'd like to see some visualizations that explore keeping Echo Park and Highland Park together in
particular. Glassell Park would be great, although that probably then requires folks who — Mount Washington, which is where I live, which is a very, very high income and not really like the rest that surrounds these communities, but just I -- yeah.

I'm moved by a lot of our comments from last night, and I'm -- I'd still like us to keep an eye on, not just the CVAP -- the Latino CVAP in this area, even if there aren't sort of all three conditions met for a voting rights district. I think to -- there's a community of interest historically of Latino population that is shifting with gentrification, and so just want us to take a wider view of sort of who is in these neighborhoods now and just don't want to dilute the power and experiences of the communities that are -- you know, like Boyle Heights and East Los Angeles by putting them with communities that are so influx that they won't look anything like they are even now in two or three years.

Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Mr. Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. And I just wanted to give a general direction in terms of some of the districts, including this one, has pretty high Latino CVAP. In trying to get some of the -- to shift the CVAPs to other VRA districts that may not be as high,
especially these that are in the 70s and 60s, trying to
get them a little bit lower so that they're -- so that
they can -- so trying to reduce the deviation closer to
zero, and then trying to get the CVAP lowered and more
even and balanced across the VRA districts, if possible,
and I think -- so that would be my direction. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. Following that -- up on
that, I'm wondering if VRA council could comment on the
NLA district as it's drawn, and then in relation to some
of the suggestions that are being made and whether -- and
what -- what are the extent -- what is the extent of our
VRA obligations there. I did not actually understand
that to be a VRA district in my notes, but I could be
wrong. So if Mr. Becker's available, possibly.

MR. BECKER: Yeah, absolutely. It is an area where
we do not see three Gingles preconditions. So the Voting
Rights Act does not require a particular district to be
drawn to protect minorities in that area. It also
doesn't preclude that communities of interest be kept
together given that there are some natural concentrations
of communities within that area, but this is not on area
that the Voting Rights Act -- Voting Rights Act
considerations are particularly strong.
CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Any other direction to the line drawers with regard to Los Angeles before we move to Southern California?

Thank you, Commissioners, for your thoughtful feedback this morning.

Thank you, Jaime.

At this time, I'd like to acknowledge Andrew.

MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you, Chair.

Sivan will be coming on in just a second, and she will be pulling up the map in the southern region of the state.

In this region, we have a total of twenty-three districts we're going to be talking about. The population overall is -- we're above by 80,000 as we heard just this morning from Commissioner Sadhwani, you know, there -- there's considerations of -- on the LA/Orange County border, some conversation yesterday with Kern and Tulare borders, so I think there will be some changes there.

Given the -- the swap in mappers, I would just ask a little patience. We adhered to a lot of the requests that -- that we received from last week, and we got most of them in. There were a couple situations where we found we still need to -- to add those in, and Sivan will highlight a couple of those areas.
There are, you know, for the most part, I think twenty of the twenty-three are in the deviation of the minus five to five. There are two -- just two visualizations that are currently just over five percent, and there's one that is -- is over seven percent that we will be addressing, but just wanted to let you know we're -- we're aware of that, and the -- those are changes that we aware of and -- and will be making.

With that, I will hand this over to Sivan, who we are going to start with the visualizations that have VRA considerations first, and so I will turn it over to Sivan.

MS. TRATT: Hi, everyone. In case you missed it yesterday or forgot, my name is Sivan. I'm part of HaystaqDNA team, and I'm really honored to be here. I'll be taking over for John's region, so Southern California, and as Andrew mentioned, we're just going to jump right into the districts that have some potential VRA considerations.

This is largely going to be in order of the PDF booklet, so if you wanted to turn to page 90 to follow along, I'll going to start with the SEC district, Southeast California.

So there were not many changes that were made to this district from last time, and I'll just being also
toggling on and off last week's district -- or sorry. Excuse me -- visualization boundaries just to kind of
further highlight where those changes were made and where we kept what we had.

The main change that was made to this visualization right here is that as you can see up here near Needles, we received direction from multiple commissioners to try and add more of a buffer around some of these rural communities, just keeping in mind that there are folks who live outside of those incorporated boundaries who are likely associated with the city or town nearby, and so you can see here that we just added a little bit more of a buffer around Needles.

So also regarding changes that were made to accommodate commissioner requests, we -- we definitely heard loud and clear that we want to have it as a goal to keep as many tribal lands intact as possible. So keeping that in mind, there are thirty-one reservations or Indian associated lands that are in this visualization. We were able to keep twenty-nine of the thirty-one intact, and the two that are split are actually just land splits, not population splits, and we have some ideas of how to kind of wiggle things around to maybe even reduce that further.

But as you can see, this was a little bit more
successful at incorporating some of those instructions that we received, and this district currently -- or this visualization, excuse me, currently has a deviation of negative 1.97 percent with a Latino CVAP of 54.75. And with that, I'll turn it over to Mr. Becker in case he has anything else to add.

MR. BECKER: Nope. I don't have anything to add here.

MS. TRATT: All right. This will be the only jump in order, so bear with me for just a second. If you would turn to page 112, I just wanted to quickly talk about this district. Not much to say as it maintains the same boundaries that you saw in the last round of visualizations.

Mr. Becker, did you have anything else to add?

MR. BECKER: No. I don't have anything else to add. In fact, I'll just -- I'll just interject if I have anything, or I'll obviously respond to any questions that you all have as we go through these.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Perfect. In that case, I will move right along. So if you would flip back to page 91, and then we'll be on track. We should be on track to stay in order. I'm just going to zoom in this area here where we have a cluster of these potential VRA districts, and pardon the buffering. So sorry about the lag.
Hopefully it will speed up soon.

All right. There we go. Thanks for your patience, everyone. So starting out right here, again, there were no changes in this PCO. That's the Pomona/Chino/Ontario visualization. So this maintained the same boundaries that you saw last week.

The next one on page 92 would be the RCFR visualization right here, which also did not have any changes from last week. On page 93, SBCHR right to the east of the previous visualization. Again, we did not make any changes from last week. So this is the same visualization that you've already seen.

And then going down into the Jurupa Valley, again, no changes were made to this visualization, and then the final VRA consideration visualization is this MPH district, and I'll just turn on last week's boundaries to highlight the changes that were made. It's really minor, and I'm actually going to have to zoom in just to highlight it, but it was in consideration with the same instruction to preserve Native lands.

So as you can see, the border last week kind of zigzagged to accommodate the -- the border of the City of San Jacinto, and all that was changed was that the border was actually just moved slightly farther to the west just to reunite the Soboba Indian Reservation that's right
bordering it, but otherwise, it is the same that you have seen.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sivan, would you mind giving us the page numbers also? Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Yeah, absolutely. So that last one was on page 95, and I'll just be going in order, so once we get to loading, I will move on to page 96. If you'll just bear with me for one more minute. Actually --

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. I -- I'm sorry I was late. I heard that we've already done Imperial County and the San Diego visualization, and I -- as we were waiting for to -- this to upload, I just wanted to know if I -- that one isn't going all -- the -- I think the most important, and this goes for just all the visualizations that includes that San Diego -- the South San Diego side is to make sure that we're keeping National City, Imperial -- Imperial Beach, National City Bonita, Barrio Logan, Logan Heights, Chula Vista and San Ysidro together as one COI, as one community of interest, and that's both looking at it as a -- as just a low income, working class Latino and Asian area.

And it -- and in some of them, I know, and I'm talking a little broad, we're connecting that area all the up to San Bernardino, and the truth the South Bay
area is very different than the far east area, and the
most I think of it, the more that visualization wasn't --
isn't making sense.

MS. TRATT: Commissioner Sinay, just to confirm, so
are you talking about this Chula Vista/San Ysidro
visualization that's on page 112, or are you talking
about the southeast -- the SEC district that's on page
90?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So the one on 112, I think is
close, and I don't think it can expand to include barrio
Logan and Logan Heights, but ideally, it would include
barrio Logan and Logan Heights.

MS. TRATT: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Which -- and, you know, we can
talk about where we would have to change, but Barrio
Logan and Logan Heights is really part of that whole
visualization.

Sorry. I think I jumped because I thought this one
was the one that connected to Imperial County, but then
I -- that's more in the Congressional and the Senate
side, but I just --

MS. TRATT: No. That's totally fine.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- wanted to say in all of
them, that that -- this should be -- the kind of the
anchor is those communities.
MS. TRATT: Absolutely. We can definitely go back to our VRA counsel and try and potentially see if there are options to kind of extend this National City border north to include some of those neighborhoods in San Diego, such as Barrio Logan.

And yeah. Were there any other questions from commissioners about these VRA visualizations, or should and move on to the other ones?

CHAIR LE MONS: Continue.

MS. TRATT: Thank you, Chair.

All right. So we are going to talk about San Diego first, so good news, Commissioner Sinay, you did not miss it.

I'm going to start with page 96, so this is the SESDC district, which is right above that district -- or the visualization we were just talking about, and as you can see, these red lines are last week's visualizations. There were no changes that were made, so you've already seen that.

And pardon me. I just realized I still have my CVAP -- would it be helpful if I kept my CVAP numbers on, or should and just turn it to show the deviation? What would you all prefer?

CHAIR LE MONS: Just the deviation.

MS. TRATT: All right. Just give me one moment to
turn that off quickly. Sorry about that. All right. So now the labels are just displaying the deviation for your reference.

The next visualization is on -- pardon, is on page 97, and this is the SDC visualization that kind of comes all the down that -- the coastal areas of the City of San Diego, and then going all the way north to actually split Carlsbad, which is new in this visualization, and also accompany -- excuse me, encompasses Coronado.

We definitely heard your feedback last week to kind of play around and see if Coronado could fit in a district with the downtown area of the City of San Diego, and unfortunately, we were not able to, kind of, incorporate that feedback for this round of visualizations, but if it's something that you would like us to keep in mind going forward, we will definitely hold on to that instruction and continue to try and fit that into a visualization so you can see what that would look like.

The only other differences between this district that you're seeing now and what we saw last week just highlighting again that Carlsbad is now split down a major street, and then also a little bit more of the City of San Diego was incorporated into this coastal district.

Moving on to page 98, this is the SDCY district, and
I'm going to zoom in just a little bit so you all can see more clearly, but this really encompasses just kind of the central area of the City of San Diego stretching from north to south, and the only change that was made from last week is that it was extended just a little bit north of the City of San Diego northern border right here, and I believe that was for population balancing. Any questions? Is this pace okay for everyone? Just checking in.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. Can we go back to the coastal one? The one --

MS. TRATT: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Because I think there's just a few things to kind of in mind. I did review kind of the report that we received from Equality California, and then compared it to some of the work that we're doing, and many of the LGBTQ+ communities also kind of butt in or are right next to or share areas that are also other communities of interest as well as in some cases VRA districts, and so I think that that's important to realize that, you know, we are looking at all the different communities of interest, but we do have six criteria that we need to follow with kind of the VRA being up at the top at number 2.
I do -- for this one, the coastal, one of the things that is -- that might be possible, and I'll explain, all of this kind of connects together, so the LGBTQ+ community in San Diego encompasses North Park, Mission Hills, Hillcrest, South Park, Normal Heights, University Heights, Kings -- Kensington, sorry, down -- parts of downtown, I mean, downtown is a little bit of everybody, downtown, and if possible, Golden Hill. I mentioned those neighborhoods, they're all -- they are all basically together in the yellow, the San Diego City one, but if they could be with the coast, the reason I would like to see if we can move those neighborhoods to the coast, that would allow going up to the coast for Carlsbad to be whole because we -- wait, no. It would be the opposite.

So while it could be that Carlsbad could be whole going south, right, and be with the Camp Pendleton, but one of the things that came up on this up there is that Oceanside is really -- doesn't fit in with the Orange County communities that are on the other side of Camp Pendleton, so if -- we had said that as much as possible, we would try to keep it balanced, the cities from two different counties, and to keep it balanced and in similar community demographics, I know originally I had said go from Oceanside south to Carlsbad, but looking at
it, I would say Oceanside east to Vista, but we can keep playing with it as -- when we get there, and I would also include Coronado with downtown. So it might be that the coastal district just moves north a little bit or -- anyway.

MS. TRATT: Okay. So just to reiterate, just to make sure that I understand, are you saying that you would rather Oceanside come in with vista to this VSME district so that Oceanside is --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, no.

MS. TRATT: -- removed?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Camp Pendleton -- Camp Pendleton, Oceanside, and Vista.

MS. TRATT: Okay. So to extend the SOCN/SDE to include Vista?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right. And so we could --

MS. TRATT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- take -- keep Carl -- you know, Carlsbad as much as possible together, whichever way it has to go, and then take Vista, and then if you still need more, then go south on Carlsbad.

MS. TRATT: Great. And I will definitely look for community of interest testimony that is talking about neighborhoods and San Diego. Unfortunately, we don't have an official San Diego neighborhood layer, so any
specific instructions you could give to kind of further define where those neighborhood boundaries would be extremely helpful.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. I'll --

MS. TRATT: -- in kind of adding those areas.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'll do a quick Google Map, and then get back to you.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think Andrew's raising his hand, but I'm not sure.

CHAIR LE MONS: He is.

MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. I was just --

CHAIR LE MONS: I got -- hold on, please. I'll manage the meeting. Andrew.

MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you, Chair, and I was just going to say we will also look at COIs that have been submitted as well, Commissioner Sinay, to see if there's any -- there's been a number of COIs that are submitted, so we'll look at those as well as we're considering that -- those directions for this visualization. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Just quickly, in terms of Coronado, the San Diego one, the
SDCY is negative, so if possible, maybe move that because I believe Coronado is not as -- it's only 20,000, so that might fit in well there, and if that happens, trying to keep Carlsbad, yeah, not split. So I'm hoping that that will maybe open up Carlsbad not being split, plus that district is already a negative, almost negative 2. So maybe that will be enough to keep Carlsbad together. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner.

Any additional feedback in this particular area?

Okay. Sivan, you can continue, please.

MS. TRATT: Thank you so much, Chair, and thank you for that feedback, commissioners.

All right. I believe we just covered the visualization that was on page 98. So moving on to the visualization on page 99, which is WSDC right here just to the east of the City of San Diego.

In terms of changes, the main change that you can see from last week is that the City of Ramona is now incorporated into the visualization as well as this unincorporated area that lies between Poway and Ramona, and that is really the big change that happened in this district, and that added about 21,000 people to this visualization district. So as you can see the deviation is a little bit over, but that is what happened when we
moved Ramona in.

And then moving to page 100 just north, obviously since we pulled Ramona out of this district and moved it south, that's one change that you'll see from last week, and then just give my map a second to load again.

Awesome. So as you can see, so Ramona was removed.

Sorry. I thought it was going to buffer faster, but it stays -- it's really slow. Excuse me. We'll work on getting this a little bit faster for last time.

All right. So this VSME visualization, which you can find on page 100 of the PDF, this removed Ramona and this unincorporated area. The other thing that it did was it added Bonsall as well as Fallbrook and Rainbow.

So you can see in the previous version of this visualization, it was cut off just south of Bonsall, and so we've extended that north to the county border.

Moving on to the next visualization on page 101, so looking at this coastal area that includes camp Pendleton as well as Oceanside -- excuse me one second. I want you all to be able to see while I talk about it so it's in context. All right. Thanks again for everyone's patience.

So yes. So this district is incorporating Oceanside with Camp Pendleton, and obviously we received some direction today about some ways in which this could
potentially extend. It does cross the Orange County border to pick up the cities in the south of Orange County, and in terms of changes from last time you saw this version of this visualization, the border with Carlsbad we've already discussed in the San Diego coastal district, but this was split just slightly right here, and then obviously Rainbow, Fallbrook, and Bonsall were removed from this area. So now it stands at a slightly negative deviation.

All right. So moving on to the visualization on page 102, which will just move us slightly north up the coast. This is the NOCCC, which I believe is North Orange County Coastal. I'm not sure what the last C is, but this is the North Orange County Coastal district, and the only changes that were that Laguna Woods and Laguna Hills were added, and then Costa Mesa was split, which was previously not split in order to add the southern part, and I will turn on last week's borders just so you can kind of see where that change occurred. Just up here, it extended a little bit north to include that portion.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair.

Sorry. On the visualization, West San Diego City, the -- page 99. We've been -- one of the questions that
was asked before was where do we kind of split El Cajon
because El Cajon is really part of East Count -- part of
East County, which is a lot of what that pink district
is, but also, we -- there's a lot of immigrants and
refugees and Latinos. You know, it's a working class,
lower income community and a very wealthy community, and
I think in looking at where are most of the resources for
low income and where -- there's -- there seems to be a
line at -- El Cajon at Hammish (ph.) Avenue.

So I'm not sure if El Cajon would split here and
what was used, but I just wanted to put that group --
that west of Hammish is more the low income, and the part
that should be connected with Lemon Grove -- City
Heights, Lemon Grove, and Spring Valley, that -- and
Southeastern San Diego and north can stay with the --
that pink area. Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Thank you for that feedback. We'll
definitely take a look at that.

Were there any comments on previous districts, or
should I go back to where I was, Chair?

CHAIR LE MONS: Go back to where you were.

Continue.

MS. TRATT: All right.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Just one moment. Absolutely. All
right. So the next visual --

CHAIR LE MONS: Sivan?

MS. TRATT: Oh, yeah.

CHAIR LE MONS: Excuse me. Andrew, did you have a comment before we continue?

MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. I was just looking at the El Cajon just as we're waiting. It looks like we -- the -- obviously it was a split, but there were 8,000 people in one district and about 90,000 in the other. So you know, we will look at trying to keep that as one.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Thanks, Andrew.

Okay. So we're just going to move away from the coast slightly into this Santa Ana/Anaheim district, or SAA, and you all can find this on page 103.

CHAIR LE MONS: Excuse me, Sivan. Before you continue, Commissioner Sinay, do you have a comment on -- okay. Go ahead, please.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. I just wanted to reply, make sure I was being clear. El Cajon should be split. I just want to make sure that the split was at Hammish Avenue.

MR. DRECHSLER: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Sorry. I thought that you were -- thank you.
MS. TRATT: Thank you for that clarification.

That's very helpful.

Okay. So yes. This SAA visualization actually did not see any changes from last week. So you have already seen this, and if there are any instructions on tweaks, I would be happy to hear that.

Otherwise, moving on to the following page, 104, this is the Garden Grove/Westminster district, and I'm going to zoom in to give you all a better look, and the instructions that we received about this visualization from last week included an instruction from Commissioner Akutagawa to move Cypress out of the district and move it in with a portion of Costa Mesa.

We also received direction from Commissioner Kennedy concerning Los Alamitos about shifting Los Alamitos from Harbor Gateway into the Garden Grove. We did not do that for this version of the visualization, but could definitely take a look at doing that for this next round, if that is an instruction that still stands.

And then we also received — let's see. Obviously trying to keep intact COIs that are concerning Little Saigon, and I'm just show you, these are just two examples of community-submitted maps that describe what the potential borders of Little Saigon are, and as you can see, the current configuration of this visualization
does a relatively good job at keeping this COI intact; although, you can see there's a little bit that is excluded from this visualization, but overall, seems to encompass what a lot of folks were giving feedback about what is Little Saigon. So I will just turn that back off.

And let's see. So the changes that we saw in this visualization from last week, just to highlight, the northern part of Costa Mesa was added in. So previously Costa Mesa was not split, but now you can see this northern portion is added in with the green. Additionally, all of Cypress was removed just given that direction that we received from Commissioner Akutagawa. Stanton was also split, and we split Stanton along the 39. So you can see that right here.

All right. Moving on to the NOC visualization, which is just to the north. So let's see. So the main instruction that we received last week about this visualization was from Commissioner Akutagawa and asking to see if there's flexibility to keep Little Arabia in one district.

So we were able to pull some testimony COIs about Little Arabia. This is just one example of what community members defined as like the Little Arabia kind of corridor, and so as you can see, this is kept intact.
within this visualization; although, I believe the
directions were initially more about this Santa Ana
district, but we were able to keep this intact in
visualization. It was just in this Santa Ana/Anaheim
district.

The other things that were changed, all of Cypress,
Artesia, and Cerritos were added, and I will just turn on
the other -- the other borders to show you what that
change looked like. And then other -- the other change
was that the part of Stanton that was cut by this Garden
Grove/Westminster visualization was added into the NOC
area, and this is one of the visualizations that, as
Andrew kind of mentioned at the very beginning, is a
little on the high side for a deviation; although,
keeping in mind that these are still very much kind of
exploratory visualizations. We would be really happy to
hear feedback in -- just concerning what populations to
lose, and I will be working very closely with Jaime about
this LA border area, which has we know, has been, you
know, a little bit difficult to say the least to kind of
split up and categorize. So any feedback about that
would be greatly appreciated.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.

Sivan, I'm sorry. Did you explain why we split
Stanton? I probably missed it. So I apologize.

MS. TRATT: No. The -- I didn't give a reason. I believe it was for population. It was split along a major transportation corridor, the 39, I believe, but I can definitely -- if I receive an instruction to try and kind of reunite --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well --

MS. TRATT: -- Stanton in either district. I could take a look at that.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, that -- that's what I was thinking is right now, the district below is negative, and if you added all of Stanton in there, it could also reduce the positive 5.8 in the current district. So I was trying to -- that might level both of them out. Stanton isn't huge, so that's just --

MS. TRATT: Absolutely. Yeah. We'll definitely take a look at that --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

MS. TRATT: -- adding that back in. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yep. To me the problem with this district stems from the previous one, the Garden Grove/Westminster one, I had disagreed with Commissioner Akutagawa last week about the Costa Mesa addition, and I continue to disagree with that change. I think we've
also had a lot of community testimony about Costa Mesa staying with Irvine, Tustin, possibly yes and noes on Newport Beach.

So I think that that needs to come out of this district, and perhaps that's one of those decision points that we need to be discussing about which direction we want to go there, but I don't think it belongs in that district. So I would be -- I was more comfortable with what was there last week that included Cypress, and I forget what else was included. I don't recall if Los Alamitos was a part of that district. I think so. No. No, it was not.

MS. TRATT: No, it wasn't. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Got it. Yeah. I forget what the deviations were on that, but I mean, certainly, I think the that cut we had had last week made a whole lot more sense. I do like where we're going with that district up above that we were just looking at, that North OC one, so if we took at all of Cypress to add it back into the Garden Grove one, you know, certainly that's going to shift the deviations there. I don't have a good answer for you. I don't recall what it was before, but I think it's also, again, stemming from that South LA/North OC district where there's also those API COIs. Again, I think we need to get that sorted out, and
that's going to help answer a lot of these questions in the North OC area.

MS. TRATT: Commissioner, would you like me to look up what the deviation was last week? I have it in a -- I can look that up quickly, if that would be helpful for you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Either way. I mean, I think to me, you know, getting that Little Saigon area right, and then going -- as we move further up, you know, getting that area with Hacienda Heights, Diamond Bar, Walnut, et cetera, right will help us answer what needs to happen in that North OC area. It's the connective tissue, so to speak, between those two regions. So it's okay. It's okay. I'm okay with that. I can look it up. I have it.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. And Commissioner Sadhwani, I will admit, I was wrong on that one. So I have been trying to figure out how to move out Costa Mesa and put it back in with the -- with Irvine without throwing off the numbers completely because Costa Mesa is so big, and I have yet not quite figured it out. I've been, you know, trying to figure that part out.
But I will agree, I was going to -- one of my directions was to ask to remove Costa Mesa from this Garden Grove visualization. I know we've also heard quite a bit of testimony, there's also a lot of written testimony, both pros and cons, in terms of the placement of Los Alamitos and Rossmoor as well as now Cypress. I would maybe just say for right now, we leave those as kind of flexible areas. I think those are those LA/Orange County border areas that we'll have to grapple with whether or not they -- you know, we'll need to put them back in with Long Beach to, you know -- to balance out the populations in Orange County or whether or not, for example, we were to put Los Alamitos and Rossmoor in with the Orange County Coastal, which is Seal Beach, Huntington Beach, Newport Beach, and then make some adjustments to the Irvine visualization with the addition of Costa Mesa.

I do also agree with what you just said in terms of the North Orange County visualization. I do like where that is going as well too because I think it's hitting a number of communities of interest in those areas.

Sivan, maybe a thought, and this is where I think there's going to be somewhat of a dismantling because the -- it's the CNF. I know that you haven't -- I don't think you quite got to that one yet, but the CNF
includes, you know, just a really odd combination of cities. It's really huge. It includes a lot of Riverside County, but it also includes Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar, Walnut.

I'm mentioning this now because I think I said this yesterday, Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, and Diamond Bar should be together. I know that Diamond Bar and Walnut want to be together. Brea is also pretty closely aligned with these communities as well too, so I was also quickly trying to figure out population numbers. I'm still working on that, but I think there's going to be a dismantling here. So it may be that I would just -- my direction would be, I think just globally --

CHAIR LE MONS: Can you hear me, Nadia?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, I can now. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So Sivan, just globally, I think given some of these additional changes, I'd like to see what you come up and see how these other areas turn out to be given some of these changes of moving a city as large as Costa Mesa will be.

MS. TRATT: Absolutely. Did you want me to jump to talk about --


MS. TRATT: Pardon. I can talk about --
CHAIR LE MONS: (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

MS. TRATT: -- CNF next if that would be helpful for your directions, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sure. That would be great.

MS. TRATT: Okay. So that would be on page 108 just flipping forward slightly, and as was mentioned, some of the major changes were that Walnut and part of Industry, Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar, and Chino Hills were all added to this visualization, and I'll give it another moment to buffer.

So you can see the addition of those areas just over here. The other changes were that all areas in Orange County were removed. The ones that were previously in the district that kind of stretched From Silverado to Mission Viejo, additionally Meadowbrook and part of Lake Elsinore that's west of Meadowbrook was removed, and I will turn on last week's borders just to show.

There was kind of pretty drastic changes. So you can see the loss of Meadowbrook right here, that this border was moved up to exclude these kind of mountainous Orange County areas, and then extended northwest to capture Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar, and Chino Hills.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I'm just going to say
a big no on this one and back to the drawing board. You
know, I think we've mentioned numerous times, there's a
whole bunch of COIs, COI testimony that we've received,
you know, about this South LA County area. We have -- I
think we have to figure that piece out. I just do not
see that area as connected to Temescal Valley and some of
those other -- NorCo and these other parts of Riverside,
et al. So I think that we need to go back to the drawing
board here. That's as much as I'll give it as -- at this
stage.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Akutagawa, did you an additional
comment?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. It -- perhaps I
could just give direction in terms of what I would like
to see with these cities, and then Sivan, maybe you can
add other areas that might make sense for population.

MS. TRATT: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Because I think with
what's -- similar to what Commissioner Sadhwani said, I
mean, these are as diametrically opposed as you can get,
very, very different COIs, very different kinds of
communities. I'd like to see Walnut, Diamond Bar,
Rowland Heights, Hacienda Heights, La Habra Heights, La
Habra, and I know that we're also looking at some
reshuffling of the San Gabriel Valley cities, which is why I'm also noting La Habra and La Habra Heights.

Perhaps we can also look at -- I saw some COI testimony speaking to the Phillips Ranch portion of Pomona, I believe is that little, teeny, tiny like, I don't know. It looks like an iPhone charger little block piece that seems to be right in between Walnut and Diamond Bar. We did also hear some testimony, both in terms of written and also last night, about Chino Hills. I don't know enough about Chino Hills. Maybe there's a portion of Chino Hills or we can take a look back again at the testimony, COI input to see, you know, if there's a specific portion of Chino Hills that may make sense to pull in.

I would also add in, if it makes sense to pull in Brea as well, too, and that unincorporated Carbon Canyon area that is right next to Brea for some population, and Brea and Rowland Heights, and Diamond Bar have a lot in common. They're all up the 57 there. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner.

Sivan, you can continue.

MS. TRATT: Great. Thank you so much, Chair.

I believe that last week we did receive direction that we -- that commissioners would prefer that Chino Hills stay with cities in Riverside County. Is that
still an instruction that you would like me to attempt
for the next round of visualization? Does anyone feel
strongly?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'll say for me, I think we
heard some testimony last night, at least from one
person, that he feels that they have more of an affinity
to the Orange County/LA areas for more so than
Riverside, and so again, I don't know enough about Chino
Hills, and I would just go back and look at COI testimony
to see if anybody noted like any specific borders that
they feel might make a distinction between -- you know,
is it the whole city, or if you split it, like if there's
any re areas in Chino Hills that make sense.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner. I just
want to remind commissioners to cue themselves with the
hand raise, please.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. Thank you. And this
question of Chino Hills, I'll say I think Chino Hills is
one of those areas that could end up potentially in a lot
of different places. It's right on that cusp, right on
that border between LA, OC, and Riverside. So I really
do see it could go in different directions, and we've
received a lot of different kinds of testimony about
Chino Hills.
Earlier in the summer, I recall getting testimony about keeping Chino and Chino Hills together, that they share school districts and all sorts of local resources. At the same time, we also received testimony that Chino is a more working class neighborhood whereas Chino Hills is not. So I think that there's definitely a divide there between Chino and Chino Hills, and for me, I would be very flexible about where it goes. I see it could potentially go in different places, and if need be, I don't have the population in front of me, but even if we needed to make a split within it, I'm sure the people wouldn't -- of Chino Hills wouldn't be happy about it, but I believe there's like a reservation or canyon or something that's in there, if we turn on the -- we don't need to turn the terrain layer right now, but I believe that there is some natural border within the city.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. I was just going to say just from my experience of the region, Chino Hills is more culturally aligned with Orange County, and so that would be my preference; although, certainly I believe it -- Commissioner Sadhwani is right, it probably -- there may be a split, or it could potentially go with LA County. Though I -- it is very distinct from the rest of
the visualization that starts with Chino and goes north.
So I'm less inclined to put them together with Chino.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you. I also recall COI testimony from the summer, some including saying that Chino Hills could actually go with Yorba Linda as it's sort of all in the hills, that area. So that's another possibility as we decide where Chino Hills goes.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner.

Any additional feedback on this particular area of the visualization?

Okay. Sivan, you can continue, please.

MS. TRATT: All right. So I think the next logical one we should talk about then would be this LAOSB visualization, which you can find on page 106. The major changes, which are also reflected in some of the changes that I've already said for previous districts, so excuse me if I am repeating myself, but all of the change -- all of the areas in LA County were removed. So this does not include any LA County cities or areas.

So previously, what was in LA County that was included was Rowland Heights, Walnut, Diamond Bar, and Industry, and then also Chino Hills was removed.
Placentia was added, Tustin and North Tustin were removed, and the district also previously ended in the south at the edge of Anaheim, and now the district goes down to include the kind of canyon areas of -- and mountainous areas of that Orange County.

So that would be Silverado, Williams Canyon, Modjeska, Trabuco Canyon, Mission Viejo, Rancho Santa Margarita, Las Flores, and Cota de Caza, and then that would also include all of the unincorporated area that goes up to the Orange County border.

So just to show again what that change looked like, major changes from the last time you saw this visualization, again snapping to Orange County borders, kind of moving to include Placentia, excluding North Tustin, and sweeping all the way down to Mission Viejo all the way up back to the Orange County border.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So this visualization, LAOSB, I know that one of our directions was to add Costa Mesa back into Irvine. If we need to do that, my direction would be to remove Lake Forest and add it to the LAOSB visualization because it will then at least bring up the standard deviation a little bit more and -- yeah.

MS. TRATT: Thank you so much.
Was there any other feedback for this visualization, or should I continue?

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Thank you. I agree generally speaking with Commissioner Akutagawa on this one as we shift Costa Mesa, I think parts of that Irvine district can get shaved off. Can you tell me in the Irvine area, there's like a lighter pink area on the -- yep, right there. What's -- is that a part of the City of Irvine, or is that a different city?

MS. TRATT: I believe that's actually unincorporated. Let me just turn off this layer so we can see better. Yeah. This is actually just an unincorporated area, and I believe it's --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it.

MS. TRATT: I can turn the terrain layer back on if that would be helpful, but I believe this is pretty mountainous right here.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it. Okay. So I don't know what the population swap would be between Costa Mesa and Lake Forest, but I do recall receiving some testimony about the, what is it, eastern parts of Irvine east of the 5 freeway being somewhat different from the western portions of Irvine. I'm not suggesting that we need to cut into Irvine, but if we do, that that would be a
border that we could think about.

My understanding, if I recall the COI testimony, and maybe it's worth it if staff or line drawers can go back and take a look at it, that that was sort of a natural border, I recall, between where UC-Irvine is and where there's a lot of renters versus homeowners, et cetera.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I was of the same mind about Irvine. However, I've read more recent testimony. Most people are asking for Irvine to be kept whole, including, I believe the vice mayor of the city. Of course, you know, for them, they'll probably prefer that the entire region or the entire city be together.

Commissioner Sadhwani, just to let you know, that pink corner that you were asking about, that's the Great Park in Orange County that used to be the El Toro Marine Base.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it. Thank you so much. And I agree. Keep it whole, if possible, but if end up we needing additional population, I think cutting in that direction would make sense.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

Sivan, continue, please.

MS. TRATT: Thank you so much. The only other thing I'll add before I move on is that the directions that
were incorporated from last week for this visualization were from Commissioner Akutagawa saying North Orange County, including Brea and Yorba Linda, to add Hacienda Heights, and then remove Chino Hills. So that was removed for this visualization, and then Yorba Linda and Brea remain in this visualization as well, and Hacienda Heights is not in this visualization.

The next one would be talking about this Irvine district, IRV, which is on page 107. We received direction from Commissioner Akutagawa to include all of Tustin with all of Irvine, and as you can see, we maintained that in this visualization. The changes in this visualization from last time were removing Laguna Hills and Laguna Woods as well as adding all of Tustin, which had previously been split, as well as North Tustin, and you can see those changes right here.

And then moving on to page -- oh, the next one would be CNF, which we've already covered. So --

CHAIR LE MONS: Sivan, excuse me.

MS. TRATT: Yeah.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa, you have a comment?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Sivan, if it helps, because moving again Costa Mesa, the numbers are so much more larger than moving -- just moving out Lake Forest,
and I try -- I saw mixed testimony on this, but North Tustin, if it helps to move that out also into the CNF or LAOSB visualization, if that brings the numbers down for Irvine and the numbers up for the CNF one. Or no, I'm sorry, LAOSB. Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Thank you so much. We'll definitely give that a try and see what it looks like and show you all.

All right. Were there any other comments, Chair, or -- I'm sorry. I don't have the whole Zoom screen up on my --

CHAIR LE MONS: No, no. There isn't at this time.

MS. TRATT: Okay.

CHAIR LE MONS: You can continue.

MS. TRATT: Thank you so much.

CHAIR LE MONS: You're welcome.

MS. TRATT: All right. The next one I wanted to talk about was visualization MA. I'm just going to zoom out for one second. And MA is this Temescal Valley kind of corridor, and we actually did not receive any direction on this visualization last time. However, the changes that were made were to include more of Lake Elsinore as well as all of Meadowbrook, which had previously been split, so reuniting both of those cities.

And then moving to page 109 --
CHAIR LE MONS: Before you move --

MS. TRATT: Oh, yeah.

CHAIR LE MONS: Before you move forward, Sivan, Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Just a quick clarifying question. Is that bottom portion of Temecula cut off into SEC 1102?

MS. TRATT: I believe that this is actually tribal land, but let me just confirm that. Yeah. So it looks like this is actually part of a Native reservation.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Got it. Okay. Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Absolutely.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Sivan, I -- I'm looking at the South Orange County/North San Diego visualization. I know that the LAOSB visualization is still short some people, even with the addition of Lake Forest, I think if I'm looking at this right, yeah, Lake Forest and North Tustin. I'm also looking at perhaps if you were to incorporate in Ladera Ranch and Rancho Mission Viejo, would that bring up the numbers enough, and then could you then extend the North Orange County Coastal Coastline all the way down to the coast and including San Clemente with that? Because it's under deviation right now.
MS. TRATT: Yeah. So just to confirm, you're saying try moving Ladera Ranch and Rancho Mission Viejo into this LAOSB district? Is that what you're --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MS. TRATT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MS. TRATT: And then taking the --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So that you can bring the --

MS. TRATT: The Orange Coast all the way down to this -- the county border?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Because the -- because the deviation is pretty large right now still. So I want to see if it would bring that number up, and then seeing what you might have to do. Yeah.

MS. TRATT: Absolutely. We'll give that a try.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy.

MS. TRATT: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: The population of North Tustin is a little bit over 25,000. That's in and of itself going to swing the variation on the LAOSB district to slightly positive, so --

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

We're going to be coming up on a break in five
minutes.

Sivan, continue, please.

MS. TRATT: Absolutely. I believe I only have two more. So that's the good news. Maybe I can get through them in the next five minutes.

The next one is going to be quite large, so let me zoom out quite a bit, and this is the Morongo Basin/Coachella Valley, MBCV, which is on page 110, and if you'll just bear with me while I get a good visual of that visualization.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa, while that's loading, is your hand raised from before, or do you have a new comment?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No. My apologies. I'm going to --

MS. TRATT: All right. So again, this is one of the visualizations that is quite off for deviation. So this is going beyond that positive 5, negative 5 percent deviation. So we would really appreciate any feedback, especially kind of concerning these bordering counties, and I will be working very closely again with Jaime and Kennedy to incorporate those changes.

But this visualization, the main changes from the previous version that you saw were to remove low populated areas in eastern San Bernardino County.
Additionally, unincorporated areas that lie between Homestead Valley and Lucerne Valley as well as Big Bear City were removed.

Whitewater and Cabazon and the tribal area south of Palm Springs were added, and Desert Palms was removed. So it almost combines two visualizations, so there's quite a lot of changes, and I'm happy to zoom in a little bit closer to the Coachella Valley area, if that would be helpful for commissioners to get more detail on that. Just let me know.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

Just my initial reaction is see about removing the portion above Interstate 40. You know, not sure what best to do with it, whether it's to attach it to a single other area, in which case, you know, that might be with Inyo County or to divide and put part of it with northeastern Kern County and another portion with Inyo County, but the area above Interstate 40, I don't think there's much population there. So that would be my initial reaction. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Sivan, I think this is a good stopping point. We are going to take a break in about thirty seconds. So when we come back from break, which will be at 12:45, Commissioner Kennedy will be stepping
in on my behalf to chair the next ninety minutes, and I will see you all after lunch. I do need to step away for a moment. So I wanted to make everyone aware of that.

So at this time, let's take a break. We'll pick up where we are right here, again under the direction of Commissioner Kennedy. So enjoy your break, and see you all back a little bit later. Thank you so much.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Welcome back from the break.

Thank you for your patience, and I will once again turn it back Sivan.

MS. TRATT: Thank you so much, Chair.

All right. So I still have this kind of large-scale, zoomed-out view, and I just wanted to quickly highlight the Coachella area, so I'm just going to zoom in quickly so you can see some of those changes, and definitely feel free to interject at whatever point if you have feedback, but I just mainly wanted to point out how this -- the border of the visualization now goes outside of these cities in order to not split these Native lands right here, and then as I mentioned before, it removed Desert Palms, which was initially in this visualization.

And then if there's no immediate feedback, I can just move on to our final visualization for Assembly
districts. That's just to the north, and then let me zoom out to give you more of a macro view. So this is visualization VVHD, which is Victor Valley/High Desert, and it should be on page 111 of your PDF booklets.

The main changes from last time you saw this vis were that unincorporated areas between Lucerne Valley and Big Bear City were added, and I believe this goes along with the general commissioner feedback to give mere of a buffer to rural areas. We also added Barstow to this visualization; although, as you can see, it splits Lenwood, and it does not give Barstow very much of a buffer.

So I would definitely be open to hearing feedback about how to proceed with this area, but as you can see, currently we are over the 5 percent allowable deviation. So we're definitely going to need to lose some population from this visualization district in order to make it work, but that's what I have in terms of visualizations. So I'd be happy to hear comments and feedback.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you. Yes. To your question, Sivan, I'm wondering if it may make sense to include the portion of Highland that's currently not in SBCHR, yes, to start there. That may give -- I'm not sure how -- there's probably more population honestly
there in that portion of Highland than places up in -- in
north in Barstow, so I'm wondering if drawing our
boundary -- moving those boundaries will give you a
little bit of play up north in Barstow.

I'm not sure where else. There's not really another
clear line I see, but maybe other commissioners do.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: And Sivan, I also have a
question because I believe there are tribal lands in the
Highland area, and I'm not seeing them on the map.

MS. TRATT: You know, the layer that I have on the
mapping software is -- I believe it's all registered
tribal land. So it's possible that there could be some
Native population over here, but unfortunately, it
doesn't look like it is included on this map layer.
You're --

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Oh, wait a minute.

MS. TRATT: You're talking about --

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Is that right here?

MS. TRATT: -- right here? Is this where you're
talking about? Let me zoom.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: That could be. I know there's
a casino.

MS. TRATT: It looks like this is part of the City
of San Bernardino, the San Manuel Indian Reservation.

MS. TRATT: And currently this is in -- this is not in the -- this is in the SBCHR visualization.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Right. Okay.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And I'm probably going to have to rely on you, Chair, and others, I'm not as familiar with this area, and I do know that the district -- the visualization right next to it on the right is also over, and I believe Sivan said that the last visualization we had asked for Big Bear City to be in this VVHD.

Is that what you said, Sivan?

MS. TRATT: It wasn't actually a specific direction. I was just saying what had changed --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh.

MS. TRATT: -- from the last time.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Because I -- I'm just kind of --

MS. TRATT: I'm actually not quite sure why --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, I see.

MS. TRATT: John had drawn these evaluations, so I --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

MS. TRATT: I think he just moved this farther out to incorporate some of the unincorporated folks who might
be living outside of these, but are kind of associated
with either Big Bear City or Lucerne Valley.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. So my -- so I mean,
just -- you know, just looking at the maps and the -- how
they stand right now, just potentially you can move Big
Bear City to MBCV to get that -- because right now, it's
at a positive almost 8, and then I'm not sure about
Lucerne Valley and the Barstow area up there. I -- I
think those are areas that we might have to play with too
between the two visualizations, and then obviously if you
move that, then the other visualization, the current one,
the VVHD, will be even higher positive deviation. So
we're going to probably have to move to the west to fill
up some up some of those areas.

So I'm just -- unless, Commissioner Kennedy, you
move north to grab some of the population in a different
county.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, I had said that the area
of San Bernardino County north of Interstate 40 might
possibly be connected with Inyo County, but I'll need
some time to take a look at these two and surrounding
districts, and I will come back with some other ideas.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I just wanted to
also respond to what Commissioner Fernandez was asking
about. I believe I had given direction to incorporate in Wrightwood because we got some COI testimony that Wrightwood, Pinon Hills, and Phelan were a community of interest, and then also Wrightwood is more of a ski area in this particular area, and so it just seemed like it would make sense to be in a district that also included Big Bear City and Running Springs because those are also ski areas as well, too, so more mountainous ski areas. That way then they're all contained in the same district.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Some points. I do think Lake Arrowhead, Running Springs, and Big Bear City, we should try to keep them together. They're the ski mountain resorts, so wherever they go, we should try to keep them together. Same with Lytle Creek even, that those all sort of -- those are the mountainous, up -- go-up-the hill recreation areas for folks in the suburbs in the IE.

What was I going to say? I just also wanted us to be mindful that while we are overpopulated for this green and sort of tan district and pretty much right on the money for that San Bernardino visualization right now, I do -- if I'm remembering correctly, we do have some VRA considerations in the San Bernardino area, so we don't
actually have as much play in terms of which -- where -- or just around those areas. We don't have a lot of play because the CVAP there is really important for us to track.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Very good.

Andrew.

MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you, Chair.

And I was just going to make that exact point, that we will talk to the -- especially about Highland. Yes, it's split, but we do have some VRA considerations, and the other thing is this was the area where, you know, the border between Kennedy's maps and Sivan's maps is -- wasn't as worked out as we had hoped for today, but definitely something that we will have a little bit more nailed down for someday when we revisit these next week.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair.

Just one reminder. The East 210 is actually at a negative deviation, and that's also the one I think that we said that could be more -- the more flexible of the LA -- of the LA areas. I know we keep saying not to cross counties, but we've got to start crossing counties. There's no way around this. So I just wanted just to remind that that's one of the flexible areas, and I know
that's kind of that, Jaime, and, you know, it's a shared area.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Thank you.

Commissioner Vazquez, is that another --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: -- comment?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Actually, so I may -- I would love to hear some feedback if you're out there, IE fam, would love to know what you think about extending the East 210 corridor to be very much a more mountainous community to include not just Lytle Creek right now, but also include Lake Arrowhead, Running Springs, and maybe even Big Bear City.

Again, I don't -- I don't know what those populations are, but is that something that the community would want? And so maybe could I see a visualization that extends, brings the Lake Arrowhead and Big Bear City, depending on population, into the East 210? Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Absolutely.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: I think -- go ahead, Sivan.

MS. TRATT: Oh. I was just saying thank you for the feedback. We will definitely give that a try. I think
that makes a lot of sense given the COI testimony we've heard.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Big Bear Lake is listed as 5,000, so that's approximately one percent of a -- an Assembly district. Big Bear City is 12,738, so that's a little -- that's a little over two percentage points, and Lake Arrowhead is another 12,000, so we're starting to go way over on what we need to move, but I think the idea in general is possibly is sound one, and we might be able to accommodate those changes. So I'm with Commissioner Vazquez. We'd very much like to hear from the community if that's something that you think makes sense.

Commissioner Vazquez, did you have more?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: No. I was just going to add, maybe there's some play. Again, it might honestly be with some live line drawing, but like portions of Upland, the southern portions of some of those -- that East 210 corridor, we could maybe potentially lose some population there in order to keep -- in order to keep Big Bear and Lake Arrowhead together.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Very good. Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I want to support that. I also want to just remind everybody that we had given early in the line drawing start time, the
possibility of even breaking up the East 210. So if that were to happen because of some other reshuffling that's going to be done in the East LA/Downtown LA area, that may even make that idea of bringing the mountainous areas of that Inland Empire even more feasible.

I like that idea of at least having a district that would include all of the mountainous recreations/ski/fire hazard areas all in one district. I think that that would work out really interestingly well. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Great. Thank you.

Okay. Sivan, did you have more?

MS. TRATT: That is it for me, unless there's other commissioner instructions. I'm happy to go back and look at any of the previous visualizations that I've shown.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Andrew, where do we stand from your perspective?

MR. DRECHSLER: From our perspective, I think we're ready to move on. I think we're -- I -- next, we are going to go to, I believe it's the --

MS. CLARK: Senate.

MR. DRECHSLER: I'm sorry. The Senate.

MS. CLARK: Next we're going to the Senate visualizations, and we can start in the Central Valley with the potential VRA areas, and Kennedy will start screen sharing very shortly. Thank you so much.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. Thank you so much --

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- Jaime.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Thank you so much, Commissioners.

MS. WILSON: Was that my introduction to start, or do we have something else? Okay. So I will get started. We're going to start again.

This is our Senate visualizations. I do have -- I know that you have them as well, but I'm just keep the deviations, percent Latino CVAP, percent black CVAP, percent Asian CVAP, percent indigenous CVAP, and percent white CVAP on just as we look at these.

And so I was ask for all of my plans to do a revamp of taking a new look at these Senate, Congressional, and Assembly VRA consideration districts, and so here we have us kind of piggybacking off of what you're going to see from Assembly and just kind of making them bigger, and it's going to start off, for this, we have two, and again, it's covering the same areas within Bakersfield, and again, I'll say some of those communities: Arvin, Benton Park, Cottonwood, Fairfax, La Cresta, East Niles, Hillcrest, Patomic, those are all together here in Bakersfield.

And then we move north, and unlike the Assembly, I
do add all of Shafter, again no splits, even out to the corner, and we have Wasco, McFarland, and Delano, and then if you recall my Assembly visualization, it took on a similar shape of Kings and Tulare, and I was able to kind of nest those in together and put those together, and so one thing I would like to point out that's different is that Visalia is not split, and it is noncontiguous. There's a piece over here, but all of it is together and with Three Rivers, which was not able to happen, as you saw before in my Assembly plan, but this is together now.

And then it reaches -- keeps Kings County completely whole, reaches north into Fresno and takes Selma, Fowler, Del Rey, Sanger, Reedley, Parlier, Orange Cove, and keeps those all together. And so that is the first one that I have. Again, I'll zoom out so you can see. We have Kings, Tulare, and down into Bakersfield for this one.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Kennedy, what was the page on that? Sorry.

MS. WILSON: Oh, and my apologies. Again, the page numbers, that is page 30.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Kennedy, can you do me favor and turn off the -- the -- the blue dash --

MS. WILSON: Yes.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: -- dashed lines.
MS. WILSON: And those are the existing -- and I was going to say, those are the existing lines as well, and I will turn those off so you can --

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Thank you.

MS. WILSON: -- take a better look at this, and I will outline it with my hand and circle around where that goes. So here's the border within Fresno, and then follows Kings and down.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. For the line drawers, will you all be taking all the comments that we said before on like the Assembly maps and applying them, when appropriate, to these maps as well, or should we be repeating our thoughts?

MS. MACDONALD: I think we're -- and thank you, Commissioner Sinay, for that -- for that question. We are going to take whatever we can into consideration unless you change the direction.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead, Kennedy.

MS. WILSON: So -- yeah. Sorry. So I will move on now, and to the second one. Here, we have something we have not seen before. I was told to take a look into adding San Benito as well as the Salinas Valley down to King City and putting this within a visualization. We --
I'm going to zoom in closer to Fresno so we can see what that looks like there, but we have one split of Fresno again, which was compared to, I think about three before, but keeping Old Fig Garden, Sunnyside, Southwest, West Park, and west of the 99 together, and I was told also to look into the -- where the Hmong community resides in Fresno, and we saw them -- I saw, in looking at Airtable through their testimony, saying that they were in a lot of the places that the black population was in Sunnyside and Southwest Fresno, and I would like to also say that I took a look, and I'm going turn this stream light on so you can see the streets.

The Muslim community -- and again, I cut this off actually at Shaw, so before, it was closer down by Shields, and we saw the community saying that if we were going to cut this city east-west, that Shaw, Ashlan, or Shields would be the streets in which we should cut, and then I also saw that there was a Muslim community that outlined itself between North 1st Street going down here to East Bullard to Ashlan Avenue and North Cedar, and so cutting at Shaw does split that up, just for future.

And so -- sorry. So I'm going to zoom out and just to let you know what's there. And I also would like to say that if San Benito isn't something that you want to be added in -- I could, within the two that I drew in
Assembly, I would, in a way, merge those together. However, the problem that we faced was population. So I was at a negative twenty-nine percent deviation, and that required me to take some things in because I had to take out Yolo, and so without taking out Yolo, I moved this in, and that's how I was able to explore this and --

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Just a process question. Chair, are -- should we hold our comments until Kennedy is done, or did we want to do it with each one? I mean, I kind of prefer waiting until the end, and I like to have her just go through it. So I'm just -- I do have a question on a prior, but I am very willing to wait.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I was going to -- on these VRA districts, I was going to have questions and comments during, and then once we get into all the others, then we can hold until the end. So if you have a question or comment on that --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, just a quick one.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: -- on the potential VRA district.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sure. Kennedy, on the page 30, and I think -- and this is just related to the comments, public comments that we received yesterday
regarding concerns with Kern County and Fresno being
together. Is the only visualization for Senate that has
that -- the link from Kern to Fresno, and is there
also -- on the Congressional side, will we see it as
well?

MS. WILSON: Yes. You will see it in Congressional
as well, and that is due to the fact that for this VRA
district, it has to take into Bakersfield and --
Bakersfield and Tulare alone isn't enough. So if it
doesn't go up to grab Fresno, which as you see, we have
North Fresno and Clovis kind of helping to populate this,
but we would need to get population from somewhere, which
I don't have direction to go south or west or east unless
I was told to take San Bernardino out So Ridgecrest could
be with Kern, but that is the reason for them being
together is because they help to populate this region,
and this kind of --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: For the VRA?

MS. WILSON: -- takes away a lot of that Bakersfield
area.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. For the VRA
purposes, correct, Kennedy?

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. I appreciate
that explanation.
VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.
Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair.
And you had this for a hot second, but could you turn on the terrain layer? I just want to --

MS. WILSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: -- take a closer look at Merced/Fresno.

MS. WILSON: Would you like me to zoom in a bit closer?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes. That would be helpful.

MS. WILSON: And now that you've seen the labels, I can also turn those to make them not have as many numbers, if that helps the commissioners as well.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, go ahead.

MS. WILSON: Okay. I will do so right now.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I was going to say, I don't know. Do people want it? I don't know. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Ahmad, did you have any further question?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Sorry. No, that was it. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: You're good? Okay.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. I would definitely
like to explore how to fit in those Islamic areas that had been identified. We had definitely received a whole bunch of testimony that they want to be kept with that south of Shah region, I believe. I don't know what our options would be there since we're already overpopulated in the district, but that -- I would like to, at minimum, explore that.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

Mr. Becker, do you have any comments before we move on to the non-VRA areas?

MR. LARSON: I think -- this is Dale Larson here. I think Becker stepped off for a few minutes, but I have nothing else to add on this.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. He said he was back, but anyway.

MR. LARSON: Oh, okay.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: That's fine.

MR. BECKER: I didn't know if you didn't hear me. I appeared on video, and I said no, there's nothing to add.


MS. WILSON: Okay. So now we have finished with the VRA districts, and I will remember to tell you the page numbers now as we move forward. Those were 30 and 29, and now we're going to move to 31, and this is going to
be Madera down to Kern, and this is keeping those eastern
teams of Fresno and Madera together and not with Mono and
Inyo. We have Tulare here, which I said Visalia and
Three Rivers is connected in this visualization, and down
to Kern, the rest of Kern that is not a part of that VRA
district, and that VRA district does create those
constraints as far as what's connected going north
instead of going opposite directions.

And so that is that on page 31. Don't know if I
mentioned that, but I'll say it again for everyone. And
now we are going to move on to our next one, which is on
page 28. I'm going to move north -- continue moving
north in the Central Valley.

So here in red, we have our San Joaquin down to
Merced. It says Stanislaus, but it also includes Merced.
This City of Merced, Atwater, Fairmead as well are in
these -- or my apologies, not Fairmead, Winton. Atwater
and Winton are in this as well, and then moving north, we
have all of Stanislaus being kept whole, and it does
include Mountain House and Tracy, Ripon, Escalon, and the
eastern farming cities that are within San Joaquin County
as well.

Now, we will move on to page 27. It says it went to
Stanislaus, is does not, San Joaquin and Sacramento, and
as you can again, the request to keep Stockton whole, it
is. Lathrup and Manteca are also added in here, and then moving north, though Elk Grove is with Stockton in this visualization, I would like to point out that Elk Grove is with this Greenhaven-Pocket area of Sacramento, foreign, Vineyard, Fruitridge Pocket is in here. I'll zoom in so that you can see that clear, but Fruit Ridge Pocket, Lemon Hill Parkway, Southeastern Sacramento are all together, and I believe we heard yesterday -- Elk Grove and Galt having some similarities, and they're together in this visualization as well.

And then continuing to move north, we go to page 24, and we do have West Sacramento, a part of this visualization, along with northern parts of Sacramento, Natomas being up here, Del Paso Heights over here, East Sacramento, there in the middle, keeping Arden-Arcade, Carmichael together. We have Rancho Cordova, up to Elverta, Rio Linda, Citrus Heights, and Fair Oaks, and Gold River, all kept in this area, as well as Rosemont, too, which is down here, and everything in green.

And now, zooming to the left, we have our Eastern California. So I'm going to zoom out so we can see that clear, as well. So in here, I was not able to keep Sierra, Nevada, Plaster (ph.), and El Dorado together, but in this visualization, unlike others, Plaster is kept whole. It is with El Dorado. Folsom is brought into
this visualization, as well as Rancho Murieta from the Sacramento County. And then, keeping Mono and Inyo up, and I also moved to keep Tuolumne, Mariposa, with Calaveras, as directed before.

And now, we are going to jump pages quite a bit and go to page 8, and that will have our Northern California visualization on here. And it's keeping together, as I said, Sierra, Nevada, Sutter, Yuba, and Butte, Colusa, going with the north. We did bring in Trinity. You can see, we're still under negative 7.43. Something that might be able to help that is bringing in Del Norte. And then we do have the part of Humboldt carved out that has the Karuk tribe. And that is it for the Senate visualizations in my area.

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

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, thank you. I'd like to go back to, starting with the Fresno/Kern, Merced/King -- or yeah, Madera/Kern maps. I'll start with Trinity. I'm going to have some questions, and then, also, specifically, directions, possibly.

So in the Merced/Fresno visualization, is it possible to cut off -- if you go and you zoom in on where the line -- the border between where Merced/Fresno and Madera/Kern is, if you could zoom in on that part?
Now, if you were to -- in Madera, there is the mountain areas, and I think Madera is partially split already. I'm just trying to think about, you know, taking into account thinking about what some of the folks from Kern, the callers that we had, giving testimony about just the length of this district.

If we were to incorporate in a little bit more of that Madera County, and then take all of what is the mountainous areas, Yosemite Lakes, Oakhurst, and put them into the Eastern California COI, which -- or not COI, the visualization, because I think that is almost just a little over four percent under deviation. I don't think there's a lot there that's going to throw off that number, but if we were to bring in that part of Madera, would it throw off the Latino CVAP for the Merced/Fresno visualization that we're looking at right now?

And also, on that same vein, Fresno County also includes Auberry and Big Creek. There's a mountainous area along that area. If we were to include that in the Eastern California, or the ECA visualization, that would also close that gap in terms of the being under the standard deviation; not by much, but it would. And then bringing in a larger portion -- I don't know if I want to say a larger portion of that Fresno area, maybe it's just, you know, taking away a little bit more of that
top-most portion from that Kern County visualization. Would it throw off the VRA numbers for this district, because I know that this Merced/Fresno one is a VRA district?

MS. WILSON: I will definitely take a look at it. Definitely taking something like this out would change that and make it lower, but I will take a look.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Because I'm also trying to think about, you know, how can we bring that northern-most border down on that -- on this visualization for a potential district.

The other question I have is specifically around Fresno. I know that, I believe, yesterday I was asking about the Hmong, and I know we've gotten a lot of COI testimony about the Punjabi/Sikh community, and I wanted to see -- I asked, yesterday, how this visualization is also taking into account these two communities, and I wanted to see if you might be able to give some perspectives. Because I want to make sure, and I know that we've gotten some additional COI testimony about community input for the Hmong and Punjabi communities, and I just want to make sure that we're not inadvertently disenfranchising, you know, a community that would have a lot in common with the communities that would be to the west.
MS. WILSON: Yes. So I did describe that briefly before that the Hmong communities working in Airtable and looking at their testimony and feedback, they're COIs and responses to visualization said that they reside in, you know, Sunnyside, and Southwest Fresno where a lot of the black COIs also reside. And then I -- there was a COI that described itself, which I'll turn on the street layers again, that said it has one of the biggest mosques in Fresno and there is a big Muslim community in COI that is founded between North 1st Street, East Bullard, down to Ashlan Avenue in Cedar (ph.).

And so I was told to make, at Shaw, you know, that's where a lot of communities' interest said that they would like that line split, but looking at Airtable and other feedback, I saw people saying that they -- COI saying they would be fine with Shaw, Ashlan, and even Shield's (ph.) being taken.

So I --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I guess I'll just point out to you, if you could take a look; I think we've also received some new testimony about both the Hmong community and the Punjabi community in Fresno. It's hard for me to compare and contrast with what we're looking at on the visualizations and the descriptions on the, you know, on the testimony that we're getting, but it said
something about being east of the ninety-nine, and I'm
not totally sure.

I also noticed that there were some comments, also,
that said that there are communities in and around the
Cal State Fresno area as well, too. So even though I
know that a lot of testimony did say, you know, south of
Shaw, I just want to make sure that we're mindful of not
inadvertently leaving out, you know, a community that
shares a lot of commonalities with the black community,
the various Asian communities, as well as the various
Latino communities. So I just wanted to make sure that
that's taken into account.

MS. WILSON: Yes, understood. And I will say that,
you know, continuing to move this border up would
probably result in having to separate some of these
communities that we've talked about already, as far as
Bell Gardens and Sunnyside Westpark. But I will take a
look at that and let you know further.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner
Akutagawa.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.

Okay, Kennedy, I don't know if I need to repeat my
comments from the Assembly side, but -- and when you get
to, oh my goodness, twenty-seven and twenty-six, the whole Sacramento County -- yeah, if you can just go up there, that'd be great. Thank you. A little bit more would be great. Thank you so much. Yeah. If you can zoom in, that's perfect. A little bit more. Can you bring it down a little bit? Thank you. You already -- like, you almost know what I'm going to ask, because you probably do. You already know. It's pretty much repetitive. If I miss anything from the Assembly, please take that into consideration as well.

Here, we have Sacramento that's -- the greater Sacramento that is split up in, one, two, three, four -- probably four or five different visualizations. Again, from Elk Grove up north. Tight now, you've got -- you're splitting up -- I realize that you kept Lemon Hill and Parkway and Florin together with Vineyard and Elk Grove, but that is also part of the greater Sacramento area that is also a community of interest with the downtown Sacramento; we've heard various COIs on that. And then we also have the Rancho Murieta/Folsom Granite base. So pretty much repetitive of what I said before.

In terms of West Sacramento, I would prefer to keep that with Yolo County. I don't believe that we should add West Sac when we're removing some communities of interest from Sacramento proper. And again, also, up to
Roseville and that whole area. And this is going to bleed into Tamina's, and we'll probably end up looking at another visualization and potentially, breaking that up to try to create another potential district in this area to encompass those Sacramento-type communities, and you can also bring in some of the, like, Sierra, El Dorado, if needed, for numbers. And I think I'll stop there.

And in terms of Galt; I realize Galt is in Sacramento County, so it can go either way. I believe Commissioner Turner was saying it's more Sacramento. Galt, actually, there's quite a bit of agriculture and open land, so I kind of liked it being with Herald and Clay and some of the southern communities, which were more agriculture because once you get to Elk Grove, unfortunately, those agriculture lands are no longer there.

And there was another -- and I already said West Sac with Yolo. So any questions for me, Kennedy?

MS. WILSON: Just -- no, not too many. Just one. Like, just noting that a lot of this results, too, from trying to have as little splits as possible within counties, and this, you know, could lead to trying to push that up -- might lead into, you know, splits and Stanislaus in going further, and I just want to know that that's okay, because I see that as being a direct result
and I'm being told to, like, keep that whole -- and I
know Merced isn't whole -- trying to keep as many
together, but I do foresee this having to be split a bit
more. And if I were to split it, I know, you know,
Modesto and Turlock having to be together, and I just --
yeah.

And I just -- I mean, I know that wasn't necessarily
what you were talking about, but you know, moving that
north, I'm going to have to continue to move upwards.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. Yeah.

MS. WILSON: And just was wondering.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I don't want to give that
direction right now because that's probably a different
commissioner's direction. But yeah, because right now
you do have the NSAC and the SSSAC, they're both -- one's
under, one's over almost a break-even point right there.
But as you get to -- if you look at the ECA El Dorado,
that's a negative, so we can pull from that as well,
which was what I was getting to, to try to get some of
the population from that area as well.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Kennedy, are you clear
from Commissioner Fernandez?

MS. WILSON: Yes. You -- sorry, you can continue.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Commissioner Yee.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair.

About Fresno; when you are looking at options for what to do around Shaw, just to give the specific instruction to experiment with Old Fig going north, with North Fresno, Old Fig Gardens.

And one other thing, the Northern California, the far north, you had mentioned this, but to give the specific instruction to experiment with, including, Del Norte, with the eastern Senate visualization. We've gotten mixed testimony about that, and maybe one way to honor that is to have it go eastward for the Senate, and then southward for Assembly and Congress. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair.

Just a quick question. On page 24, the visualization is NSAC. Can you please zoom in, into the Fruitridge Rocket area. I just want to take a closer look at that. The words on the PDF are blocking that area. Are those two separate cities? The two different shades of blue on the left side, and then the right side --

MS. WILSON: Oh, this --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: -- of Lemon Hill.
MS. WILSON: This is -- these are both Sacramento together.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Got it. Okay.

MS. WILSON: And then separated by these cities in the middle.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay. Got it. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And I just want to clarify; they're not necessarily cities, they're communities within Sacramento.

MS. WILSON: Like, the census designated places.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you,

Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I guess, a couple things. I just have some questions.

So Commissioner Fernandez, I was just comparing the Congressional and Senate maps and they're pretty different, and I think it was similar to the direction, Commissioner Kennedy, that you gave or somebody gave about trying to keep the Senate and Congressional districts as somewhat similar in size and shape so that it reduces the confusion as to who I'm voting for and what district I belong in.

So I am wondering if it would be possible to look at the Congressional map as foundation? I don't know if
that one's that much better, but maybe using one or the
other as a foundation for this Sacramenta area.
Specifically, like the -- I'm looking at, like, maybe the
Plaster/Sacramento map that was on the Congressional map,
and I think there's -- just trying to get to that page
again, but I think there is a similar map for the Senate
map, too. Or maybe it's called NORCA.

So anyways, I wanted to suggest that. I also have a
couple other questions for Kennedy.

Kennedy, can you tell me, where is Del Paso Heights
on this visualization?

MS. WILSON: I will zoom in and show you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was trying to look, and
it was hard to just to get that content.

MS. WILSON: Yeah. Definitely is hard to do. It's
here in Northern Sacramento under the Dwight Eisenhower
Freeway, kind of following this Raley Boulevard, and Rio
Linda Boulevard, in this area here.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. It is in the
Sacramento visualization. Okay. I wanted to just
double-check on that. I think this is -- I think, maybe,
this is similar to what -- anyways, I think maybe just
what I said in terms of trying to have somewhat similar
basis for both the Senate and the Congress might be
helpful, and then I guess I'll just comment on the
Congress one later on when we go to that one. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you, Chair.

I'm looking at the Napa, I think it's NAPABYRON, and I'm -- the lower part of the Delta and Contra Costa County seems a little bit -- I mean, I understand why we have -- why we have it here. First, I want to say, the map's sort of looking better, from my perspective. I'm just a little bit concerned about the lower -- the Contra Costa part of the Delta being with this district.

I do think this -- from Colusa County, there's farm worker communities up there, the Williams and Arbuckle, Grimes communities, as well as -- that potentially could be part of -- that I could see being part of this Yolo County, Napa, Solano district. The population may not be there to try to shut this a little bit up, to try to make it more of a agriculture district. And so I also would be supportive of adding the City of Sonoma and some of the wine producing areas of Sonoma/Kenwood area and to try to, maybe, even to run a park to try to bring in some population, if needed, if we can shift around the -- shift the district up a little bit.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. We'll take that up in
greater detail with Tamina since that's part of her responsibility.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you, Chair. Sorry about that.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: That's all right. Did you have anything else?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No. And I concur with Commissioner Yee on Del Norte. I think that would be a good compromise. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

I just want to respond to Commissioner Akutagawa. And I do agree and would like the Senatorial as well as Congressional districts to look alike, so I obviously have the same issues with the Congressional. So I'm trying to get to that point, and what I'm trying to do is fix -- trying to, I don't even want to call it fix it, but trying to address it at the Assembly level, that hopefully, that then carries forward to the Senate, as well as the Congressional. So thank you for that.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez. Commissioner Toledo, is your hand still up, or is it a new comment? Thank you.
Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. Excuse me.

Back with that, the Madera/Kern, the area that we're sort of talking about. I was thinking this pops back into Sivan's area, that area that you were saying, say north of I-40, if we wanted to put that into that Madera/Kern area, and then take, possibly, the mountainous area of Madera out and put it with the East California, you know, the Sierra area, that one. That might give us enough population in both. It might help out a little bit with reducing some population in the Madera/Kern and also, locate it a little closer down to, you know, keeping the southern area, and add a little bit more population up north where we need more population. So that's something to consider.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Kennedy, are you clear on that?

MS. WILSON: I am. Thank you for checking.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

I just wanted to -- one comment about Del Norte. I do agree that it seems like it would make sense to add it
to the Siskiyou, NorCal visualization. I just want to note that there were some COI testimony that said that it would be difficult to access Del Norte without going up and down the 101. The transportation corridor doesn't really allow easy access east to west, so I just wanted to just state that.

I do have a comment, I mean, on this NorCal one. I mean, with the deviation under seven percent, I mean, that's quite a bit. I'm thinking that perhaps we just need to start going south on this one because we don't -- I mean, Del Norte's not going to add enough to it to really bring down that visualization more, especially for a Congressional district.

I'm thinking that we should look at placing portions of Plaster and El Dorado. I know that we've gone back and forth on this and I'm sure Commissioner Fernandez is going to have something to say about this, but that is just a thought that perhaps the eastern portions of Plaster and El Dorado might belong in this NorCal area so that, at least, the Lake Tahoe portions of this county will remain together and together with the northern part. And then for the ECA, maybe that might help with some of the Merced/(audio interference) issues. We'll just have to pick up -- I know that it wasn't what they wanted, but that might be the easiest way to pick up some of the
population to keep this as an intact district as well
too, so. That's my guidance. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner
Akutagawa.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

And while I appreciate what Commissioner Akutagawa
was saying, the numbers are -- Plaster has a 151,000, so
that just sort of blows it right out of a ballpark,
adding it up there, where Del Norte is at 25,000. So I
believe that would take it from negative seven to about
negative two, in terms of the numbers on this NorCal,
which is not ideal, but you know, it's certainly within
the ballpark. So I do agree, also, with Commissioner Yee
and then Commissioner Toledo, second and putting Del
Norte and then kind of leaving it like that.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fernandez.

MS. WILSON: If I could add something to help you
thinking about. With direction to have Elk Grove moving
north, and then moving more of these cities to the east,
that will populate this as well. Like, I can't remember
the numbers of Citrus Heights and Rancho Cordova, but
they are pretty populated. And so bringing -- I'm going
to have to bring those out to put this in, and that's
going to help with that. Although, you know, then we
have the Madera issue, but I'll figure that out later.
But just something for you to -- to know each other's stuff as well.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Good. Thank you very much, Kennedy. We appreciate that.

Any further comments on Kennedy's visualizations at this point? Okay.

Karin and Andrew, back to you for next steps.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. Thank you so much, Chair, Kennedy. We are going to move over to Tamina's area and if she could, please, just share the screen that will be fantastic, and then we can get started there. Screen's up, Tamina.

MS. ALON: Good afternoon, Commission.

We are starting today with north coast areas, and I was listening to the instruction that you gave to Jamie, so I'm going to do my best -- I'm sorry, Jamie; to Kennedy. I'm going to do my best to tell you a little bit about how the direction that you just gave to Kennedy may affect some of these regions. Just -- I'm just kind of doing some live numbers while we were here. So if you'll bear with me.

There are no areas in this -- in this map which are under consideration by BRA Counsel, so we're going to go ahead and start in the north with N-Coast (ph.). So
we're going to start on page 9. So N-Coast is similar to the N-Coast that we saw last week. The difference is that Trinity was taken out and moved into Kennedy's area. She needed it for population. This does bring the deviation -- this does bring the deviation down and -- to 1.33. It was at a 2.96 percent before. So aside from that, nothing was changed.

A few comments about some of the movements that you just described. Del Norte's population is 25,140. So if we were to move Del Norte out of the north coast visualization district, then this would change the deviation to a negative 121 percent. So we're still within the deviation thresholds here.

There was also discussion of possibly taking Sonoma City from -- whoops, sorry, we're right down here. Taking Sonoma City and bringing it over into the NAPABYRON visualization. And so I am happy to look at that as well.

Again, we're going to kind of look at these in -- in sets because they all tend to affect one another. But because this is Senate, we have -- the sets are a little bit smaller, in terms of number of visualizations. So really, these two are the ones we are going to look at together, N-Coast and NAPABYRON.

N-Coast, we just talked about. NAPABYRON puts
together a lake in Napa, all of Yolo County, all of Solano County, the Delta area, and the northeastern Contra Costa County. I -- I'm sorry, this is page 12 for that; page 12. And did hear comments about possibly exploring an alternative to northeast Contra Costa County in order to make up this area. You'll notice that this visualization is under populated by 7.81 percent, and this is because we're going to be discussing it in very shortly with COCO, which is on page 15, which is over by six percent.

So I wanted to give you a couple of ideas of what we could possibly do with this area. The first is one that I just heard from you during your -- during Kennedy's, which is to take West Sacramento. West Sacramento is 53,915 people. And so if I could add West Sacramento into this visualization as it is, and that would take this area, this NAPABYRON visualization district to a negative 2.34 percent. So that would fix the problem of the overpopulation here.

Another option are, we have Vallejo and Venetia, which are part of Solano. There was -- there were two request which conflicted. One was to keep Solano County whole. And the other was to move Vallejo and Venetia with North Contra Costa County.

So just giving you an idea of what those could look
I could move Venetia or Vallejo into this lower Contra Costa based area over here. I could not do both. Venetia is 27,167 people, so that would create NAPABYRON as like a 3.46.

And Vallejo by itself would actually move NAPABYRON up to a 4.99. And that would be without West Sacramento. So I could not do both, but I could do either one. They are both bridge continuous to this COCO area. And so if either one is moved back, the other one would still be able to stand with the COCO visualization.

Another solution here was to look to Colusa. Colusa is 21,898 people, so definitely can bring it in. It's still going to need more. But definitely could bring that in if that's your direction because that's such a small number of people.

Similarly, the city to Sonoma down here is only 10,761 people, so that switch could be made without negatively affecting this population too much.

So I'd like to go to page 15. This is COCO. And we'll continue talking about this. This is a Contra Costa and Alameda based area.

So this -- if you'll recall, this visualization used to come out east. And it used to actually include Lathrop and Manteca. And I was given direction to cut this at the county line, so that is what I did. This
keeps the county line of Contra Costa and Alameda intact. This also keeps Pittsburg with Bay Point, which was a small change here, but there was -- the co-ed testimony and commissioner direction that they put in Pittsburg should be together, so this keeps them both together in this visualization.

As I mentioned, we do add Vallejo and Venetia here. And then, coming down, you'll see that the Tri-Valley area here is completely intact. We have Dublin, Pleasanton, and Livermore intact. And then all the way up through San Ramon, and actually all the way up to 6 AD corridor are together in this visualization.

This area over here actually used to go out east as well. And so this is per direction that we have this on this line currently.

And as I mentioned before, this is 6.21 percent overpopulated. None of the cities -- there are only two cities that are split in whole section. One is south San Francisco, which we'll talk about in a little bit. And the other is the City of San Jose, which is just massive. So I have not experimented with city splits in this area. So would love some direction as to where you believe population should move from these areas in order to balance.

And again, of course, if Vallejo or Venetia are
moved to the NAPABYRON area, then that would alleviate some of the overpopulation here, and I might be able to balance that just fine. But also open to any other suggestions that you may have of how you'd like to move that population.

And depending on how this populations moves as well; we may be able to get Sunol in there. I didn't include it, of course, because we're already overpopulated. But it is in the back on my mind to try to keep Sunol together with the eastern Alameda County neighbors.

And we'll move to page 13, which is Alameda. So Alameda starts with Oakland being whole and then going up the AD corridor all the way up through the rest of Alameda County and Contra Costa County, all the way up to Rodeo. It does preserve the Oakland Hills line. It does not go over it. And that's all I have to say about that one.

So we'll go to page 16, please. Page 16 is EDENTECH, and this keeps all of the EDEN area together, keeps the Tri-Cities together.

We did take Pleasanton out before Pleasanton was in here, which kind of created a little bit of a split. So by taking Pleasanton out, that was able to be accomplished. It was traded for this this Berryessa area in this little area of San Jose down here. So this line
is to keep some of the COIs intact that we have in the area. But that was really the trade that we were looking at.

This also took out North San Jose, which is this area right here and added it to this SCRUZ district in order to balance it for population.

And we'll move to page 18, which is SCRUZ. So SCRUZ is so named because this in Santa Cruz, so you can see how far this district has moved along. SCLARA used to be the one that was over here. And in fact, SCLARA used to come east all the way to Modesto, Turlock. And so it really -- it came out to this area, and you said, no, don't do that.

Definitely took a look at ending at the county line. And so this cuts off again at the Santa Clara County line and instead it has become a San Jose city-based district visualization. In this area, we stopped at the county line. We have all of south San Jose in here. We have quite a bit of it actually. The only areas that we don't have are areas around Cambrian Park over here, and then there's some areas around Burbank over here. The rest of San Jose City is intact, except for this Berryessa, Foothills area up here.

Now, this line here is according to the COI testimony. I want to note that this line does
technically split the Alum Rock, East Foothills areas. However, the COIs for Alum Rock actually draw it differently. And so they actually want their area to start down here. And so that's the line that we followed was the line for the COIs that were actually in that area.

Just an idea of some of the COIs that are here that we are preserving: North San Jose, Berryessa; the Latino Alum Rock neighborhood, Japantown and the Punjabi Sikh COIs. They're all overlapping right in this area and down in this area. And so that's where this line came from to make sure that those COIs could stay intact.

We'll move to page 14, SANFRAN, please. So SANFRAN hasn't changed since the last time we looked at it. San Francisco is still whole, and we include Daly City, Brisbane, Colma and South San Francisco.

What I'd like to go into a little bit more with you today is just where this split in South San Francisco is, so I'm going to zoom in a little bit and turn on some streets for us.

So you'll see this pink area over here. This is South San Francisco, the areas that are not included. So just to orient you with the area, we're starting this visualization up here right at the border of Daly City. So this is the skyline area here. Where this split
actually begins in South San Francisco is right at the 35 point, and then we're going to go along east to Kings -- there you go. So this is King Drive, which is going to go over to 280. After you go over to 280 it becomes Arroyo and then crosses over to 82 to Memorial. And that's it. Just that area.

And we'll go to PENINSULA, page 19. So PENINSULA, the difference here is we took -- the PENINSULA visualization was very closely related to the SCLARA visualization, and this was because of several different pieces of advice -- direction that I received. One was the Santa Cruz to Los Gatos. So here is Santa Cruz wanting to connect it with Los Gatos. In a previous visualization, Los Gatos was in with the PENINSULA area, so that was taken out.

The reason for this area, the shape which includes Saratoga, Campbell including it with Mountain View, this is all part of Santa Clara County by the way, but not going directly through, is to preserve the Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Cupertino COI in this area. And so reached over to get Saratoga, Campbell, still part of the same county, but just moving one over in order to keep that COI together.

They're also are just those few areas of San Jose City in here that I mentioned from before. They are also
a part of this. But the main direction was to keep San 
Mateo with San Mateo, and we have all of San Mateo County 
in this visualization with the exception of those areas 
which were taken for the San Francisco area.

Which brings up to SCLARA. This is page 17. And 
before I zoom out, I'll just, again, point out the Santa 
Cruz to Los Gatos along Highway 17 corridor. We do have 
Morgan Hill, San Martin, and Gilroy in this visualization 
as well.

This is a costal visualization. So you've seen this 
before, but the difference is, as you've seen when you 
talked about Kennedy's areas, is that we have the San 
Benito and the Highway 101 corridor of Monterey County 
being connected to the eastern areas in those potential 
VRA area districts.

So we did some exploring on how to move around and 
try to bring up the CVAP -- LCVAP as directed in these 
areas. So currently this is not part of my area anymore 
because it is part of Kennedy's today. But the resulting 
district, which is from taking this part out -- I just 
want to zoom in and show you. We have -- this is Salinas 
down here. And this comes all the way down to King City 
and to Pine Canyon.

So this is a lot like what we were speaking about in 
the Assembly of a possible line that could be down to
King City. This is pretty much what it would look like with our particular line. The rest of Monterey County is included. And then in San Luis Obispo County, we come as south as Arroyo Grande, making sure that Arroyo Grande stays with San Luis Obispo County, and that is per direction.

Lastly, we have page 20. Page 20 has SCOAST. Direction to keep all of the islands together was followed, though I will be adjusting that to follow the new direction to keep the islands with their respective counties as directed earlier.

We have Southern Santa Barbara Coast staying with Southern Santa Barbara. And the Ventura split is still the same as you saw it before, just cutting right before Camarillo, Somis, and Moorpark, as you could see before. and as I mentioned, there are no other city splits.

And that is my whole area. I'm happy to take feedback.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much, Tamina.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.

Thank you, Tamina.

So if you can just zoom into, you probably already know, 12 and 15, which is the Yolo, Napa kind of area.
Okay. Perfect.

So on the NAPABYRON, on this one -- yes, in terms of what you said earlier, we can potentially pull out West Sacramento from the NSAC visualization. And then down below Southern Solano down there, can -- where is the Solano County line?

MS. ALON: The Solano County line is over along here --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

MS. ALON: -- and including Vallejo and Venetia.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So my -- what I'd like to see is moving Venetia and Vallejo into the NAPABYRON. And then where your hand is right now, moving Bethel Island, Oakley, Antioch, moving that to the visualization below, which is can't remember what the name of it is. That is --


COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- that the COCO. But then I wanted to see what some of the -- okay. And COCO is already over. I already foresee an issue with this because I believe by moving Venetia and Vallejo, that population wise, is not going to equal what I'm suggesting to move in. So I was trying to see where -- can you move down COCO real quick. Thank you.

Okay. Yeah. I have to think about that one a
little bit more. Unfortunately, Commissioner Fornaciari
had to leave, and his comment regarding this was also the
same, in terms of moving Vallejo and Venetia into the
NAPABYRON. And then the Bethel Island, Antioch, moving
that to the COCO visualization. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner
Fernandez. Let's -- I don't know, at some point it may
be useful to have a very bare bones map that just has the
deviations and nothing else because we need to keep sight
of the fact that we need to be moving population north
rather than south. I see Commissioner Anderson nodding.
So let's just keep that in mind.

So with that, Commissioner Yee and then Commissioner
Anderson.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair.

So on that same point with Vallejo and Venetia, I
think you said to me that you can't move both. So if we
have to choose between the two, I would keep Venetia with
COCO on a shared industrial interest there, that we keep
all the refineries there together. And then Vallejo
going to NAPABYRON. But that may depend on what we do
with West Sacramento. So if we had to choose the two, I
would keep Venetia with COCO.

And then I had a question about South San Francisco.
And thank you for the detailed look at the split that you
made there. Could you say a little bit more about how you sided on the particular split? Thanks.

MS. ALON: Sure. It's really just knowing the streets in the area over here. Happy to entertain and trying to keep the census blocks looking as much of aligned and a little bit less jagged than they would. But happy to entertain any other street splits or any other ideas of where we can move that population.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Yee, did you want any further detail?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I think it's fine. I just wanted to hear the thinking behind the -- you know, that particular line.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And you're happy with what you've heard?

COMMISSIONER YEE: For now, yeah. Thanks.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good.

Commissioner Andersen and then Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair.

On that one, actually, Tamina, again, I'm thinking of shifting populations and move it up north but it sort of starts going around. I'm just wondering if you could -- since south San Francisco is already split, if you could adjust that so that COI is more even, instead
of the, you know, close to four, if you could adjust it so that it's more even because then I'd like to take some things out of the PENINSULA one to move a little bit of population on the coast. But just for right now, if you could just have a look at that one, please.

And then I'd actually like to go back up to the NCOAST, page 9. And I appreciate your -- all your suggestions to me. And I really -- I liked your -- the way you've been giving us sort of this or that and these -- what happens with the changes. But we have said, take down the word out of this one. I would actually like to put Lake in. And then the populations, that's the change, there's around 40,000 people or so.

And then I'd like to add to the NAPABYRON by taking Lake out of NAPABYRON, I'd like to add more of the Wine Country. Commissioner Toledo said the City of Sonoma. I'd like to add more of those, like, Glen Ellen, that area, to bring the population up. Correct. Yeah. There's -- you see Kenwood, Glen Ellen, Hot Springs. Those are certainly all Wine Country -- wine cities. I'd like to add that into it.

So I don't want to put West Sacramento in this area because I believe if we add the Wine Country to Napa, Solano, Yolo, we've created that agricultural area.

And then with the Vallejo, Venetia area, with that
population, I don't believe we can add more. But if we want to, I agree with Commissioner Yee, add Vallejo. And I would put the Antioch, Bethel Island, Oakley, that area, back with COCO.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Anything else, Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I will stop there. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Very Good. Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I'm going to try to contribute to this puzzle. I was thinking similar to what Commissioner Fernandez was saying. Let's add Vallejo and Venetia to the NAPABYRON visualization. That total based on the population numbers that I counted up is 153,663. If we then deduct the deviation because there's 77,151 under, that would leave us with 76,512 over.

And then if you remove West Sacramento, we'll just placeholder them with North Sacramento for right now. That's 54,071. Then that would then leave us still 22,441 over, and if we remove some of those smaller Delta Towns, that may bring it down in terms of -- I don't know what the population numbers. I didn't have time to look up all of those populations just yet, but perhaps they
may get us a little closer to a standard deviation that's a little bit more reasonable.

But also, on this COCO visualization, one of the things that I was concerned about is the fact that we have a rather interesting array of industries that are not necessarily what I would call shared communities of interest. You have your Delta Towns like Bethel Island, Oakley Knights, and Brentwood, Discovery Bay, Byron. And then you have Antioch and Pittsburg split, as well as Martinez and Clyde, along with all of those, I'll call them bedroom communities, that share the 5 A -- I think it's the 5 AD corridor or the 6 -- yeah 6 AD corridor in the Tri-Valley community.

So this may be a way to not necessarily create something that's totally alike, but at least you have some more balance where you have your areas that are the Delta Towns, as well as those that follow the 6 AD corridor. So thank you.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

We have five minutes remaining until lunch.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. On that same map, I'm just sort of -- the African-American community and their COI out in Vallejo is wanting to be with the Contra Costa
area or Richmond area, and so that is something that I just keep in the back on my mind. And I know that's one of the reasons why we pulled it down. But yeah, we do need some population.

I'm also thinking, attend to the City of Rohnert Park because of its hospitality focused. There's quite a bit of population there. I would want to balance the two districts so they have -- the deviations, they're both low. And with the movement of Del Norte into Siskiyou area, that's going to make the north coast district deviation bigger. And so if there's a way to balance the two and bring in some populations from the Wine Country area, exactly what Jane -- Commissioner Andersen mentioned, potentially going even into Rohnert Park, which has a significant alignment with Napa/Solano area as well, if we need to.

And I don't know how I feel about West Sac at this point. I think I'd like to keep the county whole if possible, but I also see significant similarities between West Sacramento and Sacramento, so I -- that's -- yeah. That where I'm at this point. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Just
really quick.

Just for clarification, I'm going ask Commissioner Akutagawa because we tend to refer to the Delta Towns. And I see Delta Towns as -- there's like two separate areas. There's the area that is northern most that is kind of the real vista all the way north. And then you've got, you know, from Bethel Island, Antioch, Pittsburg. So I believe Tamina was clear on what Commissioner Akutagawa was talking about, but I just wanted to make sure that we're specific as to which part of the Delta we're talking about. Thank you. Because there's lots of small little towns in the Delta. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. You're -- Commissioner Kennedy, if you don't mind, I'll just reply.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Please.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Yes. Commissioner Fernandez, you're absolutely right. I just don't have all the little town names. But when she has -- hold on. Sorry. Let me just look at the map here. Yeah. I'm talking about like Bethel Island, Oakley, Knights, and Brentwood, Discovery Bay, Byron. I'm referring to those. I think they refer to themselves as Delta Towns. I wasn't thinking going all the way up. I think that it's unnecessary to grab that much. I don't -- I know that there's also -- there's going to be other ripple effects
if we grab too many of them too.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

And Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you.

I apologize. I totally blew the one area. I left a lot of population hanging out there. I agree --

Commissioner Toledo said, you know, the Vallejo, Venetia, and we talked about going across the top of Contra Costa County. So I would take Crockett, Martinez, Bay Point, Pittsburg. That's that area of Antioch, Bethel Island that I meant to take out of NAPABYRON. I did not actually mean to put it into COCO because that makes the population crazy.

And I don't know how much population is in that area if we, you know, go across the Highway 4, so we might need to come down into grabbing a Concord, Clayton, that area, to come up with the population to help.

And then -- excuse me -- if we go the south part of COCO, please. And then we might be able to grab Sunol. And then that would -- we could -- as a population, I was arranging on the PENINSULA to possibly move it up and around. That's what I would like to do in the area.

Tamina, I don't know if that was -- I apologize if that was sufficiently vague. But the idea being, can we capture across Highway 4, that area for the industries,
if that would help. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

That brings us to lunchtime. So continue contemplating how we resolve some of these conundrums in front of us. Enjoy your lunch. And see you back here at 3 p.m. Commissioner Le Mons should be back in the chair.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 2:15 p.m. until 3:00 p.m.)

CHAIR LE MONS: Welcome back. I hope everyone had a wonderful lunch and got a little bit of a break.

Before we went to lunch, Tamina, I just wanted to check in with Commissioners to see if there was additional feedback on your maps.

Commissioners?

MS. DONALD: Chair Le Mons, may I please ask a clarifying question?

CHAIR LE MONS: Yes. Absolutely.

MS. DONALD: Thank you so much. We were just wondering if you could please clarify West Sacramento, which way that's going to go. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Give me one second. I will clarify that for you. My understanding is that West Sac should go with Yolo. Is that what you're talking about?

MS. DONALD: Sorry. Yes. Just wanted to make sure...
that that's on the record. Appreciate it.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Perfect.

Before we jump back in, I'm sorry, I wanted to just remind the public that we're going to have public comment toward the end of the day. And also wanted to also remind the public that comments can be provided at any point throughout the meeting via our comment forum which is at our website. So feel free to utilize that particular tool to provide us comment. We are tracking that all during the day. So we do see it quickly, and we'll make sure that that information is being incorporated into the experience as well.

We got a lot -- several hundred comments via the forum yesterday which was very, very exciting. So continue to utilize it. And, of course, if you want to give live verbal comment, that will be happening a little bit later today.

So with that, I will go to Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair.

I just actually want to lift a concern. We're splitting a significant community of interest in Gilroy, Watsonville, and Hollister by the -- this is the Santa Clara on page 17, and then -- then we said Fresno, which I don't have the page on. And I just wanted to know was this considered -- in the VRA, was these two cities were
eliminated from what's connected in the Assembly
district. So I'm just wondering if we could address
that, please, how that came about. It's just a little
further -- yeah. You'll see Gilroy and Watsonville.
That was with -- Hollister was that community of interest
that was mentioned many, many times earlier in the
summer, and all about San -- keep San Benito with that
area.

MS. ALON: So in the Assembly, we have them together
with this area, and it creates a fifty plus -- fifty
percent plus LCVAP area in the Assembly. In the Senate
district, they do not contribute to raising that LCVAP.
And they were together in the previous visualization, but
the prior direction we got last week was to take these
areas of San Benito and Monterey and try to move them
east for LCVAP purposes. So that's how we came up with
this configuration.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. So yeah, you could
not create another Senate Latino district in this area
without going east?

MS. ALON: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

MS. DONALD: Would you like us to move on to a
different area?

Chair Le Mons, you are muted. Sorry.
CHAIR LE MONS: No wonder no one is responding. My apologies. Yes, please, Karin.

MS. DONALD: Okay. So thank you very much. We're moving on to Jamie now. So just one moment while she pulls up the map. And there it is already fast as lightning.

And Jamie, take it away. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could you get a little closer to the mic, please? Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Last week, of course, we didn't get to go through in too much detail Senate districts. We talked about general directions. So based on that, that's what I have for you today.

First visualization we're going to look at that Mr. Becker might have comments about is page 41 of the handout. And this visualization is at a negative 4.40 percent deviation. I got direction in San Gabriel Valley to have sort of north to south oriented districts. And that's what we see here.

I also was instructed to include these areas. It's San Marino, Alhambra, Monterey Park, Rosemead, San Gabriel areas to keep that -- those cities together, and then to sort of move south. So this visualization includes the cities I just mentioned. Also includes Montebello, Pico Rivera, Downey, Bellflower, Cerritos,
Artesia, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, East Whittier, and South Whittier. The City of Whittier is split for population and CVAP purposes. And again, this is a negative 4.40 percent deviation, and this was on page 41.

MR. BECKER: And I'll just say -- and this will be -- this will be applicable to both of these VRA visualizations. As you can see, they're both underpopulated towards the upper boundary. And given the current percentages of Latino Citizens Voting Age Population and the Voting Rights Act that we've determined here, if you're -- you probably only need to add population in here rather than subtract it, and you probably need to -- you probably don't have a lot of leeway to reduce the Latino CVAP. So I would just make those -- we give those pieces of advice as you consider direction of the line drawers.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

And next, I'm going to be moving to page 43 of the handout. This is the sort of east 210 area. We receive direction to have Walnut, Diamond Bar, Rowland Heights, Hacienda Heights with Orange County cities. So that's why this area here is not included in the visualization. And this visualization includes areas in Angeles National Forest, includes Claremont, San Dimas, Glendora, Duarte, Bradbury, Azusa, Irwindale, Covina, West Covina, North El
Monte, El Monte, and South El Monte, La Puente, most of the City of Industry.

I'm going to zoom in to see some more detail on the southern end. And this includes the northern part of the City of Whittier, and also includes La Habra and La Mirada for population. This is also a negative 4.45 percent deviation in this visualization.

And this is a visualization Mr. Becker also -- oh. I know you just gave some comments about the last -- about this on the last one.

So moving on from here, I'm going to go to the Northern most part of Los Angeles County, and then move sort of south mostly following the pdfs and the handout. And first going to page 44, please. This is looking at the Antelope Valley and Victor Valley areas. So I'm going to zoom out, and then I'll zoom in to show more detail as discussing this.

On the east and northern most parts of this visualization, it includes the northern San Bernadino County areas. Near the Los Angeles-Orange County border, it includes Victor Valley, Barstow. It also includes some areas along 210 in San Bernadino County. These areas I tried to include for population with this SD east 210 visualization, and for CVAP purposes, I could not include them. Then looking at northern Los Angeles
County, this includes the Antelope Valley in this visualization.

So from now on, we're going to go mostly in order of the pdfs. And our next visualization is on page 34, please. This visualization includes the Santa Clarita Valley. It also includes part of the San Fernando Valley including -- I'll zoom in to show you more detail of what's in the San Fernando Valley. This includes Sylmar, San Fernando, Mission Hills, Pacoima, Arleta, Van Nuys, Lake Balboa, Reseda, Sun Valley areas. These were included for population during our last meeting. I didn't receive general direction to try and keep Santa Clarita Valley and San Fernando Valley separate.

I'm just going to zoom out and talk about this direction a little bit more. So in this visualization, the Santa Clarita Valley is a little bit more than 300,000 people or so and the San Fernando Valley is around 600,000 people. So making this change would be a really big change. It's about, you know, thirty percent of a district is that 300,000 population. So making a change like that, of course, we can do that, and would have ripple effects potentially throughout the entire state. And depending on just sort of the direction that that -- that that ripple would go could have less, more like half the state or the whole state.
Happy to discuss that further if this is a configuration that the commission, like, really, really doesn't like, or really wants to see changes to, or just has questions about. Happy to discuss that further.

And next, looking at page 35, please, of the handouts. This is the East Ventura and San Fernando Valley areas. In East Ventura, this goes all the way to Camarillo, and it additionally includes Moorpark, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks areas. And then also includes areas in the San Fernando Valley of Granada Hills, Northridge, Chatsworth, West Hills, Hidden Hills, and then here following Mulholland all the way out to Sherman Oaks.

And this line here does include the Poso community of interest. This one goes all the way up to Oxnard. As I mentioned yesterday, there's differing testimony in terms of how far north that line goes. It is to some degree -- also this area here where the hand is also included in some COIs that go further north. So just making a note of that. I'm happy to go over that, of course, as well.

Next, page 36 in the handout. This visualization represents a percent deviation of 1.57 percent. It goes all the way from Malibu to Palos Verdes, including Lomita, Torrance, Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach, El...
Segundo. The airport itself is in -- is not included in this visualization. And this visualization also includes Venice, Santa Monica, Palisades, Bel Air, West Hollywood, such areas. I can zoom in on this. It includes Mid-City West Neighborhood Council, Westwood, and Westside Neighborhood Council, and Westside Neighborhood Council does include Century City.

And next, I'm going to go page 37 of the handout. It's this west of 110 visualization. This includes the City of Inglewood. It also includes parts of Westchester. And, you know, I'm going to correct what I said previously in the -- in this sort of, like, coastal visualization. LAX is included in the coastal visualization and is not included in this. So I -- pardon me. I misspoke earlier. So this is, again, on page 37 looking at the west of 110 visualization. It includes Inglewood, northern parts of Westchester, Del Rey, Mar Vista, Culver City, Palms, South Robertson, Pico, Olympic Park, Westlake, the Empowerment Congress areas, Zapata King Neighborhood Council, Park Mesa, Ladera Heights, View Park, and also includes West Adams if I missed that in my list.

Next on page 38, please. This visualization includes San Pedro, Wilmington, Carson, Compton, East Rancho Dominguez, West Rancho Dominguez, Willowbrook,
Watts Neighborhood Council, Westmont, West Athens, Hawthorne, Lennox, Del Aire, Lawndale, Alandra Park, and all of Gardena.

And next looking at page 39 of the handout, please. This visualization includes all of the City of Long Beach, Hawaiian Gardens, Signal Hill, which is here under the label, Lakewood, Paramount, Lynwood, South Gate, Bell Gardens, Florence, Firestone, and Huntington Park. And this is a .54 percent deviation.

Going to move to page 40. In this visualization, I had received direction to include Boyle Heights, Lincoln Heights, LA-32 Neighborhood Council, and East Los Angeles together. Those are all together in this COI, and also to -- or in this visualization. And also to keep COIs. Also to keep API COIs together. And it already includes Little Tokyo, Chinatown, the Koreatown Neighborhood Council, and Historic Filipinotown. And this COI additionally includes Vernon, Commerce, Bell, and Maywood.

Now, if we could please go to page 42. This visualization is a -4.88 percent deviation. It includes areas in Angeles National Forest and additionally includes Monrovia, South Monrovia Island, Arcadia, Sierra Madre, San Pasqual, Pasadena, Altadena, South Pasadena, Eagle Rock Neighborhood Council, Los Feliz, Burbank,
Sunland-Tujunga, Foothill Trails District. These are in San Fernando Valley. Also includes La Crescenta and La Cañada Flintridge.

And that concludes -- that concludes the visualizations that were prepared for you today in Los Angeles County. Thank you so much.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioners, comments, direction?

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.

As I noted earlier, Commissioner Fornaciari had to go home. So he did have one comment, which I agree with also. So I guess it could be both of ours. Page 34 and 36. That is the San Fernando Valley -- yeah. It's right next to each other.

So the comment was -- and I think you did mention what the population is, Jamie, but the comment is to keep San Fernando Valley together and then combine the rest of that. Even -- event -- event with -- yeah. There you go. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: So the direction is to try to keep San Fernando Valley whole and have Santa Clarita and with the sort of eastern Ventura area.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. Yes. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Thank you --

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner --
MS. CLARK: -- so much.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

I wanted to just check facts with Jamie first of all. My recollection of the input from VICA is that they were asking that to the extent that districts were not able to remain holy within the San Fernando Valley that we look at the possibility of having half or more of the population based in the San Fernando Valley. So I heard you say that in the SCSFV visualization, we have roughly thirty percent in the Santa Clarita Valley and sixty or seventy percent in San Fernando Valley.

MS. CLARK: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. And what about for the other visualization?

MS. CLARK: For the other visualization, I believe that this population in eastern Ventura County is also less than -- less than fifty percent of the population that's included in the San Fernando Valley. And I believe that if these areas were to be together in -- in a district, the Santa Clarity Valley and then eastern -- eastern Ventura County areas, then this -- then it would also need to include all the areas out including the City of Ventura to --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right. So --
MS. CLARK: -- to create a whole district.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Good. So I'm going to express my acceptance of the visualizations as they stand in that they do, in fact -- they are set out, in fact, in line with the request from VICA that more than half of the population of a district be based in San Fernando Valley. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. I'd like to first go to the Orange County one. It's the -- I think it's the Santa Ana, Anaheim, Garden Grove, Buena Park, Cypress, Los Alamitos, and Rossmoor.

MS. CLARK: So --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I thought we were focusing on LA County.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought she went through this part. So if -- if not, then I could just wait. I -- I'll just comment then on the LA County map then that I also have a comment on. And this is the SDNS.

On this particular one, I saw that Arcadia is removed from this particular visualization. Arcadia is -- even though they have a different social economic kind of level in terms of the residents of that area, they also do share a lot of the same affinities in terms
of their shopping, the kind of restaurants that they frequent. I think there's a lot of in between. And I do believe that we also saw, if my recollection, there was comments around keeping this particular area as close together in a district as possible.

So I want to -- I want to ask that we move Arcadia into this district. If we do, it will reduce the deviation a little bit, and actually put it slightly over. My thought is then, if we can, we -- I guess we either remove, or the other one is to actually instead of going north south like the way it is, we relook at the SD east 210 and actually incorporate in a east-west district that encompasses these cities, Arcadia, East San Gabriel, San Gabriel, Alhambra, Monterey Park, Rosemead, El Monte, South El Monte, stretching out to perhaps to Walnut, Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar in one super district that would then fit the numbers that are needed.

I know that we also discussed maybe breaking up the 210, but it -- I'm looking at some of the other communities that are in the SD east visualization. And the communities of El Monte, Baldwin Park, Covina, West Covina, La Puente, Irwindale, they are different from the communities to the north in a lot of different ways. And I don't believe we had any community of interest
testimony expressing that they should belong together at any point in a district. So -- and they would rather -- I think there was comments that going further east, like, to Walnut and Pomona would be preferable. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: If I -- if I may just respond to the very first part of that. And thank you so much, Commissioner Akutagawa, for all of that feedback. I tried to include Arcadia in this visualization, and for the CVAP purposes could not. And, of course, I -- I will -- I'm happy to try it. I just keep working this puzzle out, and I absolutely have noted you'd like to see Arcadia in this visualization. Happy to keep looking at that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Jamie, if I --

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm sorry. If I could follow up.

Jamie, would -- if -- if you look at it going eastward, if you include that, would the CVAP go down, because I am conscious of the CVAP in both those districts too. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: That's -- I would have to look at it. It's pretty similar to what we had last week. And I would just need to go back and double-check. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yep. Thank you.

First, I would agree with Commissioner Kennedy on that. I'm okay with how that San Fernando Valley piece is looking for now, though my next comments might have ripple effects for it. I want to take a closer look actually in the -- that North LA, the NELA district again. Similar to my comments on the Assembly level, for me, this becomes a major anchor point for LA county because it's the confluence of so many different communities of interest. And I think what's happening here is we have this district, again like in the Assembly, including Boyle Heights in east LA with some of these other areas. And the effect is breaking up a lot of the LGBTQ communities of interest that we've received.

So again, it's exploratory. So I think -- tell us what's possible, you know, in the next visualization to keep some of these communities together, because I think if we took out from that NELA district the Hollywood pieces, as well as pulling Los Feliz from the --- the Glendale-Burbank kind of area. We're going to have to make it up somewhere. So that's going to end up having those ripple effects.

I could see for the NELA piece -- oh. It doesn't really then stay NELA if we're -- if we're taking off some of those northern parts and dipping down into, like,
Bell Gardens and Cudahy. I'm wondering if that might be an option, you know, for those areas.

I'm also -- just want to take a -- if we can zoom in. Is -- how are we doing on Koreatown? Are we split there or we're -- are we keeping K-town whole?

MS. CLARK: So the neighborhood council of Koreatown is whole. Last week, I asked if I should look at the neighborhood council lines or look at the lines that were submitted as a Koreatown COI. I was -- I was told to keep the neighborhood council lines intact for now because the COI version of Koreatown splits Greater Wilshire. So for now, or in -- in this visualization, the Koreatown neighborhood town council is together. I guess, also -- actually, I -- I do have a question and happy to let you finish. I'm sorry for interrupting.


MS. CLARK: I guess a question, in thinking about taking some of these East Hollywood areas out of this visualization is that Thai Town, I'm -- sorry, words here that Thai Town is in this area and that would be separating Thai Town from some of the other COIs that I was asked to keep together in this visualization. So just a matter of -- but that's a decision point. And I think some of this could be a live line drawing
discussion, because some -- not all of these Senate
districts are just so big. Not all of these are going to
necessarily trigger, like a whole structural change of
the entire area.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. No. That makes total
sense. I think -- let's see what we can do about those
COIs now, you know, for the next round. But yes, I mean.
Definitely when my line, live line drawing would be
helpful to kind of compare and contrast the K-Town
neighborhood council to the COI districts. The COI
testimony that we've received. And I forgot the second
part of your question for me. But yes, totally fine to
leave some of this for live line drawing. But I did want
to lift it up because I think this -- I think this
district can shift southward a little bit and ease up
some of those -- those COIs that we were trying to keep
together as well, so.

The Thai Town piece, I mean, it's definitely a part
of Hollywood, right? So I think that's where we have
some conflicting testimony. So I'd like to take a closer
look at what we're doing with Thai Town across all three
sets of maps to better understand. I mean, I think one
of the things I'm seeing is, in some places, for example,
if we go back up to the -- the Antelope Valley, here we
have Antelope Valley connecting with -- with Victor
Valley, you know, in other maps we don't. And so I think those are some of the tradeoffs that we're making as we -- as we're working across all three maps. So, you know, I recognize that that might need to be an area that we trade off. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Anderson.

COMMISSIONERS ANDERSON: Thank you. I have one back on the East Ventura, San Fernando Valley. And I believe we were talking about taking Camarillo out and putting it back -- putting with the South Coast, which I -- I believe would help kind of even the population, maybe. But also it would give more weight to the San Fernando Valley.

Then the other one I was thinking of, but I -- at Reseda and the other little area -- those two blue squares there. I was wondering if those could be switched for Foothill Trails, Sunland. But then I realized, you're already negative 4.8. And I only brought that -- that's -- so that portion, the Reseda, switch in there. I would only say if more population moves into the 210 corridor. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Going back to the VRA districts. If there was a way to add more population to -- to increase the -- the CVAP for those that
they're -- the CVAPs are on the lower end. So if there's a way to -- to increase population, either by adding, I mean, there's -- there's -- I knows there's other considerations -- so there's a way to bring in more population and also increase the CVAP, that would be my direction. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez. Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry, I'm struggling with mute. We can stay here for right now. I do think -- I'm just not -- I'm not sure that the north-south orientation of these maps is working. And in -- in particular, I think it's -- it's a pretty big oversight for us to cut out particularly, Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, potentially, even Walnut, maybe Pomona, from the rest of the Greater San Gabriel Valley. And especially if you -- if we look at this SDNS districts, you know, San Merino -- grouping something like San Marino with Cerritos, Norwalk, Bellflower, also doesn't feel like it's working for me.

And then, finally, we have this weird, sort of the southern border of the SDNELA is also not really working for me. Bell Gardens, I think is separated -- or Bell -- Bell Gardens, Cudahy, that, like -- that's not a great line to draw there. I feel, like Bell Cudahy and Bell
Gardens, potentially even Maywood and Vernon and Commerce feel -- feel like a thing and it feel -- those need to go -- those need -- feel like they go together more-or-less. So I'm -- I'm just not -- I think I agree with Commissioner Sadhwani, if we can figure out, maybe this SDNELA district. Maybe pull it -- pull that south, or maybe east, I'm not sure. I just -- I don't know. This part of the map is just really not working for me. So I'd like maybe if -- I know this is probably going to have a lot of ripple effects. But I feel, like, similar to how we sort of tried to crack the nut by doing and east-west orientation in the Assembly districts, that we may need to do that again for the -- for the San Gabriel Valley and the Senate. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Thank you. That's really similar to what we had last week and I'll do my best to incorporate all of this -- all of this great feedback into something similar to that. Thank you so much.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. I was looking at the SPCC visualization and it's under a little bit and I was wondering if -- we've gotten public testimony asking for Lynwood to be included in this -- in this group. And I know we can't add all of it, but if we can, you know, get the difference, you know,
Linwood. And I believe then that would raise the -- the Latino CVAP. And I was trying to -- it might also raise the -- the black CVAP. I was trying to figure out exactly those two.

I know Gardena -- where Gardena and Torrance are -- is Gardena split where they asked to be split or is it separate from Torrance?

MS. CLARK: In this visualization, Gardena is not split. Gardena is whole. And with Hawthorne, I believe that the split that was requested there is just north of Marine. Happy to make that happen or take a look at that. And this visualization is just with the really quick turnaround of these maps didn't have -- didn't have time for the, like, fine tooth comb.

And Commissioner Sinay, could I please ask a follow-up question?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, just -- just before we go back to Gardena --

MS. CLARK: I'm sorry. I apologize.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, no, no, no. You said Gardena with Hawthorne. I just want to make sure it was Gardena with Torrance.

MS. CLARK: Yes. Part of Gardena with Hawthorne, part of Gardena with Torrance.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Perfect, okay. And your follow
up? Sorry.

MS. CLARK: So for the Lynwood piece, I did try to include that, just for population. It didn't quite work out. And if the direction is to look at a split, happy to look at that, of course. Additionally, wanted to note that on this visualization with Long Beach moving up 710, I also just received direction to include Bell Gardens, Huntington Park area to the north. This visualization is already .54 percent deviation. And then removing Lynwood would, you know, removing Lynwood, plus these northern-most areas, I think would cause a deviation issue. So just -- it is a -- not necessarily a question, but wanted to mention it and, I guess, one follow-up question, I guess, could be then, would you be okay with Florence potentially moving into the, sort of, like, San Pedro north visualization. Would that be -- oh wait, that's actually going the wrong way, too.

I will take a look at all of this and if -- if Lynwood needs to be split, it sounds like that's -- that's the direction, potentially.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, just --

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- just, yeah. And -- again, looking at the CVAP for -- for two of the -- the communities. If it helps. Thank you.
CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. On this particular -- on this particular one, I guess I would ask Jamie if -- if -- I notice that Florence-Graham and Lynwood both have about similar sized populations, you'd have to split the -- either the neighborhood or the city. But perhaps that might make sense because I think in addition to the previous visualization that you received -- and I do agree with Commissioners Vazquez on, you know, not including -- or -- or making sure that Bell and Cudahy is included -- Bell Garden is included with Vernon and Maywood and Commerce. I -- I do agree that they belong together.

I think as you relook at also the SDNS visualization, which is the north-south of the San Gabriel Valley, going into the -- the gateway cities and the I-5 corridor, it might make sense -- I guess I'll just -- just generally say, I would encourage you take a look at some of the Assembly visualizations based on the directions that we gave this morning and -- and perhaps using that as a basis, because I think -- I think we're pretty close -- I -- I'm feeling much better about the Assembly than we are about the map in terms of the -- more the east-west direction and some of the groupings of cities where we've gotten community of interest.
testimony, in terms of their similarities and -- and their affinities with each other. Also with the residents sharing similar kinds of shopping and, you know, school and worship and other things like that.

So I -- that's going to be my direction, Jaime, as -- perhaps we can look at the Assembly as our -- as our starting point. And I agree with what Commissioner Sadhwani said, too. I think that Northeast LA -- what we discussed with the Assembly, I think could help, maybe break this nut, too. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Just quickly. Jaime, you probably already said this, and I -- I didn't hear it. On 38, that's the one the SPCC, I just wanted to confirm that Watts was kept whole?

MS. CLARK: The Watts neighborhood council is kept whole, similarly to the -- to Koreatown neighborhood council and Koreatown COI. We've also received COIs around Watts. They're a little bit larger than the neighborhood council area. And in this visualization, the Watts neighborhood council is whole.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And -- and how much of -- how much population is the other portion?

MS. CLARK: I'm not sure in terms of population. I will -- I'm looking for that COI now, and I'm just going
to zoom into it. So it goes up and include parts of Florence, Firestone, and the area on the map labeled Empowerment Congress Southeast Area Neighborhood Counsel.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

MS. CLARK: So it's this area in red.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. I was just thinking, because this visualization is low on the deviation. So if we added all of the Watts, that might bring it up a little. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa, do you have another comment?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I wanted to comment about that Gardena piece, because I know that we did receive some court testimony about a historic Japanese American community in that Gardena area. And I believe it was more south of Marine versus going north.

MS. CLARK: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: But I also recall that the caller mentioned that it was cleared with the black census and redistricting hub. I -- I'm going to ask that we look at that piece of Gardena included into the LA Bay area map. I think, with some of the also other new directions that we've given around northeast LA, I believe that there's going to be some shifting that's
going to probably happen on that upper part of northeast LA because looking at it, it looks like it's a rather long district. And it -- yeah, and it looks like it includes some of West Hollywood.

It is kind of interesting that Studio City is included there. My understanding or -- is that that's part of the San Fernando Valley as well, too. And I just also want to be conscious about the request that they've given us to not go south of Mulholland, so --

MS. CLARK: Yeah, thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- as you're making some of those adjustments, maybe keeping those in mind.

MS. CLARK: To -- to clarify, Studio City is not in this visualization. Nor is West Hollywood.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, okay. It was a little misleading from what I'm looking at. Okay. What is -- what is the part that the LA Bay area goes up to. It's kind of hard to tell from this?

MS. CLARK: That goes up to Studio City.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. That's -- that's what I mean, okay.

MS. CLARK: Oh, thank you. I'm sorry. I thought you were talking about the northeast LA --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, no, no, no, no. I was talking about the LA Bay area part. Yeah. And then,
yeah. I mean, as you're doing some adjustments, it could be that you might need to pull in mid-city west into the north -- northeast LA, depending upon what happens to the north, you may -- it -- it may make sense to pull Studio City into the San -- back into the San Fernando Valley.

So just wanted to just point those out as well, too.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioners. Any additional comment or feedback?

Thank you, Jaime.

MS. CLARK: Thank you so much.

CHAIR LE MONS: Andrew?

MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you, Chair. Let's see, Sivan is going to be pulling up her map in just a second. Just to remind you, we're going to be looking at the Southern part. We have eleven visualizations that we want to show you. We have three that are -- that we worked with at the VRA attorneys with. So we will start with those. And then we will go through the other ones that -- that we have.

So with that, I will turn it over to Sivan.

MS. TRATT: Thank you. So starting again in this southeast California visualization, which is pretty similar across all of the plan types. This is another one that is up for some VRA consideration.
Mr. Becker, did you have anything specific to add about this visualization?

MR. DRECHSLER: This is on page 47.

MS. TRATT: Thank you, Andrew, yes. I apologize. And I'll be moving in order. So you can just follow along and I'll announce the page number. But thank you for the reminder.

MR. DRECHSLER: I have nothing to add, other than just to note the perfect deviation here so that there is some flexibility if there's some instruction that the Commissioners want to give with regard to removing or adding a little bit population there.

MS. TRATT: Thank you so much. And then I'll just zoom in right over here. And then on page 48, you'll find POF, which is this visualization right here. And it is also at a perfect deviation, currently. So there might be a little bit of flexibility as Mr. Becker mentioned for the previous visualization.

And I should have also mentioned before the last district. The only change from the -- none of these have changed from the last time you've seen the -- these VRA visualizations. The only thing that has changed was a slight portion, sorry to backtrack here, a slight portion of this rural area was extended to incorporate more of that rural unincorporated buffer. But I actually don't
believe that it added any population or made any
significant change. So just to point that out.

And then back to these again. You have seen the
same thing already. And this visualization, SBRC, can be
found on page 49. And I believe it's -- yes, I think it
takes in -- into account as it does split Riverside City,
trying to follow some neighborhood bound -- borders in --
in there. Just to kind of minimize disruption of that
city split. But that's all the notes that I have on the
potential VRA districts.

Does anyone have -- or Mr. Becker, did you have
anything else to add about any of these? Okay.

MR. BECKER: No, no. Very -- very low deviations
with some flexibility if you want it there. The Voting
Rights Act considerations are -- are there, but they're
also likely addressed by the -- the current percentages
of these districts.

MS. TRATT: All right. I'm just going to go ahead
and quickly turn off the CVAP numbers just to kind of
reduce some visual clutter. So just give me one moment.

All right. So now the number displayed should
represent the current deviation of the visualization.
Moving right along to page 50, this is the SESDCEC
visualization. So this is moving into the southwestern
corner of San Diego County. This visualization
incorporates the boundaries of several southeast San
Diego COIs. And then also maintains the integrity of
Paradise Hills. And you can see, I'm just outlining the
border here.

And then moving to page 51 --

CHAIR LE MONS: Sivan, before you go on --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Commissioner Le
Mons. I wanted to go back to the southeast corner and
just have -- this district is huge, geographically. And
it -- it includes so many different communities of
interest, as well as counties, as well as geography, as
well as cities. Is -- is there -- and if we keep it the
way it is, most likely the southwest corner is going to
be where a lot of the candidates come from. So I don't
really know if it's going to represent -- it it's going
to be representative for everybody in this district.

And so I was curious if there -- if we have explored
it. I -- I know I brought it up last time a little bit,
but is there a way to look at VRA in a different way so
San Diego has a VRA district and then Imperial Riverside
and San Bernardino have one?

MS. TRATT: Mr. Becker, did you want to make a
comment on that?

MR. BECKER: I mean, my main comment here would be,
this is -- this is one of the easier districts to define. It is the largest of the types of districts, the Senate districts. And it is anchored to the entire southeast corner of California, the entire southern border and much of the eastern border. There's not a lot of leeway there. But you can absolutely feel free to give some instruction to see if that can change. But this is going to be one of those places where there's the few -- there's -- there's the least amount of leeway.

Fortunately, the way this was drawn, is there is some population deviation possibilities here.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. I mean, I can understand, the way you just described it is a way that we can tell the story better. I know that we're getting a lot of pushback on how big this district is. And just -- just how the representation --

MR. BECKER: I'll just -- I'll just say really quickly, there is no way this district isn't huge, geographically. There's no way to draw it that way --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I know that's -- it's very --

MR. BECKER: -- it is a mass -- it has massive areas of underpopulated area. There's just no way to draw it differently. If you change the overall area of this district, it'll probably be changed as an overall
percentage by a very small percentage. It'll -- It'll --

    MS. COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I mean that -- South
Bay is the one giving the most of the population. South
Bay, San Diego, I believe.

    MR. BECKER: That's -- that's possible. It also goes
up into the Riverside -- into that Riverside corridor
there. It's -- it's capturing some of the -- some of that
central part of San Diego County. I mean, they -- they
can absolutely try to do that, but it's, you know, if the
concern is size, the size is still going -- if you take
out a heavily populated area from this district and
replace it with another area, the size is actually going
to grow.

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, it's not -- yes, exactly.
But it's -- it's -- it's size, but it's also -- it's --
it's -- when I say huge, it's not -- it's just the
diversity and the -- there's a lot to bridge here.

    MR. BECKER: Yeah. I -- so I absolutely, you
should --

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: That's what I mean, is the
bridging --

    MR. BECKER: -- you should feel free to give
whatever direction you'd like. I just also want to point
out about all of these Senate districts. We're talking
about districts that are nearly a million people large.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right.

MR. BECKER: They are some of the largest districts anywhere in the United States that are larger than Congressional districts. And so absolutely feel free to give direction. But there is no way to create districts that probably won't encompass some disparate areas that won't encompass some areas that have -- have different interest to some degree, just because of the sheer size of these districts and the number of people in each of them.

MS. TRATT: Commissioner, I just zoomed in slightly to give you a better view of some of those cities that are bordering. Those San Diego districts and then the southeast California district. Do you have any -- are there any specific areas that you were wanting us to kind of experiment with switching out? I know that this SDC has a positive deviation. So this might be where you've got the most flexibility. But I just want to hear what your thoughts were about that.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. This is really difficult, because my thought would be for the VS -- yeah, the SEC neighborhood -- district to move north and east more than continue move into San Diego. So the idea, you know, if you -- if we pulled out, you know, Chula Vista, National City, yeah, that bottom west
triangle. Yeah, the -- the South Bay, it would
definitely leave a big hole.

Could we, I guess what we could do -- but then we
won't have this -- I don't think we'll have the CVAP data
if we grab -- that's the thing is -- is we were to grab
some of these other communities that -- that, you know,
Lakeside, and -- and Spring Valley and La Puente. I
don't think those are going to help us with the CVAP
number. Because that's -- that's part of, I mean, for
VRA purposes, that -- so that's why I think we -- it
is -- we are a little stuck. And that's why it's good to
have these conversations publicly. So those listening
can also see where -- where the challenges are.

CHAIR LE MONS: Andrew?

MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you. And thank you, Chair.
And Commissioner Sinay. One thing that we -- the San
Bernardino part of this has about 7,000 population. So
that is something that -- as, you know, could be possibly
shifted to that -- that district up there. But that's
something we can explore in live line drawing and -- and
I don't think that would -- but, of course, being
conscious of the -- the VRA consideration as well. But
just wanted to give you heads up on that.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, just quickly. I -- I
just wanted to respond to this conversation because I just want everyone to remember the size of this. And then when we go north it's really big. And then Coast is really big. So there are going to be, unfortunately, areas that do have commonalties and some that don't. And I -- I'm just really -- especially this one that's a VRA district, I would -- I -- I think we're challenged with it, unfortunately, because it is VRA, to find a different way to not make it so big. And so anyway, just -- it's probably just one of the -- something that we'll have to grapple with as we move forward. Thanks.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Again, I want to -- my point isn't so much that it is big in size, it's just that the bridge -- the difference between -- Chula Vista is the third largest city in San Diego County. It -- it's one of the largest cities in -- in California. And so I -- I'm just -- it -- it's -- and it's very urban and -- and, yes, Imperial, Chula Vista, that's the border. But that is the most unique part of the U.S. Mexico border is, it -- it's a very urban area, it's not rural like the rest of the border, all the way to Texas. And so that's why I'm saying it's very different from the salt and -- salt and sea. And you know, and when Imperial County said they wanted to go up into the salt and sea, they
were very clear that they didn't want to go east -- I mean, west, sorry, to San Diego.

So I understand it's a huge area. It's just that this part, that South Bay piece -- so there's two questions, is can we have two VRA areas; is there a way to do that? And second, you know, is there a way to give representation, not so much to the Bay area, my -- south Bay, but my concern is representation to the rural areas, especially Imperial and east Coachella Valley.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner -- Mr. Becker, you want to respond to that?

MR. BECKER: Yeah. I'll just say -- I'll just say, very briefly, I just want to remind the Commissioners, there is where we found consistent VRA considerations, definitely in Imperial County, definitely in at least the western part of Riverside, maybe moving out towards the east, and definitely in the southern part around, probably, Chula Vista, we saw this -- there were not as many VRA concerns in areas, kind of, directly north and west of here, there -- really, none.

So you know, I want to give credit to the line drawers. I think this is very, very good. And there is literally no way -- if you drew -- there's -- absolutely feel free to give instruction from Imperial beach, Chula Vista, that area, if you like, and there might be
something that can be done there, but most of the
district can't really be moved that much because of the
southern border and the eastern border.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I was just going to
ask on this -- I think, you know, hearing what
Commissioner Sinay is saying, if this district were to
move into that part of what is visualization MCV, which
is -- I'm not sure what page it's on, but it --

COMMISSIONER TRATT: That is on page -- sorry, 57.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: 57, thank you.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Just so that Andrew, who's
taking notes, can also take note. If you're to go into
portions of that district, to then offset the removal of
Chula Vista, one, is that still going -- would that still
ensure the -- you know, the VRA district; and two, is
Chula Vista specifically a VRA city, or one that we have
to consider as part of the VRA, and therefore removing it
would actually then hurt, you know, it's ability to
respect the VRA?

MR. BECKER: I'll respond briefly. I don't have the
really zoomed in maps to look at whether it's -- there's
an area around Chula Vista, and I just don't have the map
zoomed in as much with my -- with the racially polarized
voting analysis that we've looked at. But it's right around there, and it's an area where we've seen consistent racially polarized voting, so it's certainly an area that we should be highly considerate of.

That said, you should absolutely -- I mean, the questions you're asking, there, Commissioner Akutagawa, I think, are instruct -- are directions you could give to the line drawers to try out, and we could see what happens there.

I actually think that it's likely that this area might give you a little more flexibility than the Chula Vista, Imperial Beach area does. But we'd have to look at the voting rights and considerations in that south San Diego area.

That being said, the Chula Vista, Imperial Beach area, you just -- you run up against the Pacific; there's nothing you can do there. Whereas, this gives you some flexibility if you want to give instructions in this area with regard to a couple of those communities that -- in that area of Riverside.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Then, I'd like to go ahead and to that, then. If the line drawers can look at Chula Vista, National City, Imperial Beach, that you know, southern tip of the corner there that butts up against both the border and the Pacific. And then to
look further into, looks like, Riverside and San
Bernardino County to still maintain that VRA district and
see if that might be doable. I mean, at the very least,
we'll know. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Any additional comments
on this visualization?

CHAIR LE MONS: All right. Continue.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Thank you, so much, for that
feedback. I think it's always good to have these
conversations. Definitely, the point of having these
visualizations is to explore all the options, so I really
appreciate all the Commissioners' input on this. I
believe --

CHAIR LE MONS: Excuse me.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Yeah?

CHAIR LE MONS: Sorry, Sivan. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. Thanks, everybody,
for helping think this through. I just wanted to add,
you know, National City, Imperial Beach, Bonita, San
Ysidro, Logan Heights, and Barrio Logan, so the South
Bay -- what's defined as the South Bay in San Diego.

And if we do need to take parts out, it's almost
better to keep it all together in this big one than pull
out one or two of those, because they really work as a
very tight group -- tight community.
COMMISSIONER TRATT: Commissioner Sinay, can I just ask a clarifying question quickly?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Where would you prefer -- would you prefer that the cities and neighborhoods that you just mentioned go in with the San Diego visualization, or more with the southeastern visualization? I'm just -- I'm not sure where you're directing me to move them into.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. Probably -- yeah, that's a great question. I would probably move it in with the southeastern, and then there might be -- then there might be a need to move some of the southeastern, then, up into the City of San Diego, because --

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- you know, there will be too many. But we -- yeah. So that's -- great question. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Are there particular cities that you're okay losing from this district? I can also zoom in, if that's helpful.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, could you zoom in and --

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Yeah, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- so basically, Santee, Eucalyptus Hill (sic), Lakeside, Winter Gardens, Crest,
the split we talked about on El Cajon or all of El Cajon, and Rancho San Diego.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Okay. Perfect. Thank you, so much for that clarification.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I know that's a lot, but --

COMMISSIONER TRATT: No, that's great. We'll definitely try it out and let you know next week what we found, so --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: All right. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Andrew?

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Chair, was there anything else? Oh, sorry. Excuse me.

MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. Thank you, Chair. Just Commissioner Sinay just wanted the El Cajon; we will do Hamash -- Hemish (ph.) Avenue as the split again. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I just wanted to flag that we did receive a comment from the Pala Band of Mission Indians around this area just expressing some concern about putting all the Indian tribes in one district and the amount of responsibility that it would -- lead to this for this one Senate district.

And so I just wanted to flag that as -- and there's some advice in the -- or some guidance, suggestions in
that letters as well; so I just wanted to flag that for the lien drawers and for -- and it came in yesterday, so it's in the -- and it's from the chairman of the Pala Band of Mission Indians. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo. Is there any additional feedback or guidance? Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: All right. So I can't remember if we had actually talked about this district visualization or not, but this -- yeah, this visualization incorporates the boundaries of several southeast San Diego COIs, and then also keeps Paradise Hills intact.

And I can also turn on and off the boundaries from last time; although, I don't think any changes were made, because I don't believe these were presented, so not going to see anything too dramatic there.

And then moving just to the City of San Diego, this SDC district, this is on page 51. It looks like this visualization was drawn keeping in mind COI testimony that had to do with Poway Unified School District. So as you can see, the City of Poway is included in this visualization; and it stretches south from Coronado, all the way north up into Escondido, Hidden Meadows, and Valley Center.

And then, I believe the Poway School District looks
something like this. And so that should be intact within this visualization as well. Were there any comments before I move to the north side? All right. Just going to zoom out one more time.

The next visualization is this INC. I believe the page order skips over -- oh, excuse me. I'm sorry; my eyes are getting very tired at the end of the day, all these screens. Okay. SOCNSDC is the next visualization, and that's this coastal area right here, so let me zoom in a little bit closer.

And as you can see, this stretches to include the, kind of, southern coast of OC cluster of coastal cities, and then stretches all the way to wrap around rainbow. And then it goes as far south as Solana Beach, Del Mar. The notes I have this for visualization were that it kept in mind a commissioner request to exclude Temecula from a San Diego County district. So as you can see, Temecula was removed from this visualization.

All right. And then, continuing north along the coast, this district visualization is called INC; and you guys can reference the map on page 53. And this visualization keeps in mind a commissioner request to modify a prior north Orange County coast district to include Irvine rather than the Buena Park area.

It also keeps in mind COI testimony to keep Irvine
and Tustin together, which you can see right here. And then it goes as far north as Seal Beach, and stops just short of the Los Angeles County border and Long beach. All right.

The next district is -- that we'll take a look at is this SAA visualization, which is Santa Ana, Anaheim. You can find it on page 54. This keeps in mind a commissioner request to not split Santa Ana.

So as you can see, Santa Ana's kept whole. It also separates Anaheim valley area, or the Anaheim lowlands, and then splits off from the Anaheim Hills area over here, wraps around Buena Park, and then also includes Rossmoor in this visualization as well.

One thing to keep in mind is that we are working at a pretty high deviation for this vis, so we're at almost nine percent. So really looking for direction on, potentially, something that we could swap out or change to get closer to that five percent deviation would be really appreciated from commissioners.

Were there comments, or should I just keep chugging along, Chair?

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioners, do you have comments at this time, or shall we -- Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I do have a comment about this SAA one, and I did notice that really high
deviation. One of my biggest concerns is that it is splitting Little Saigon, and I think that that's -- I understand why, but I think that we need to re-look at this one.

I would like to give new direction -- okay. Who am I -- who are we charging $1 to? Okay. I would like to remove Los Alamitos and Rossmoor from this visualization. I know what I'm going to say is not necessarily going to make it that much better.

But Sivan, maybe, instead of me giving specific cities, I would like you to re-look at this. I think Garden Grove, Westminster, West -- Midway City, Fountain Valley need to be in this visualization with Santa Ana, Orange, and Anaheim.

I think you have -- I would just comment and say that -- or direct you and say, Los Alamitos, Rossmoor, Cypress, even Buena Park, I think you can, perhaps, look to move to other areas.

Buena Park, perhaps, to a new district, because we're going to do -- I think there's -- we've instructed to do some moving around in those northern Orange County district that could possibly be attached to Fullerton, and La Mirada, and La Habra, maybe.

Los Alamitos and Rossmoor, we've also talked about bringing down into the district with Seal Beach, so
hopefully that's clear.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Yeah, that's -- that's great suggestions. I just put up -- these are two Little Saigon COIs just for commissioners to reference this is what you were talking about, I hope. But yeah, I will definitely play around with the southern border, especially, to try and kind of dip down and reunite that Little Saigon area. Thank you, so much, for that feedback.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, I -- I also realize I didn't name Stanton. And Stanton and Anaheim, also, is home to Little Arabia. So I think those also need to stay together with Little Saigon in the same, you know, visualization with Anaheim and Santa Ana, and Orange. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: So this is just for your reference; this is the Little Arabia corridor. So as it is now, it is kept whole in this area. So I'll -- again, I'll do my best to try and kind of shift things a little to the south to pick up Little Saigon, as well, and keep those together. Thank you, so much.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. You can continue, Sivan.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Thank you, so much, chair. All right. The next one would be IOC, which you can find on page 55. Again, this is a little bit high deviation, not
as bad a nine percent, but we're at almost six percent here.

So let me just zoom out slightly, so you can see. It is a bit of a long district, so just bear with me for a second. And let's see if I can get a better view for you all. All right.

So this IOC, the vis had a slight change. The boundary was moved to include Hacienda Heights and La Habra Heights. And then it also removed a previous split that was in Industry City, and that snapped the border to the Rowland Heights boundary.

And then, I think you should be able to see that change from the previous iteration of visualizations. You can see that change right over here. And then the other commissioner direction that this visualization keeps in mind is, again, splitting Anaheim and Anaheim Hills, which you can see Anaheim Hills is incorporated into this visualization.

Continuing on. And definitely jump in and interrupt me if there's something else that comes to mind. Moving to --

CHAIR LE MONS: One moment, Sivan.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Yeah.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sivan, can you zoom in on
this?  Is Hacienda Heights split?

COMMISSIONER TRATT:  Let me just turn this.  So it
doesn't look like it is in this vis.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA:  Okay.  Thank you.

I -- this is part of what I was saying early, I think it
was to Jaime, about looking at more of a east/west
orientation for these Senate districts in this San
Gabriel Valley, I guess, north OC area, but specifically,
the -- you know, that east San Gabriel valley.

I think to group these cities -- I think there's a
different way that -- or a better way that we could look
at grouping these cities in a district, because there is
a -- I think there's a distinct difference.

And we've heard -- we've seen this from, actually,
even some of the COI testimony from some of other
visualizations that we've had.  The citizens or the
residents of Brea, Yorba Linda, Placentia, especially
Diamond Bar, and Walnut, and those areas, don't feel that
they have much in common with those in south Orange
County.

So my direction to you is to look for a way -- and I
guess you'll be working with Jaime to see how we can
create more of an east/west orientation on this.  And
then for the south Orange County, perhaps, looking to go
down into that south Orange County, north San Diego area
to combine them. I think they would rather be together than with the south Orange County, even the coastal Camp Pendleton district, than to be to the north. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner.

Sivan, please continue.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Yeah. Can I just clarify something --


COMMISSIONER TRATT: -- with -- was that Commissioner Akutagawa?

CHAIR LE MONS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Perfect. Okay. So when you say east/west, you're talking about, kind of, extending north -- my cat is sneezing in the background, if you hear some weird noises, to extend north to include Silverado and these areas; is that kind of what the general line of what you were talking about?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: For the south Orange County, north San Diego County?

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Exactly, yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Yes, and that --

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- Cleveland National Forest. I do also want to say I just learned something new; I didn't know cats can sneeze.
COMMISSIONER TRATT: All right. Thank you, so much, for that clarification. And then, we'll also look at also getting Hacienda Heights and Rowland Heights, maybe Rowland and Diamond Bar, potentially, kind of, reallocated into one of these other districts that's closer to Los Angeles County. All right.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I'm feeling a little uncomfortable about the direction that we're taking on these Senate maps in this area. And my general instruction would be to take a look at the Orange County Table. OSEP (ph.) had put together a couple possible ideas for consideration that was specifically linking some of the Latinx and Asian American communities in these areas. You know, many of them having some very specific religious and cultural communities of interest testimony.

I'd really encourage you to take a look at that report. And I think it might hit some of the general notions that Commissioner Akutagawa is trying to achieve, but perhaps doing so in some different configuration. So I'd really like to take a look at that -- those a little bit more closely and see what parts of that might be incorporated into these maps.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Thank you, so much,
CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm sorry. I'm going to go back to San Diego for a second, because I just want to make sure that when we were saying -- you know, earlier we had talked about -- and doing the Assembly district just to look at the LGBTQ community; and the Senate maps right now kind of split it up a little bit -- split it up in half.

And so I just wanted a reminder of looking at the neighborhoods and -- of Normal Heights, Hillcrest, Mission Hills, South Park, North Park, University Heights, and Kensington. And again, I can get you the roads if that helps, so that you know exactly where those areas are.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: That would be helpful, thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Chair, just a question -- and this might be for legal. When we're asked for -- you know, can you get us specific roads and stuff, should we do that in public, or how should we follow up with that, so that we're keeping it all on the up and up?

CHAIR LE MONS: Anthony? We'll get an answer -- I'll get an answer for you for that question, Commissioner. Thank you.
Any other feedback before we move on? We are coming up on a break in about six minutes, just making you aware. Okay.

Sivan.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Should I resume? Okay. Perfect. All right. So just moving over here to this red district right here, this SWRC. You can find this map on page 56. This visualization takes into account commissioner request to not cross the Orange and Riverside County border across the Cleveland National Forest; and then it also respects the COI testimony that we heard that reflects the same desire to stay together.

And the next one is just this large one which we sort of touched on, but we can revisit in its entirety. This MCV, which is the Coachella -- the -- includes the majority of the Coachella Valley. And let's see, this keeps Hemet and San Jacinto together, which had previously been a direction from the Commission.

And I'll just pan a little bit north so you can see where this ends. It stops short of the county border, but it takes in some large swaths of this low population land over here. And that is all of the districts that I have to present on. I'm happy to go back to any previous ones if there are additional direction from commissioners.
CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioners, is there additional direction that you'd like to provide at this time?

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Sivan, if it gives you more flexibility -- I'm re-looking at this IOC map, and if it gives you more flexibility, I would instruct you to look at Yorba Linda, Placentia, Anaheim Hills, and it looks like that east Orange section, down to the south County OC inland communities, if that gives you more flexibility, then, to combine it with the south OC northern San Diego. I do believe that --

COMMISSIONER TRATT: I'm sorry; would you repeat that one more time? I -- I'm not sure I understand.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So do -- if you look at that map -- if you go up a little bit further north and you go to Yorba Linda and Placentia, and if you -- if it gives you more flexibility to include those with those communities that are currently in the green, and perhaps more into -- like, I think it would be Rancho, Mission Viejo -- yeah, little bit further south to create a different kind of district; if that gives you more flexibility, I wanted to just say that out loud to you.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Okay. Thank you, so much. Yeah, we'll definitely try it a couple different ways and come back with what we found with the option.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I would just say that Fullerton, Brea -- in this case, even Chino Hills would, I think, be a little bit different -- although, they could -- I mean, you could include Chino Hills if you needed it for population. But I think -- some of the COI testimony, they seem to want to be more with, like, Diamond Bar, Walnut, Rowland Heights. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Thank you, Commissioners. We're going to go break shortly. And then when we come back from break, we will be at 4:45. I'd like to make sure that we get an opportunity to review the notes and make any updates during that time. Then, I'm going to ask for a motion to approve the notes.

That should take us right up to our 5:00 point, in which we like to start public comment. So we'll be taking public comment on our discussion about the notes and the motion, as well as the visualizations for the day. Okay? So let --

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Am I okay to stop sharing the map, or were there --

CHAIR LE MONS: Yes. Yes.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: -- okay.

CHAIR LE MONS: You can stop sharing that.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Thank you, so much, Chair.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, so much. Thank you,
Sivan, we appreciate it.

COMMISSIONER TRATT: Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: So with that, let's go to break, and everyone report back at 4:45.

(Off the record at 4:28 p.m.)

(On the record at 4:45 p.m.)

CHAIR LE MONS: Welcome back, everyone. And I'd like to ask Commissioners if they've had a chance to review the notes? And the notes I'm referring to are from 10/23, 10/27 through 29, and 11/2.

If there are any corrections to the notes, we have someone on hand to take notes on those corrections. And once that part is completed, I'll ask for a motion to approve the notes with the corrections.

So Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Yes, I have had a chance; and I do have some corrections, so bear with me.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Sulma is going ---

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: The first --

CHAIR LE MONS: -- to be taking notes corrections for us, so --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- okay. Salma, so on the notes for 10/27/21, on the first page under myself, the last bullet says, "New visualization of Rio Vista." On
this, I had revised it to have Yolo whole with Northern Delta, combined with Solano, Napa, and/or Colusa, if needed, for population. And on the second page, kind of in the middle --

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Can I pause you, quickly, Commissioner? So your -- the revision should be Yolo -- the direction is Yolo combined with solano, and what was the last piece?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So revised to have Yolo with the Northern Delta.

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And combined with Solano.

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And then add Napa and/or Colusa, if needed, for population.

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Napa or Colusa, or and Colusa?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And/or, depends on what the numbers are.

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And then on page 2, in the middle, under page 39 to 42, under myself, it's put West Sac "with" Yolo, not "and" Yolo. And remove Natomas if necessary.

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Okay. So that direction is
West Sac.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: With Yolo.

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: With Yolo. Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And then at the end -- and remove Natomas if necessary.

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. And then for the 11/28/21.

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Let's see, one, two, three -- the fifth page under Northern Central -- Sulma, do you -- you have copies of this, right, so --

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- okay. Great. No need to call me ma'am. So basically, under that -- for -- myself, Fernandez, North Cal, it's the same direction as I did prior. Yolo with Northern Delta and Solano, and combined with Napa and Colusa Counties, if needed, for population.

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: So again, that's Yolo combined with Northern Delta and combined with Solano, and Napa, and/or Colusa?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And combined with Solano, then comma, and then combined with Napa and/or Colusa, if needed for population.
COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Okay. So Yolo with Northern Delta, with Solano, and combined with -- and Napa and/or Colusa?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: If needed for population.

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Did you get it?

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So for 10/29/21, first page --

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- first page --

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- I'm right -- I'm right in the middle. The first one, I've given direction, so --

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- so that -- the last sentence, "Keep Yolo with Northern Delta, Rio Vista to Clarksburg, both sides of the Sacramento River."

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: So Keep Yolo with Northern Delta.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And then explaining Rio Vista to Clarksburg, both sides of the Sacramento River.

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Explaining -- can you repeat that, again, Commissioner?
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ:  Keep Yolo --
COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ:  The second piece.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ:  -- the Rio Vista to
Clarksburg, both sides of the Sacramento River, so
include all the towns on both sides of the river.
COMMISSIONER KAPLAN:  Sulma, we're going to use the
notes that we have -- the closed captioning. So if we
can just skip the repeat, and I'll help you with
capturing the feedback the Commissioners are providing.
COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ:  Okay.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ:  Okay. Did you get that,
Sulma?
COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ:  Yes.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ:  Okay. And then on page 7,
correction to the line drawers, under myself, my name.
COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ:  Uh-huh.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ:  Okay. So right now it
reads, "Yolo with all of Solano, and if needed for
numbers, include the Northern Delta." Move "and if
needed for numbers", that's going to go right before
Napa. So it's going to be, Yolo with all of Solano,
include the Northern Delta areas, and if needed for
numbers, go to Napa. Enter Napa and/or Colusa.
COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ:  Okay.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ:  Okay. And the last one I
have are for the notes for yesterday. Page 4 -- and
actually -- I mean, these are supposed to be directions
to line drawers, so some of the stuff that's in here,
it's not really directions to line drawers, it's more of
comments that are made by commissioners.

So on page 4, right before "Bonsal", so there's a
conversation between myself and then -- or a comment that
I made, and then Andersen made, which is fine, and then
Sinay made, and then I made. And those three really --
they're not direction to the line drawers. It's
directions in terms of deviations.

So I'm not sure how -- if you're going to keep then
I believe it's -- we need to be transparent about it.
And right before "Bonsal", I did provide another comment,
clarification. So if you're going to leave it in, and my
comment was that I did not provide direction in terms of
having higher deviation in the north.

What I did was explain why the north was negative,
not that it was okay for rural areas to be negative. And
as I had mentioned earlier, I will be keeping track
to -- of the positives and negatives to ensure
representation throughout California. And that's all I
have.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you Commissioner.

Commissioner Anderson.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. First of all, on all of them, could you please spell Andersen correctly? It's S-E-N. In almost all the documents, it goes back and forth. But then on the 10/27, first page at the bottom, under Andersen, that should be "Sears Point."

CHAIR LE MONS: Continue.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Then, on page 2, I say, "Eldorado, Amador." That's Eldorado and Amador share Highway 89; nothing about likes, or anything like that. And then on page 4, I start the top. If you just remove the last bullet item of mine.

CHAIR LE MONS: Continue

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: That was page 5, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Pardon?

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: You said page 5?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I said page 4. Yeah. I -- that's me at the top; take the last bullet item out, just delete it. Okay?

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Then 10 -- okay. Then, 10/28, on the second page, under me, it should say, "Add La Puente", not Fluente. It's the P -- it's a P. Very minor.

CHAIR LE MONS: Continue.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And then page -- on the 10/29, on page 7, and it's in my -- the second sentence of -- I say something that says -- it should say, "What remains fits in with", and Commissioner -- what Fornaciari -- Fernandez said, blah, blah. But "What remains fits in with." And then --

CHAIR LE MONS: Continue.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- on 11/2 notes.

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Let me know when you --

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Yes.

CHAIR LE MONS: Continue. Continue, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- on the first page, the second bullet, basically, delete that. It just should say, "Page 42, Sac, Stanis." Remove "Floren, Vineyard, Elk Grove. Add to page 36 Sacramento. Reason, agree with Commissioner Fernandez. Then, page 42, Sac, Stanus, remove, "Terminus area to I-5", add to page 17 Solano. Reason, keep delta areas together.

Then on page 3, under me, it should say, I'm okay with plus or minus 4.7 to 4.8 deviation for now but must balance areas in the State." Then -- and just -- and delete by -- that little section there. Say, page 44, "Stanislaus." Remove "Antica, Lathrop."

Add to page 42, Sac, Stanis. Reason, agree with
Commissioner Turner. Then, page 44, Stanislaus, add, "Series from page 45 Merced." Reason, for population, unless it affects VRA or Merced district.

Then, page 5, it should say -- after Novato, it should say, "and south", and delete the second bullet. Then, on page 7, we talked about Azusa -- when I talked about Azusa, it should say, "From COI testimony." Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, I have a few corrections. This is on notes 10/27. And I believe this is on the second page. I don't know; these are not numbered. So I'm going to also ask that they be numbered, so that when it comes to these kind of things, it also makes it clear.

There's -- I think it's -- I don't know. It's the second page. It's the one that says, "Split Lake, add North coast." And then it says, "Or Van N Coast", is that supposed to be V-A-D N Coast? I'm not sure about that. It's a little unclear.

And then, there's another page under -- for me. It says, "Consider massive districts and accessibility to representative." What should be -- it should say is, "Be mindful of massive districts and accessibility to
representative", not consider. Any questions?
Otherwise, I'll move on.

CHAIR LE MONS: No.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. On 10 --

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- okay. I do have a
correction on 10/28, and that's on the first page under,
"Central coast", under -- for me, it says, "Cut off after
Montecito." I do believe cut off Santa Barbara map after
Montecito.

And then down under Los Angeles, on that same first
page, it says, "Glrosso", G-L-A-S-S-O -- I'm sorry, I have
to just say that; it should be Glassell, E-L-L at the
end. And then what is a DUC? This is on page 2 under
Southern California? And what is a COA, at the very end
of that page? Those are --

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: DUC is a Disadvantaged
Unincorporated Community, generally, adjacent to an
incorporated community.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I don't know if
those kind of acronyms should be spelled out since the
members of the public are also reading these, as well,
too. And it's not -- it may not always be clear to
everybody. We've been cautioned on the use of our
acronyms. And then COA? This was under Commissioner Andersen. I don't know if that's --

CHAIR LE MONS: I think that's noted, Commissioner Akutagawa, the -- our team will make sure that that acronym is spelled out.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: All right. Another question. 10/29, page 2; what is "Elysian Valley, Riverside"? So that I can give accurate clarification on that. I don't know what that was meant to be.

COMMISSIONER KAPLAN: We have other staff filling in that took the notes, so if you just want to clarify the correction, we can update that.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I -- to be honest, I'm not sure what that meant, so that's why I can't give additional clarification. One last one. Page 6, it should be, "Split between two tribal lands", not "Split to tribal lands."

And then the last one is on the November 2nd notes. There is -- I want to remove the part where -- under west side, page number 6, I want to remove that third bullet point, and that's it. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. It's a Elysian Valley, Commissioner for clarification on that question you had earlier.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh. Okay. All right.
So -- okay. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Moving on to Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I was just ready to make a motion unless there are more changes.

CHAIR LE MONS: Are there any more changes, Commissioners?

All right. Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Motion to approve the direction to the line drawers provided on 10/23/21, 10/27/2021, 10/28/2021, 10/29/2021, and 11/2/2021, with edits provided.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Second.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Okay. So we're going to go to public --

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. This is the court reporter. Who seconded, please? I didn't catch that.

CHAIR LE MONS: Ahmad -- Commissioner Ahmad. Okay?

Okay. With that, we are going to go to public comments. The public can comment on the motion on the floor, as well as any of the visualizations presented today.

Before I do that, Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Chair, I don't know if we need someone to check. I thought we had already approved several of these; certainly, not all of them, but I think
we have approved --

CHAIR LE MONS: Not per --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- no?

CHAIR LE MONS: -- not per my conversation with Counsel, so if we did --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay.

CHAIR LE MONS: -- then we'll do a reapproval.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay.

CHAIR LE MONS: It won't hurt to reapprove, particularly, since changes were made to almost each of those dates, so I like to just move forward if you don't mind.

So who is going to be our -- Katie. Hi Katie, welcome.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: If you could read the instructions, we can go to public comment. Thank you, so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Absolutely, Chair. In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247.

When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed. It is 84595221762 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply
press the pound key. Once you havedialed in, you will be placed in a que. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star nine, this will raise your hand for the moderator.

When it is your turn to speak, you will hear a message that says, the host would like you to talk, and to press star six to speak. If you would like to give your name, please state and spell it for the record. You are not required to provide your name to give public comment.

Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call. Once you are waiting in the que, be alert for when it is your turn to speak; and again, please turn down the livestream volume. And we will be giving a warning at 30 seconds and 15 seconds remaining in the two-minute public comment segment.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And I'm so sorry to interrupt. But just for clarification, this is public comment on the motion and general public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you, so much. At this time, we will start with 2 -- call 2080. And up next after that will be caller 7693.

Caller 2080, if you will please follow prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. And one more
time; caller 2080, if you could please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star six. Perfect.
The floor is yours.

MS. GARCIA: Thank you. Hello, Commissioners. My
name is Yvonne Garcia. First off, I would thank the
Commission for the great work they have made so far. I
currently live in Sugarloaf, California, which is an
incorporated community near Big Bear Lake in the San
Bernardino County National Forest.

Earlier today, I was watching the Commission
discussing drawing me and my family into different
Assembly district than the current visualization that
keeps the San Bernardino County National Forest, Big Bear
Lake, and Lake Arrowhead with the San Bernardino County
high desert communities of Apple Valley, and Hesperia,
and of course, Victorville.

Our community of Big Bear and the mountain share
similar rural values of the high desert communities. We
also have similar transportation -- excuse me,
districts -- water districts and our air quality
districts with San Bernardino County high desert.

I believe it's incredibly important that we keep our
area whole, and we -- excuse me, and we are not
drawn -- drawn into districts that population is based on
LA County. Thank you for your allowing me to provide
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you, so much.

Right now, it will be caller 7693. And up next after that will be caller 0723.

Caller 0 -- caller 7693, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing start 6. The floor is yours.

MS. ROWE: Hello, this is Christine Rowe (ph.). I'm calling about DSD event San Fernando Valley-1102. The San Fernando Valley should not be drawn with Ventura, the areas of Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, and et cetera.

There's 1.4 million residents in the San Fernando Valley, in the City of Los Angeles 1.8 million if you count the communities of Calabasas, Burbank, and Glendale.

Please draw the San Fernando boundary at the LA County line but include Bell Canyon because they're landlocked and can only get out through West Hills. I'm a former member of the West Hills neighbor counsel, and I'm very engaged in our communities, our neighbor council system, the City of LA government, and the LA City redistricting process.

Please do not include any of San Fernando Valley with going out into the Santa Clarita Valley. Use the boundary line if you need to -- the southern boundary, use the DSD, LA Bay area; 1102 is your southern boundary,
keep that straight, and go east of there -- north and
east of LA County boundary on the west, as I said before,
including Bell Canyon, go east to the 405 Freeway, and
you should be able to get a million people between there
and the neighbor counsel to --

MR. MANOFF: 30 seconds.

MS. ROWE: -- the north of the 118, and then start
another district of LA City in the areas of San Fernando
Valley, roughly, and going south from there --

MR. MANOFF: 15 seconds.

MS. ROWE: -- to pick up Burbank and Glendale. And
please stay in LA City, because we have more than 10
million people in LA County and about 4 million in LA
City. Thank you, very much, for your time. I appreciate
it greatly.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you, so much. And
right now, we will have caller 0723. And up next after
that will be caller 3028.

Caller 0723, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor
is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right. Hello,
Commissioners. I hope you're doing well. My name is
Karsalese (ph.), and I live in Isla Vista, just outside
of the City of Santa Barbara in Santa Barbara County.
And I'm calling because I really want to urge you to keep Santa Barbara County whole.

I have family in -- up in north county in Santa Maria and in Southern San Luis Obispo County -- Nipomo, and I work throughout all of Santa Barbara County, as well as occasionally in Southern San Luis Obispo and San Luis Obispo City.

So I'm up, down, all around often, but usually spend at least a week out of the month in Northern Santa Barbara or Southern (audio interference) County since I was a child. And the voices in Northern Santa Barbara County are very often forgotten or pushed to the wayside.

And I just really, really want to urge you to keep Santa Barbara County whole, because North County has, historically, been underrepresented and wherever it is politically convenient.

So please break that cycle and allow North County and our Latino population the representation that we deserve by keeping it with Santa Barbara County. Thank you, so much and -- for listening and for your service.

I appreciate it.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you, so much. And right now, we will have caller 3028. And up next after that will be caller 3196.

Caller 3028, if you will follow the prompts to
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unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours. Caller 3028, you are unmuted; can you hear me?
You may want to double-check and make sure you're --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, sorry. Can you hear me?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- perfect. There are
you. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. The district that has Fresno and Kerman is too geographically large. The amount of distance between Fresno and Bakersfield would require a representative to try to voice the concerns of vastly different regions, economically and culturally, that would not be unified voice and result in many people, effectively, disenfranchise. Having these areas separated would mean better representation for both areas. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you, so much.
Right now, we will have caller 3196. And up next after that will be caller 3700.

Caller 3196, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, can you hear me okay?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners and staff. My name is Christian, and I live and work in
Long Beach. I actually did public comment a few meetings ago to thank you for the visualizations you were considering for my area at the time.

Throughout this process, our Long Beach community has been really consistent asking you to keep our city together, and this appeared to be the direction the Commission wanted to go. I know several of you have been really clear in your support for our community, and I want to thank you for that support and your continued work on our behalf.

This said, I want to be really clear in expressing the disappointment with the current visualizations in the Long Beach area Congressional districts. I understand that you and your staff have a lot of balls in the air and a lot of considerations to keep in mind. And I'm aware that my neighbors and I may not come out of this with every single thing that we want.

Compromise is going to happen. The problem is, this map isn't compromise. It runs the Congressional boundary right up the middle of Long beach, including through neighborhoods where there is no organic boundary anywhere near this.

This border completely bisects Cambodia Town. And as a member of the LGBT -- LGBTQ prep community, I'm especially hurt that it cuts apart my city's historically
clear neighborhoods and institutions. When you get the chance to give direction on this map in your meeting tomorrow, I want you to -- respectfully urge you to explicitly request Long Beach to be a whole.

As you know, this work is incredibly important to the future of our State and to every community touched by these decisions. And I want to thank you, again, that you and your staff are doing everything you can to --

MR. MANOFF: 30 seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- protect communities and keep communities of interest together. Thank you, so much, again, for all you're doing; and please keep Long Beach together.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you, so much. And right now, we will have caller 3700. And up next after that will be caller 4201.

Caller 3700, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. Perfect. The floor is yours.

MS. WILSON: Hi, my name is Betty Wilson. I am the executive director for the business council. My comments today are regarding Zone F, San Joaquin County. We want to thank the Commission for all your hard work, and we would like to request the Commission to take into consideration the maps we submitted -- Senate map 1006,
202, 1123. Congressional map 1006, 202, 1112, and Assembly map 1007, 202, 1124.

When preparing these maps, we carefully listened to our coalitions in our community, and the message from the people was very clear. They would like one Senate seat, one Congressional seat, and our neighborhoods would also like two Assembly seats representing our diverse and unique population.

Our community has submitted a flood of emails and requests for this Commission, and we hope you have been able to review their concerns and comments. We understand the task before is not easy; but we have followed the Commission's criteria, and we are confident we have checked all the boxes.

I heard earlier comments from several of the Commissioners about the disappearance of agricultural land and outgrowth. This speaks to our request not to move too far north. I also heard comments of keeping the Congressional and Senate districts similar to prevent lack of confusion for the voters.

I believe our maps satisfy these points also. I would submit to the Commission, please honor the voice of the people, and protect our communities of interest, and keep our county together. Thank you, so very much.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you, so much.
Right now, we will have caller 4201. And up next after that will be caller 6451.

Caller 4201, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MR. WALDMAN: Good afternoon. Stuart Waldman from the Valley Industry and Commerce Association, VICA, as well as the San Fernando Valley Redistricting Coalition. I want to thank the comments of many of the Commissioners today talking about the San Fernando Valley, trying to keep the San Fernando Valley whole, trying to put Studio City back in the San Fernando Valley, that's very important. Studio City is part of the San Fernando Valley. It would be a shame. I know there's one map where they are in a Senate district alone, and I know there was talk about putting them in an Assembly map where they'd be the only valley part outside. We'd like to keep them. They suffer the same traffic and peace that the rest of us do as well.

As for the Senate seats, appreciate that we --right now, have what looks like a forty percent Latino sea back district. But I think we can probably, with taking a couple blocks, get it up to fifty percent. And we'd like
to not see too many changes on that.

We think that you've done a great job and we really appreciate all the hard work and the efforts for the valley. And thank you, we really appreciate it.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. All right. Now, we have caller 6451. And up next after that will be caller 8680.

Caller 6451, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

MR. O'NEILL: Thank you very much for your service and for taking my comments into consideration. My name is Will O'Neill. I'm on the Newport Beach city council and was mayor of our great city during 2020.

We are an easily accessible city located in the center of our coastal Orange County city. This means we received tourism from up and down the Orange County coast. Our premiere shopping center is Fashion Island which receives business from folks traveling here -- anywhere from San Clemente to Seal Beach.

We remain a connected city, especially with cities around us. For shopping, dining, or tourism, our residents are more likely to enjoy coastal neighbors like Huntington Beach rather than travel away from the coast. So please make sure that the Orange County coast is
properly represented in the same Congressional district.
Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now it is caller 8680. And up next after that will be caller 9879.

Caller 8680, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.
The floor is yours. Caller 8680, can you hear me?

MALE SPEAKER: Yes, hello. Hi.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Perfect.

MALE SPEAKER: I apologize.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: There you are.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Um-hum. That's okay.
The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: You're welcome.

MALE SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Samuel (ph.), I'm calling on behalf of -- in reference to VSD_MaderaKern.
The map as it's currently drawn, I have to voice my strong opposition to combining Kern County with Fresno County. For a long time Kern County has been combined Tulare County and San Bernardino County, all of which are significant, particularly with reference to agriculture.
And our energy production, Fresno County is vastly different and certainly would not be appropriate pairing up.

Although realizing that maps do have to change, we do need -- and our community does need to be paired up with -- currently Tulare and San Bernardino counties. Please keep those communities of interest together.

I do appreciate your work on all of this. Thank you so much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. And right now it is caller 9879. And up next after that will be caller 9652.

Caller 9879, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I appreciate you taking the time to hear my concerns about the Commission's decision to combine the Kern and Fresno communities together in a new district. But as a Latino, I feel that that much of Kern County existing diversity can be change or otherwise blocked if the district is altered so drastically.

To the community that truly recognizes that impacts to of the Latino community of the past and present and agriculture. Introducing so many communities that are
representational does affect the representation of the Latino community in Kern Country.

Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 9652. And up next after that will be caller 6332.

Caller 9652, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

MS. ALLEN: Hello. Good evening, Commissioners. Happy Wednesday. This is Sky Allen, with IE United. I did call in on Friday and given that little to no changes were made to the IE over the weekend, all of that still stands. But I did want to offer a few thoughts on your discussion today that will hopefully be worthwhile.

Regarding your Assembly discussion in the morning, I heard you all wrestling how to honor Heyawise (ph.) in the mountain community below the High Desert. We actually submitted an Assembly district in our proposal that keeps all of those mountain communities together. And I would encourage you all to review it as it might help you answer that question.

At the Senate level, I did say this Friday, but I just have to repeat a visualization VSD_SVRC is our least favorite idea. Thank you for drawing of the area
districts, but there are -- there are better ways to do it. And you can -- we submitted some as well.

But back to today's discussion, I wanted to comment on the VSD_ECA, that southeastern one. Thank you, Commissioner Singh for reading that any state senator for this district would have a hard time reflecting all of the community interests given that it crosses four different counties. And that likely San Diego folks would leave despite of most of that district being -- being inland.

We actually submitted a district map for that area that combines all of Imperial County with the Coachella Valley and Eastern Riverside County, San Gorgonio Pass and Morongo Valley. This way keeps the Coachella Valley whole, keeps the Morongo band admission Indians with the Pass. And it ensures the environmental interest around the fault and sea and farm worker interest of Valley and Imperial County are all connected.

So I hope that's helpful. That you so much for listening in. And as always, the maps we submitted to you are a great guide and we encourage you to use them. Thanks so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now will have caller 6332. And up next after that will be caller 6478. And I would like to ask all of those
that have called in, if you will please think of the pace, be considerate of our captioners and our ASL team interpreting our meetings here. Thank you so much.

Caller 6332, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

MS. STARCZYK: Thank you very much. My name is Nancy Starczyk, S-T-A-R-C, like cat, Z like zebra, Y-K. Nancy Starczyk. And I wanted to let you know -- let me shut this off. Sorry about that. I am calling regarding the Santa Clarita and the San Fernando Valley Assembly and Senate seat.

I've been a realtor in the area for thirty-three years. And I'm concerned that you do not put the San Fernando Valley and the Santa Clarita Valley together, Northridge, Granada Hills, Porter Ranch, Chalk Ridge, Reseda, all of those should be separate.

You were -- you did great with the Senate seat, so you got that right. The two cities are extremely different. There's a huge mountain range and pass between San Clarita Valley and the San Fernando Valley. Everything is different between the two. Median home prices, transportation, housing, schools, utilities, demographics. Everything is different between the two.

We are seeing -- in Santa Clarita Valley, there's a
huge amount of housing being developed. There's
greenfield issues there. There are unincorporated areas.
There's huge growth and there's a younger demographic
there.

So I would be very happy to see that you not mix the
two valleys together. So thank you very much for the
time. I appreciate your efforts. And I commend you for
this difficult task that you have.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right
now we have caller 6478. And up next after that will be
caller 8499.

Caller 6478, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

MS. ROBINSON: Good evening, Commissioners. Thank
you so much for all you do and for the opportunity to
allow us to speak public. My name is Robin Robinson and
I'm from Bakersfield, Kern County.

I just want to really reach out and say that I
strong oppose Kern County being partnered with Fresno
County. There's so many things that we just do not have
in common geographically. Our cultural connections as
well are completely different. Our agriculture, our oil,
all of those things -- the economy, all of the things
that are so unique about Kern County. To be paired with
Fresno County would be really something that's not a match and you know, we just have much more in common with Soleri and San Bernardino counties. We've worked there. I am a community-based organization. And we have worked through the earthquakes and different things that go right near San Bernardino County as well. And I just wanted to say today I think that the pairing of Kern County with Fresno County is just something that would not be good for our community. Thank you so much for listening today and allowing me to speak.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now we have caller 8499. And up next after that will be caller 3422.

Caller 8499, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I feel that Kern County's unique history with deep roots in oil, which we are seeing now is evolving a nuevo and clean energy will immediately fold in with Fresno's own history and energy practices.

With new efforts made by our local businesses and industry keys clean and renewable energy, I feel it is not true to the work and efforts forced by Kern County to
fold in Fresno County and change the district and its representation.

Thank you for allowing me to speak.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now we have caller -- right now we have caller 3422. And up next after that will be caller 2668.

Caller 3422, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

MS. SALAS: Hi. Good evening. This is Juanita Salas calling again. I heard the discussion around the Imperial Senate seat. I want to remind you of my continued message.

It is perfectly acceptable to pull southeast San Diego into Imperial while including Coachella. This is a VRA seat that serves all of our communities, so please hold the course. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now we have caller 2668. And up next after that will be caller 826--28.

Caller 2668, will you please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six?

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. So I live in Bakersfield and I think having my representative accessible to me is
quite important. With the visualization right now, my district can very likely have someone representing me who lives two plus hours away.

I wouldn't want someone from Fresno having the same trouble as me. You know, having someone down in Kern pretty much inaccessible to them. That's why I think have Fresno and Kern separated would mean that someone I know, who will be in my community will represent me in Washington. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 8628. And up next after that will be caller 7690.

Caller 8628, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

MR. O'NEIL: Hello. My name is Trevor O'Neil. I am a resident of Anaheim Hills and I served on the Anaheim city council so I know the area well.

Anaheim Hills is contiguous with the cities of Orange and Yorba Linda. And to me, it makes sense to keep those communities in the same Congressional districts. Our cities are very similar. Large -- largely single-family neighborhoods.

We have similar zoning. Similar shopping and dining locations that all intermix without a clear border or
boundary between them. So we really are one community that is tied together.

I believe that all of our cities have plans for future growth and economic success. And our governments already work very closely together. So I'd ask the Commission to keep this in mind when making their decisions. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now we'll have caller 7690. And up next after that will be caller 4688.

Caller 7690, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. And one more time. Caller 7690, if you will please follow the prompts -- oops, there you are. The floor is yours.

MR. MAGGARD: Thank you very much. I'd like to begin by saying thank you to the Commission members for allowing me to share my concerns with you today?

My name is Mike Maggard and I am a big -- I am the third district representative on the Kern County board of supervisors. And I would to speak to proposed Madera -- to the proposed Madera/Kern map, 1102.

Kern County is a unique and distinct community of interest and should not be linked to Fresno County. First, geographically, the district has proposed unnecessarily divides the community of interest which is
the City of Bakersfield. Thereby denying a common voice for our residents about issues vital to our way of life and our common interests.

The proposed map divides school districts thereby dividing and diluting the voices of parents regarding the education of their children. The map divides city council wards and country supervisorial districts further dividing and diluting our representation and voice regarding neighborhood concerns.

The health care of Kern County residents is also threatened. Healthcare is delivered to our underserved community by at least two providers, Clinica Sierra Vista and Omni Health Care, which tend to care for people within distinct geographical boundaries. This proposed map separates those residents and further imperils their ability to receive health care services and voice concerns about their medical care.

Kern County economy has many sectors unique to Kern County and distinct from Fresno. Oil, renewable energy, Kern is the largest producer of an oil renewable energy in California, logistics, and two military bases. Water is an extremely scarce resource.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds remaining -- thirty seconds.

MR. MAGGARD: Water is an extremely scarce resource
vital to our economy and citizens for which competition is fierce. Kern County is the distinct water basin from Fresno and will compete directly with Fresno for our precious water resources.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MR. MAGGARD: For all these reasons and more, the proposed map will unnecessarily dilute the voices of residents of Kern County by linking us with Fresno which is -- has a dissimilar and competing interest.

Thank you very much for hearing my concerns this afternoon.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we'll have caller 4688. And up next after that will be caller 3392.

Caller 4688, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: You're welcome.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you very much. Thank you for the time to speak. I'm calling with regards to the San Bernardino County and specifically map covering the High Desert.

I want to thank the Commission for the new visualization that keeps the Victor Valley connected with the Antelope Valley in Los Angeles. Please continue to
listen to the communities of interest as you move forward
and thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right
now we'll have caller 3392. And up next after that will
be caller 9505.

Caller 3392, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: Good evening, Commissioners.
This is Alejandra Ponce De Leon. I am calling today as a
resident. A resident of Jurupa Valley.

And speaking about my city here, where my family is
growing. I wanted just to, one, appreciate all the work
that you're doing. You're really taking into account a
lot of the feedback that you're receiving for the IE,
Inland Empire. And I particularly wanted to think
about -- thank you for the way that you've designed the
Assembly district, specifically that encompasses Jurupa
Valley and connected to Riverside.

I do want to call also but -- to raise some concerns
about your Senate district for Jurupa Valley where
connecting our city with Ontario, Upland, San Dimas.
Even though they are neighboring cities, I do have
concerns about, you know, being placed in San Bernardino
County district instead of staying within a Riverside
County district.

And especially where we can have more of a say, especially if it's a district that allows for, you know, a greater Latino feedback as well residing with Riverside. I think a lot of my connections here, a lot of our family here are this side, in Riverside County. And so I definitely want to lift my concerns of this for you to consider keeping Jurupa Valley with Riverside in the VRA district in Riverside.

Thank you so much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 8542. And up next after that will be caller 2911.

Caller 8452, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. One more time.

Caller 8452, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. And caller 8452, I do apologize. There appears to be some connectivity issue. I will come back to you. I have it labeled.

Right now we will have caller 2911. And up next after that will be caller 9575.

Caller 2911, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.
The floor is yours.

MS. ERIKAT: Hello, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

JEANINE ERIKAT: Good evening Commissioners and staff. Thank you all for your time and your dedication to this process. My name is Jeanine Erikat. I've spoken to you before. I'm a policy associate at PANA.

PANA serves hundreds of immigrant refugee families across San Diego County, but especially in the neighborhoods of City Heights, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, Spring Valley, and El Cajon. And as you know, we've been engaged with our community members for the past year on redistricting and worked with the Black census and redistricting helping community members to draw maps that accurately reflect our community's shared values, and interests, and concerns.

Which is why it is concerning that the Assembly visualization splits El Cajon and splits part of La Mesa, and pairs with Santee. When you split El Cajon, you're splitting a significant community of interest of the Arab community and a growing African community in El Cajon.

Where you are disenfranchised and made invisible in the census, I urge you to not split the City of El Cajon, which is a vibrant and community-connected neighborhood and has a long history of interconnectedness. Similarly,
I'm alarmed that the Senate visualization pairs COIs of Lemon Grove, La Mesa, Spring Valley, South East with Santee.

Many of the residents of City Heights, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, Spring Valley, Southeast and El Cajon are refugees, immigrants, or largely Black indigenous people. Our communities have shared needs such as increased affordable housing, equitable transportation, and language access.

All which are not a concern for many Santee residents. You can pull up the demographic data of Santee and the price -- the house -- the housing ownership, the schools, all of which would show how detrimental it would be to map us with Santee. We don't share anything in common with residents in Santee and have different priorities and concerns.

I urge you to keep our community of interest together.

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

MS. ERIKAT: Please don't split El Cajon, and don't map us with Santee. Thank you for your time.

MR. MANOFF: And as a reminder to those calling in, your comments are being interpreted and live transcribed. Please speak at a moderate pace and take time with city, county names, and numbers. Thank you so much.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we'll have caller 9575. And up next after that will be caller 6207.

Caller 9575, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

MS. DIAZ: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Karen Diaz. And I'm the electoral field manager for the Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights.

I've been a resident of Palmdale and Antelope Valley since my family came from El Salvador. And ever since I've been working to organize my community, helping them get out to vote and informing them about redistricting and the census count. Although I can't vote, this is something that's really important to me in my community.

CHIRLA is an organization that has been organizing for thirty-five years. And our mission is to achieve a just society pulling closer with our neighbors. And so CHIRLA organizes our individual communities and coalitions in order to vote power, transform public opinions, and change quality.

We want to congratulate you on all the work that you have done and the Commission staff has done so far to create opportunities to engage. Today, I wanted to provide feedback on the Antelope Valley, High Desert, San
Bernardino for district Assembly revisualization.

The High Desert is one of the communities that should be kept together at the state Congressional level. But the voters here deserve the first shot at electing an Assembly member of their choice. We want the High Desert communities of Hesperia, Adelanto, and Victorville to be grouped together with the Antelope Valley communities of Littlerock, Palmdale, and Lancaster in order to have the area of strength at the Assembly level.

We know that it's not going to be possible to keep all of those cities whole, but that is something we can do as long as we attribute the area of district in our community can elect candidates of choice.

This could be achieved by modifying visualization VAD_AntelopeValley --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. DIAZ: -- and VAD_VVHD. We also want to (indiscernible) and we all think that should be grouped with San Bernardino all levels. And by taking out redline and Yorba Linda to replace it Rialto and this should be for the visualization VSD_BEHR that you presented yesterday.

So thank you so much for all the support. And we just want to uplift and submitted by the IE redistricting come at all redistricting level that have been drawn to
comply with --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now we will have caller 6207. And up next after that is caller 8495. And again, please, a moderate pace for our translators.

Caller 6207, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I recognize the thought behind the vision to join together Kern and Fresno Counties, yet these counties are extremely distinct in our needs and enterprise, which is why I ask the committee to maintain separation between these two communities when the congregational districts are drawn.

Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And now we have caller 8495. And up next after that will be caller 4270.

Caller 8495, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

MS. ABDI: Hi, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. ABDI: Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Rahmo Abdi, and
I'm the community organizer with PANA. PANA serves hundreds of immigrant refugee families across San Diego County, especially in the neighborhood of City Heights, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, Spring Valley, and El Cajon. We have worked hard with Black hats and community members to build and map that our community share values and interests.

That is which is why it is concerning that a simple visualization has placed El Cajon, part of La Mesa, pair them with Santee. In the Santee visualization also pair of Lemon Grove, La Mesa, Spring Valley, and south San Diego with Santee.

Many of the residents of City Heights, and La Mesa, Lemon Grove, Spring Valley, and El Cajon are PANA event largely by five communities do have shared -- shared needs such as includes affordable housing, equitable transportation access, and language access.

All of which are not a concern for many Santee residents. We do not share anything in common with the residents in Santee and have different priorities and concerns.

I please urge you to keep our community of interest together. Please do not split El Cajon and do not map us with Santee. Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we'll have caller 4270. And up next after that we will have caller 0276.

Caller 4270, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Commission, for the hard work you guys have been doing. I know that the Commission is convene every ten years and it is an important task because you set the -- sort of the pathway for how the -- select our elected moving forward.

My concern this evening is with regards to the Congressional district that was presented which combines Kern County with Fresno County. I am a resident of the City of Clovis. And we are in eastern Fresno County.

Within our county, there's already enough issues. There are different -- sort of the economy is very different from Kern County. And I think that the interests can better be served if it was not such a large district in our Congressional representative can take care of our area.

Not only that, I have seen that water is also a big issue and as a previous -- previous caller already stated, the water issues in Clovis/Fresno area is very different than those down in Kern County. And so for those reasons, you know, just how vast it is, and for
water, and for the economy, and also keeping the two counties more separate are reasons why I would push that we change that Congressional district to where make it where is it similar to how it is today.

Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 0276. And up next after that will be caller 8044.

Caller 0276, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. First, I'd like to offer the courtesy by saying thank you for your continued work on these maps. Now, I'd like to urge the Commission to continue work on the Congressional maps in the City of Fresno.

I believe that there should be a Voting Right Act Congressional seat anchor in Fresno that includes everything south of Shaw Avenue and west of the 99 Freeway to ensure the tail areas of Fresno are included in one district. As of now, there are three Congressional seats in Fresno which is diluting the Latino vote.

The Commission should draw two seats in Fresno, which one of them must of be over fifty percent Latino.
I firmly believe that having those two seats will ensure that Latino will have presence in Fresno will have them stick together giving their similar interests.

   That is all I have to say. And thank you for listening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And thank you so much. And right now we'll have caller 8044. And up next after that will be caller 7296.

Caller 8044, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good afternoon, everyone. Good afternoon Commissioners. I am a resident of the City of Victorville. And I'd like to start off by saying thank you for the effort put forward. Thank you for the involving the community in this way.

   My reference today is for the visualization of the High Desert map. There was a map submitted from the IE hub that included a VRA -- a Latino VRA of over fifty percent. The visualization submitted by the Commission, there is no VRA at all.

   So I would urge you to take a look at the map submitted by the hub and just include a VRA. We'd love to be able to vote someone in of our choice. That's it for me. Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we'll have caller 7296. And up next after that will be caller 8037.

Caller 7296, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

MS. KITAMURA: Good afternoon. This is Deana Kitamura with Asian American Advancing Justice Asian Law Caucus. Thank you for many of the new instructions you've provided.

I'm calling today about the timing of the release of the draft maps. We've heard the Commission say that it plans to release draft maps either November 10th or 12th and we support that.

We recently -- we recently saw that the Commission added meetings for November 12th, 13th, and 15th. We hope this does not mean that the Commission is thinking of releasing the draft maps after November 12th.

You may remember that Asian Law Caucus was part of the MET letter brief that supported your attempt to get additional time from the court. We were extremely disappointed when the court denied your reasonable request.

But I'm bringing up that letter brief now because it mentioned the analysis and outreach in education
community groups plan to do once the draft maps are out. My organization had already scheduled community meetings for November 15th and 16th to prepare community members for the input hearings you have scheduled that begin on November 17th.

Now, we are scrambling to figure out if we can somehow do all the analysis and community meetings in time if you delay the release of the draft maps. You might think you can simply delay the input hearings, but that would take you into the Thanksgiving week. And we know we'll lose community participation if you do that.

So we're asking you to stick with your plan to release draft maps on either November 10th or 12th, the earlier the better. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we'll have caller 8037. And up next after that will be caller 2115.

Caller 8037, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. Can you all hear me?

Can you all --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- we sure can.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Perfect. Hi, my name is Christian and I am a student at Orange Coast College. And I'm here to voice my support for the Orange County beach cities together. Although I live in Costa Mesa, I do spend a lot of time in Newport Beach and Huntington Beach. And I believe that the beach cities have many things in common.

One of which is sharing the highway which is p -- I often drive from PCH and Huntington Beach all the way up to Sunset Beach to visit some of my favorite places. And I highly recommend that you keep us all together. Thank you and have a wonderful evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And now we'll have caller 2115. And up next after that will be caller 1998.

Caller 2115, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. Thank you for all your efforts to draw up these maps in the most effective way. And I understand the inclination to combine Kern and Fresno Counties.

But it's important to note that these are really two unique communities who don't share the same culture or history or any of the enterprises with each other. And I
would strongly urge the Commission to separate the two communities when drawing up the Congressional district.
Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we'll have caller 1998. And up next after that will be caller 2408.

Caller 1998, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

MR. BESSINGER: Good evening. My name is Drew Bessinger. I am Clovis City council member and the mayor of last term. I'm calling about the Congressional district Fresno, Madera/Kern.

The Fresno metropolitan area consists of Clovis, at 120,000 people and Fresno, the fifth largest city in California with over 500,000. We share regional issues with our neighbor, water, economy, transportation, housing, et cetera. The proposed redistricting removed Clovis from all of the other incorporated cities in Fresno County and links us to Bakersfield, which is two and a half hours away.

We don't -- we don't share a lot of issues with our friends in Bakersfield as they -- as they've already called in and talked about. And the proposal would remove us from the cities of our county. The proposed
Congressional maps of the adjacent areas in the Fresno metropolitan area will separate Fresno -- the City of Fresno into three Congressional districts, which I think is detrimental to our influence.

You're giving the proposals of other adjacent counties -- the proposal for the other metropolitan areas are very similar to the county lines. I request that the Commission either keep the existing borders or at least come up with some logical county line or major rivers, like the San Joaquin River or Kings River that permit us to stay with our regional area.

Thank you so much.

CHAIR LE MANS: And Katy, before you continue, I just want to announce that the phone lines will be closing in just about five minutes. So I wanted to make that announcement.

We also have a hard stop on comments at 8 p.m.

Katy, please continue.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much, Chair. Right now we will have caller 2408. And up next after that will be caller 0106.

Caller 2408, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. And one more time. Caller with the last four --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: There you are. The floor --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm sorry, can you --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- can you hear me? Oh, sorry, it didn't work --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- the first time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. Yes. My name is Andrew, and I'm calling from Long Beach. I'd like to thank the Commission for providing this opportunity to weigh in and for all your work throughout this process. I'm joining my neighbors this evening in asking you to keep Long Beach together in your visualizations for California's Congressional map. In the most recent visualizations, our city is cut in half between districts. And I'm respectfully requesting that when this map comes up for discussion, you direct staff to reconsider this most recent update to our area.

Long Beach is incredibly diverse city, but we're all united here and ask for you to keep us together. We think this is a completely reasonable position and something that can be accomplished along with many of the other priorities I know you are considering throughout
your work here.

But by keeping us together, you're helping to preserve not only our city borders but the communities of interest that call Long Beach home. I know this Commission has received letters from organizations across our city representing our Latino community, our Cambodian neighbors, LGB -- LGBTQ plus residents and many others. When you keep us together, you're working to make sure all of us across Long Beach have a full voice in choosing members of Congress who understand our needs and represent the best of our city.

Thank you for the support you've given our needs over the past few weeks/ And I hope you'll take our feedback to heart by working to reunite Long Beach in your next Congressional visualization. Thank you again for the chance to speak and for your time this evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we'll have caller 0106. And up next after that will be caller 1461.

Caller 0106, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

MR. WATKINS: Hello. Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Nevon Watkins and I am calling today on behalf of Long Beach College superintendent, Dr. Mike Munoz.
I'd like to read into the record a letter that Long Beach Community College district submitted earlier today. I'd like to express concern with the fourth round of visualization for the 2020 citizen redistricting Commission released earlier this week. We'd like to oppose to put each of the Long Beach Community College district campuses on the edges of different Congressional districts.

LBCC serves a diverse population of students and our campuses must be kept together. They are both important parts of the Long Beach community. As a community, we have been following the process closely and have witness all that has gone into it. Over the past several months, several of our students, community members, and board members have called in to voice their preference for Long Beach to be kept as whole as possible in our state and federal legislative districts.

Please do not dismiss their voices. Long Beach City College is the fifth largest single college district out of the 116 colleges in the statewide system. We are a nationally recognized institution of higher education within the California Community Colleges system. We maintain a hyper-local focus and work closely to bring students in from the greater Long Beach area.

We rely on our ability to organize with our state
and federal partners to fund some of our most important programs including the Long Beach College promise and our economic and workforce development programs and our career pathway programs. Please keep our campuses connected.

Thank you for your consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now we'll have caller 1461. And up next after that will be caller 1268.

Caller 1461, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. And one more time, caller -- oh, there you are.

The floor is yours.

MR. HICKS: Thank you for taking public comment. My name's Chris Hicks. I'm from Running Springs. I'm calling about the visualization. I like the Assembly and Congressional maps that you have. They connect our mountain town with a lot of communities we feel a common bond with in San Bernardino County.

I heard some people talk about how we have ski resorts and ski area, but that's just part of our economy. Most of the folks that work at those are really just temporary seasonal workers. But the folks that actually live up here, choose to live here to have a more rural lifestyle.
We're not luxury communities. Our full-time residents just like being away from the overcrowded urban areas below us. And we don't want to be connected with the flatlanders, as we call them. We feel like we are a rural San Bernardino County community and the BEA DICVAL and DVHD maps reflect this.

Last, I heard some chatter about putting us in a mountain district with Los Angeles County communities. And I really -- I can't stress enough how much people in rural San Bernardino County want nothing to do with Los Angeles or any other county outside the Inland Empire. Most of us moved to the mountain or desert to enjoy a more natural environment.

And we want our representatives to understand that and represent our issues not to be a population grab for other areas. So thank you for taking comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we'll have caller 1268. And up next after that will be caller 8751.

Caller 1268, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. Kern County is California's leader in energy production. We have a strong petroleum industry which supports the value of
family in our community as well as a vibrant renewable
energy section -- the cutting edge of the green energy
section.

Fresno, however, is not an energy producing county.
Cherry County, the Senate district will dilute the
representation of our oil producing families and could
potentially curb the advances we're making in renewable
energy.

Thank you very much for your time and I hope you'll
consider my comments as you continue to decide.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we have caller 8751. And up next after that we
have caller 6777.

Caller 8751, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you so much. I'm
calling -- I live in San Bernardino County. And right
now, San Bernardino County, a large part of the rural
area, are combined with Kern County for the Senate
district. And I really like the way that is set up
because we share a lot of common interests.

Our way of life is very similar in terms of rural
living. But the way the proposal looks for the Senate
district, it would cut San Bernardino, the rural
portions, in half. Combine one with L.A. and the other with the Coachella Valley, and then combine Kern County with Fresno.

And I think that's a mistake because it takes all three Kern, and then the two portions of the High Desert in San Bernardino County that, right now, are all combined well and splits them up and combines each one of them with a community that does not -- is not similar but has a higher population, like L.A., Coachella Valley, and Fresno. And would potentially then take representation away where currently they all are represented similarly, it would skew it more towards the urban areas.

So I would ask that you would try to keep Kern County and San Bernardino County connected rather than linking Kern and Fresno or San Bernardino with Riverside or L.A. County. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now we'll have caller 6777. And up next after that will be caller 0082.

Caller 6777, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing -- the floor is yours.

MS. ORODIVERI: Thank you. My name is Kate Orodiveri (ph.). I live in Fresno City. Thank you so much for all your work on the redistricting.

I would like you to keep the Hispanic precincts
together, please. Please do not split our Hispanic communities. Dividing up our communities takes our voice away and makes it difficult to elect people who truly represented -- represent us.

That would be a real mistake. So please do not divide the Hispanic community in Fresno City. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 0082. And up next after that will be caller 9816.

Caller 0082, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

MR. STEVENS: Hello. My name is Jason Stevens (ph.). I'm a resident of Bakersfield. I'd like to thank you for taking the time to hear me out.

Kern County and Fresno are very far apart. The districts would be too far for a single person to cover. And our different industries -- industries and different cultures and different interests that I think one representative will not be able to represent these two areas well enough. And I would like to keep the districts as they are. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we'll have caller 9816. And up next after that will be caller 8600.
Caller 9816, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. I appreciate you taking this time to hear our concerns for and the hard work you're doing to make sure we have fair balance, we have equitable districts in Congress.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Sir?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'd like to point out that Kern Valley --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Sir?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes? Yes.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: One moment. Is -- is everyone hearing the distortion?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I think so.

MR. MANOFF: Okay. To caller 9 --9816. If you are listening to the live stream, if you could please mute that. And then, go ahead and press star six to unmute your phone and we'll restart your time, please. That's for caller 9816.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: One more time. Caller 9816 as you were just unmuted. There was some feedback. If you could please mute the livestream and then, please press star six again to unmute yourself.
The floor is yours.

MR. MANOFF: Caller 9816. You're getting an echo because you have a live stream on or because you're connected with multiple phones. We'll come back to you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We will make note. If you could please get one speaker. Right now, we have caller 8600. And up next after that will be caller 4003.

Caller 8600, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. Thank you so much for taking the time to hear me and voice my concerns.

I worry that the new Congressional visualization -- visualization, sorry, will change the treatment of constituents from representatives because the district will be so large and it will be difficult to travel within.

Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Right now we'll have caller 4003. And up next after that will be caller 2996.

Caller 4003, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. Can you hear
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. Thank you for taking public comment. I appreciate all your hard work on this Commission. I am a resident of the City of Clovis and I a member of the Latino community.

And I'm concerned about the way the Congressional maps were drawn to include Bakersfield with the City of Clovis. This option does not seem to serve all communities equitably. And would not be accessible to all constituents.

In the Congressional map, the City of Bakersfield, in Kern County, was combined with Clovis and Fresno County. And to travel from the southern population center of Bakersfield to the northern population center in Fresno/Clovis, you have to drive through about three Congressional districts.

Kern and Fresno Counties have very different interests including agriculture and oil. Fresno and Bakersfield are home to two separate California state universities and they have two different media markets. They have different industry and businesses and different needs.

I believe it was last week at one of the Commissioners' meetings, it was mentioned that Kern
County -- the Kern County seat spans 300 miles was too vast. I urge the Commission to create a more compact Congressional district in Kern. Please do not put Clovis and Bakersfield in the same Congressional seat.

I want everybody to look at everything equitably and accessibly to constituents. So thank you for your consideration. And thank you for hearing my public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now we'll have caller 2996. And up next after that will be caller 1334.

Caller 2996, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

MS. RAU: Hello. My name is Susan Rau (ph.) from Bakersfield, California. Thank you for your hard work and opportunity to allow us to speak into the redistricting proposal.

I am strongly opposing combining Kern County with Fresno County. As stated by the previous speaker, and by our Councilmember Mike Maggard earlier, the proposed redistricting would drastically dilute representation of concern for both communities of Kern and Fresno County.

Being a leader in energy and agriculture improves the economy and culture of Kern County is uniquely
important and vital to be represented well. Please don't
dilute Kern County be extending representation into an
unfamiliar and unrelated, distant area of the state. We
have much more in common with to the geographically
closer Tulare County and San Bernardino County.

Thank you for hearing and your considerations of my
comments and concerns. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we will have caller 1334. If you will please
follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing
star six.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you for taking the time
to hear my concerns. I just -- I think that the new
Congressional visualization will change the treatment of
the constituents. With the districts being so large if
you combine them, I think it'll take away from the
constituents in both Fresno and Kern County.

And it'll make it hard for --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Oh. Well, thank you so
much. I believe they hung up, Chair.

CHAIR LE MANS: Go ahead and take the next caller.
We'll go to break right after.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: All right. Right now we
will have caller 0135. If you will please follow the
prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. And one more time. Caller 0135, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star -- the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I'm a resident of Yorba Linda in north Orange County. I just wanted to say that I appreciate that you kept Placentia, Brea, Yorba Linda, Anaheim and Orange together because I believe that it's important that we keep those cities together as we do not focus as much on tourism or clean beaches in our county. We focus more on our infrastructure, maintaining high quality roads and doing whatever we can to minimize traffic. And I believe that's important for both Congress and the State Senate and the State Assembly.

However, I do see one issue with how our new state districts are made. It's very hard to access the southern part of Orange County from north Orange County. There is no clear roads that go through the incorporated area of the county that has now been assigned to our district. And so I would like to please have the changed and noted if possible. It'll take a lot longer for us to access that lower part of the county.

Thank you and I hope you agree with me.

CHAIR LE MANS: Thanks, Katy. We're up on our breaks. We're going to take a fifteen-minute break and
we'll be back at 6:30.

Please don't hang up. If you hang up, you will not be able to get back into the queue because our lines have closed.

We'll be back in fifteen minutes. Enjoy your break.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 5:57 p.m. until 6:15 p.m.)

CHAIR LE MANS: Okay. Welcome back from break, everyone. We have quite a few people in the queue.

I just want to re-announce that we do have a hard stop at eight. So I'm going to take the final caller at 7:55. And then we will close the meeting with the vote on the motion on the floor.

So a reminder to callers, if you want to speak on the motion, please do as well as any of the visualizations.

Katy, please continue. Katy?

MR. MANOFF: Katy, I think you're muted.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Oh, can you hear me now?

MR. MANOFF: Yes, I can.

CHAIR LE MANS: Yes, I can.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I'm so sorry. Right now we'll have caller 0362. If you'll please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

And one more time, caller 0362, if you'll please
follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six.

The floor is yours. Caller 0362, can you hear me? You are unmuted.

MR. BEJAS: Yes. Yes. Okay, thank you. Hi. My name is Victor Bejas (ph.). I live on the -- in the Imperial County.

So first, I would like to thank the Commissioners, the Commission for their hard work on this redistricting process. I also want to thank to you because of the -- because you listen all our participations or the community requests to have the -- the -- to expand the districts, I believe the -- now the -- the three -- three districts for Congress, Assembly, and Senate are very aligned for the interest of the community.

So first, I believe the way it is it works perfectly for Imperial County and the -- the communities. Like for example, all the way to San Diego because of -- we share the border, and we are a high -- high populations of Hispanics, I think that's -- that's a very important to keep together.

And the north with -- with this new drawings, I believe now also it's very important to include all the -- the communities that surround the Salton Sea now are -- they are all together under the Congress, Senate,
and Assembly. So that works perfectly as well. Also at
the north with the Coachella Valley --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. BEJAS: -- we have -- we have in common that we
are all agriculture areas, rural areas, mostly Hispanics
as well. So that works perfectly.

I -- and by the -- by the east --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MR. BEJAS: -- all the way from Needles to
Winterhaven which we have in common the Colorado River.
So I think that's the most important topics we have in
this area.

And now I believe the -- the -- the three levels
as --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now we have caller 0073. And up next
after that will be caller 7175.

Caller 0076, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star six. And the
floor is yours.

MR. AI: Hi there, Commissioners. I'd like to start
by thanking you all for your hard work. And specifically
I'd like to thank Commissioner Sadhwani for their request
to keep Los Angeles' LGBTQ community united.

My name is Mike Ai with Equality California, the
nation's largest statewide LGBTQ+ civil rights organization. And I'm calling to ask that the LGBTQ community of interest stay united in Los Angeles.

The Senate visualization continued to separate the City of West Hollywood from Hollywood, which divides the heart of Los Angeles LGBTQ+ communities that reside in this core area and surrounding neighborhoods.

The City and the County of Los Angeles is home to an expansive and culturally intersectional LGBTQ+ community as connected through their rich history of LGBTQ+ plus civic activism dating back to the 1967 Black Cat riots, which erupted in response to police brutality experienced by LGBTQ+ people, marking one of the first LGBTQ+ demonstrations in the United States. This solidarity and sense of belonging among Los Angeles LGBTQ+ residents continues to this day with several LGBTQ+ businesses and communities bases thriving in neighborhoods from Silver Lake to -- to Los Feliz to North Hollywood and Studio City to Hollywood and West Hollywood.

With this history and solidarity, the LGBTQ+ community of interest in Los Angeles has actively engaged -- actively organized around LGBTQ+ candidates of choice, and made history with the LGBTQ+ communities in the city, county, and state level. It's paramount that the LGBTQ+ community --
MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. AI: -- be kept together and not separated into three Senate districts that fail to see the LGBTQ+ commonality between West Hollywood and Hollywood. Thanks so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 7175. And up next after that will be caller 8978.

Caller 7175, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MR. PAYNE: Hi there. Thank you. This is Jeremy Payne with Equality California. Didn't know I'd be going right after my colleague Mike.

But again, we are calling from Equality California, the nation's largest statewide LGBTQ+ civil rights organization.

Called in yesterday about San Diego.

I'm calling again today about San Diego, but for the Senate visualization SBCY that was released 11/02. Despite some concerns being raised by San Diego's LGBTQ+ residents, this Senate visualization continues to split the heart of San Diego's LGBTQ+ community by dividing Hillcrest at the California 163 Highway.

The visualization not only divides the LGBTQ+
residents of Hillcrest, but the LGBTQ+ residents in the neighborhood that surround Hillcrest and Buffalo Park, which include Mission Hill, Banker Hill, University Heights, North Park, South Park, and Normal Heights.

For the LGBTQ+ community of San Diego, these neighborhoods are our home, and we were rooted together with LGBTQ+ businesses and community spaces that are culturally as vibrant as much as the history of our region.

And so we ask that the LGBTQ+ community be kept together are not separated or divided at the California 163 Highway. Instead, we recommend using Interstate 15 as eastern boundary of the Senate district so that we may keep our LGBTQ+ community united.

I want to thank the Commissioners for your advocacy of the LGBTQ+ community, especially Commissioner Sinay for your LGBTQ+ community throughout California. And I hope that we're able to keep San Diego's LGBTQ+ community together. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have 8978. And up next after that will be caller 4984.

Caller 8978, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. I'm a resident of Central Valley. And I want to first say I want to thank you for your continued work on these maps.

I am concerned, however, that the Latino vote will become diluted with three Congressional seats in the City of Fresno. The Latinos should be able to have the ability to elect the candidate of their choice in the City of Fresno. And drawing two seats in Fresno, particularly in the area of south of Shaw and west of 99 will ensure that. I want to thank you so much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 4984. And up next after that will be caller 7672.

Caller 4984, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I called in today because I asked -- I'm here to voice my concerns with the proposal, specifically that which joins the Counties of Kern and Fresno, which I see as being too distinct and large to group together.

I ask that the Committee please think of the constituents who do not wish to be overlooked or forgotten by their representatives, specifically in their Congressional District.
And these offices as we've noted before during this committee -- committee meeting, these offices could be as far away -- as far away as ours. And therefore -- therefore would be harder to get a hold of and accountable.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now we will have caller 7672. And up next after that will be caller 9642.

Caller 7672, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

MR. MANOFF: To unmute --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

MR. MANOFF: -- you are unmuted.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

Please indiscernible --

MR. FONG: Good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- your livestream.

MR. FONG: Hold on. Okay. Is this -- is this better?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Much better.

MR. FONG: Is this better?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Better.

MR. FONG: Okay.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Perfect.

MR. FONG: Hi. My name is Henry Fong. And I'm
I'm a Cal Poly Pomona graduate. And I'm calling about the districts that are cutting through Cal Poly Pomona. Cal Poly Pomona is uniquely split up between the unincorporated LA County and the City of Pomona. So you have people living in dorms that are in unincorporated LA County aren't part of Pomona. And I would like to see that Cal Poly Pomona be united in the City of Pomona, such that people that live in dorms don't vote in different districts than people that live just off campus. So that's one thing.

And then the second thing is regarding the districts that go along the 210 corridor, while I am not a fan of those districts, I ask that those districts do not cross LA County and go into San Bernardino County. Our interests are much different, as the San Bernardino residents have mentioned. I think that like the Senate district I think is good on the 210 corridor, but I do not like the Assembly and the Congressional District stretching all the way from La Canada and -- and La Crescenta all the way out to Rancho Cucamonga. That is not a community of interest. The community of interest needs to stop at the San Bernardino/Los Angeles County line. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 9642. And up next
after that will be caller 3781.

Caller 9642, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute by pressing star six.

MS. TESTA: Hi.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor -- Hello.

MS. TESTA: Hi, my name is Andrea Testa. Hi, can
you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. TESTA: Okay, great. Hi, my name is Andrea
Testa. And I am a resident and business owner in the
City of Long Beach, specifically a realtor in this area.

And I'm calling to express my disappointment in the
Commissions map that split Long Beach into two.

Long Beach is a single community. We've
consistently asked to be kept together because we truly
do work so closely together. And we've been so thankful
to hear that the Commission has heard us. I believe at
several Commission meetings, Commissioners have voiced
support for keeping Long Beach together. And staff has
summarized comments from Long Beach as wanting to be
together. We love all of that.

I don't remember a single Commissioner having --
giving direction to split us in half, which is why we are
so shocked and disappointed to see that this Commission
would consider breaking us into two. If that happens,
the synergy that we've got going could also break in half
and no one wants that.

Please keep Long Beach together and reject any
proposals that would split us apart. Thank you so much
for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now we will have caller 3781. And up next
after that will be caller 9436.

Caller 3781, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor
is yours.

MR. RYAN: Hello, thank you. Hello, Commissioners.
My name is Andrew Ryan. I am a current resident of Santa
Clarita, California.

I called in a few days ago regarding our
Congressional and center maps urging you to possibly
replicate our Congressional District boundaries with the
Senate district for better representation.

I did also just want to call in today as I wanted to
flag that recently our Santa Clarita Valley council has
actually submitted a second letter requesting that Simi
Valley can be placed back into our district by boundary
lines. And you know, I really just want to kind of call
it as it is. This is a complete bend of political
pressure from our region and some of our certain
leadership out here.

And I did want to point out the City of Santa Clarita actually defies the California Voters Rights Act. And by marginalizing our minority voters, as they are the only city I believe left in Los Angeles County that is refusing to go to districts, we are actually in a potential lawsuit against.

Previously they had also sent a letter on July 20th of this year requesting that we do keep the City of Santa Clarita within the boundaries of Los Angeles County.

So I did want to just urge you to reconsider. Our local NAACP has also sent a letter in regards to this. So I just want to thank you for the current map you have given us. And I urges you to continue using our current Congressional map and keep our city within the boundaries of Los Angeles County, and to just protect our communities of interest. Thank you again.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we will have caller 9436. And up next after that will be caller 0893.

Caller 9436, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MR. TANAKA: Can you guys hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. TANAKA: Okay, great. This is Councilmember
Greg Tanaka calling from the City of Palo Alto. I'm calling as an individual and not behalf of the council. I'm calling in -- in reference to Congressional District VCD_SCLARA (sic).

Wanted to first thank the Commission for your hard work on this. I've been on the other side, been into a lot of public comments. I really appreciate your patience and the opportunity.

I agree with the -- the current maps of excluding Santa Cruz County. I think those are different social demographics, so it makes sense.

But I am -- I'm calling in today because I think it's important that we keep Silicon Valley together. So over the past ten years, Santa Clara County, Silicon Valley has actually become majority Asian. And -- but the -- but in the current proposed map, 11, November 2nd map, the demographics for Asian vicinity is almost exactly the same as ten years ago, even though the county itself has swung majority Asian.

In fact, many cities -- including the city I live Palo Alto -- has moved from being thirty percent Asian to now thirty-eight percent Asian. So it's a larger -- largest ethnic group. And in our view, it's nearly the majority as well, as well as Los Altos and other -- a few of the other surrounding cities.
Yet, if you look at the current map, it shows the proposed Congressional map shows almost the same percent as Asian as it did before, even though in the City of -- (indiscernible) map --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. TANAKA: -- there's an enlarged Asian increase.

So what -- what -- remedy this I recommend that (indiscernible), Simi Valley, and Santa Clara is not carved out, and that we move the other boundary to the Santa Clara County line. I think it's important to keep Silicon Valley together. It wouldn't be looked as--

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- gerrymandered. Silicon Valley has a much more high-tech industry.

So thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we will have caller 0893. And up next after that will be caller 3974.

Caller 0893, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MS. OBEID: Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you so much for the -- taking the time to listen to us. My name is Yasmeen Obeid. I'm a Muslim Arab community
organizer from Spring Valley, San Diego. And I'm also the redistricting fellow with Majdal, the Arab Community Center of San Diego, which is located in El Cajon.

Majdal serves hundreds of immigrants and refugee families in El Cajon and surrounding areas. And over the past six months, we hosted four bilingual community of interest sessions, spoke directly to dozens of community members, and hosted redistricting workshops in both English and Arabic.

Our community members are especially connected with other refugee and black indigenous communities of color, Hubs in our region in the neighborhoods of City Heights, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, Spring Valley, and El Cajon.

After working hard with our community members to draw maps that accurately reflect our community, shared values, and interests, it was very concerning to see that Assembly visualization flipped El Cajon and flipped a small part of La Mesa and pairs them with Santee.

When you split El Cajon, you are splitting a significant community of interest of the Arab and Muslim communities that I work with on a daily basis and represent.

Our Arab community is currently already disenfranchised --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.
MS. OBEID: -- by being invisible in the census and by being split in El Cajon City into two different districts.

I speak on behalf of over 300 families, please do not flip El Cajon. And do not map City Heights, La Mesa --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. OBEID: -- Lemon Grove, Spring Valley, Southeast San Diego with Santee. Thank you so much and have a wonderful night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

And right now we have caller 3974. And up next after that will be caller 1506.

Caller 3974, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MS. CASIO: Patty Casio. Hi. This is Patty Casio. I'm a realtor in the Clovis and Fresno area.

And I understand that there is potential for Clovis to be separated from the City of Fresno and incorporated with the -- the Bakersfield District.

And we request that Clovis and Fresno as part of Fresno County be separate from Bakersfield/Kern County. Clovis and Fresno have -- we have a joint community, a joint history, and a joint culture. And also, there's a
large Latino community in our area. And for -- we would urge that the Commission continue working on the Congressional maps in the City of Fresno. There should be voting rights acts Congressional seats anchored in the City of Fresno that includes everything south of Shaw and west of 99 to ensure that the Latino area of Fresno is included in one district.

And right now we have three Congressional seats in the City of Fresno, which is alluding the Latino vote. The Commission should draw two seats in the City of Fresno --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. CASIO: -- one that is over 50 percent Latino.

And drawing these two seats in Fresno, one that includes the Latino areas south of Shaw and west of 99, will ensure that the Latino precinct in Fresno --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds

MS. CASIO: -- stay together given their similar interests. Thank you for your consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we will have caller 1506. And up next after that will be caller 7815.

Caller 1506, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MS. JOHNSON: Hello, Good evening, distinguished
Commissioners. A very blessed -- again a very blessed
good evening to you. And I can't express enough how I
appreciate the very transparent manner by which you are
conducting your -- your job of making the decisions of
redistricting, right? And also the very inclusive manner
by which you are allowing members of the community to
speak to your group.

My name is Elena Johnson. And I am a resident of
Simi Valley. I came to Simi Valley in 1984 and left for
a short time, and then returned again in 1992.

At the same time, I worked in a place in LA County.
And most of my coworkers are coming from Santa Clarita,
Palm Dale, that area of Los Angeles County, the northern
part.

And I urge your -- I urge you, dear Commissioners,
to please keep Simi Valley and Santa Clarita together.

Having worked with my colleagues and having lived in
Simi Valley for a long time, our aspirations are very
similar. Our way of life, what we believe in, and the
way that we are honor and respect each other's families
are very, very similar. And I would hate for our group,
Simi Valley and Santa Clarita, to be divided or be
separated, because I feel I use kindred to the people I
work with -- with the Santa Clarita people. And it's
very, very important --
MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds

MS. JOHNSON: -- because I'm a minority. I'm a triple minority. I'm a female. I'm from Asia. And I'm 65 years old. And I feel that these two cities, which I hold close with my heart, are separated --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. JOHNSON: -- it's going to be very devastating to how I have loved my life here in the United States since the 1980s.

I thank you for your time. And again, I urge you to please keep Santa Clarita and Simi Valley together.

Thank you very --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we will have caller 7815. And up next after that will be caller 7625.

Caller 7815, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

DR. SARO: Hello

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

DR. SARO: Hello, Commissioners. Thank you so much for all your hard work.

My name is Dr. Suely Saro. And I'm a councilmember in the City of Long Beach. I'm the first Cambodian-American elected to serve on Long Beach City council.

And I represent the largest Cambodian population --
Cambodian-American population in the United States.

And I'm greatly concerned and disappointed in the map that was released this week that splits the Cambodian town into two Congressional Districts.

And we are survivors of genocide. And we've developed the first Cambodian town in the United States ever.

From 1975 to 1979, the Khmer Rouge killed over 2 million Cambodians, and many have been impacted by it, traumatized by it. Several hundred thousand Cambodians fled the country and became refugees resettling in countries across world, making Long Beach the longest Cambodian population in the United States.

So due to the impact of the genocide and resettlement, many of the communities (indiscernible) need access to various healthcare, mental health services, as well as social services, and workforce development opportunities. We as a community have made conscience effort to organize and elevate the Cambodian voice in politics, education, and civic engagement, and have established ourselves as equal members in the entire Long Beach community.

And we are united in opposing any map that splits Long Beach apart, especially the part that splits the Cambodian community.
And this progress has only been possible because we have been working and organizing and advocating for equity. And --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

DR. SARO: -- we ask you to please keep us united, keep Long Beach together, and please keep the Cambodian community and Cambodia Town area together. Thank you so much for your consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

I'd like to ask every person that has called and that wishes to share comments tonight to please press star nine. If you have not pressed star nine, please press star nine at this time it will raise your hand and it will give our staff a count how many people we have left. Please press star nine. It will help us do our job in supporting you. Thank you so much.

Caller 7625, you will be right now. And then up next after that will be caller 7644.

Caller 7625, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank -- great. Thank you so much for listening to all these public comments. My name is David.

I'm calling about the Alameda Assembly District, and
calling to urge you all to please keep the unincorporated areas west of 680 together with Hayward and expand the populations north -- north and south in the San Leandro or parts of Fremont instead of doing what you currently have, which is to expanded it east to the Tri-Valley area. Those suburban communities are a lot of Livermore and Pleasanton that are currently included with Hayward and Ashland and Carolands are a lot more similar to areas further east like San Ramon and Dublin and Danville. Whereas Hayward, Union City, these unincorporated areas are a lot more similar to places like Oakland and San Leandro. The 680 corridor is -- is second ring suburbs and excerpts to the east. And in that way the populations are completely distinct and the communities faces different issues.

These unincorporated areas are intrinsically linked to Hayward, both in terms of school communities, parks, all sorts of different legislative bodies. And so we're asking, you know, that you all consider race, class, education, public transit access, all these different things, and keep those unincorporated areas with the other places that they belong with. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And I'd like to give the opportunity just one more time to please press star nine. We did get a number of
hands. But just one more time, please press star nine if you did not do that in my previous announcement. Thank you so much.

Caller 7644, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. And the floor is yours.

MR. PAYNE: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Eric Payne. I'm the executive director of the Central Valley Urban Institute.

And I just like to say generally on all levels you should be keeping inner-city urban communities in Fresno whole and together, including Southwest Fresno, West Park, emerging black communities in the Old Fig Garden area, the area around Fresno State, specifically the El Dorado neighborhood between Cedar and West and the Sunnyside community in southeast Fresno. The City of Thelma should also be paired with these communities where possible, since they share similar demographics. None of the communities should be paired in a district that include Clovis.

I'm not clear on the Commission's position to incorporate some of the country's poorest census track in Southwest Fresno with the City of Clovis. It's bewildering.

Additionally, wanted to lift up that the data
doesn't show there are many black folks in the Old Fig Garden area, but these are emerging black communities and multifamily developments in the area, because the state neglected to invest the proper resources to ensure complete and accurate count of black families in the region that resulted in sixty percent of black families being undercounted.

The Commission should be mindful of -- of that, and that it should be paired with communities previously listed rather than with dissimilar communities like Clovis.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. PAYNE: I know the Commission has to consider VRA districts as well, so I wanted to lift up that you should -- you can create a VRA seat in Fresno while also protecting and paring the COIs. The Hub map is a good example --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. PAYNE: -- of how to do this.

Finally, I'd like to thank you for keeping Pixley and Tulare together and Lemoore and Hanford, and for moving California City into LA County.

Thank you on behalf of all black families in the Central Valley.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now we have caller 8775. And up next after that will be caller 4769.

Caller 8775, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you so much, Commissioners, for holding this forum and allowing all these public comments. You have a daunting task in front of you.

I'm calling to voice my concern with the -- the lack of the voting rights district in Fresno County.

The South Fresno city area is a great place to anchor a voting rights district and keep the Latino community together. And that area is very, very important.

Right now the Central Valley Congressional District visualization maps shows three Congressional seats in the City of Fresno, which is diluting the Latino vote. And the Commission should look at drawing two seats in the City of Fresno with one that is over fifty percent Latino that's ensuring the Latinos' voice in our future elections. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now we have caller 4769. And up next after that will be caller 5058. Caller 4769, if you would please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MS. YANG: Good evening. Hello. Yes. Thank you. Good evening. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. YANG: Okay. My name is Lucy Yang. I live in Walnut. And I'm also the president of the Chinese American Association of Walnut. I'm very, kind of, shocked to see the map that I see both in the Senate, and also the Assembly District because the -- for example, the -- the standard that I see, the new boundary, I'm glad to see that Hacienda Heights is included, but then we're looking into extending to Orange County, but then there's -- you know, in my area -- you know, where we -- Walnut, Diamond Bar, Hacienda Heights, we're mostly -- a high percentage of Asian American communities. And we really should have a voice. And we -- we really wish that we could have that Irvine, you know, that area to be combined with us and versus the current drawing and also for Assembly were very strongly opposed, while I see, in -- in the current maps, because in the -- in the -- in the current Assembly, you -- you left out Hacienda Heights.
For some reason, Hacienda Heights is in the Senate, but Hacienda Heights not in your Assembly. And then we -- you left out West Covina. You left out -- you know, a lot of the -- the areas that we should be -- we have the same, you know, culturally, you know, and ethnic -- ethnicity, and also economic interests. But you added the whole rural area, mountain areas of Riverside and San Bernardino County, which is totally not very similar, you know, in -- in -- in social economic interests with that. It's --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. YANG: -- very strange that you're -- so we're strongly opposed to the current drawing that extend till Riverside and San Bernardino County. It's so -- so -- so strange. It's very odd. Well, you know, if we kept -- keep the original, we'd rather keep the original. We --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. YANG: -- really like Hacienda Heights and West Covina to be a part of us. Thank you for your consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will have caller 5058. And up next after that would be caller 0029. Caller 5058, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute, the floor is yours.

MR. HILL: Good evening. And thank you to the
Commission for the work that you've doing. My name is Nick Hill. I represent the Kern County Black Chamber of Commerce. And our concern is that you do not combine Stockdale Country Club and Oil Dale to our communities of interest, which falls from the area of South Planz going all the way up to California Avenue. We would like to keep Oleander in that area as well. But going all the way back south to -- I'm sorry, going back east all the way back to Cottonwood Avenue to make sure you know, that we are counted correctly because number 1, our demographics are not that large here in Kern County, and it would be devastating to us if we were separated between these lines. So I'm asking you to keep these lines intact especially from the South Planz area all the way going up to California Avenue, and then going back -- all the way back east to Cottonwood area and things like that because like I said, these are highly populated African-American areas. And if you split these areas, you split our vote; you split our voting power; you split our ability to get better schools, better hospitals, and better representation in general. So I'm asking that you --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. HILL: -- keep us together. Thank you, so much. And thank you for your time.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. And right now, we have caller 0029. And up next after that, we will have caller 6121. Caller 0029, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you so much for your time this evening. My name is George (ph.). I'm a resident of Fresno, and in, currently Clovis, grew up in Fresno. Just wanted to express my concern on the current Madera/Kern map for State Senate. We really appreciate the work that you're doing, but just do not believe that the current county region should be grouped in with North Fresno and Clovis simply because the interests are just too vastly different, maybe would encourage, respectfully encourage the Commission to consider expanding the City of Fresno slightly to include Fig Garden at Central Fresno, maybe in the North Fresno and Clovis map to make up for that population. Really appreciate your time. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. And right now, we will have caller 6121. And up next after that, will be Caller 9691. Caller 6121, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.
MALE SPEAKER: Good evening. Thank you, Commissioners for all the hard work you're doing. My name is John (ph.) and I live in Simi Valley, California. And I'm calling to ask that you please keep Simi Valley, Moor -- and Moorpark together in the same Assembly, Senate, and Congressional District.

Simi Valley is an inland working class community. And the current map has us drawn into the very, very wealthy beach community of Malibu. We have no community of interests. Malibu is not a community of like interest. We have more in common with Moorpark, Santa -- and Santa Clarita. We share a wildfire issues with them, a national forest, energy grid, and water issues. So please draw us with Santa Clarita and Moorpark. Thank you for your consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 9691. And up next after that will be caller 1270. Caller 9691, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Hi, this is Christian (ph.) calling in from South Fresno. As a Mexican born and raised in South Fresno, I -- I really urge the Commission, who's already done some great work to -- to reconsider the Congressional maps that are considering for the City of
Fresno. As currently drawn, I think the maps do a poor job of strengthening the Latino/Mexican vote in Fresno. I think Fresno and its Mexican community would be better served if there was a -- a district set in the heart of Fresno's Latino community in South Fresno, somewhere, you know, south of Shaw and west of the 99. So I -- I please urge you to consider my recommendation. Thank you so much again for the work you're doing.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 1270. And up next after that, we have caller at 9194. Caller 1270, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm calling from East Contra Costa County. A whole lot of us have been calling in pouting our strong connection to the San Joaquin Delta, how in -- how important it is to our complimentary economy, including the hard-fought fishing tournament in the City of Oakley. Maybe we mention this too much because the current map Concord TR 1102 is literally a really tall fish hook with the hook part facing the wrong way. Map CDA East Contra 1013 (ph.) was the best visualization and Visualization United East Contra Costa 1102 united our community interests. I'm not sure where the fish hook came from.
The residents of East Contra Costa don't travel north all the way to Yolo County as there's no common transportation corridor to get there. And we don't get visitors from Yolo out here. We don't have economic commonalities with the suburban enclaves of Orinda and Moraga to the west. We do, however, have common transportation corridors with Stockton. As proof, we got a puppy and we needed it boarded. We were desperate and we couldn't find any place that would take her. We were so happy to find a fantastic border in Stockton.

We get visitors from Stockton traveling through our cities. They stop; they shop; and they eat and have fun here, and likewise. The Delta unites us, and we need Congressional representation that focuses on cleaning, shoring up, and ensuring that salination of the freshwater that farmers rely on doesn't happen. We've been calling and emailing consistently with this information --

MR. MANOFF: 30 seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- but we don't see changes in our area to keep the San Joaquin Delta community whole including Stockton that has already be included in the Assembly maps. Please make our district cohesive, logical, and manageable, and let's go fishing to the east, please.
MR. MANOFF: 15 seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will have caller 9194. And up next after that, will be caller 9858. Caller 9194, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. Can y'all hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excellent. I am a resident of Dana Point, California. I'm calling today because it is concerning to me that we are trying to separate the three cities of Dana Point and San Clemente with Costa Mesa and Newport and Seal Beach because I've lived in Dana Point my entire life. And I -- we have -- everyone I've know, we've all felt a greater connection with parts of northern Orange County than where we are now with San Diego County. And as (audio interference) is our part of that district, we are -- our beautiful beaches are being ignored in favor for the larger population of the Greater San Diego area and (indiscernible) that our beach cities are deteriorating quick (audio interference) --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Caller 9194, are you still there?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- in Florida Commission to
keep -- keep Dana Point and our beach cities with Newport and Costa Mesa. Thank you very much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now we have caller 9858. And then up next after that will be caller 8091. Caller 9858, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MR. MALCOLM: Hello. This is -- this is Malcolm. I'm with Pillars of the Community based in San Diego in district 4, and in Canto (ph.). I'm just calling to say that we are -- we are very disappointed, and we do not support the Assembly Visualization, which -- which splits El Cajon and parts of Lamesa, and Paris in with Santee. And we also don't -- do not support the COIs, which this is a Senate Visualization, which pairs the COIs with Lemon Grove and Lamesa and Spring Valley and southeast with Santee.

The reason is because that, for one, we don't share cultural -- culturally or economically with Santee. Also, and this is -- this is no disrespect to all the great people in Santee, but -- but historically, Santee has been known to have some of the most vociferous white supremacists and neo-Nazis in the county. And we don't -- we don't -- we don't -- of course, we don't think that the refugees black and brown minority groups
in -- in Southeast Spring Valley, Lemon Grove, and Lamesa would -- would -- should be districted with the people in Santee that have those views. Thank you for your time. And you guys have a wonderful rest of the night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 8091. And up next after that will be caller 5701.

Caller 8091, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I'm calling from Kern County, Bakersfield, specifically. And I wanted to bring to the attention of the Commission, who, of course we thank, the issue of Valley fever, which is an infectious disease of the respiratory system caused by a fungus that grows specifically in the soils of the Central Valley. This is a disease that's treatable for most people, but for people with a compromised immune system like mine, this infection can be catastrophic. It can be -- even be deadly in -- in some cases. Obviously, with the issue of the ongoing pandemic, that brings an even greater risk to our community. And Kern County, for example, has a per capita rate of Valley Fever that is over six times higher than that in Fresno County according to California Department of Public Health.

And that gives me pause when I'm looking at the
visualizations on the Congressional and Senate side, which are linking the two. So another example of how Kern and Fresno County are -- are different. We're not a monolith. We should not be treated ubiquitously. And I would ask the Commission to consider separating the two for this reason, and for all of the other reasons that you've heard. Thank you very much for your time. And I hope you have a great rest of your evening. And thank you for taking my comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we'll have caller 5701. And up next after that will be caller 9260.

Caller 5701, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you very much. Good evening, Commissioners, and thank you for the work that you're doing. My name is Alex (ph.). I am in the Fresno region --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And you had a late phone calls and --

MALE SPEAKER: Oh, hello?

MR. MANOFF: Go ahead.

MALE SPEAKER: My name is Alex. I'm calling from the Fresno -- from the Fresno area. I'm calling to not
only echo, but also reinforce some of the comments that
have been made throughout the night that Fresno and Kern
County are two completely different communities. They do
not share the economic, cultural, educational,
infrastructural similarities that one would need in order
to successfully be in the same State Senate or
Congressional District. I will echo in the fact that
Kern County is no oil producing county. They specialize
in energy. Fresno County is the nation's fruit, bread --
breadbasket, and agricultural powerhouse. We have
different universities. We have different schools --
school districts, and -- and other methods of higher
education.

I will also highlight that we can and should look at
other, not only areas, but regions to be able to build
different Congressional seats and State Senate seats. We
implore you, do not -- do not reduce and water down each
of these wonderful communities' abilities to advocate for
themselves by sticking them and clobbering them together
into one State Senate or one Congressional seat. These
are two unique and special communities that deserve to be
heard, considered, and receive the attention that the
diverse community that live within each one of these
different cities, and counties, and parts of this region
deserve. So we ask you to please separate Fresno and
Kern into different --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MALE SPEAKER: -- Congressional and state Senate seats. It is sorely needed, and the criteria is -- is wholly there for that to happen. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we have caller 9260. And up next after that will be caller 7558.

Caller 9260, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

DR. MATOBSON: Hello, everybody. This is Dr. Matobson (ph.) and I am in Kern County. I have been practicing physician since fifteen years in the Kern County and represent six communities. My opinion is Fresno County should not be linked with the Kern County because they are different with respect to big minority needs. As a minority, we are trying to keep our culture alive among us and merging this will dilute our effects. Please honor the voice of sick minority people in Kern County. And I strongly oppose joining Fresno County and Kern County.

Second aspect, I am the healthcare professional. In the middle of pandemic, both counties have different healthcare needs, so please I strongly oppose joining
Fresno County and Kern County. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we will have caller 7558. And up next after that will be caller 0 - -- 0008.

Caller 7558, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to be heard. I'm sure you've taken great care as a Commission in drawing the districts. My concern is the proposed Madera/Kern District. It is so geographically broad. It's huge, too huge.

Kern County is wonderfully very diverse, but unfortunately there is high unemployment and high poverty. There would be no way for so many -- from so many citizens to have access to their representative. Fresno is over two hours away. The represent -- the redistricting would absolutely disenfranchise many by combining Fresno and Kern, one.

Also Fresno and Kern County have very different needs. They're very different communities, so they need different representation. And with the competition for water between Kern and Fresno, a representative can represent only one of -- of them -- one of the interests
of one County of either Fresno area, or Kern, but not both. It'd be working at cross purposes. There would be a tug of war. It would -- problems couldn't be solved with that kind of representation. We need a congressman or congresswoman who will work on -- excuse me, the specific needs --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- of unemployment and poverty in Kern County. And I thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will have caller 0008. And up next after that will be caller 2079.

Caller 0008, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I'm a long time business owner in Kern County, and I'm strongly opposed to combining Kern County with Fresno County. The two regions have little in common geographically and have no historical or cultural connections. Kern County is a leader in renewable energy and the petroleum industry, two areas that have no shared connection with Fresno, but even our agricultural base is different. The economy and culture of Kern County is uniquely important.

Please don't dilute the communities of Kern County by extending representation into an unfamiliar and
unrelated area of the state. We have much more in common
with Tulare County and the San -- and San Bernardino --
San Bernardino County. Thank you for your consideration
of my comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right
now we will have caller 2079. And up next after that
will be caller 2966.

Caller 2079, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MR. PETERS: Good evening. My name's Phillip
Peters. I'm chairman of the Kern County Board of
Supervisors. I just wanted to call and express my
opposition to the Kern/Madera Visualization. That's map
number 1102, I believe. Fresno and Kern counties are the
number one and two ag producing counties in the United
States. And Madera/Kern Visualization as drawn would
link both Kern and Fresno in the same district, which
would severely limit the rep -- representation for one of
California's largest industries.

There's already fierce competition for water ag in
the Central Valley, which are becoming even more scarce
in the face of the drought as well as the newly
implemented groundwater regulations. Federal funding,
and grant opportunities are becoming increasingly vital
to the survival of the agricultural sec -- sector as well
as the jobs that it creates. And merging these areas into one Congressional district would pit our two biggest agricultural regions -- regions against one another.

Additionally, according to an economic diversity index by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Fresno County is more than twice as economically diverse as Kern County. So with Kern Coun -- with California's continuously evolving economy, it is essential for Kern County to diversify its economy, especially with nonwater intensive industries, which would put us squarely at odds with the Fresno area with regards to attracting logistic-based companies, renewable-energy producers, and other industries that have low-water impacts. And lastly, Bakersfield is California's ninth largest city --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. PETERS: -- by population, while Fresno is the fifth largest. And as much as we value our neighbors to the north, Kern County would not be well-served by sharing a Congressional representative.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 2966. And up next after that will be caller a 3755.

Caller 2966, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi, my name is Molly (ph.). Thank you for the monumental task of redistricting for all Californians. I live in Fresno County, and the Congressional maps in the City of Fresno still need some revisions. There needs to be a Congressional seat in Fresno from south of Shaw Avenue and west of the 99 to ensure that our Latino communities are represented.

Currently, the City of Fresno is divided up and it is muting our Latinos' voices and votes. This would allow our Latino community to have representation in this great state. I would like to see the lines drawn to allow for two seats in Fresno. One that includes our Latino areas just south of Shaw and west of Highway 99. That would ensure that our Latino communities stay together since we have similar interests. Our Latino community must have the ability to have our voices heard by being able to elect a candidate that represents our needs. Thank you for your efforts and for your time. Have a good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will have caller 3755. And up next after that will be caller 1526.

Caller 3755, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Hello. My name is Martin (ph.). I'm
calling from the Clovis area in Fresno County. I'm a first generation Mexican-American, a really proud son of immigrants that I got to see my parents earn their right to vote, and I'm deeply concerned about what the Congressional map proposal does to their voting rights, to my voting rights, to our voting rights, and just general community interests.

I love being from the Central Valley. Our county fairs, the rodeo, our farm communities, the dairies, you know, all of our lakes. Our places are really a special place that -- that I think a lot of us love calling home. Our community is a sort of community that gets up at 5 a.m., toils under the sun, you know, we deal with cold mornings, and we feed our state, our country, and the world. And while products from the Fresno area, and Tulare area are being represented globally, these maps really don't even represent us federally or -- or locally.

I'm really worried about how these maps have combined our areas with Kern County. For those of us from here, we're pretty surprised to find that those raised in the shadow of the Sierras and downtown Fresno skyline are now being combined with Kern, which is a great county, but they're very unique in heritage and even in their energy industry and -- and other
backgrounds.

It's also very far away. I mean, if you've ever dealt with the Central Valley fog day, that three hour drive is probably four. And I'm thinking just about what it means for living and representation day-to-day is really important. As our current maps stand, combining our half of Fresno County and having most of Tulare County as part of our district is not only fair, but ensures neighboring voters have easy access to their representatives. California should for this year a clear example --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MALE SPEAKER: -- with our maps. And I think we do that by pursuing compactness, by creating districts that really take into consideration that at the end of the day, a lot of us, no matter where we're from in the state, we want to just vote with our neighbors the people that we've grown up with --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MALE SPEAKER: -- and we really want to continue doing that. So thank you and have a good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will have caller 1526. And up next after that will be caller 3384.

Caller 1526, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute by pressing star six. One more time, caller
1526, if you would please follow the prompts to unmute by
pressing star six. The floor --

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. MARIE: Hi. Okay. My name is Sarah Marie (ph.). And we're going to be talking -- I'm going to be
talking about California's water-related issue.
California often faces water-related issues. And as a
member of Kern County, I believe if Kern -- Kern and
Fresno County were combined, the -- the representative
would have a hard time trying to get water to both
counties having to favor one or the other. This would
create unnecessary division and conflict. These counties
should remain separated just so we can get fair water
quality, and no one's being favored over the other.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right
now, we will have caller 3384. And up next after that
will be caller 1535.

Caller 3384, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute by pressing star six. And one more time,
caller 3384, if you will please follow the prompts to
unmute at this time by pressing star six. Hello, 3384, I
do apologize. There's a connectivity issue. If we do 
have time, we will try to come back.

Right now, we have caller 1535. And at this --
after that will be caller 5716.

Caller 1535, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute. The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello, my name is Carrie (ph.). I 
live in the City of Fresno. I am a Mexican female. And 
I've looked at the proposed districting of Fresno, 
Clovis, Bakersfield, and the whole Central Valley. And 
I'm very concerned that the representation for the 
Mexican community, which is largely in Fresno, and South 
Fresno will just be diluted. We won't have any 
representation. We will -- our interests would be 
diluted. We won't be able to get anything done. We're 
already suffering here, and we're trying to get better 
education, better resources.

And by pitting us into these areas, we'll be pitting 
against one another buying for resources with other areas 
that are distinctly culturally, and physically, and 
distance-wise, different than what we currently have. We 
already have enough issues. We don't need to bring in 
other counties that are completely different and do not 
share the same interests.

So I really implore you to please reconsider this
new districting. If you're going to do anything, we need to have our Mexican and Hispanic community have at least fifty-plus percent representation wherever you can do that. Otherwise we are just -- we will have no voice. So thank you very much on addressing --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

FEMALE SPEAKER: -- these issues. And I hope that you take everything that we're saying here tonight to heart. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we will have caller 5716. and up next after that will be caller 2771.

Caller 5716, if you will please follow the prompts.

the floor is yours.

MR. MINTO: Thank you very much. Hello, Commissioners. I am the mayor of the City of Santee. My name is John Minto, and I'm focusing tonight on Senate District 38. I agr -- agree with Commissioner Sinay and -- about the not separating communities of a common interest such as Hillcrest, Normal Heights, and Kensington.

I've had the opportunity to live in all of those districts, so I know they're very different from what we have in East County, San Diego. I want the Commission to keep our inland San Diego County united to continue
working with social, transportation, and business issues. These collaborations have existed for more than sixty years, and we are stronger together.

And regarding the comments about the City of Santee by the Partnership for the Advancement of New Americans, also known as PANA, there's no reason to separate East Counties of El Cajon and Lamesa from Santee. I worked in the community of City Heights, which is where they're from, for more than a decade with a variety of community-based organizations to address social issues. Contrary to what was said, all of the communities do share many everyday needs.

I would like to invite the people from PANA and the other callers who obviously don't know the true Santee to visit the City of Santee and me. And anybody that has any questions about our community, which is a vibrant, wonderful community, to give me a call. Thank you very much for your time. I know because I have to do redistricting how hard --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. MINTO: -- it is, and I appreciate you for being here, and taking the time to listen to everybody. Have a good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will have caller 2771. And up next after
that will be caller 6778.

Caller 2771, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. And one more time, caller with the last four digits 2771, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. I would like to state that I'm a resident of Kern County. I work at the northern tip of Kern County, and it shares the border with Tulare County. I urge you to reject the idea of combining Fresno County with Kern County because as many have said before me, the communities are entirely different.

I would also like to point out that Kern County has a vibrant aerospace industry that it shares with the county to the north -- or to the south of us. It makes no sense, and it appears to be illogical to combine two counties that are separated by two other counties and have no geographical border and share no natural common community together. It would make it difficult for a representative to have to commute and represent such a vast and huge area. And it makes me wonder why, why in the world is Fresno County being combined with Kern County. Why would that even be proposed? I'd like everyone to take a long hard look at that. Thank you
very much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 6778. And up next after that will be caller 0597.

Caller 6778, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

MR. MUSSER: Yes.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

MR. MUSSER: Thank you. My name is Don Musser. I would like to add one more voice to the opposition to combining Bakersfield with Fresno. I live in Ridgecrest and it's a two-hour drive to get to see the representation or to have them come to our community. That would add another two hours to that drive. And you would be disenfranchising about 40,000 people in the Ridgecrest area. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. All right, now we have caller 0597. And up next after that will be Caller 8423.

Caller 0597, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you. My name is Cassidy (ph.) and I'd just like to say that in regards to the redistricting proposals, that while I see the logic in combining Fresno and Kern counties together, it's
necessary to see the clear differences within the community, two Korean culture that affects them today. So I ask that the committee, please bear this in mind when drawing Congressional districts and keep the two separate.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will have caller 8423. And up next after that will be caller 1898.

Caller 1- -- caller 8423, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MR. MARTIN: My name is Wallace Martin. I'm the former vice mayor for the City of Ridgecrest and in Kern County. Prior to that, I was with the Department of Defense here with our naval weapon base for about thirty years. So I'm very familiar with the -- with the area.

While I appreciate the need for this mandated evaluating and fine-tuning of a few lines based on demographic changes in ten years, as we all know this is never a time for any partisanship of any kind. And this representation exercise is simply for the good of all the people in California. And in that regards, I'm very thankful for your efforts in having to tackle this.

But of all the things considered, these map changes in my opinion are highly unusual and unprecedented. I
strongly object to the current discussion of chopping up Kern County significantly and incorporating us into a county that's four hours away. To me, this is preposterous. For decades, our representatives in Congress and the legislature have been from our county seat in Bakersfield where it should be. This new map redistribution would further alienate us from our representatives, and I see absolutely -- see no need whatsoever for these dramatic changes. And we need to all ask why is this even being proposed. Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we will have caller 1898. And up next after that will be Caller 6373.

Caller 1898, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing -- the floor is yours.

MS. NEWMAN: Thank you. I appreciate you taking the time to hear my concerns about the Commission's decision to combine Kern and Fresno County. And forgive me, I did not introduce myself. My name is Sandy Newman (ph.), and I am a resident of Fresno.

Fresno and Kern have much different history and culture that -- and -- that I think would be misrepresented if the districts were combined. For that reason, Fresno and Kern should be separated. Thank you
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. All right. Now we will have caller 6373. And up next after that will be caller 9919.

Caller 6373, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. Thank you for allowing us to voice our concerns regarding these new districts that you guys are drawing. I want to express -- first of all, my name is Daniel (ph.). I'm from Fresno.

And like many others, I want to express my concern for the division of our Hispanic communities here in Fresno. Right now as the visual -- Visualizations of our Congressional districts are showing, Fresno is being divided into three separate Congressional districts and being pulled and tugged away. And I -- I feel that it really harms the representation of our Hispanic communities. And I feel that in looking back at those that the Commission can make districts that are a little bit more representation -- represent -- representative of our current districts that we have now, where areas west of 99, Highway 99, and south of Shaw are grouped together. Our cultures are similar, and we -- we just asking that the Commissioners honor that and provide us

for your time and your effort.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. All right. Now we will have caller 6373. And up next after that will be caller 9919.

Caller 6373, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.
representation that the Hispanic community deserves.
That's all I have to say. Thank you for your time. And
y'all have a great night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right
now, we will have caller 9918. And up next after that
will be caller 6688.

Caller 9918, if you will please follow the prompts
to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. How are you?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Wonderful. Please share
the -- your -- the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you so much. I wanted
to thank the Commissions on their work on these maps, but
I would like to bring attention to the area of Fresno. I
would like to bring in that the splitting of the
district, the way that you guys are doing it, or -- or
the way that it's going to be proposed, it's going to
take away a lot of the Hispanic vote, and that's just not
fair. I feel that this should be drawn into two seats,
that Fresno, that should be Fresno over the -- I
apologize. That Fresno should be under (audio
interference) --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: It would appear we lost
our caller. Right now, we will be going to caller 6688.
And up next after that will be caller 3187.
Caller 6688, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I called -- I've called a couple of times now. But I -- I feel like it's important that our voice is heard. I live in Santa Clarita. I've lived in Santa Clarita for twenty-five years.

And I'm getting a little concerned when I hear the callers call in and talk about the similarities and how we share water with Simi Valley. And it -- it's -- it's not. We don't. If we were going to go into Ventura County at all, it would make more sense to incorporate the areas of -- of Fillmore going out that way and Piru because we do actually share waterways with them. Then it makes no sense for us to get -- to connect to Simi or incorporate Simi into our district.

This is a -- this is a pol -- this is a political play. It's a ploy from the California GOP. They're really putting pressure on the City of Santa Clarita. And I have to tell you that the City of Santa Clarita really has no standing in this whatsoever. They've spent taxpayer dollars, hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer dollars to not district our own city. So our city council members serve an at-large community and they have not districted at all. So they have no standing.
here. They need to sit down.

The other thing is the map that you have right now, the VCD AVSCV 1102 where it combines Santa Clarita and the Antelope --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- Valley community is -- is a -- that is a very favorable map. I -- that map is representative of our district. It incorporates part of the San Fernando Valley, which a lot of our commuters from Santa Clarita --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- actually commute into the San Fernando Valley and into Los Angeles. There are very few that go to Simi. So I would appreciate it if you would put forward the VCD AVSCV 1102 map. And thank you for all of the work that you're doing on the Commission. We appreciate you. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you -- thank you so much. Right now, we have caller 3187. And up next after that we will have caller 3989.

Caller 3187, of you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I'm calling from the City of Fresno and as part of the Latino community, my concern is there is currently three Congressional seats
in the City of Fresno, which is diluting the Latino vote. With drawing two seats, it will ensure Latino precincts to stay together. Given the similar interests, I urge the Commission to continue working on the Congressional map. Thank you so much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will have caller 3989. If you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MALE SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I just want to start by thanking you for all your hard work and for all the hard work that's going to come. My name is Rahul (ph.). I'm calling in from Long Beach. I would like to express my deep disappointment in the Congressional maps that were released this week. My community and I have been following this process very closely and we're interested in staying together. We have been consistent in asking to stay in -- intact -- as intact as possible. And I probably had the largest community engagement of any city in the state.

We don't remember a single Commissioner giving directions to split us in half. This -- this puts us back to pre-2011 levels when the first independent redistricting commission united most of our city in one Congressional map. We used to be very gerrymandered
prior to the last independent commission. And now this
Commission might make things even worse for us.

So please don't let that happen. We think keeping
Long Beach together is a reasonable request that reunites
our residents, business community, nonprofits, racial-
justice groups, and other community-based organizations.
Please restore the Long Beach maps to the way they were
before. Our city needs to be kept together East and West Long Beach work together. We
share downtown, a port, a university, and a school
district. So thank you for just recognizing our
comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now, we will have caller 6054. If you will please
follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The
floor is yours.

MS. MARTIN: Hi. My name's Margaret Martin (ph.).
And I'm the former public health nurse for Kern County
Department of Public Health in Ridgecrest. I object to
any major redistricting, trying to chop up Kern County,
and integrating us into Fresno.

Fresno is four hours from my community of
Ridgecrest. Bakersfield and Ridgecrest, being part of
the same cou -- county, we share major medical services
and hospitals. Separating us into different Senate
Districts or Congressional Districts with Fresno would unfairly put our at-risk community and our disadvantaged community enter further risk with lack of understanding of our community issues and inadequate representation. Please consider what is best for my community and leave Ridgecrest and Bakersfield in the same district. Thanks so much for giving me this -- a chance to give my input. Thanks so much.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Katie.

I'd like to thank all of the callers this evening. I'm happy to report that we were able to get through all of the raised hands.

Also want to thank all the callers who have called in not only tonight, but yesterday. We will also have public comment again tomorrow.

To date, we've received over 10,000 community of interest input as well as public input since June. So I think the Commissioners should feel pretty -- pretty proud of the outreach. And we want that to continue, so please continue to call in and provide your feedback.

With that, I'm going to close the lines and we're going to go to Executive Director who will read the motion, and we'll do a vote on the motion, please.

Executive Director Hernandez.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes, Chair. Oh, what
happened here? One second. Okay. So the motion is to approve the line draw direction provided on 1023, 1027, 1028, 1029, 1102 with edits provided. And we'll --

CHAIR LE MONS: You can do the roll call.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes. Begin the vote.

Commissioner Sadhwani. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Anderson.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner
Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: The motion passes.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you very much. So I'd like to thank all the Commissioners. We will be recessing for the evening. Thank you to the staff. Thank you to all of the support. And we'll see you all in the morning at 9:30. Have a good evening.

(Recessed at 7:20 p.m.)
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