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PROCEEDINGS

November 30, 2021 11:00 a.m.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. Today is our public input/line drawing meeting, where we'll be focusing on Los Angeles County, Orange County, and San Diego. With that, we'll -- Ravi, can you please take role.

MS. SINGH: Yes, Chair. Thank you.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Presente.

MS. SINGH: Commission Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Kennedy.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Sadhwani. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Present.

MS. SINGH: And Commissioner Toledo.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Present.

MS. SINGH: You have a quorum, Chair.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

So today, we'll be focusing on the Assembly, specifically our regional focus is that of South and East Los Angeles working Southward to Orange County and then San Diego. Our focus will be and we'll start off with the VRA district in Los Angeles County. Those -- those districts will serve as an anchor. Each one of them certainly will have an anchor of their own, but the district themselves will serve as an anchor from which we will -- we will work through the rest of that area.

We've allocated three hours for Los Angeles. We may need a little bit more maybe, but we will be able to come back if we need to. We've allocated two hours for Orange County and San Diego. We plan to take public comment at
5:30. We do have a lunch break between 2:15 and 3 p.m. And -- and so we'll start with the VRA districts in Los Angeles. So I'm going to ask Commissioner Fornaciari to -- to -- who's been helping with -- with putting together the framework for today, he and Commissioner Sadhwani who will be joining shortly to -- to give us an overview of the VRA districts with, of course, our VRA council. And so may the line drawers please put up the -- the map for -- for Los Angeles County.

Okay. So we have Los Angeles County in front of us. Jaime, can you go over the VRA districts for us once more?

MS. CLARK: Certainly. One moment, please.

CHAIR TOLEDO: We're actually -- since we have Mr. Becker on the line, maybe Mr. Becker can -- can give an overview of this area for us from a VRA perspective.

MR. BECKER: Sure. What -- what we found is applying the three Gingles preconditions, the first one being that a minority is large enough and geographically compact enough to form a majority in a district, and the second and third being that the minority votes cohesively to prefer particular candidates of choice and that the rest of the voters vote cohesively to oppose those same candidates.

We found these yellow areas are areas of Voting
Rights Act concern, and they mainly are in the Eastern part of Los Angeles County working towards the San Bernardino and Riverside County lines and the Northern part of Orange County and -- and the Santa Ana area, which you see down there. Yeah, there you are.

And these are all Latino areas, with the exception of the -- I want to make sure I get the name of it right -- the West San Gabriel Valley, WESTSGV district, which is an area where Asians meet the first Gingles precondition. This is the only area where Asian voters appear to meet all three Gingles preconditions, but they do so very clearly here in this West San Gabriel Valley area of Los Angeles County.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you very much. Commissioner Sadhwani, do you want to give an overview? I know you've been working very -- and -- and Commissioner Yee as well have been working through the -- the VRA committee to -- to think through this area. Is there any -- any framing that you would like to give the Commission at this point?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, there is. I'm sure that there is. Apologies. I'm running in from my other job.

Commissioner Toledo, have -- have -- you went through generally the -- I had the run of show for today. Would it be helpful if I also went through some of the
priorities that were identified yesterday, which -- in which VRA was, of course, the number 1 concern?

CHAIR TOLEDO: (Audio interference). Sorry about that. My mic was not off. That's exactly right. So if you would go through the priorities. We just did the run of show. We didn't go through the specifics.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it. And was that -- was that docu -- was that PowerPoint posted?

CHAIR TOLEDO: It has been. Yes, it's posted.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: It has been. Very good. Neal, do you by chance have that up? I apologize for my not being entirely prepared here.

So there is a document then that should be posted and in it, it -- it kind of gives -- through a run of show for today as proposed, in any case. Of course, our focus here is the Assembly starting in Los Angeles. I really want Commissioners to focus here on what are the priorities -- priority changes that you would like to see.

Yesterday, we spent a couple of minutes going through, and every Commissioner had an opportunity to share some of their top priorities. I was taking notes. Chief Counsel Pane was taking notes. And what we captured here is -- is in this document.

Almost all Commissioners said that VRA districts
were their -- were their -- were a top priority. So I
definitely want to focus us there today and really begin
to work out some of the kinks. In particular, there
were -- there was a lot of concern about the Gateway
cities, that we get those areas right, in addition to the
NELA district, which is not technically a VRA district,
but we've certainly received a lot of communities of
interest feedback on that area.

I have argued in the past that I think starting in
NELA makes a whole lot of sense. It's the central part
of -- really of Los Angeles County in many ways. And I
think the changes that we might want to incorporate in
NELA are going to have an enormous impact potentially on
some of the VRA districts there. So I would -- I would
push us to think about starting in the NELA area and --
and try and make the kinds of changes you want to see
there.

Lawndale and South L.A. was certainly identified as
an area. Also, again, non-VRA area. Not necessarily, in
any case, a VRA area, but an area of -- of key interest
that Commissioners raised. And certainly a lot of
interest for the border between Los Angeles and Orange
County.

You can see here in the document, I had bolded VRA
districts NELA, Lawndale, South L.A., border between
L.A./OC. That's not to suggest that other areas that were mentioned weren't of importance or anything like that, but, for example, the West San Gabriel Valley was identified specifically on the Congressional maps, and today our focus is Assembly.

Simi Valley, Moorpark, San Fernando Valley is more of that Northern portion of Los Angeles, and so I would argue that we should not start there, but instead start -- start in that Southern region because we're going to be working our way further South.

Just to highlight, there were also -- there were also pieces raised around Van Nuys and Sherman Oaks and the POSO area, Malibu and the splits in West Hollywood. My -- my sense is we should start with the NELA and the VRA districts. NELA is kind of up against all of those VRA districts, and so I think what we -- what we have in that region will set off some ripple effects throughout the rest of the map.

Before we leave today, there's also a -- excuse me -- a slide for the Southern California priorities as well. So please take a look at that as we continue to move further South. Before we leave today, I think what's really important is that we identify the key changes that we have all agreed upon, some of that which we are going to do live here today, but also document a
list of priorities.

The way that we anticipated this -- this process to work was that Jaime and Sivan are key mappers for Los Angeles and the rest of Southern California will go back tomorrow and will be working off-line behind the scenes on whatever our priority list is that we don't get done today.

So to the extent that as Commissioners, if we can clearly articulate and identify what kinds of changes we want to see and have general agreement from all Commissioners that this is a priority that we want Jaime and Sivan to work on, that's a key piece, unlike the visualization process that we were doing earlier on where Commissioners would all give their own personal priorities and then it would lead to maps with all sorts of changes that we didn't necessarily agree -- agree with here.

Here, I think to be efficient with our time, I would ask that we -- that we really think about -- about what it is that we can all agree upon and send Jaime off with that list. And Commissioner Fornaciari and I will try our best to the bullet point those as we did yesterday, and we can review them at the end of the day before we go to public comment.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Excellent.
Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Anything you would add, Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Nothing except perhaps some more attention to the San Fernando Valley. I know that didn't come up yesterday in people's punch lists, but it has come up in the past. So that's all.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

So Commissioner Sadhwani, just thinking about these priorities, are the ones that are -- and I'm -- I'm asking because I'm not clear right now. Are the ones that are bolded the -- the ones that rose to the top? We have the VRA districts NELA, Lawndale, South L.A., border between Los Angeles and Orange County. Is that -- is that why they're bolded?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, that's correct. And as you can see, I identified the Commissioners who mentioned them in their -- in their two minutes of priorities. A lot of Commissioners also said, I agree with everything that's been said, so it might -- it might be even higher than this. I did my best to capture it, and my apologies if I didn't get everyone's completely to the tee, but I was -- I was doing the best with -- with the two minutes that -- that people had to share.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. And I take it the -- the recommendation from the Committee is to -- to start with the VRA districts. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That's correct. That's correct.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So we just did a overview of the VRA districts. Thanks to -- to you and Mr. Becker. So with that, we'll go into closed session to review our -- our VRA strategy, and then come back -- under the litigation exception, and then come back to -- to the public and -- and provide an update on that.

So with that, we will recess to closed session.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 11:13 a.m. until 12:55 p.m.)

CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are in -- we're coming back from closed session under the pending litigation exception. No actions were taken. We are going to be going on to the Los Angeles region. If we can get the map up. Excellent. We have it.

And so we will be starting with the NELA area which abuts a VRA district, or districts, I should say, and does have VRA considerations. With that, we will begin the process of going through the -- the visualization feedback.
Is there any Commissioner that has feedback on this area at this point, in terms of the NELA district?

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thanks, Chair. Yeah. I'm -- I'm glad we're starting here because I think this NELA district, it is right up against all of these VRA districts, and so I think as we continue to think about our VRA considerations in other areas of -- of Los Angeles County, I think this is a really great place to start.

Certainly throughout the -- the -- this whole year, right, from summer, and certainly in response to the draft maps, we've heard a lot of communities of interest testimony in this region. And so in -- in this area, I -- I would be curious to hear what others are thinking, but certainly I wanted to uplift some of the testimony that we've received from Eagle Rock and Glassell Park wanting to be a part of this district. And I -- I'd love to be able to explore options for bringing those into the NELA district.

I think that if we were to pursue that, it -- it certainly would put us way overpopulation. This district's already somewhat overpopulated, so I think we need to start to explore what would come out. I know in the past, and I think this was my own -- my own
preference, was keeping Boyle Heights and East L.A.
together.

But I think that there's -- that -- that we had also
heard testimony from -- just in the last couple of weeks
about the possibility of -- of wanting to decouple
those -- those two -- two regions. And I think that
would be an -- an option to explore, but I'd be curious
to hear others' thoughts if we were to move in that
direction.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Any other feedback on this area?
Okay. I think I'm hearing that consensus in the room.
Commissioner Sadhwani, could you please create a
direction on this?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Direction on this area for us to --
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure, sure. If there's no
other conversation, yes. You know, I -- I -- I think for
me, what I would like to see is -- is what would happen
if we started to move Eagle Rock and Glassell Park into
the NELA district, and then what -- you know, perhaps
Jaime, I know you've -- you've had hundreds of hours
working on this map. I'd be curious to get some of your
thoughts on -- on areas that we might want to explore to
remove.

Certainly I want to be cautious and conscious of the
communities of interest testimony we've received in other areas. I think in this -- in this region, you know, we're certainly right up against to the East some of the -- the COIs that we've heard from the LGBTQ+ communities as we move further South.

There's been a number of -- of -- of COI inputs surrounding school districts and other historic communities that are -- are connected through economic -- their economic and socioeconomics and other access to services that have been mentioned. So I -- I'd love to just kind of explore how to -- how to -- what -- what the impact of -- of making that change would be.

I'll also just raise, you know, just to the -- to the West -- excuse me, East of this district, we're obviously up against our one VRA district where we have an obligation for the Asian-American community. I would -- I -- I'd be curious to hear others' thoughts on that district. To me, that's looking pretty good, pretty solid. So I would want to make sure that we keep that intact.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So your direction at this point is to add Eagle Rock to the -- to the NELA. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And -- and Glassell Park.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And Glassell Park.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And those are both -- both neighborhoods of the City of Los Angeles, and it would make sense to have them included in the NELA district and then possibly removing Boyle Heights, maybe even portions of South -- South -- like, that Southern region of downtown L.A. And -- and I think we'll have to think through how to -- how to take those out, and I -- I'd be curious to hear Jaime's thoughts on some possibilities there.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Jaime, do you have any feedback on that, or any thoughts on -- on the impacts?

MS. CLARK: Yes. Thank you.

So this Southern area of the NELA district is where there's higher population density. So if we were talking about removing Boyle Heights and, you know, some Southern parts of downtown Los Angeles, absolutely there would be room in terms of population for Eagle Rock and Glassell Park.

I do believe you would have to incorporate some other areas as well. And just sort of looking at, of course, city boundaries and just the location of other areas. You know, potentially moving Silver Lake in or other areas sort of on this Northwestern boundary of the NELA district as -- as Commissioner Sadhwani mentioned, sort of to the South and East up against areas that are
currently the Commission is looking at VRA considerations in those areas.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: The inclusion of Silver Lake would make total sense to me but would be really curious to hear what other Commissioners think.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's hear from Commissioner Kennedy, Sinay, and then we'll come back.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I think it was fairly early in the process where I was looking at East Los Angeles as potentially a -- a Northern anchor for what I was calling a 710 corridor district. And I do see some -- some linkages between East L.A. and the area to the South.

Now, we've got -- we've got both the 5 corridor district and the Gateway cities district sitting in -- in what I had initially envisioned as a 710 corridor. So I -- I'm -- I guess the -- the most logical at this point would be to see if it helps us at all to put East Los Angeles in the 5 corridor district and be able to rotate any population from there to elsewhere.

As far as downtown, we have heard community of interest testimony suggesting that we look at taking all of downtown or -- or at least part of downtown and joining that to, I guess, it was the 110 corridor district. So you know, that I would be supportive of as
long as we're not breaking up too many other communities of interest.

I'm -- I'm -- I would have to say, and I've -- I've spoken before, that I think Silver Lake probably should be grouped with Hollywood and West Hollywood. I'm opening to hearing -- open to hearing others' thoughts, but that's my initial take on that. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks. You know, we did receive a -- a significant amount of input recently around kind of NELA and -- and -- and some ideas, and it was -- what I appreciated from the input was the diversity of players who -- who kind of -- who engaged showing that there was some consensus among the neighbors.

And the idea was, as you were saying, kind of East L.A. being an anchor and going North, you know, El Sereno, Highland Park, Mount Washington, Cypress Park, Elysian Valley, which I think -- I believe is all in that district already, and then adding, as you said, Eagle Rock and -- and Glassell Park, but also Taylor Yard.

According, you know to the -- to -- to the COIs, they were kind of looking at the Southern border of Glendale. That -- from the 2 to 5 to the 110 to the 134,
but I'm not sure what I meant by 2. Is there a 2 out there? Yeah. I'm, like, somewhere along on my notes, I messed up, I think.

MS. CLARK: The 2 freeway runs --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. so there is a 2 freeway. Whew. Okay. So anyway, that was kind of the notes I took from -- from all the COIs in that area.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Any other comments on this area? So for this district, the NELA district, Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, no. I was going to ask can we start seeing what those numbers look like if we can start? Because I heard we're interested in starting East Los Angeles and going up. We heard Eagle Rock and Glassell Park, which I'm interested in, but we also heard perhaps maybe Glassell Park with Hollywood. So if we start looking at some of the numbers and see how it begins to change, we can kind of know, you know, what we can do.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And are we --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Silver Lake --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- able to get data on --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'm sorry. Silver Lake --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- on this --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- would probably work.
CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Jaime?

MS. CLARK: Yeah. Just -- just a moment while I explore those changes, please.

So the area that's selected right now is just the neighborhood council areas for Eagle Rock and Glassell Park. It is about 56,000 people. And then, again, sort of depending on what areas you are looking to move out of NELA, then this is not enough population to have -- to have, like, a equal -- equal-ish change in terms of deviation.

CHAIR TOLEDO: How much -- how many people are in the Boys -- in the Boyles area?

MS. CLARK: One moment. I can pull that up, but I need to remove this selection and -- and grab that for you. So one moment, please.

So the area that's selected, which does have a little bit of population up here, so not quite the Boyle Heights exact neighborhood council boundary, but I can adjust it as needed, of course. But the highlighted area is just shy of 84,000. So it's -- it's 83,915.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Turner, do you have your hand up? Okay.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Just rolling back a bit, I wanted to affirm Commissioner Sadhwani's -- I just wanted to --
Commissioner Sadhwani's question about the WESTSGV VRA district, and affirming, yes, I think that looks good. Probably want to keep that pretty much the way it is. If we do make these changes to NELA, I would be interested in possibly being able to combine Little Tokyo, Chinatown, Koreatown, Thaitown. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Does the data pic -- Commission Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I was just going to -- a question for Jaime. I mean, I think in response to Commissioner Yee, can you envision a way of doing -- making -- removing Boyle Heights? It looks like we would still need more population if we were going to get Eagle Rock into the NELA district.

If we started taking from downtown Los Angeles, are there ways that we could do that that could potentially also respect as many of those AAPI COIs as possible? I know you've looked at the AAPI COIs in the past. I -- I -- I think I put you on the spot at one point asking for this same file, so I -- I know you're familiar with those.

MS. CLARK: I will turn on those COI layers in this area so we can all take a look together. So let me look at my long list of layers here.

Okay. So right now, in blue, turning on Thaitown.
In green, Chinatown. This purple one is Historic Filipinotown. In red, I'm going to -- I'm going to clear the selection so it's easier to see. In red, this is Little Tokyo. And, of course, here in pink is Koreatown.

Thinking about these changes, I think that trying to unify Little Tokyo and Chinatown together with Koreatown and Historic Filipinotown potentially triggers, like, a really big redraw of not just sort of these -- these districts that we're looking at, but potentially -- potentially a much larger redraw that I think could potentially impact the South Bay areas, South L.A., potentially Long Beach, just if we're -- mostly -- and -- and of course, there would potentially be some wiggle room here in the Gateway areas.

I think that with a change that is being discussed just for the NELA district in terms of moving areas from the Glendale-based district into L.A., it would certainly be possible to keep -- to still keep Filipinotown and Koreatown together, to keep Little Tokyo and Chinatown together. I don't know that it would be possible to unify all of them just because the population here in the NELA district really is down here South of -- excuse me -- South of the 10, and then also sort of right here. This is really, like, the most densely populated area in -- in this district.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum. Thank you, Jaime.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I was just going to ask Commissioner -- so it seems, though -- as though, even in our draft maps, we have divided some of those -- those COIs but kept some together, right? They're -- they're not all -- all -- not all -- what was there was four of them are not all in one district. But perhaps if we can do this in a way that continues to maintain keeping together, I think, Commissioner Yee, did you say Chinatown and -- and Little Tokyo together?

You know, I -- I think maybe keeping them with Boyle Heights, if we -- if we end up removing those areas, could -- could be a reasonable -- a reasonable compromise. And -- and I was going to ask, you know, I don't recall in the last -- since the draft maps have come out, we've gotten a lot of COI testimony from AAPI communities.

In other parts of this -- the map, I don't specifically remember a whole lot in these downtown ones, although it looks like Commissioner Sinay has other -- has -- has -- has -- might have -- have some pieces on that.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. What we have heard, and
it was from the same group of people who had submitted kind of this -- this desire to have Boyle Heights and East L.A. kind of be anchors for different districts, not be in the same district, was that -- and this was -- you know, I think it was specifically Koreatown, and -- and they also had called in saying we don't necessarily need to be kept all -- all of us together, but don't split us, meaning don't split Koreatown, don't split Little Tokyo, because that's what's happened in the past.

So they want their community to stay whole and if possible, you know, bring them all together, but not at the expense of -- of this request -- you know, this community request of looking at how can we kind of change the NELA district. I hope that makes sense.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I think so. So then it seems like that would probably make sense if Eagle Rock, Glassell Park came into NELA, Boyle Heights, and that downtown L.A., including Chinatown, Little Tokyo, potentially gets removed.

And then, Jaime, I know that's going to set off a whole lot of other -- other ripples.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So Commissioner Sadhwani and Ms. Clark, we're still missing about 50,000 people if I -- if we -- where would you -- where would you advise identifying those -- those communities to add into this
MS. CLARK: I don't know if that was for me or not, and --

CHAIR TOLEDO: For -- for both Commissioner Sadhwani and -- and yourself. Any suggestions on what -- what areas to -- to add into this district? We've heard a little bit about downtown and also some of the challenges around that. Any other suggestions you might have?

MS. CLARK: Actually, a question that I have is if we're talking about keeping Chinatown and Little Tokyo together and then removing them, that again is a lot of the population of this district.

I'm wondering the Commission's thoughts on still keeping those together, but sort of keeping them with the NELA-based district and, you know, and up -- up to you, of course, and just kind of thinking through the population changes that would be required to make something like that happen.

If you were to remove Boyle Heights and then part of downtown L.A., not including -- not including Little Tokyo, then -- then I think Eagle Rock, Glassell Park, and then some areas here. Silver Lake potentially would fit. There also was a question about Taylor Park and maybe exploring moving areas of Glendale in, and I think that that -- that would be, you know, up -- up to the
Commission's discretion.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay, then Commissioner Sadhwani, and -- and hopefully we'll reach a level of direction so that -- that we can come back with visualizations tomorrow.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, I was just going to re-bring up what I -- what I -- I looked up Silver Lake, and most of the COI testimony we've received for Silver Lake is similar to -- is what Commissioner Kennedy said, you know, to -- to keep it with East Hollywood. The -- so my thought was to look at exploring the part that's South of Glendale, kind of that funky triangle to add more.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I -- I would definitely be open to exploring that and/or Silver Lake, right? Like, Silver Lake and Echo Park have a whole lot in common. Eagle Rock and -- and Glendale South -- South of the 134 have a lot in common. So -- so I think either way would -- both could -- could make sense in such a district.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's -- let's --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I get the question is,
Chair, do you want to have Jaime start making these changes now and then we'll see where it takes us on -- in the rest of the map?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let -- let's just do it now if --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- if it -- if it can be done and then -- and see if we can solidify this a little bit more because this, I think, will impact the other maps.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, exactly. And I -- I think that that's going to set up a whole bunch of changes then that we're going to have to deal with in -- in other areas. So we could potentially work our way through some of that now, and then if there's -- if it comes to things like deviation being a little bit off, I mean, I think those are the kinds of things Jaime could work on tomorrow. Unless, of course, we make a huge mess of things, but hopefully we're not going to do that. I see these as -- as minor refinements.

MS. CLARK: I wonder if it would help the Commission to sort of -- like, if I zoom out the map and talk about maybe -- like, because right -- right now, thinking about these changes based on all of your criteria, I would envision this impacting these five districts, the NELA, Glendale, West Side, potentially 110 L.A. and the North of 10 district.
So if I could maybe walk through what some of those -- what some of those changes would be, and then the Commission could decide if that's something that I should do or, like, that you want to look at and see happen live right now, or if that's something that could be done, you know, overnight, basically for -- so if that sounds okay, then I will talk about what some of that could be. So --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes, please.

MS. CLARK: -- for the -- thank you so much. So for the NELA district, right now we're discussing removing Boyle Heights and Southern areas of downtown Los Angeles. To make up for that population, moving areas from the Glendale area -- or excuse me -- the Glendale-based district, so that would be moving in Eagle Rock and Glassell Park and then either sort of Southern parts of Glendale or Silver Lake. Then this GLENGLA -- Glendale, North L.A. district -- would be underpopulated.

Thinking about other considerations that the Commission has -- or other -- other sort of priorities or wishes that the -- the Commission has expressed in the past, for example, keeping Mulholland as a boundary between San Fernando Valley and the rest of L.A.

Then a suggestion or a -- an option that I think would maintain that boundary would be pulling population
from the West Side District into Glendale/L.A. So kind of zooming in to that would be maybe West Hollywood and Beverly Hills. There's also an LGBTQ COI in this area the Commission has expressed interest in maintaining. Just putting that out there. Yeah. Then the West Side district would be underpopulated.

Here, there would be a decision point, and I would love to hear from the Commission on this whether then to sort of move population into the West Side district from this N10 district. That would be Mid-city, Pico, Mid-city West. Previously -- in previous visualizations, when Pico has been with West Side areas, the Commission has expressed dissatisfaction with that.

So the other option could be to add Culver City and Palms just by virtue of location into the West Side District. Culver City has been an area that the Commission in the past has said -- or has -- has -- it seems like has potentially considered, like, okay to go with the West Side, that other cities in the West Side district -- there's also COI testimony that kind of links Culver City with -- with Venice and Del Ray.

And then that sort of leaves wiggle room for the Boyle Heights/downtown area that we remove from the -- from the NELA area. That could go probably just again by virtue of contiguity with this 110 L.A. district, and
then population could be balanced sort of between these three districts, the NELA, North 10, and 110 L.A.

And I believe that that would -- I -- so I think that it could be complicated to get them all, like, perfectly balanced live. And so that's something, of course, I could do off-line. But right now, just sort of thinking about -- thinking about this area, what the Commission has -- like, the interest of the Commission as you've expressed it in the past and as you're currently expressing it, I think that that -- that is -- that's sort of what this trade would -- or the population trade-offs would look like.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That's very helpful, Jaime. Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Looking at the Boyle Heights as an anchor, and you had said putting it with the 110? Is -- because originally that -- I mean, what the -- the -- the COI testimony was -- that we've received was kind of taking Boyle Heights kind of going to Pico-Union and then going to South L.A. And I don't know if that's -- that's breaking up too many -- too many -- you know, if that works that way or it's better to go the -- in the other direction. So I just wanted to check -- check that since that was kind of what the community had
asked.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Jaime, do you have any feedback on that?

MS. CLARK: I think that an iteration like that could be possible. I can't off the top of my head say exactly what the population trade-off would be. So just sort of thinking through, it would be -- is Boyle Heights and then downtown L.A. area to connect with the N10 district, then I think that some of this area, the, like, Mid-City West, maybe Greater Wilshire, would need to also maybe be moved out because, again, these -- the areas that I'm waving my hand right now -- it's like Boyle Heights, downtown L.A., Pico-Union, Mid-city, Pico. These are some of the most densely populated areas in Los Angeles County.

So it would mean -- yeah. I can't -- I can't say right now what the -- what the population trade would be then to balance between the N10 and the 110 L.A. given the other changes that I just sort of discussed.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I was just going to ask -- I believe we've also had COI testimony, though, that would -- that -- that has linked downtown L.A. and in particular the Skid Row area of downtown L.A. with South Central. So I -- I think it can make a lot of
sense if -- if that region goes towards that 110 -- what
is currently that 110 district as well. So I think I
(indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

CHAIR TOLEDO: So -- so I do think -- I hear Jaime's

concerns about if we start making changes here, we're
going to have deviation problems throughout the map,
but -- but that's actually part of the process, right?
We're going to have -- we're going to -- the refinements
are going to have impacts across the map and we'll have
to think through that. So maybe if we figure out --
maybe if we started line-drawing here and then see what
those implications are and -- and -- and work through
those as we -- as we go.

So Commissioner Sadhwani, I think you had the
direction to add or to -- you know, to add --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yep.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- certain sections. Can you
please --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. I agree --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- give that --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So I think --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- direction?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I -- I think that if we can
start making these changes because also on the priority
list that folks had identified were, you know, the VRA
districts further -- further South from here, the Gateway cities.

And I'd want to get a sense of what some of these changes are going to look like, even if they're -- even if they're a little bit choppy right now. And then, Jaime, if you -- if you feel like if it's feasible or reasonable to -- to do kind of a rough -- a rough refinement of these areas today live, and then we can -- you could always go ahead and do the cleanup tomorrow.

But just so that we have a sense of what we're working with once it comes to re -- renegotiating or rethinking some of the -- if we're going to work on VRA districts, if we're going to work on Gateway communities, if we're going to working in -- in the L.A./OC border, which Commissioners all identified as priorities, I think it would make sense to spend some time now and do these changes so that we can better understand what we have to work with in other parts of L.A. County.

So I think the first change is, yes, if -- if there's agreement from everyone of making this change of Eagle Rock and Glassell Park. I might say for now to -- to do Silver Lake only because it's actually a part of the City of Los Angeles, and then it gets to -- we get to keep the City of Glendale whole. And if people are comfortable with it, perhaps Jaime could explore breaking
up Glendale as an option off-line. Would that --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Would that be reasonable?

CHAIR TOLEDO: So in terms of adding these --

because that's -- that's -- that's a direction, adding

two these communities. Is everyone in agreement with

adding these Eagle Rock and Grissel Park (sic)?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Glassell.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Glassell. Thank you.

I'm seeing no opposition at this point to exploring

this option, and that's what we're agreeing to. We're

agreeing to explore the option. All right. Let's --

let's add that to -- to -- to this district.

And then further direction, Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I would say for now, and

I -- and I hear the -- the back and forth on Silver Lake

versus Glendale. I would say for now is an exploration.

Let's add Silver Lake. And if we're comfortable having

Jaime explore Glendale off-line. I think it also meets

that criteria of not splitting cities where possible

because Glendale is a separate city from the City of Los

Angeles whereas Silver Lake is a neighborhood within the

City of Los Angeles.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Taylor while -- while

we're line-drawing.
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. I -- I agree with Commissioner Sadhwani. And I think I would -- based on COI testimony and -- and transportation hubs, especially since we have that 134/2 corridor that Glendale South of the 2 is a similar community as -- community of interest as Glassell Park.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I -- I agree with that completely, Commissioner Taylor. I mean, do you feel comfortable with just for today keeping Silver Lake but then potentially having Jaime explore the -- the South Glendale area off-line? Would that be --


COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Perfect.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So we'll capture that. And then any communities to remove, Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And -- and then I think the removal -- and Jaime, you tell me how the mapping system works. If it's better to now deal with the GLENNLA at this point or if it's better to deal with the -- like, removing Boyle Heights and that downtown Los Angeles part that we --

MS. CLARK: I think that -- you know, for example, if I was doing this off-line at home, I would probably deal with the, like, Glendale one and then --
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it.

MS. CLARK: -- kind of go from there, personally.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. So -- so -- so let's do that, and we'll know that we're -- the goal is to get to Boyle Heights and -- and downtown L.A. remove -- removed from the NELA district.

MS. CLARK: Right. And -- and with the knowledge that if there are any glaring deviation issues, and that's something I can work on off-line --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Perfect.

MS. CLARK: -- to kind of clean up any --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

MS. CLARK: -- anything.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I think here you had suggested that this would be an opportunity to bring West Hollywood in with Hollywood and Beverly Hills. Is that correct? And -- and I think the nice part about that is that -- is that it is, you know, in conjunction with -- oh sorry, my lights just went off here -- in conjunction with communities of interest testimony that we've received.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Just want to hear from other Commissioners as we work through this. Let's see, we have -- Commissioner Taylor, do you have your hand raised?
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I do not. I'll lower it.

Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez. And also I'm curious to hear from Commissioner Vazquez, too, and Akutagawa and others.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, I did -- Commissioner Sadhwani just brought up one of -- one of my higher priorities was West Hollywood to unite that with Hollywood. So if that's possible, that would be great.

Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sorry. I want to go into -- I guess I want to just ask a different question. I know that the conversation has been about removing Boyle Heights, but I don't recall hearing anyone say anything about possibly removing East L.A. instead, and perhaps looking at pairing East L.A. with the -- with either the Gateway cities or -- or -- or the 5 corridor cities. Is that -- is that -- is that something that would be -- could be an option?

CHAIR TOLEDO: At this point, we're visualizing, so it -- it certainly could be an option if we're -- if -- if -- if visualization allows. Commissioner La Mons.
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah. I just wanted to support starting with Glendale and -- and potentially being able to add the West Hollywood back in -- well, not back in, but in with the communities to the West. So I like this direction that we're going in. Maybe if we could try it and not go off in another direction before we try it, that would be great.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

That's -- that's great. And that's helpful. So let's go back to that area and -- and incorporate those communities if we have consensus.

MS. CLARK: So this change which would be moving West Hollywood and Beverly Hills into the Glendale-based district, the Glendale-based district would still be underpopulated. It would be almost negative seven percent deviation. If the Commission wishes, I can make this change and, you know, look -- look at it later or, you know, work it out now, whatever is your preference.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's -- let's hear from Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I do think that -- that change is good. I just wanted to remind us that we started with using East L.A. as the anchor for this district and the changes based on significant community of interest input that we receive from throughout San Diego, and also, you
know, that Glendale should be part -- you know, with the Wilshire District.

And so this is a lot of different COIs, but I don't want to -- I want to just address what Commissioner Akutagawa said is that we purposely have chosen this -- this going North for East -- East L.A. because that's what the community had asked us to explore. Well, they didn't ask us to explore. They asked us to do it, but we're exploring. And then Boyle Heights going East. And that was part of a full request.

If we do this, Jaime, is it possible -- you had mentioned the Mulholland Drive line, the infamous line, would that help us be able to improve that or we still need to think through other parts for that?

MS. CLARK: For Assembly, the border currently is on Mulholland, so -- and it would not -- it would not impact -- this change would not impact that.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. You know, I read COI testimony, one, that said Beverly Hills with this GLENNLA district is not a good -- I mean, completely polar opposite types of COIs.

I did also read COI testimony that it -- while it would break up the San Fernando Valley a little bit,
that -- the greater Toluca Lake in Studio City -- City neighborhoods could be and would be also another option potentially that would unite an LGBT COI and as well as including West Hollywood in -- in this district would be a way to unite some LGBT COIs based on some of the COI testimony that I read.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

All right. So in this area, we're incorporating -- so at this point, we have highlighted Beverly Hills.

MS. CLARK: Yes. And West Hollywood.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And West Hollywood. Just looking for consensus from this group.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I'd like, Chair, if we can give Jaime this direction, we can then see what else is around it and we can always come back to it. But for now, I think it's a good -- I like the direction we're going in.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So is there con -- is there anyone opposed to moving in this direction?

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I -- I would just not like to see Beverly Hills in this. I -- I -- I do -- I -- I think just not -- besides the COI testimony, I mean, they are very -- I mean, Beverly Hills is a very, very
affluent community and -- and different economically from
the larger GLENNLA district that we're looking at.

MS. CLARK: If I may.

CHAIR TOLEDO: We can't hear you, Jaime. Maybe
you're --

MS. CLARK: So keeping Beverly Hills with the West
Side area, that would mean that the GLENNLA-based
district would be underpopulated by negative 13.58
percent. I think that that potentially would -- I think
that the trade-off there is that it would be, instead of
Beverly Hills, probably having some of this, like, Mid-
City, which, you know, with -- with Beverly Hills, it was
still almost seven percent. So probably the Mid-City,
Greater Wilshire, and Koreatown areas going with the
Glendale-based district instead.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I was just going back to COI
testimony again, flipping through, because there's also
COI -- you know, I guess the challenge we have is the ,
of course, conflicting COI testimony sometimes or kind of
frequently. But there's also COI testimony that's not
wanting West Hollywood with Hollywood. So because to me,
starting with West Hollywood then moving into Beverly
Hills, but if we don't go that direction. I don't know.

Let me keep reading.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

What about Burbank? I -- I know that Burbank is in the East San Fernando Valley. Would that dismantle -- that has -- okay. I -- I -- I would be interested in just, Jaime, what your thoughts would be on that.

MS. CLARK: So moving Burbank in would -- I think that -- I think that, ultimately, a -- an impact of moving Burbank in would definitely be crossing Mulholland. If you really didn't want to cross Mulholland, then it would -- unless it was, like, a redraw of the whole state and kind of moving things, like, up through Northern California everywhere, then it would probably impact also where the split would be in Eastern Ventura.

I am not sure, but it would potentially split the Piru/Oxnard COI here just for population purposes. Again, really not a hundred percent sure about that. And then would need to pull area into the Malibu district. This would then either mean, like, Santa Monica, Beverly Hills, et cetera. Then the West Side area would still be -- would then I think be underpopulated, and you would have to maybe move into this, like, Hollywood area that -- it seems like the purpose for this would be to

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Jaime.

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

Jaime, if could you just also click -- and I guess you might have to commit the West Hollywood for now and back it out later, but I'd like to see what happens if we -- if we had -- if we added both West Hollywood and Silver Lake to the GLENNLA district. Thank you.

Okay. So we've gotten much closer to five percent.

Thank you.

MS. CLARK: And also the -- the NELA district would still be overpopulated, so you would -- yeah -- would still need to sort of trade out population there.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And we've just been adding, not subtracting yet. Any direction for subtraction?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Can I jump in?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, Commissioner Sadhwani. Sorry. I didn't see your hand. My screen looks a little different.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No worries. Yeah. I mean, I think the direction there was that we were going to do downtown L.A. and Boyle Heights out, but that -- but
Jaime's suggestion, like, working in one direction and -- and working back around that -- that kind of counterclockwise was -- was better from a mapping perspective. So I think -- I think -- I think that direction is still there.

I -- I had originally raised my hand, though, around the question of Glendale again. And again, as I said, the Silver Lake/Glendale piece, I could see it going different ways. The Glendale to Beverly Hills and in there potentially including Mid-City West and Wilshire, I -- I -- I don't think we've actually gotten that much COI testimony from Glendale. And please, someone let me know if that's not correct. I -- I -- I am not advocating because I've lived in that area.

I'll just talk about it a little bit and others hopefully can chime in, too. There's a lar -- large and sizable Armenian population in Glendale. I -- I -- I don't know what their preferences are. We haven't received tons of -- of testimony, from the best of my knowledge. But Little Armenia is in the -- the Hollywood area, actually. So there is an area of Los Angeles that's identified as Little Armenia despite the fact that so many Armenians live in Glendale.

It's very close to Thaitown as well. Also in Glendale, there's a large population -- a sizable
population of Filipino-Americans. And I believe that we had had testimony -- I can't remember exactly where Filipinotown was, if it's still in this district. So I -- I can see -- no, so it's not in there.

So, I mean, I can see connectivity between Glendale and some of these areas potentially. And -- and I think to me, if we started -- if we started here and then later start thinking about making changes up above through the La Crescenta area -- we've talked about this before, North of the 134 freeway, you see a big change in -- in, like, the population density between the -- the Southern parts of Glendale and Northern parts of Glendale.

Going up into La Crescenta and Sunland, it becomes almost more rural in nature as you get closer to the mountains. So I could see if we're going to start making cuts in Glendale that -- that -- that there might be places where it makes sense to do so. But again, I'm -- I don't recall receiving that much COI testimony about Glendale itself. So I think that remains an open question for me.

But I wouldn't be opposed to, you know, continuing in this path of these changes and seeing where it takes us because I -- I think that it can allow us to bring together some of the areas where we have received a lot of COI testimony. For example, the West Hollywood, the
Hollywood, further South. We've had a bunch of -- of testimony about school districts, transportation corridors in South L.A., for example, that -- that it might open up for us to bring together.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So in terms of -- I'm trying to just rough out this district at this point because, as you say, it'll impact all of these other areas. So if we can figure out where -- where to take out some population and give direction in that -- in that regard so that we can start looking at other districts around the area.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Correct. So that's it for me. I mean, I think keeping Silver Lake for now just as a -- just as a general direction moving forward, pulling in -- you know, keeping Silver Lake with NELA for now. And we can put that on our priority list for Jaime to work on off-line perhaps.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And then making the change, I think it was Beverly Hills, Mid-City West, maybe Wilshire all going into that GLENMLA district for now. And again, maybe some changes, whether it's the 134 or further up, making maybe one single cut to -- to the City of Glendale if need be, and then seeing what changes that -- that sets off further South in the map in some of those districts closer to South L.A., working back to
pulling in downtown L.A. into the -- what was it, the 110 district?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum. So it looks like NELA is overpopulated by sixteen percent.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So it would be taking out at this point some area of downtown and Boy -- Boyles -- Boyles Heights. All right.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Boyles Heights. Exactly.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Do you have direction on what specifically you'd like to take out so the Commission can -- can explore that?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think specifically downtown L.A. and Boyle Heights.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Jaime, can you please highlight those areas? And I believe we have Chinatown and Japantown in this -- in this area as well, and we want to keep those whole.

MS. CLARK: I'll turn on the Little Tokyo COI. So and then Chinatown is further North in Historic Cultural North Neighborhood Council.

So Commissioner Sadhwani, if I could please clarify your direction, would it be to keep all of downtown L.A., Southern parts maybe to include -- you know, pre -- previously in this discussion, the Commission expressed
interest in keeping Little Tokyo and Chinatown together.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

MS. CLARK: Okay. Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That's right.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Keeping them together. And there has been COI testimony actually about that Southern region of downtown Los Angeles where Skid Row is and keeping it with areas further South and East -- West, excuse me.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay while -- while we're doing this.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just want to make sure that --- right now there's a little triangle that's going into Little Tokyo that -- that doesn't -- we don't split Little Tokyo.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Just for the good of the conversation, wanting to say that we actually have over 200 comments in regards to Glendale. We've moved from beyond that, so I can come back to it later and talk about that area, but we do have communities of interest testimony there.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Excellent. Thank you.
And we'll take more from Glendale if they want, and everywhere else in California.

Commissioner Sadhwani, is your hand still up?

MS. CLARK: So the area that's highlighted on the map -- and I can definitely sort of clean this up and maybe shoot -- I'm looking for sort of major streets here in downtown Los Angeles. Like, I -- I could try and adjust the line to follow Olympic, for example, or another larger street. But this highlighted area would change the percent deviation in NELA to 2.7 percent deviation.

And I'll zoom out so we can see exactly what that would mean. But so with this, that would be 2.7 percent, which would include Eagle Rock, Glassell Park, the Elysian Valley areas, and Silver Lake and would not include Boyle Heights and Southern areas of downtown Los Angeles.

I believe, if the Commission wishes, there may be room to move sort of some of the Westlake neighborhood councils out, or, of course, with the percent deviation, it would work to keep them.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Jaime, can you zoom in on that little weird cone-shaped thing that's -- where it says Los -- downtown Los Angeles, the (indiscernible)
under Historic Cultural Neighborhood Council. I just want to see the streets. Okay. Okay.

MS. CLARK: I -- I wasn't sure what area you're talking about, but this is --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. It's --

MS. CLARK: -- East --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, yeah. That's exactly where I'm looking at. Okay. That's not necessarily Skid Row. That's more the Arts District up to 7th Street at the very least. And -- and if that were to be removed, what would it do to the deviation? So in other words, can you make the cut off 7th Street?

So then -- so can you -- can you --

MS. CLARK: Right there?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- take in -- yeah. Right there. A little bit more there. And -- and actually you could probably even go up to, like, 6th or 5th Street. So -- so anything West of Alameda, like, below -- depending on who you ask it -- 5th Street going -- I guess on my screen going South, if you needed to -- if you needed to close the deviation some more.

MS. CLARK: Thank you so much for that direction. Currently, so this is the river here and then this is 7th and the 110.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Um-hum.
MS. CLARK: And the Southern boundary here is the 10 freeway. I'm just going to --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Um-hum.

MS. CLARK: -- zoom out. And then all of Boyle Heights. Right here is the boundary between Boyle Heights and the City of East Los Angeles. Removing these areas from the NELA district would make the percent deviation of new 1.87 percent.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Jaime, if you were to -- to take that up to 6th Street, what would it do to the deviation?

CHAIR TOLEDO: And Commissioner Sinay while we're waiting for that.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to see if she can make the -- the box a little bigger, the -- that shows all the different -- what's changing. Yeah, that box. Thanks.

MS. CLARK: I will do that once I select this area.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. When you're able.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So I -- I also realize that in looking at this, this -- it does get into some of the downtown financial district. Sorry about that. I guess I shouldn't have said that wholesale. I think if you -- if you look at Los Angeles Street going West. I'll stop.

Yeah. Okay. So -- so Los Angeles Street West,
you're getting into some of the -- the financial
districts. Also Staples Center, is that -- that kind of
corner. Yeah, right there. That's Staples Center, and
that whole area that goes from probably, yeah, Los
Angeles all the way to the 110 is -- is part of -- more
of a financial and then also now the entertainment area
because of Staples Center. And it's pretty gentrified.
Actually, very gentrified --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.

MS. CLARK: So would you like me --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- as you saw.

MS. CLARK: -- to remove that area from the
election?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think that's a question
for others. I think it -- to me, I think it belongs
better with downtown L.A.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Any other thoughts on that from the
Commission?

Commissioner Sadhwani, Commissioner Vazquez after
that.

If you're trying to talk, Commissioner Sadhwani, I
think you're on mute.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh. Sorry about that. I --
I mean, I could go both ways on that. I -- I think that
area is undergoing so much development and it's putting a
lot of pressure on historic communities that are in that region.

You know, certainly as you go further down the 110, you're going to -- you're going to cross into USC. I don't know which district exactly USC is falling into at this point in time, but the relationship between all of the development that's going on in this downtown L.A., South L.A. area is a concern for -- I believe, for -- for a lot of the historic communities that -- that have -- that reside in these areas.

And certainly there's been a lot of COI testimony about the economic development and -- and the socioeconomic status of -- of communities throughout this region. So I could see -- I could see making the case for it to stay in downtown L.A. But I could also certainly see the case for making it connect further South.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's hear from Commissioner Vazquez. Our deviation will be very good. It's a 0.42, if I'm seeing this correctly, for NELA.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I could also go both ways. I think maybe my suggestion would be to keep it as is for now, knowing that we may be able to sort of back off or move that particular, like, slice of downtown L.A. someplace else if it makes more sense down the line.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Any other feedback from other Commissioners? If not, we're going to lock it in.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Can -- can we just pull back some so I can see where we are --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. Let's pull back --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- Jaime?

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Jaime.

MS. CLARK: Sorry. I (audio interference). I can revert it. So based on the change that I just made, the NELA district now includes Eagle Rock, Glassell Park, Elysian Valley, Silver Lake, and does not include Boyle Heights and downtown L.A. South of 6th Street. And the percent deviation of this district is now .42 percent.

CHAIR TOLEDO: It's a very solid district in terms of deviation. Any other feedback on this? Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I mean, I definitely like the direction that we're going with the NELA district. You know, I -- I -- I certainly hear Commissioners' concerns about the Silver Lake piece and -- and potentially Glendale. And I would keep that on our -- our list of take-homes for Jaime for tomorrow just to explore -- to explore some of what -- what may or may not be options for -- for those areas. But I -- I like the look of this. Obviously, it's setting off a bunch of
ripple effects in other areas that we now need to clean up, but I'd be curious to hear what others are thinking.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum. Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa. Commissioner Yee after that.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Jaime, can you zoom in again on that Southwest corner, the Westlake South area of the map and -- and that Staples Center area again? I just want to take a look at that again. Okay.

Okay. I -- I was just -- my other thought was -- and -- and I was just -- anyways, it's okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I just wanted to push ahead and think about, okay, so when -- where are we going to get population for GLENNLA? And it looks like it basically has to come up from 110 L.A. somehow through N10, right?

So I'm wondering, Jaime, if you just can -- if you have any -- any imaginations that -- suggestions you can offer right now, maybe you can start thinking about those.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And I think Commissioner Turner was looking at COI data for that area as well. So I don't know if she has any -- any input on -- on the COI data. Glendale area? Oh. Commissioner Sinay has some -- some
COI information as well.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, earlier you had mentioned Culver City and that -- and there's been -- you know, Culver City is an interesting COI when you read through all the different ones. But moving Culver City to -- yeah, moving it up to I guess it would be -- would it be to the N10 that you had mentioned earlier or to the GLENN? Sorry.

MS. CLARK: So --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I couldn't remember exactly what you said.

MS. CLARK: -- if we -- if you wish to explore moving into N10, then there would be, like, point contiguity. It's -- it -- it's contiguous with the West Side --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

MS. CLARK: -- district.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. Then we would need to --

MS. CLARK: So we would need to move it --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm sorry.


COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. Oh. And it's at negative. Okay. Perfect. Yeah. So that was --

MS. CLARK: Should we explore --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- kind of -- the --
MS. CLARK: -- that now?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. Depends on what my
colleagues say. Sorry.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you -- can you remind me what
the -- what your direction, your proposed direction is?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Taking Culver City and moving
it to the West to the West Side.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you highlight Culver City for us?

MS. CLARK: And Palms --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner --

MS. CLARK: -- neighborhood --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Akutagawa, do you have any comment
on that?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I -- I mean, I'm -- I'm
reading the testimony. It's -- it's -- it's kind of one
of those, you know, transition kind of -- it could go
either way.

MS. CLARK: So right now, what's highlighted on the
map is Culver City. This change would make Culver City
whole, and the ADWESTSIDE District right now is split at
the 405. And then also including Palms neighborhood,
again just to keep your districts contiguous, this would
make the ADWESTSIDE District 9.69 percent deviation, and
the 110 L.A. still be over population. It would be 13.92
percent deviation.
Just kind of zooming the map out a little bit. So the ADWESTSIDE district would need to lose population, and also there is opportunity, I think, for there to be, you know, other changes if you wanted to also kind of use the N10 district, which right now has a really high pop or relatively higher population, or deviation. It's 3.99 percent. So there, I think, could be an opportunity to lessen that and then to sort of move -- move population around sort of throughout these districts.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Any concern with adding --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Culver City? Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Because I think Culver City -- there's a lot of testimony that speaks about Culver City being in (audio interference) with West Adams --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- and Ladera Heights. And I'm wondering, and so that's -- period. And in addition to that, I'm wondering more about West Mid-City moving into the area, or maybe up there, yeah. And the Wilshire -- I'm looking -- I'm looking more to the North to move over as opposed to some of these areas. We've lots of COI testimony about keeping Culver City, Mid-
City, West Adams, you know, down that -- Crenshaw Quarter and then going on down into those areas, so I'm just looking for other opportunities to not move Culver City out of the COI.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's look at other areas at this point. And your suggestion, Commissioner Turner, would be to --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Mid-City West.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you -- can we get Mid-City West highlighted?

MS. CLARK: Yes. And -- and where would you like to move it to? To the Glendale-based district?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: GLENNL -- yes.

MS. CLARK: So this change would make the GLENNLA district's percent deviation negative 1.31 percent. It would make the N10 percent deviation negative two -- or excuse me -- negative 8.27 percent deviation.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Negative eight. Is everyone com -- comfortable locking this in? Any concerns about locking this in? Commissioner Sinay, then Sadhwani, and then Akutagawa. No concerns? Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. No, I don't have any concerns about that. I -- I think, Jaime, when you had kind of walked us through some possibilities in this area, I think you had suggested, you know, to move into
GLENNLA the possibility of Beverly Hills, Mid-City West, Wilshire in order to populate GLENNLA which then opens up opportunities further Southward to keep some of those COIs together. Is that -- was that correct?

MS. CLARK: I apologize. I -- I missed the last -- or the first part of the last sentence that you said.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: The first part of the last --

MS. CLARK: So to do what South? Oh, to move the boundary of N10 Southward?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: But well, yeah. If we moved Mid-City West, Wilshire, and Beverly Hills into GLENNLA because right now it's under population. I thought -- I thought that you had suggested that that might be a way of kind of moving population so that we can ultimately get back and reorient this district further down the 110 L.A. that's overpopulated.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, yeah. And right now, again, it's overpopulated by almost twenty-seven percent.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Um-hum.

MS. CLARK: So --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So can you walk us through, like, if we were to go in that direction, what -- can you just -- what -- I know you did this once before, but could you -- could you just walk us through that one more
time? So if we did Mid-City West, Wilshire, Beverly Hills into GLENNLA.

MS. CLARK: Mid-City West, Wilshire, Beverly Hills into L.A. Then moving Beverly Hills out of the West Side district would leave the West Side district underpopulated.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right.

MS. CLARK: So then we would need to pick up population from somewhere. That could be Palms and Culver City.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Um-hum.

MS. CLARK: Could be -- and -- and, you know, sort of looking really just at these districts here that the Commission's been working on so far. Another option would be to start at, like, Pico, Mid-City, et cetera. And previously in visualizations, the Commission has expressed not wanting Pico and these areas to be with the West Side.

So that kind of would leave Culver City and Palms as part of it. And then -- and then to balance district here in N10, one option could be to try and grab some of this Westlake area and include that with the N10. It could be to include Westlake with N10. I think there is some flexibility here because it's so densely populated that it wouldn't necessarily be a geographically really
large change.

If you did not want to include Culver City --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, and it could be -- you know, and this is just something for -- for my colleagues to consider, right? We've talked about this notion before of sharing the pain where a -- a community of interest may not be kept together in one set of maps such as this Assembly.

Perhaps it can be kept together in a Congressional or Senate map if -- if we -- you know, because I think there has also been testimony about Culver City being kept with the West Side as well. So it could be the case that that perhaps it split from Ladera Heights here but another -- in another map, it's not.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's hear from Commissioner Sinay and Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sir, I'm going to go back to Boyle Heights because in looking at the -- the COI testimony, it's very clear that Boyle Heights wants to go East towards Pico -- Pico Rivera. And so I'm just -- what? West, sorry. One person said East, and ever since then, it's got us all messed up. West. Thank you. To Pico Rivera. And I'm just concerned that going South is -- is -- we're not listening to what the -- that most likely, the community would want it to stay with East
L.A. if we -- you know, I mean, is there a way for Boyle Heights to -- to go in that direction versus South or -- or is this another share the pain?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Akutagawa and then Commissioner Taylor. And then we'll see if we can answer that question.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Jaime, could you --

CHAIR TOLEDO: And lunchtime is almost -- it's almost lunchtime, too, so let's try to -- Commissioner Akutagawa, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Just Jaime, could you zoom in on Mid-City West? I just want to see what is included in that area. Can you zoom in more?

MS. CLARK: So Mid-City West includes, like, the Grove. This is La Brea.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MS. CLARK: And then roughly bounded --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MS. CLARK: -- by Olympic in the South and then, you know --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MS. CLARK: -- up against Beverly Hills and West Hollywood --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Yeah. So it includes, like, the Beverly Center as well as Cedar Sinai
Hospital as well, too, I think, if it's -- yeah. La
Cienega, or maybe not. Okay.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. Cedar Sinai is right here, so it
is --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MS. CLARK: -- in -- it is in Mid-City West.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Yeah. Because I --
I -- yeah. That -- this little area here is -- of course
I'm waving my cursor and you can see it. Okay. I -- I
just wanted to get a sense of where we are.

Just another question in terms of this GLENNLA. We
haven't really explored it, but what about going, you
know, to the -- to the North part of GLENNLA and looking
at, you know, like, some of the mountain communities. I
read some COI testimony that also spoke to some
affinities and alliances between La Canada Flintridge
and -- I don't know what's that other city -- that other
little space. It's an unincorporated area next to --

MS. CLARK: La Crescenta.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, La Crescenta. I -- I
did see some COI testimony about Glendale and also
Burbank, but I -- I -- I understand that we can't move
Burbank. But I'm just thinking if we were to go to the
North and include La Crescenta and La Canada, then we
could -- would that -- I know the ripple effects would
probably then go East, but would that also then give us more options, or are we blocked in?

I know there's several VRA districts in that -- you know, in that Eastern San Bernardino, L.A. -- Eastern L.A. and -- and San Bernardino/Riverside border. But just the thought in terms of, you know, your perspective on that if we go North for GLENNLA.

MS. CLARK: That question, I think that if we pulled population from that area -- so the very Eastern 210 area -- or excuse me -- Western 210 corridor area, that would I believe -- there's a couple options, of course. But maybe split Victor Valley. Or kind of would need -- because of these areas where there are VRA considerations would need to pull from this Victor Valley-based district. So that, you know, if not Victor Valley itself would need to pull area maybe from Big Bear area.

If that was underpopulated, then I guess it depends on the route that you wanted to take in terms of balancing but could either cause really big ripple effects or really big population swaps that, you know, potentially would have San Bernardino and Inyo together, for example. Pulling part of Inyo County or all of Inyo County South potentially would require splitting Antelope Valley and then would impact -- would impact the rest of San Fernando Valley as well.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Jaime. Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes, thank you. And sort of not to leave Commissioner Sadhwani hanging, so when -- when -- I think of the share -- share the pain, I think that we -- we're drawing district lines consistently throughout the state so we're doing what's best for the entire state, so it's going to -- it might hurt equally throughout.

I -- I would hate for us to -- to fall into maybe the -- the -- the trap of having to repay a given area or community because we drew another district in a certain way. So I think that we draw them all individually in that -- it -- it -- to draw the best maps possible for that given -- for that given area. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Appreciate that feedback, Commissioner Taylor.

So we will be going to lunch now. It's 12 -- 2:20. I -- I'd appreciate it if all the Commissioners -- I know you're already doing that -- would take a look at the maps as -- during your lunch when you have some time after -- after you eat and give consideration of what other changes you'd like to see in the maps.

We are hoping to get through Los Angeles and -- by the -- or at least the sections of the Los Angeles that
we have outlined in our run of show by the end of the
day. So let's -- and getting into San Diego and Orange
County. So -- so let's take a lunch and -- and maybe you
guys can think through -- look through your testimony and
your notes and come back with some direction for the line
drawers. Thank you. So we are in recess for lunch
until -- it's a forty-five minute lunch.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 2:21 p.m.
until 3:05 p.m.)

CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California
Citizens Redistricting Commission. We're visualizing
in -- in Los Angeles region. I just want to remind
Commissioners that we are trying to get to decision
points here. At this point, we have NELA visualized and
I am hearing that Jaime is working on -- on trying to --
to implement some of our vision across the districts.

At this point, I'm going to take final direction on
this area, and then we will move on to the VRA districts
because the VRA districts is where we want to spend some
of our time just to make sure that we are -- that the
districts reflects our -- our thinking and -- and vision
for this area and -- and the COIs that are represented.
And if that's the case, then we will -- we will take
direction on those areas.

So any further direction on -- or discussion on the
districts that we're at this point? And Jaime, it would be helpful to -- if you could just give us a little bit of -- any further direction that you might need before -- so you can work on these during overnight.

MS. CLARK: Yes. Thank you so much for that question. I'm going to move the pending changes box away just to kind of look at it a little bit better. I think that -- as the Commission's goal is to balance all of these districts, I think -- and -- and because the Commission in this meeting and in previous meetings has touched on all of these areas, I think that I would be comfortable trying some options -- trying some options out for you, keeping in mind some of the discussion that has been had today surrounding these areas, and kind of working with the general framework that is here right now if -- if the Commission is comfortable with that, of course.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. And is there any other feedback regarding the discussion -- any -- any decision points that we might need to make that would be impacting these areas at this point before we move on to VRA?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Just -- just food for thought. There is a -- a Jewish community in that Mid-City West Neighborhood Council area, and I -- I think
being --

CHAIR TOLEDO: So --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I don't know if it --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Just to -- sorry to interrupt.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yea.

CHAIR TOLEDO: But just to try to stay high level and on the decision points that -- that we had been -- we'll come back to -- to minor refinements, but any -- any of the larger issues that we have been looking at in terms of decision points? Commissioner Fernandez, do you have any?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I -- I don't know if this falls into it. Because it looks like you're possibly going to go into the ADWESTSIDE, and I just remember quite a bit of -- of input that we received regarding coastal communities staying together. So it looks like some of this might be broken up. So I'm not sure what our direction is going to be for that, but I just wanted to make sure that I highlighted that because it looks like we -- we may be going into that.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thanks.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And we may need to break up some of these communities in order to implement the vision that we've had. And we -- we don't want to do that if we
don't have to, but we may need to.

All right. With that, let's move on to VRA District. Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I was just going to -- that's fine. I was just going to ask if we need to try to solve the GLENNLA district right now. So thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So -- so we -- Jaime is going to take everything we -- all of the information that we've -- she's gleaned from this conversation and from past history and try to reconcile it all and trying to come up with some options for us for tomorrow that will hopefully help us work these issues through and get us to refinements, or rather for Thursday. So soon. We're going to get them soon and -- and work through them.

But for now, let's move on to the VRA districts as we are trying to work through the VRA districts and into Orange County and hopefully end up in -- in San Diego. So you know -- actually, Jaime, can you focus us on the VRA district, the map?

And I think this is just a question for -- for the whole Commission. So you can see all of our VRA districts at -- at -- at this point. Any -- any -- is -- is the Commission comfortable with these districts or are there certain refinements that we want to make to these
areas?

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Are we sticking to North of L.A. or -- or are we looking at the border as well with Orange County?

CHAIR TOLEDO: So right now we're looking at the VRA districts, and so -- the highlighted VRA districts and staying within the VRA districts, of course, unless we need to shift them around.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: But -- but it's the VRA districts. They might morph a little, but still it's the yellow VRA districts.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. I -- I think I'm comfortable with them. I still feel that the 85 corridor is high. And -- and I'm curious at some point to look at kind of the 85 corridor going kind of end up Fullerton into the Santa Ana -- you know, just kind of thinking through that piece a little bit, and Le Havre, if there's some way to -- to work that all in other.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Are you suggesting connecting Orange County, the Orange area, with --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, I didn't want to say the word Orange County since we're staying in L.A. But yes, I would like to see if we could, you know, use -- you
know, if -- if there is a way to create -- yeah. to work through to Orange County, looking at Le Habra, Brea, Fullerton, you know, or --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Placentia.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Placentia. I mean we'd need to look at what needs to be looked at, you know, how it needs to work, but that would affect, I think, that 85 corridor and the Santa Ana or whatever the SAA1 is.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Jaime, do you have any suggestions on this area right here, the La Habra, La Brea, Placentia, Fullerton area on where that -- that might -- where those communities -- and -- and of course, looking at the community of interest testimony as well.

MS. CLARK: Yes. Thank you so much, Commissioner Sinay for that feedback and Chair Toledo for your question. I think that there would be room to play around with this. It's definitely something that Sivan and I would be happy to do.

Specific situations -- or excuse me -- specific suggestions, because this area there is so much overlap, I -- I would want to work through that with Sivan probably who definitely knows a lot more about all the community of interest testimony, et cetera, in Orange County than I do.

But just from a more zoomed out perspective, just
looking at the -- looking at the make-up of these districts as they're currently drawn, I think that there is definitely wiggle room probably to, you know, potentially move La Habra, for example, into the 8060 corridor.

I think that there's probably wiggle room across the Orange County/L.A. border in these areas and potentially between the 60 corridor district and the 5 corridor district if the Commission is comfortable with sort of, like, blending some of these areas here in the -- the Whittiers essentially, or maybe having Pico Rivera.

So basically off the top of my head, I -- I think that there are options and specific suggestions. I think that, again, because there's just so much overlap with Sivan, then I would want to be able to work through those with her, and would love to hear any specific suggestions from the Commission.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So if there are any specific suggestions, it's time to hear them now. Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Sadhwani, if you can -- if you can focus on this area right now. If not, we'll come back to you. Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. My -- I -- I guess -- I -- I hear what Commissioner Sinay is asking, but I also want to just note that COI testimony does
speak to specifically the -- the cities of Downey and Norwalk, and I believe Santa Fe Springs is in that mix there, too, La Mirada. Those cities particularly being -- I believe I saw one COI testimony seeing -- saying that Downey is the Latino Beverly Hills.

And -- and so generally speaking, and also seeing some affinities also that mentioned Pico Rivera and Montebello as well, too. Are -- are -- are we talking about -- I -- I guess I just want to understand what Commissioner Sinay is asking. Are we talking about breaking this up and creating perhaps another district between the 5 corridor, 85 corr, and 8060 corr? I -- I think I -- I'm just trying to understand what we're doing here now. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So at this point, we're -- we're exploring the possibility of adding these communities that are connecting Orange County with -- with -- with districts, and if there's a potential to add a different -- another district, then we would explore that possibility, but it's -- it's -- if there's a poss -- potential. There may or may not be, and that's something that Jaime can work through.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sorry about that. Yeah. Sorry. I apologize for being on a couple minutes later
here. You know, we received quite a bit of COI testimony
for that Senate Ana district. We're looking at that --
the area along that border. So I think my -- my sense is
that I would be very open to seeing Jaime and Sivan
exploring -- you know, totally okay to come into Buena
Park, La Habra, maybe even parts of Brea.

And for the Sant Ana one, you know, we've gotten
quite a bit of testimony about it -- currently, it's
slightly underpopulated, so raising it up into South
Fullerton. I believe that, you know, as a VRA district,
if we took a look at -- at where populations lie, I think
would make a lot of sense. I'm -- I'm sure we can go
back to some of the testimony that we've received. There
were specific streets and such that were given. I don't
have them in front of me, but happy to -- happy to look
that up for -- for Jaime as some take-home work. Thank
you.

MS. CLARK: I --
CHAIR TOLEDO: Jaime, do you have any --
MS. CLARK: I do have -- yeah, thank you. I do have
a clarifying question since we're sort of talking about
everything in these areas, which is what are our thoughts
on Artesia, Cerritos, La Palma, sort of this whole area
right here? Previously, I'd received direction to keep
Artesia and Cerritos separate from other cities in Los
Angeles and wondering -- or yeah, I guess kind of want to
take a temperature of -- of that right now.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sadhwani, is your hand
up?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, I never put it down,
but I'm happy to give my response to that. You know, I
think -- I think the piece about Artesia and Cerritos is
that it's a mixed area, and we've definitely gotten a lot
of testimony from the South Asian and AMEMSA communities.
Artesia/Cerritos is home to Little India. That being
said, there's also a sizable Latino community.

It's right in the heart of VRA districts, and so
while I would like to do our best to -- to, you know,
uphold communities of interest, I think if it -- if it's
necessary for them to populate our VRA districts, I --
that is our number 2 priority. And I -- for me, I --
I -- I don't want to set any hard and fast rules about
our Artesia and Cerritos if -- if -- if they need to be
used from a -- from a VRA standpoint to meet our
obligations to communities in that area.

That being said, I -- I certainly want to uplift
that we've heard that loud and clear that there are key
communities of interest there. But, you know, certainly
there's a business district there that -- and services
that are serving the South Asian and -- and AMEMSA
communities. But VRA is our number 2 priority.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So quick question for -- for the
Commission is, if it's necessary to break up communities
in order to -- to fulfill the VRA compliance requirements
or to fulfill the -- to create the districts that we need
to do in this area, is everyone comfortable with that?

And of course, we're going to be getting
visualizations. We'll -- we'll get them back and then be
able to -- to make any refinements. But at this point,
do we -- are we okay with giving Jaime the discretion
to -- to -- to potentially break up cities and cities at
this point. Counties, yes. We're actually -- that's the
direction, but -- but cities and little communities here.
So just think about that as -- as we go through.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Okay. I -- I --
I'll be honest. I mean, I'm a little bit torn because I
think -- you know, I hear what Commissioner Sadhwani is
saying. I think, you know, she's right. I mean, we have
to take into account what the VRA districts need to -- to
have to ensure, you know -- you know, that -- that we
meet -- or that, you know, we meet what -- what the VRA
requires.

With that said, I think what's complicated there is
that, to me, there are ripple effects, particularly
Cerritos, Artesia, La Palma, and Buena Park because there's the South Asian AMEMSA communities but there's also a -- a sizable Korean community that are within the La Palma/Buena Park/Fullerton areas, and -- and yet, you know, that connection also to La Palma and Buena Park is also there, too. So I guess that's where I'm a little torn in terms of being able to honor that, but I -- but I also agree with what Commissioner Sadhwani is saying.

I also am -- am -- am curious again. I don't know. I -- I mean, I -- I'm definitely, you know, okay with, I think, crossing the county lines. I think -- at the same time, too, I -- I -- I -- you know, generally speaking, these Assembly districts are not super bad other than the -- the Latino CVAP on 85 corr -- corridor one being, you know, particularly high. But I think we also found that those are very dense areas as well, too, from a Latino population perspective.

So my -- I -- I don't know. I -- I -- I'm -- I -- I think perhaps just giving Jaime the -- the broadest discretion right now might be the best thing. And -- and I'm wondering if -- if people are also willing to restructuring the Carson -- you know, the ADSOUTHLA and ADLBC as well, too, as part of this.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

And then also as part of this discretion --
discretion to -- to potentially build an additional --
well, actually there is -- there -- there'd likely -- I
mean, I don't think there probably is enough population
here for an additional pop -- VRA district. I -- I -- I
think that was in our discussion, but -- but explore
opportunities for that as well.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I did want to see if Mr. Becker
was around to discuss this area and to see if we have
further VRA analysis in this area.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And since we're talking about Orange
County, it'd be good to get an update on that as well.

MR. BECKER: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes, he's available.

MR. BECKER: I'm here. So I've checked in with Dr.
Gall. The -- the way the elections were structured under
the previous dis -- districting plan means these --
it's -- it's impossible, given the elections we've
analyzed to date, to isolate those areas for racially
polarized voting.

It does appear that these areas do not have
consistent concentrations of Hispanics -- don't have
significant concentrations, others much less so. For
instance, if memory serves, La Habra has -- has
significant concentrations of Latinos. So I -- I -- I
believe that these areas very likely still fall under
Voting Rights Act considerations.

But we're -- we're -- we're discussing how to get
more refined analysis on this given the -- that -- that
the previous district just does not allow us much
opportunity to isolate some of these smaller areas from
within particular districts. There are other areas where
two districts overlap, but where they overlap is on a
particular area, so we can isolate those areas a little
easier here. Here, that's -- here, that's not the case,
so it's a little more -- it's a little more troubling.
It's a little more difficult to -- to -- to analyze with
absolute precision.

So I think for now, I think it's likely that this
Northern Orange County area is -- is an area of -- of
Voting Rights Act concerns.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Fernando.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDO: Yes. And if we've talked
about this, I apologize, but the ADSTHLA, Mr. Becker,
could you give me some information on that in terms of
VRA considerations? Because obviously it's right next to
the Gateway and also to the 85 corridor.

MR. BECKER: So we did not find consistently the
three Gingles preconditions in that -- in that area of
kind of South L.A. So we do not believe the Voting Rights Act requires that a particular district be drawn at particular levels.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Can we move the map back up to the VRA districts so that we can see more of them? So at this point, we're working through the VRA districts, and -- and -- and perhaps we may need to take one at a time. Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So I guess based on what Mr. Becker just said about, you know, he -- there's -- they're working on further analysis in North Orange County, I'm wondering if we want to not have Jaime spend her time looking at a VRA district there at this point un -- until we we've got that further analysis. I -- I don't know. I'm just throwing it out there.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Mr. Becker, do you have any feedback on that?

MR. BECKER: So I -- I -- I think the advice right now is that the Voting Rights Act applies to those areas. I -- I don't know that we're going to find evidence that would reduce the impact of that, because given the existing elections that have been analyzed, those areas -- again, we're talking about Northern Orange County, La Habra, Brea, Fullerton and even into that --
in L.A. County, Cerritos likely require Voting Rights Act
c onsiderations, so I think it would be -- it would
probably be wise to do that. If you don't like where you
are on that, we can try to look at additional evidence,
but I think it's highly likely that that's an area where
Voting Rights Act considerations are going to be
significant.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So with that in mind, we should
probably include these in our VRA areas, and if we need
to do further refinement later -- if we get evidence, we
can always do that.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I was just going to
ask a question of Jaime, here. I know Jaime, we've gone
through numerous visualizations of this region, so I'd
really like to be able to lean on your experience there.
I'm just trying to think of how do we then cover places
like La Habra and Buena Park? My sense and Fullerton --
and I'll look forward to that additional analysis, but my
sense is Fullerton is -- the covered areas are probably
the South Fullerton area, if I had to wager a guess on
that.

If we're going to try to have coverage over Buena
Park and La Habra, my sense then is that some of the
population needs to shift downwards or the districts need
to shift further down across the Orange County border.

I'm just wondering if Jaime, you have thoughts about how or where to do that? I'm curious about, for example, maybe, like, some place like Glendora in the East San Gabriel Valley district, if we started removing from places like that and shifting populations somewhat further downward, if that would ultimately lead us to a place of potentially covering some of these areas?

Or alternatively, if we had visualizations from prior weeks that you want to remind of us of, that would be helpful, too.

MS. CLARK: Thank you for that question. In terms of the -- in terms of the West San Gabriel Valley and East San Gabriel Valley districts, those two haven't changed all that much over the course of the visualizations. In terms of just population, I think it would be possible to include, for example, La Habra into the AD60 corridor, and keeping in mind trying to keep communities of interest together in these districts. For example, the Commission has heard a lot about Walnut, Diamond Bar, and Rowland Heights, for example. Keeping those together in the AD60 corridor.

I think that there could be some potential lead changes to the East San Gabriel Valley Southern border with the AD60 corridor district. Two, and I would say
also that maybe removing some of these areas, for example, into the East San Gabriel Valley district, could potentially bring down the Latino CVAP of AD60 corridor, so I think that would look at something like potentially splitting Montebello and Pico Rivera, moving -- potentially splitting the Downey, Santa Fe Springs, Norwalk COI, and again that would just be for population purposes and for Latino CVAP purposes.

I think that it would not be difficult to move Buena Park, Artesia, Cerritos areas into L.A. County based districts and still maintain that CVAP. I do think that it could end up coming out in the wash, so to speak, in Long Beach, by splitting Long Beach is just a guess, and I think that without, like, delving a little bit deeper, just because Walnut, Diamond Bar, Roland Heights were sort of out of the mix in these for a while that I don't have -- I don't have, like, a definitive answer for you in terms of exactly what they would end up looking like, but just based on working with the maps so much, that is -- like, if I were mapping this, that is where I would start.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. May I just follow up on that?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So I would say, given that, I think that's really helpful, so thank you and puts things into perspective. I would say VRA is our second criteria, so making sure that we cover those areas that need coverage is extraordinarily important. That being said, hearing all of the potential changes that you just mentioned, for me, two things really stand out, which would be priorities for (audio interference). I'm curious to hear where others fall, but maintaining those -- that COI between Hacienda Heights, Diamond Bar, Walnut, et cetera, which we've heard a whole lot about, maintaining that within a VRA district, even if that means that some of the changes that you mentioned on the Southern boundary of East San Gabriel Valley, if that might mean taking Whittier into play, but instead using La Habra there, right?

I think that those could be potential things, but keeping that COI together, and then as it relates to Long Beach, I think what we've heard is if we have to cut Long Beach, do so in a way that is consistent with some of the testimony that we've received, and so we have heard from the Long Beach folks about potential areas of where to cut, so I would want to try our best if possible, if we have to cut into Long Beach, to do so in a way that respects some of that communities of interest testimony.
We've heard from them over and over again about keeping them together.

I'm open to the cuts, but doing so in a way that's still respectful of those COIs, so those would be two priorities for me as we continue to make those changes in order to meet VRA obligations.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Mr. Becker, I'm just curious. In terms of -- your thoughts in terms of VRA compliance and VRA districts, and the La Habra area, but also even up to Chino Hills, so any thoughts around this point --

MR. BECKER: Yeah, I --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- and our constraints, because we're constrained by total population and contiguity and such.

MR. BECKER: So although Chino Hills and Yorba Linda were in districts where that included the kind of racially polarized voting and all of the Gingles pre-conditions that would encompass Voting Rights Act protections, it does appear that the Latino populations in those two areas is relatively small, certainly compared to concentrations we might see in some of the areas to the West of that.

So I'd want to take a look at how the -- I can't really say for sure that a district would either be problematic or fine with the Voting Rights Act. I think
if we overlayed the Latino CVAP in those areas, we'll see
that the blocks -- block level Latino CVAP is relatively
low in Chino Hills and Yorba Linda, whereas in a place
like La Habra and perhaps some other areas there, I think
areas of Fullerton, perhaps even in Buena Park and -- and
Cerritos will see slightly higher concentrations that
would implicate the Voting Rights Act.

Where if there is an area that was within a Voting
Rights Act district or should be within a Voting Rights
Act district before and is hard to analyze separately,
but where there just aren't concentrations of minorities
that would be protected, it -- it would likely be -- it
would be highly likely to be justifiable to leave those
areas out of a Voting Rights Act district.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. All right. So at this
point, we're exploring COIs that could potentially --
that we potentially want to -- to keep together while we
make these refinements.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: To Mr. Becker's point, I --
would it be appropriate to request to see the -- I guess
the -- the Latino population in these areas? I think --
I think there's a map layer that would show --

MR. BECKER: Yeah, I think it's the -- I don't know,
Jaime, if you are -- I don't know who's controlling the
screen, but if we can get the Latino CVAP blocks? Yeah, thank you. Yeah, so as we discussed, the orange areas, the darker the orange, the more intense the concentration and percentage of Latinos in this, and as you can see, as we get into the Western part of Placentia into La Habra, Brea, Southern part of Fullerton for sure, Buena Park, we start seeing those concentrations.

Yorba Linda and Chino Hills, not very much. A little bit on the Eastern edge of Chino Hills, which may be given those concentrations could be included in a -- maybe the PCO district.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So any -- at this point, we have the COIs that Commissioner Sadhwani mentioned in terms of trying to keep those together if possible while also prioritizing the VRA. Any other areas in these maps or is the silence that I'm seeing indicative of the fact that we are very comfortable with these -- at least the area that is covered under VRA compliance?

Seeing no hands raised, I'm taking that we are very comfortable with this area and the addition of La Habra and some of the Fullerton area, Brea, and Placentia area.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was going to ask about whether it made more sense to add Fullerton to the Santa Ana district, that -- that Southern part of Fullerton,
but I think it would boost the Latino CVAP up a little too high, so I -- I won't ask that. I also wanted to perhaps -- I think if I heard Commissioner Sadhwani correctly, I think there's going to be some shifts from AD60 corridor to AD5 corridor to the gateway, and I'm just thinking that, for example, whether it's breaking up Long Beach and/or perhaps -- I recall from COI testimony that Lakewood and Hawaiian Gardens also could be a comfortable fit with Long Beach, but that would mean breaking up Long Beach to accommodate some of the additional population, but then that would also allow some other shifts.

I'm thinking, like, for example, up in the Maywood, the Bell, Bell Gardens area, maybe that could be also shifted to the AD gateway or perhaps the inclusion of Cerritos in Artesia and some combination of this district may also bring down some of the Latino CVAP in a way that may also help even out some of the numbers there as well, too.

And then I also was thinking about what she was saying about perhaps pushing up some of that AD60 corridor into the East San Gabriel Valley district as well, too, perhaps moving some of -- like, Glendora, I think she mentioned moving that out. That I'm just thinking back to the earlier conversation about GLENNLA
and perhaps instead of going South, we go North.

With the addition of Glendora to that district, that may also help even out some of the numbers without completely dismantling everything, but Jaime, I think the Commission has just given direction to take our inputs and just try to figure out what those options could be.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

I'm seeing that Fullerton does have a -- a potential district line going through it already. My sense from what we've heard from communities of interest in Fullerton, it -- it -- it is a pretty complex place and I think we should not try to -- to treat Fullerton as monolithic. If we need to split it further to -- to really reflect and respect the communities of interest there, I think we need to look at that. Let's not feel obliged to have Fullerton as a single entity as we move through this. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Karin -- or not Karin.

Jaime, are you able to highlight the Fullerton area and the divide that Commissioner Kennedy is speaking of?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: This is Fullerton and without I guess a more specific direction in terms of what area.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you put the Latino CVAP up?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Oh, absolutely.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Because that might help us find that divide.

And then Commissioner Kennedy, do you have any --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Follow up?

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- follow up with that?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes, thank you. So what my sense is that we've heard that Chapman is a reasonable dividing line North/South, but there's also the Korean community in Northwestern, so it could be that the Korean community in Northwestern Fullerton goes with Buena Park, the Southern part below Chapman goes with the flatlands part of -- of Anaheim, and that the Northeastern part goes with Brea, Placentia, and Yorba Linda in -- in another district. That's what's going through my mind at this point or a potentially useful way of looking at where lines might go in Fullerton right now. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. No, I was just looking at some of the input that we received, and it really does get conflicting after a while because you've got some that want Buena Park, Anaheim, Brea, Placentia, Cypress, and then you have some that include Fullerton,
so I think whichever way we go, it's going to be difficult try to accommodate all of the communities of interest.

So I think Commissioner Kennedy's correct, so probably we'll need to maybe break some of these up.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So Jaime, what might be helpful is if you highlight the areas that have VRA considerations at this point and that we include them somewhere, and then you can work through it, just so that we have consensus on the VRA areas.

So at this point, what I'm hearing is -- and you can help me with this. What I'm hearing is Placentia, Brea, La Habra, Southern part of Fullerton, although contiguity may be an issue unless we explore other opportunities.

Buena Park, La Palma, Cypress, Artesia, and Cerritos. So if you could highlight those so that we can get them into somewhere? I know it's going to throw off the deviations, but -- but just so that they're highlighted at this point.

MS. CLARK: Sure, one second.

CHAIR TOLEDO: In -- in the meantime, we'll take feedback from Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I -- I think Brea, if you put the Latino CVAP again, I think it looked like Brea kind of, like -- I know it makes it kind of weird,
but Brea, a little bit like Fullerton, has a section that
is not as heavily -- it doesn't have as -- as big as a
Latino CVAP there, and maybe -- may require potentially
breaking up Brea also and perhaps putting that
Northern -- kind of Northern/Eastern portion to the North
with the Roland Heights, Diamond Bar, La Habra Heights
areas, because they may have -- I know that there's some
commonalities and I think there's been some COI testimony
about that also being an area of interest in terms of a
COI with some of those areas within Diamond Bar and
Roland Heights and Hacienda Heights and Walnut, so.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So what I heard from VRA counsel is
that we should incorporate all of these areas into our
VRA region, and -- from what we offered, and then if
there's additional evidence that area shouldn't be
included, then we can refine those later.

And so at this point, Jaime, if you could highlight
these areas and then we will figure out -- at this point,
we need to figure out where to put them, right, and we
need your help in identifying the best homes for these.

Commissioner Sinay and then Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was just going to say, we've
gone through different iterations of the work that we're
doing, and we cannot go back to visualizing. We really
need to move forward. There are areas that we have
prioritized that still need work, but in other areas, we've spent a lot of time. Yes, we -- at this point, we have 21-, almost 22,000 engagements, and the truth is, we could probably find a community of interest to back anything we want to do, because I still am a firm believer that there's probably over forty million different perspectives on what we're doing.

So it's time we follow the criteria, the one, two, three, four, five, six, and pull away -- use our -- I hate to put it this way, but use our heads more than our hearts. We got to use our hearts and listen and empathize and all that to create the structures we did and the visualizations we did, but now we need to use our heads and follow the criteria and just be okay with it, and we're not going to be happy with every decision, but we need to find a way to work together and move forward, because we have just spent a heck of a lot of time and moved very -- we didn't -- yeah, we -- what we said we were going to do today is not what we've done.

We've gone back to, what about this, what about that. That was visualization. The what-if's are done, so I just ask that we all check ourselves, including myself, and really think through, where does this fall in the six criteria, and are we moving forward? Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That's a good reminder, Commissioner
Sinay, and certainly, the VRA is a number 2 criteria, and we are filling out the VRA aspect of this map, so if -- Clark, if you could -- are these the areas that are -- I believe there's still a little bit of Cypress and Placentia?

MS. CLARK: Yeah, I highlighted the areas that were under discussion. This generally is about Chapman. I believe -- and Mr. Becker, please correct me if I'm wrong, that you had kind of mentioned maybe just the Western part of Placentia. I didn't hear Cypress, but of course happy to look at that, too, and just so the Commission and the public is aware, these cities, the area that's highlighted right now, the total population is about 355,000, and in all of this area, it's about 32 percent Latino CVAP.

So these areas would need to be added to different districts. There's just not the population or it wouldn't meet a VRA requirement, and I guess a question that I have is that is the Commission wanting to adjust some of these potential VRA areas live or is this something that we should go look at home overnight tonight and then come back to you with options on Thursday?

CHAIR TOLEDO: So what we need to do today is figure out exactly what the VRA -- or as much as we can with the
information we have available, what the VRA area is, so
the questions for Mr. Becker is are there other areas
that are not highlighted that should have VRA protection
at this point, based on the analysis that we do have?

MR. BECKER: A couple of points. I think that
likely the area from Placentia and Brea, La Habra,
Fullerton, Buena Park, Cerritos, Artesia -- is that La
Palma? Yeah. Based on the analysis that we have of
racially polarized voting, that that has fallen in those
areas. I think you can make an argument that Yorba Linda
and Chino Hills, probably less so.

What I also want to be clear about is I'm not
suggesting that there is an additional VRA district here.
I don't know if the population can sustain that. I think
that there's a possibility that these are areas that
would be included in VRA districts, in VRA
considerations, but ultimately, this is -- the
highlighted areas, for instance, are not -- it's a lot of
people, but it's not all the way up to an assembly
district, and it's only about -- Jaime, I think you said
only about a third Latino CVAP if I'm -- if I'm
remembering, correctly.

So what I'm thinking here is, likely, if the rest of
the structure is largely going to remain where it is, and
I'm not suggesting changing it, and there's probably not
an additional one here. The concentrations in to the Northwest of this area are just naturally high in the AD5 corridor and AD gateway, so there might be ways to add this -- certainly, looking at AD60 corridor is an area that I would look at pretty closely, and to the Santa Ana district.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Mr. Becker.

Any additional clarification, Jaime, on the VRA areas? Are you comfortable with the guidance that we have at this point to -- to --

MS. CLARK: Yes, yes I am. I don't --

CHAIR TOLEDO: And are you comfortable taking all this information and bringing it back to the Commission in a day or two?

MS. CLARK: Yeah, absolutely, and we will work with your VRA team on these iterations. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So any last final refinements that we might have, small refinements that we might have to give guidance to -- to Jaime as she does her work? Remembering that the VRA is the second requirement and not all COIs might be -- there is a possibility that some COIs may have to be split.

Hearing none, it sounds like this --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I do, I do. Sorry.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, Commissioner Sadhwani --
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, and I do, too.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Are you going in order?
CHAIR TOLEDO: So yeah, let's go Akutagawa, Sadhwani, and Turner.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: All right. That section that's below Buena Park and that triangle between Buena Park and Anaheim, I know that there is a little Arabia COI. Is that part of Anaheim or is that part of Cypress? I'm a little unclear.

MS. CLARK: That is part of the City of Anaheim.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay, because that section there was -- when you had the Latino CVAP up was also significantly Latino. That is in a different district than the Santa Ana district, and I guess I'm just -- I -- I would like to see that also included in what Commissioner Toledo has asked us to look at. It seems like that would make sense to also keep in that same grouping of cities.

And at that point, does it just make sense to also include the entirety of Fullerton instead of splitting it and then the entirety of potentially Placentia in -- in that grouping as well, too, because what you had highlighted before, I know that the previous highlights
did not include enough population, but would that bring
up the population to a point where it could create an
entire district?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I just -- I guess
I'll reup and echo, yes, Jaime, please work with the VRA
Counsel and with Dr. Gall (ph.) on this. I'm not
entirely sure what we're trying to achieve, here. My
understanding of the VRA is ensuring that -- that
protected communities have the ability to elect the
candidates of their choice. It seems to me that there's
a weak or questionable piece coming from Counsel about
this area.

It -- it -- it seems like it's really around La
Habra, I would sense, if it's -- I'm just trying to
clarify what needs to happen, right? So is it that La
Habra needs to be within a VRA district? Is it that -- I
mean, it seems fairly vague what it is that we're sending
Jaime off to do, and so I suppose, yes, please do work
with Counsel.

I will reup my priority areas of keeping those COIs
together of Hacienda Heights, Roland Heights, Diamond
Bar, Walnut, as well as maintaining as much of Long Beach
as possible in order to do so, but it's not clear to me
what it is that we're being advised to do, exactly, but
certainly, it seems like La Habra makes sense.
Certainly, it seems like South Fullerton can go with the
Santa Ana district. Beyond that, I'm not sure what else
we need to do.

Before we move on from Los Angeles, while I have
this turn, I just wanted to also lift up Lawndale. This
is not a VRA district. I don't know if that's going to
get impacted by the other changes that we were looking at
from NELA and that big whole workaround that we were
working on earlier today that Jaime's going to work on
tomorrow, but we definitely heard a lot of testimony over
the last couple of weeks about keeping Inglewood,
Hawthorne, Lennox, and Lawndale, I believe it was, and
someone can correct if I was wrong about that, together.
There were school districts, I believe, that --
that -- that are connected in that area, so I just wanted
to lift that up as -- as a piece. It had also been
raised in some of the priority pieces that we had
discussed yesterday, so I just wanted to raise that
before we moved further South.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I appreciate that. Thank you, and
Mr. Becker, can you clarify the direction? My
understanding of Mr. Becker's statements are that those
areas need to be under a VRA -- under VRA area, so in a
VRA district. Not necessarily in a VRA district but in a protected district.

Can you clarify if that's correct, Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: Yeah. Areas of Latino concentrations appear to be under VRA protections there, as I've indicated before.

I think, if that doesn't -- I think I've given some specific suggestions as to which areas could be included in which districts and the likely fact that there's not another district here.

But if the Commissioners want to call a closed session, you're welcomed to do that, and I can try to answer with more specificity.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I think you're very specific on that. Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I appreciate Commissioner Sadhwani going back to it. I needed to be reminded as well.

And with the changes, currently, the way we have the maps drawn, Cypress is not included with Los Alamitos and --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- Seal Beach, but we also have a significant amount of COI testimony wanting those areas to be together.
So as Jaime is going off considering other things, I just wanted to lift that up again.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And that would that Cypress be connected to --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Los Alamitos and Seal Beach.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. Going back to Commissioner Sadhwani's mentions of Lawndale. If Jaime could perhaps prepare a look at exchanging Lawndale for the Northern part of Gardena.

I tried to look at COI testimony. I didn't see anything that would oppose such a change. I don't know if anyone else remembers anything, but -- so making Gardena whole, exchanging that for Lawndale, that's about an even population swap.

CHAIR TOLEDO: It would work for population purposes --

COMMISSIONER YEE: I know Gardena wants to be with Torrance. Is it -- Southern Gardena want to be Torrance and so forth and it would stay that way, but it would simply add the Northern part of Gardena.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. That's helpful.

Commissioner Turner?

Commissioner Akutagawa?
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I think I want to go -- back and, again, just on the VRA district, I'm now just a little unclear. We're asking Jaime to go off and do all these things, and now we're adding in the non VRA districts.

But specifically, I haven't heard, like, absolute clarity. Are we asking Jaime to -- so one, I heard that counsel had -- Mr. Becker had said that we need to incorporate in some of the areas along the LA, Orange County boarder because they should be within a VRA district. Okay. So that's clear.

85 corridor, it was brought up, is -- do we need to -- are we asking for a restructure of that district? Are we also asking for a restructure of the Gateway district?

CHAIR TOLEDO: So at this point, what we're asking for is for Jaime to take the information around the VRA districts -- the VRA district input that we received, that's going to have some impacts across the region, and she's going to work through those and bring it back to us, recognizing that any minor change has impact everywhere in the maps surrounding them.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I understand that, but what's the goal that we're trying to achieve here? I think that that's what's unclear.
CHAIR TOLEDO: So the goal -- the first goal is to achieve VRA compliance so that all areas that require VRA protection are protected, and, while at the same time, while maintaining the COIs that have been mentioned in tact as much as possible, recognizing that we may not always be able to do so in order to achieve VRA compliance.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Yee?

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

So for example, if we are asking Jaime to incorporate La Habra into an existing VRA district because we don't have sufficient population to create another VRA district, then we would potentially or hypothetically be looking at incorporating La Habra into the AD60 Corridor district.

And then because we have underpopulated districts in both West and East San Gabriel Valley to the North of it, looking at where we might take some of the surplus population that we now have as a result of incorporating La Habra and shifting that population into the West and East San Gabriel Valley districts. Is that a reasonable interpretation of where we're going?

CHAIR TOLEDO: That's very reasonable --
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- and that's very accurate. That any -- these changes will have some impact across the VRA areas and the surrounding areas.

And as Commissioner Sinay has mentioned, we've visualized many of these things. We have various iterations. We've had discussion on all of these regions. And Jaime is going to attempt and do her best to try to honor as many of the COIs as she possibly can as she does this. And so we're going to trust Jaime and their staff, and each other, to work through these. And of course, we'll get them back and we'll look at them and refine them as needed with smaller refinements.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

Commissioner Fornaciari?

We're at the VRA districts. It seems like we've given direction to the line drawers in terms of bringing us back.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Perfect. So then I think it's a question for the Commission. Do we want to continue looking at VRA districts? We're looking at the one right now in orange. Do we want to continue and just skip over to San Diego and do any clean up on those VRA districts that's in San Diego first, or do you want to work through Orange County working further down, which is
perhaps what I would suggest.

What I seem to recall was that the VRA district in San Diego, that Chula Vista one, was looking fairly good. But you all can be the judge of that if we want to lock that in first before we start making changes throughout the rest of the Orange County and Downey areas.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Since we've been look --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Chair?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I had my hand up.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, sorry. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Before we move on -- yeah.

So I just want come back to what Commissioner Kennedy said about West San Gabriel Valley and East San Gabriel Valley. My understanding is that we were pretty comfortable with the West San Gabriel Valley, so, I guess, I just want to make sure that we heard, like Commissioner Sadhwani said, about Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar and Walnut.

I want to make sure, and I just want to lift up or reiterate, you know, the COI testimony that we've heard quite a bit now from Monterey Park, San Gabriel, Alhambra in particular, as well as, if possible, San Merino, Arcadia, and Temple City, you know, keeping them together.
And so as any other ripple effect changes are being made, I just want to just make sure that we try to keep that as in tact as possible, in terms of the being a VRA district as well, too.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Yes.

Commissioner Fornaciari and then Ms. Clark.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I guess I have a question for Ms. Clark. You know, considering the changes we're asking you to look at in North Orange County, is it worth, at this point, trying to go through the rest of the districts in South Orange County, at this point in time. Or, I mean, how far do you see the impacts rippling down? Or do you even have any idea at this point what that might look like?

MS. CLARK: Thank you for that question, Commissioner Fornaciari. I think that -- and again, this is kind of Sivan's area, but I think that, from a zoomed out view, I think it would be possible to more or less kind of maintain some of the changes mostly to the Orange County-based districts. Just in thinking about where your other areas are that have VRA considerations and some of the wishes that you have that you've expressed in terms of the structure of some of the districts. I do think that they could, kind of, mostly be, almost like a clock or something, in terms of those changes.
And I know that Sivan might be able to guide you through this a little bit more before you move to Southern California. So that Sivan can be working off of these exact same maps that I am, I would need to just quickly pause to export our files, and the she could load that up. So if I may, then perhaps the Commission could discuss what you would like to do next while I kind of pause here to send these files to Sivan.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So we do need to take a break to be able to get Sivan if we're going to move on to Orange County and San Diego.

But in the meantime, let's just take Commissioner Sinay's question or a comments and then give Sivan an opportunity to be able to get her screen up and prepare for the next round of visualizations.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I'm feeling the need to continue to look at the VRA districts to the East before we go any part of Orange County or San Diego because all of that informs, kind of, the work that needs to be done. And I know that our agenda didn't have it set up that way, but I'm just feeling a little anxious that if we don't start here we may need to -- the work we do in other places may be for naught.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Which areas are you speaking of in
specific?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Imperial and San Bernardino VRAs.

There's a lot of VRA districts here that really define what we can and can't do. And so I would like to see us, you know, kind of like we did with LA and Orange County, say, okay, we -- this VRA district is looking good. The structure is good. There might be some cleaning up to do. But that allows us to then know what we have to work with to fix what some of the communities have asked.

I think a big one is -- well, they're all kind of big, but, you know, just that whole conversation around Coachella Valley.

But anyway, I just think that we need to stay focused on VRAs.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Any thoughts from the Commission? Sivan will be covering both of those areas, so she covers both of those areas, so she's able to do either. But I do know that the schedule is put out, and I know some Commissioners have been working through that schedule for preparation. So I just want make sure that we are all comfortable with the direction -- the schedule as given, or shifting at this point.
So I'm curious if anyone is opposed to moving onto Imperial (sic) Empire -- Inland Empire. Sorry. Long day. Sorry. Inland Empire. Or the plan has been to go to Orange County then to San Diego, so I'm just trying to get a sense of where we should direct Sivan to and the mappers to.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: It seems reasonable to me to do the VRA districts. I think that had been a top priority to everyone, so it would seem reasonable to me to make that shift.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Is everyone comfortable with that; that'd we continue on with the -- just the VRA areas in the Inland Empire?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So we'll transition to Sivan. We're going to take a five minute break. We're going to transition to Sivan. And then after the break, I'm going to ask Commissioner Turner to -- I have to take a call, and so Commissioner Turner will take over as chair as I am not able to get through to our vice chair at this point. And so she'll take over as chair while I'm out. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 4:11 p.m. until 4:41 p.m.)

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Well, welcome back. Thank
you for hanging in there with us. I'm Commissioner Turner, and I am your stand-in chair for this next portion.

And we have moved now to the Southern California Inland Empire, and we will be looking at the VRA districts there. And what we will do, we'll start with just kind of a general overview of the VRA districts in this area.

So Jaime or Sivan, either of you, if you'll take us through these, or Mr. Becker. Who's going to lead us through?

MR. DRECHSLER: I think if we want to start with Sivan, Chair -- if we want to just start with Sivan, she can talk about these a little bit, and then we can have Mr. Becker weigh in as needed.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Okay. Sivan, we're ready for you.

MS. TRATT: All right. So just looking in the kind of Inland Empire regions, starting with PCO, currently at a negative 3.71 deviation, and Latino CVAP of 57.91. Do you want me to give more description than that, or just kind of moving through them?

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: I think we can move through with that because you've given --

MS. TRATT: Okay.
TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: -- the kind of outlined borders of what was in those areas before, so --

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Exactly.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: -- if that feels okay for that other Commissioners. Okay.

MS. TRATT: Perfect.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Yep. That sounds good.

MS. TRATT: All right. And then RCFR, which includes Rialto and Fontana, is at a deviation of 1.69 with a Latino CVAP of 55.85.

And then moving just South is JRC. And this district is at a deviation of 2.09 and a Latino CVAP of 51.58.

Just to the Northeast is SBCHR. And this district is at a deviation of negative 4.54, so that's definitely on the higher end of our allowable deviation range. Could definitely look at moving some population into this district from surrounding districts. Currently, at a Latino CVAP with 51.45.

And then the final VRA consideration district in this area is MPH. This is slightly overpopulated at .52 percent, and is under, currently under what would be protested by the Voting Rights Act at 49.81 percent, so I would urge the Commission to definitely make it a priority to get that number above fifty percent and lose
some population potentially as well to balance that out. Just moving to the South is district SECA, Southeast California. This district is quite large. It goes all the way North into San Bernardino County from Imperial County. And it's currently at a deviation of 1.11 and a Latino CVAP of 3.93.

Then our final VRA consideration district would be CVSY. And this is in the South Bay area of San Diego. And this is currently at a perfectly balanced 0 percent deviation with a 55.82 percent Latino CVAP.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Sivan.
Mr. Becker, did you have anything for us in this area before we go into it?
(No audible response)
TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Perhaps not. I'd like to then, Commissioners, if it bodes well for you, I'd like to take a look at the area, MPH, if we can start there because, as Sivan pointed out, it's a bit lower for a VRA district than we would want to have.
And so would then take kind of comments from our Commissioners. I see Commissioner Fernandez, Kennedy, and Yee.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sivan, if you could -- if we could just get the Latino CVAP overlay?
MS. TRATT: Yeah. I was going to ask, actually --
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

MS. TRATT: -- Jaime, if you could stop sharing your screen, I can start a new share. We were just overlapping here a little bit.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. That'll help us as we move forward.

MS. TRATT: Sorry. Let me just get that turned on. And it is not saving my settings, so just one second while I get that configured. So sorry about that.

MR. DRECHSLER: And I do see Mr. Becker. I don't know if you had any comments on the VRA districts that we just went over. If you had any comments that you wanted to weigh in before we --

MR. BECKER: Well, I came in -- we were on a separate call --

MR. DRECHSLER: Oh, okay.

MR. BECKER: -- when I came in. If you can zoom in on MPH, please.

MS. TRATT: Absolutely. One moment.

MR. BECKER: All right. Can you add with Latino CVAP, please?

MS. TRATT: This is with Latino CVAP on. And this is the range of percentage.

MR. BECKER: I'm sorry. I mean, on the label.

MR. DRECHSLER: On the --
MR. BECKER: On the label.

MS. TRATT: Oh, I'm so sorry. Yes. Yes. Let me turn that on. So sorry about that.

MR. BECKER: It's okay. Thanks.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: And when you finish that, Sivan, at some point, if you could darken the boundaries a bit.

MS. TRATT: Okay. I'm actually going to turn on just the layer for the -- yes. So --

MR. BECKER: That's works great. Perfect.

So I'll just note, obviously this is at the high end of population -- the high end of the legal limit. It's overpopulated against the ideal. And the Latino CVAP is below fifty percent just a touch, which is probably slightly low for this area of Voting Rights Act concern. And I know there were some suggested changes that have been discussed that might resolve this, I think, hopefully, pretty easily, so I won't say anything more about that because I think some of the Commissioners had some direction and some ideas they wanted to explore there.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Mr. Becker.

We had Commissioner Fernandez. Were you first, or did you --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: (Indiscernible,
simultaneous speech) --

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Oh, you want to wait.
Okay.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. So I'd like to make a suggestion that we start by moving Winchester into Southwest Riverside and perhaps the unincorporated portion to the West of that as well.

MS. TRATT: Chair, I'm just going to wait for your direction --

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

MS. TRATT: -- in case there are multiple inputs from Commissioner.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Yeah. We'll start with Commissioner Yee's suggestion. That was Winchester.
And Commissioner Yee, your voice cut out a bit for me. Was it is -- what was the other one?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Just the unincorporated portion West of it as well.

MS. TRATT: And that was moving that into the SECA?

COMMISSIONER YEE: No, it's not supposed to --

MS. TRATT: This -- sorry.

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- SWRIVERSIDE.

MS. TRATT: Oh, SWRIVERSIDE. Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I'm interested in Hemet as well,
but that has 90,000 people, so --

MS. TRATT: All right. So the selected area -- let me just bring up the pending changes so you all can see that. So --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Can we make that bigger, please?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. One second. Okay. So that would make the deviation of Southwest Riverside negative 3.43 percent, and MPH would be 3.63 percent.

COMMISSIONER YEE: And the change in the CVAP --

MS. TRATT: And Jaime, I'm not -- sorry. I'm having technical question for Jaime just about adding in the fields of the CVAP. It doesn't look like they carried over with the new plan.


MS. TRATT: Okay. Thank you.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So that'll be coming up in just a minute.

Commissioner Fernandez, while we wait for that to come up -- Sivan, just a question for you. So in selecting the unincorporated areas, it seems like there's an area that dips down that was not grabbed. Is that because that's a different part of -- what is that in the middle there, that little V? Green Acre -- oh, I see.

MS. TRATT: Yes. So I just --
TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Okay. I see.

MS. TRATT: -- excluded the cities of Green Acres and Homeland. And then I also made sure that Hemet was excluded. So this is just the city of Winchester and the unincorporated area just bordering it.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Before we accept that, let me take Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

Sivan, it looks to me like part of Menifee is -- or that Menifee is split, and so I would ask if we could have all of Menifee in the SWRIVERSIDE district. Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Absolutely, Commissioner Kennedy. I'm just looking at adding in the summary fields for Latino CVAP so we can get that displayed. So sorry. Just give me one moment to do that. We are trying to do this a different way than we did at the live line drawing, so thank you for everyone's patience.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: You are doing just fine. We are patiently waiting.

(Pause)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) --

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Yeah. What do you know about Green Acres?

COMMISSIONER YEE: This Thursday, the governor will
be two blocks away lighting the holiday tree, with
choirs, 5:30.

(Pause)

MS. TRATT: All right. Thank you so much for
everyone's patience. Let me make this bigger again. And
then we will be able to look at the Latino CVAP. And
then I will look at the Menifee area.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.


So it looks like the percent Latino CVAP in MPH
would become 49.82, and Southwest RIV would be 30.26 if
the added areas were moved.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So then --

MR. BECKER: So if I'm not mistaken, that's exactly
the same Latino CVAP as before.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: 49.8.

MR. BECKER: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. It actually went -- yes. Yes.

That is, I believe, the same.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Well, Commissioners,
let's keep doing some work here.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I think we had
received some COI testimony about possibly removing South
Hemet in addition to Winchester. I'm not sure what
exactly the border of South Hemet would be. I don't know
if it's that little -- obviously, it would have to be
contiguous, so perhaps splitting the city right at about
where the East Hemet line is, and taking that part out --

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: So let's accept the change
that we have. Can we do it incrementally, Commissioner
Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. Absolutely.

MS. TRATT: All right. Accepting this change. And
let me just turn on those labels again now that I have
those fields. All right.

So looking at Hemet now, would you like me -- let me
turn on the streets layer to see if we can get a better
sense of maybe a major road to split.

(Pause)

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Kennedy --

MS. TRATT: One of those days that --

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: -- while she's finding the
road, do want to go, or do you want to wait until she
finds it?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I wanted to get us back and
make sure that consolidate Menifee before we skip ahead.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Got you.
MS. TRATT: Chair, should I go back and look at Menifee first?

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Yeah. Why don't we do that. Thank you. I forgot about Menifee, so yes, please.

MS. TRATT: Okay. So looking at Menifee, I believe, Commissioner Kennedy, correct me if you're wrong, this is the area that we were looking at that splits lately?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Correct.

MS. TRATT: Would you like me to attempt to move this portion of Menifee back into Southwest Riverside?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I would. Yes, please.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Should I go ahead and commit this change?

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Yes, please.

MS. TRATT: All right. So Menifee is now back intact. And our deviations are still good with that little bit of change?

MS. TRATT: Yes, deviations still within a permissible range. Although, for MPH, we are currently looking at still under 50 at 49.61 percent.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So we dropped a bit. Okay. So we're moving Commissioner Sadhwani back into Hemet looking for boundary lines.

MS. TRATT: All right. This is the best street
layer that I have available. Technology is not working in my favor today, so thank you, everyone, again, for your patience.

So it looks like the 74 runs to divide North-South as a possible line. You could also just move from the South up and kind of play the lock group adding game to balance population.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh. So Commissioners -- thank you Sivan.

Commissioners, I don't have my communitive interest up so I can watch hands. Do any of you have an idea as far as North-South, the freeway divider? What are we hearing in Hemet for the dividing point for checking --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I thought I heard it was East Hemet that they wanted out of the COI?

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Oh. As soon as someone finds it, give direction, and we'll check it.

Now, Sivan, please hold for us as we're checking our technology -- our tools on this side.

But Commissioner Andersen, that will come up too as we're checking.

So at this point, we are trying to ensure that we -- we're trying to still balance out population and increase in a VRA district our CVAP numbers.

Commissioner Sadhwani?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I apologize. I had to step away and just heard that last piece. Did we attempt to look at South Hemet?

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Yeah. We're looking there now. We were looking for a dividing point, and Sivan pointed a couple of options for us, but we were trying to just check and refer to some COI testimony to see what testimony we've received about where to split it.

Commissioner Sinay just found some things, unless you found it already, Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I do have it in my notes. I believe it was from the Inland Empire United Group. But I will look for it.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Oh, she has it. That's the same COI testimony.

Go ahead, Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Unfortunately, they did not define South Hemet.

MS. TRATT: In that case, Chair, do you want me to just look at what the impact would be for removing East Hemet?

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Do we have -- did we find COI testimony for that --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: They did say, South Hemet, but they just didn't define what they meant by South Hemet.
TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. If I may, for me, I would say, Sivan, this could be a homework piece. Maybe you could look at this off-line tomorrow and look at if removing it can improve this district and bring it back to us.

And maybe tonight we'll even get testimony when we go to public comment. That way we can move on and look at other areas because I think this would be a fairly small change.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Beautiful.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I was going to suggest trying South of the 74 if that could be done quickly, but also, willing to just wait overnight if that seems better.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Sivan, can we quickly look at South of 74?

MS. TRATT: Absolutely, Chair. One moment. I'm assuming that you would like to add this also into the Southwest RIV district, or into SECA?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Southwest RIV.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Perfect. One moment, please, while I make those changes.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: While she's making the
changes, Commissioners, if you have the ability to look at some of the other VRA areas that we've talked about: RCFR, JRC, SBCHR, SECA, et cetera. We're going to kind of review those in a minute and see if there are changes that need to be made.

(Pause)

 TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I did find where East Hemet was discussed. I think it's from the Black Census Hub.

"To make this map stronger, CVRA district, you must include the communities of Hemet, San Jacinto, East Hemet, Via Vista, and Homeland to VADMBCV."

I don't know how old this was because we don't ever have those districts anymore. So it was probably old. Sorry about that.

MS. TRATT: All right. Chair, when you're ready. I added the area of Hemet that is South of the 74, and I'm just going to delete this portion of East Hemet. Those changes would make SWRIV 6.69 over deviation and MPH 6.5 under deviation. And it would raise the Latino CVAP of MPH to 51.27.

And Mr. Becker, I don't know if you wanted to comment on that before -- or if I commit this change.

MR. BECKER: Numbers pretty much speak for themselves. Obviously, it's a deviation problem here
that needs to be resolved. So less population needs to be removed from what's the MPH district?

The 51.27 is -- this will be a very lawyer-like thing to say. It is better. That's about -- and we might be getting around to as close to as good as could be done here. This is something I'd probably want to take a closer look at with a little more time.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Then as was suggested earlier, Commissioners, are we good to -- and let me adjust my screen so I can see this on Zoom. Are we good to let Sivan continue to work in this area, or do we have other changes? Are we good to move?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Before we do, Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Sivan, could you zoom in a little bit to that Northwestern corner of East Hemet? I'm specifically looking to see -- yeah. If you can -- there you go. Okay.

So we've got that very small portion of Hemet that is below the 74 -- correct. That one. So just for administrative ease, I would suggest that that also be included in the area to be moved.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Yes, I agree.

MR. BECKER: Although, I'll just point out, because
of the underpopulation problem in the current MPH
district, it's likely this line is going to -- this whole
line is going to move South if this is the way you want
to go because there needs to be some additional --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, we may find the
population from the other side of district. It'll be
good to see the map zoomed out soon so that we can see if
there are other places to bring in population from.
Thank you.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. The removing East
Hemet came from live testimony when we were in San Diego.
It was said by several people who spoke about that.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Okay. And if we --
Commissioners, are we -- because here's my thought, and
this is what I'll be asking about, if we lock in what we
currently have, and then I'd look to see about removing
East Hemet and see what that looks like, particularly
since we are over in this area. Are we good for that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) --

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: You want to make it more --
I thought we were over --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're over.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: We're over.
VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I would put that would SECA. But just have a look to see what it does to the CVAP, please.

MR. BECKER: Yeah. Just to be clear, with that portion of South Hemet, MPH is underpopulated.

MS. TRATT: That is correct. It would be underpopulated by 6.74 percent. So if you wanted to balance within the two districts that you were changing, you could draw population maybe from the bordering cities over here -- if you didn't want it to ripple into the other districts, I mean.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: I'm looking at -- yes. Okay.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Sivan, if you could pull up the Latino CVAP heat map again because I think there may be some population to get within -- this is going to make, I'm sure, people in March Air Force Base grumpy, but I thought I saw a significant population of Latino. And since this is a voting rights area district, I think -- hopefully, we won't have to split March Air Force base, but --

MS. TRATT: Sorry, Commissioner Vazquez. I had it and somehow just trying to get it back. So sorry about that.
Jaime, if you have technical advice about what's going on, I would appreciate that as well.

Oh, there we go. I had two -- let's see. There we go. Okay. I'm sorry about that. I had two census block layers for some reason. There we go.

Where did you want me to zoom in on?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: If you could look in the Northern -- oh, I was mistaken. I'm wondering if maybe Meadow Brook and Canyon Lake make sense that -- at least those portions. I'm not sure what additional populations. Those may be small. Those may not be enough -- populated enough to get -- it seems like we might have to grab from, like, several areas if we're trying to stay within districts.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sorry. What was the goal? I'm just --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Trying to balance population. I was also attempting to increase the Latino CVAP if possible. So I was attempting to grab additional population, ideally from areas with some higher concentrations of Latino residents.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

And as I get ready to take the other hands, keep in mind, Commissioners, we also have, as an option, is to
give direction and have Sivan leave and come back with
the numbers balanced and see what she can do to increase
as well. She just needs direction to know what area to
play in tonight.
Commissioner Vazquez, did you have more?
Okay.
Commissioner Kennedy?
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I was just
going suggest that Sivan could try, instead of the 74,
could try Stetson Avenue as a Northern boundary of the
area to be moved. Again, that doesn't have to be live,
but that's another option. Thank you.
TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Perfect.
You got that, Sivan -- Stetson?
MS. TRATT: I did.
TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: All right.
Commissioner Akutagawa?
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was going to -- I'd like
to see just the very top part. How far up this district
goes? If you could just zoom in on it and then I have
another comment after that. I just wanted to see. Okay.
I did see -- and this is the beauty of conflicting
testimony. I saw COI testimony in which -- or a draft
map that was submitted as part of COI testimony that took
that Northern border all the way up to the border where
Loma Linda and Grand Terrace and all that. I'm not sure -- I have to go back and look at the map again.

But separately, I also just want to note that in seeing some other COI testimony that is asking to keep Moreno Valley, Mead Valley, Good Hope, Perris, Romoland, Nuevo, Lakeview, Homeland, Green Acres, Winchester, and San Jacinto, and remove Hemet and -- or East Hemet, I guess, depending on what the numbers are from the area.

So it looks like a lot of what was requested is already there, but, I guess, it's still not enough. Just wanted to point that out, in terms of the COI testimony.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: (Indiscernible) --

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: No?

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I would recommend for this that we just give instruction to Sivan, and then we'll see what it looks like on Thursday.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: That has been suggested. I like that.

Commissioners, are we good?

Outstanding. Okay. Thank you --

MS. TRATT: Well, Chair, I still have these pending changes to add the Southern portion of Hemet to the
Southwest Riverside district. Would you like me to commit that, just so it'll give a better sense of what population balance in the area would be, or just consider it as I'm looking tonight and tomorrow in making those changes and potentially moving where that North-South divide is as well?

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: At this point, if you'd consider it so that you'll have greater flexibility having heard all of the testimony.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Perfect. I'm going to go ahead and release these changes then.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

We're at 5:16 now. We will got to public comment at 5:30, so we do have a little bit more time to continue in this conversation. Not for this area, Commissioners, I'm looking for your direction in the other VRA districts in our Southern California, Inland Empire.

Commissioner Akutagawa, your hands up?

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

On the SECA district, as well as the Congressional and Senate Districts, I want to refer us to the area in Southeastern San Bernardino County and ask if the mappers could give us a consistent Western boundary for that portion of that district that we kind of have similar at
all three levels. But that Western boundary in that
Southeastern corner of San Bernardino County is in three
different places, and I think that, given the low
population density, that's going to be unnecessary and
administratively difficult for folks.

So if they could, as they're looking at, between now
and Thursday, could just compare those -- the Western
boundaries of that segment in Southeastern San Bernardino
County and come up with something consistent at all there
levels. Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Absolutely. Thank you so much.
We will definitely make sure that those match between
plans. We did not forget.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Perfect.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI?  

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yep. This could be a
homework piece as well. I believe it's the RCFR
district. Rialto, Fontana, and -- oh, we have them
together. And they are together. I feel like there was
some changes that there had been some COIs that had been
lifted up, and maybe I'm getting them wrong here, but
maybe we had already made the slight changes when we were
doing it. My apologies. I will double-check my notes
and come back to you on that. I feel like it was
swapping in Upland, maybe into the PCO district to keep
Rancho Cucamonga maybe whole in there. I could be wrong, but I will come back to that and lift up that testimony.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Sounds good. We were just in SECA. There was also COI testimony about keeping Coachella Valley whole. Did we already do that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) --

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: That's a big one. We can look at the big map. I think now we can't see. Okay. Are we there? It's really small for me. Oh, because I made my -- there we go.

MS. TRATT: Chair, I can zoom in further if you'd like.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: So can you show me -- so keeping Coachella Valley -- it's the whole thing. It is a VRA district. Okay. I'm not prepared to -- it's a VRA district. I don't have the COI testimony in from of me other than the desire for it to be whole, so I'm going to call on a couple hands and see if I can do some overlap and see if that's a direction I even want to attempt.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I just wanted to go back to the district that Commissioner Sadhwani -- in my notes it said -- what do I have? Rialto and Fontana.

And then I had Highland, but I don't see Highland.

Is that the one you were thinking of, Commissioner
Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: It could be. My apologies. I wasn't planning on working on this today. I thought we were going to do that later, so I didn't have everything prepped.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. Unfortunately -- okay. So that doesn't -- that doesn't make sense.

MS. TRATT: So Highland is -- yeah --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. That doesn't make sense then.

MS. TRATT: -- is bringing a different district.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. So I don't know why that would be in there.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Thank you. I think there was some testimony about possibly splitting Fontana and keeping Rialto with San Bernardino, but I -- yeah. Maybe this is something we can come back to on Thursday. I just wasn't prepped for the Inland Empire for today.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Fernandez, was that it?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. If we can bring the map back to focusing on the Coachella Valley.

Couple of things. First of all, you know, my problem with it is, division along the 10 is very
artificial. You've got parts of Palm Springs that fall North of the 10. You've got parts of Cathedral City on both sides of the 10. You end up splitting the Agua Caliente tribal lands, which span the 10.

To me, if we're going to have to split the valley for population purposes, the more natural division would be as we come up along the Southwestern side of Indio, and then go North to take in Indio Hills.

Indio's the largest city in the valley by population anyway. So if instead of -- when that line coming up the Southwestern side of Indio hits the 10, instead of following the 10 up to North Palm Springs and Desert Hot Springs, if the line where to go North along the Western boundary of Indio Hills, you have basically there -- I can't accept that.

You know, Indio is -- and particularly Coachella, those two are more oriented towards Imperial County and towards the more agricultural areas. You know, we've heard testimony that the Coachella Valley economy is tourism and agriculture. In my mind, and I lived in the valley for fifteen years, there's kind of a dividing line between the tourism part of the valley and the agricultural part of the valley. And the agricultural part of the valley is kind of Coachella, Thermal, Mecca, Oasis. That area. And so I would ideally like to have
the whole valley whole --

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- but if we're going to have to divide it for population. You know, Indio is the largest city in the valley, and I'm wondering if we could bring that line, as I say, up, the Western boundary of Indio and following the Western boundary of Indio Hills.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Yeah. Can you give that as direction? I'd like to see that too.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay.

Sivan?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. So if -- I guess, we will have to include Desert Palms, but just where the 10 hits Desert Palms, go up to Western boundary of desert palms, which then takes in the far Northwestern corner of Indio, and then Indio Hills up to the boundary of MBCV.

MS. TRATT: And where would you -- just for clarification, where would you like to move the -- would you like to move these Northern cities South into the MBCV --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes. Yes.

MS. TRATT: -- district? Okay. Would you like me to visualize those changes now so you can see how it would impact it?

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Yeah. Let's see it. Yes,
MS. TRATT: Okay. Give me one moment, please.

Thank you.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: And this may be the last visualization or change that we see for today so that we can go to public comment. We'll see how it plays out.

(Pause)

MS. TRATT: All right. Commissioner Kennedy, moving those requested areas into the MBCV district would make that deviation 8.01 percent over. And SECA would become negative 11 deviation. It would also raise the Latino CVAP to 60.6 percent.

Would you like me to go ahead and commit this so we can look at other swaps, or leave it for now?

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Commissioners?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: If we added Hemet in there, it might make up for it -- into SECA.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I was just going to say, the change I think for South Hemet, Winchester that we were looking at before, we were putting it with that Southwest Riverside, but I think it could also go into the SECA district as well. That's another option.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Beautiful.

Commissioner Kennedy, did you have more? I'm sorry.
Okay.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I saw several COI testimony that spoke to Hemet and East Hemet being a COI with Valle Vista, so that kind of move may also work.

I also saw reference to San Jacinto too, but I don't know if moving that would be too much.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: So let's commit what we currently have, Sivan.

MS. TRATT: All right. Those changes have committed.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Okay. And where are we at? And so what we'd like to see and give direction, can we give just some general direction to Sivan for this evening because we have two minutes, and we will go into public comment.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) --

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

Commissioner Akutagawa and then Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I also saw some -- just on the MPH district, if Hemet and East Hemet were to be taken out, I did see at least one COI testimony mentioning High Grove could be one that could be included in that MPH district. It's up in that upper corner of the area. Yeah. Just to give an option.
TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So -- sorry. I didn't realize my mic had been on. So the direction that we're really -- for tonight is, we're trying to figure out how to -- you know, how to increase the VRA -- you know, strengthen the VRA for MPH and, you know, keep the VRA in Coachella Valley -- in the East Coachella Valley and Imperial Valley, and so -- and, you know, get the numbers close on, you know, the deviations down to the right place. So that gives -- hopefully that gives enough direction.

You know, we don't want to play around with any of the other VRA districts unless it increases -- you know, strengthens any of the VRA districts. So that's basically what the direction is for tonight, unless I'm mistaken.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. I completely agree with that, Commissioner Sinay.

And I just wanted to lift up, I think, I'm liking the direction that this change is going in, and I think -- if I'm understanding what's happening here, and
please, Sivan, correct me if I'm wrong, what has happened is that Latino CVAP now in SECA is actually quite high, which is good, not a bad problem necessarily. It may not necessarily need to be that high. And we're way underpopulated.

The South Hemet and Winchester change that we had made previously, we were putting those into the Southwest Riverside district. But if instead they went to SECA, I think it might -- I'd like to see that as some of that homework, if that would be a reasonable change.

And I just want to open up, I think -- I know Commissioner Yee was going to take a peek at what the population of that unincorporated area was. I don't know if he has that and maybe wants to weigh in. Perhaps that could stay in MPH to help maintain the population total so our population deviations aren't going way off.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I think it's 10 to 20,000, but I'm not sure of the boundary, so somewhere in that range.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER YEE: That's a great idea.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

And with that, Sivan, are you comfortable for this evening?

MS. TRATT: Yes. I would ask what the Commission feels in terms of prioritizing or dividing East Hemet
from Hemet or dividing -- like, what should my
prioritization be, or should I just come up with multiple
scenarios and then just explain what each thing did?

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Yeah. I would like
multiple. I think we have testimony that supports them
together and pulling East Hemet out as Commissioner
Andersen mentioned earlier. So the visualizations, the
options would be great.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Great. I'll come back with some
different outcomes for you.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioners, I'm
ready to go to the public comment. Are you all good?

Okay. Then with that, Kristian.

MR. MANOFF: Yes, Chair. I'm going to do some
screen configuration here. Just a moment.

All right. We do have a plethora of callers. We
will begin by reading the public input instructions for
making public comment by phone.

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 88465429407, for this meeting. When
prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press pound.

Once you've dialed in, you'll be placed in a queue.

To indicate that you wish to comment, please, press star nine. Again, please, press star nine. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it's your turn to speak, you'll hear a message that says, "The host would like you to talk. Press star six to speak."

If you'd 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're waiting in a queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak. And again, please turn down the livestream volume.

And again, if you can hear the sound of my voice, and you've dialed in to give public comment, you are in the right place. To let me know that you want to give public comment, please, press star nine on your telephone keypad. This will raise your hand and get you in line to give public comment.

I see those hands going up. I appreciate that. Again, that is star nine. And when it is your turn to speak, I will ask you to press star six. You'll also hear a prompt on just your phone reminding you to press
All right. So let us begin. We're going to start with caller 0317. And after that will be caller 8011. Caller 03 -- oh, one more thing. We're going to be enforcing a two-minute time limit with a warning of thirty seconds and fifteen seconds remaining. Again, caller 0317, followed by caller 8011. Caller 0317, please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.


My comments tonight are to strongly urge the California Citizens Redistricting Commission to reconsider its proposed Congressional State Assembly and State Senate district maps and keep the city of Rancho Cucamonga whole.

Rancho Cucamonga has a strong sense of identity and has historically been all or mostly in one Senate, Assembly, or Congressional District.

The proposed district maps unnecessarily split our community and our neighborhoods. The Northwest portion of Rancho Cucamonga, which is roughly one third of our community, would be excluded from effective representation with the rest of Rancho Cucamonga by being
lumped into separate Congressional and State Assembly
districts, primarily located in an entirely separate
county, Los Angeles County.

Specific to the Congressional District map, the
boundaries have a primary focus in LA County, leaving
little to no ability for our residents to influence
policy. In regard to the State Assembly district map, it
includes foothill and nonfoothill communities, inevitably
resulting in drastically different opinions on critical
issues like fire management and transportation, making
effective representation very difficult.

For the State Senate, Rancho Cucamonga is split in
half over two districts with the Northern portion being
part of the distant high desert region of San Bernardino
County.

Some of these communities are more than 70 miles
from Rancho Cucamonga and includes rural communities,
which is a stark contrast from Rancho Cucamonga more
urban, suburban communities.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. SCOTT: There are virtually no commonalities
between our residents and those of LA County and the
remote mountains and deserts of San Bernardino County.
The special needs of our unique diversity need effective
representation and only get (indiscernible) --
MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. SCOTT: -- we respectfully request the Commission keep Rancho Cucamonga whole and revise the both Congressional State Assembly and Senate district maps. Thank you.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: And as a reminder, we are interpreting your public comments, so please speak at a steady pace and take your time with county and city names and any numbers that you might have in your public comment. Thank you so much.

Next up, we'll have caller 8011 and then caller 3196.

Caller 8011, please follow the prompts to unmute. Go ahead.

MR. THAKUR: Yes. Thank you very much.

Chairperson, Commissioners, staff, thank you very much, first of all, for your service. I do personally believe that this is a great service that you're providing for the people of California.

My name is Aaruni, A-A-R-U-N, as in Nancy, I. Last name, T, as in Tom; H, as in Henry; A, as in apple; K-U-R, as in Robert.

I'm a lifelong resident of Fullerton, California, except for the time that I briefly left for college and
grad school. And I was raised in this wonderful community, and I'm raising my children here.

I have heard that the Commission is proposing some changes to North Orange County, including dividing up the city of Fullerton into possibly multiple Assembly Districts. I would ask -- urge you to please reconsider this option. Fullerton is not a big city, but we do share a very common identity, and I believe that splitting it up among multiple Assembly Districts would not be beneficial to the people of Fullerton.

There is apparently another plan to draw Fullerton into a new Senate District. I have been following along. I want to also thank you for making the provisional maps that --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. THAKUR: -- that you been providing available.

And thank you for sharing that information.

But if you would consider drawing Fullerton into other Orange County -- along with other Orange County cities, such as Santa Ana for the State Senate, I believe that that would represent --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. THAKUR: -- communities of interest.

And I would just close by asking you once again not to split up Fullerton in the ways that you've proposed
earlier today.

Thank you so much for your service. Good night.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 3196. And after that will be caller 9708.

Caller 3196, please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

MR. CHRISTIAN: Hi, Commissioners. My name is Christian (ph.), and I'm going to be reading a letter into the record from the Keep Long Beach Together Coalition.

We write you to share our deep thanks and enthusiasm for your draft maps and for having entered a new phase in the redistricting process. Long Beach greatly appreciates that for the first draft maps for California State Assembly, Senate, and Congressional Districts all who our city mostly united. Our community is engaged extensively with you in this process that began in June 2021, and we look forward to engaging with you through the adoption of final maps on December 27th.

We've been active since your very first meeting because we know how important this process is for our future. We have received hundreds of emails, calls, and comments, from individuals at organizations that represent thousands across our community. We represent a coalition of organizations like the local NAACP chapter,
our Cambodian community, Latino social justice groups, LGBTQ plus organizations, and nonprofits and business organizations.

We want to work with the Commission to ensure Long Beach stays as intact as possible for the Congressional maps, and we want to remind the Commission of some of the advocacy that you've heard over the last few months.

This includes the Long Beach Unified School District, and they have been consistent in requesting that you keep Long Beach, Lakewood, Signal Hill, and Avalon together; the Long Beach Community College district, which has two campuses, an East and in central Long Beach; the Port of Long Beach, the cities' top job and economic driver. They have made the request to stay united with the rest of the city --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. CHRISTIAN: -- the cities large and historic LGBTQ plus community, and they've asked to not split their voices and diminish their power.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. CHRISTIAN: The Cambodian community, which is the largest in the country, is asking not to divide Cambodia Town from the rest of the city, specifically, Cal State Long Beach, which hosts a number of the programs in the communities.
We thank you so much for your support in all of these advocacy --

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 9708. And after that will be caller 6115.

Caller 9708, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. I'm calling today about the Orange County Congressional Districts. I think they should be a top priority for us to revisit. I hope the Commission will focus on creating a true coastal district that goes from Seal Beach down to San Clemente. Right now the maps are very random and arbitrary. I think the Commission needs to spend more time understanding the communities of interest in the areas and adhering to their wishes. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

And up next, we've got caller 6115. And after that will be caller 7175.

Caller 6115, follow the prompts. Go ahead.

MR. CHAN: Hello. My name is Nathan Chan (ph.). I'm calling you today from San Mateo County. I would like to echo the previous commenters gratefulness for the work that you all are doing.

I recently served on the county district lines
Commission, and I know it's very challenging work.

San Mateo County is a very diverse county. It is a majority minority county. But the distribution of minorities in San Mateo County is concentrated in the North part of the county and the South part of the county, with most of the central part of being predominately white majority.

The way that the current district maps are proposed, unfortunately, carved out some of this diversity from Assembly District 22, which I know some of it is unavoidable but possibly some of it could be rectified in some measure.

For example, Redwood City, which has a large Hispanic population, is currently split under the draft map. If Redwood City could be kept whole, a significant number of Latino voters would be part of Assembly District 22 that wouldn't be part of Assembly District 22 under the current draft map.

So please consider that when you --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. CHAN: -- think about San Mateo County and Assembly District 22. That will enable representation for that Assembly District to represent the totality of San Mateo County effectively. Thank you very much.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.
And up next we've got caller 7175. And after that will be caller 8245.

Caller 7175, the time has come to follow the prompts, please. Go ahead.

MR. LOUIS: Hello. I just want to thank the Commissioners for allowing me to speak.

My name is Louis (ph.), and I live in Angels Camp area in Calaveras County.

I've heard numerous callers asking for the Sierras to be kept separate from central valley, specifically Stanislaus County in the current ECA Congressional draft, and I strongly disagree with these callers.

As a resident of the Sierras, my community has a strong relationship with the central valley and Stanislaus County. We do our grocery shopping there. We have medical appointments there. Central services we rely on are based in Stanislaus County. Many of our residents jobs are based in the valley. Residents in the central valley also vacation in our Sierras.

So there is a clear connection between the Sierras and Stanislaus County, the central valley has a whole. So I strongly support the current Congressional draft map. I ask the Sierras to stay with Stanislaus.

Thank you. And that's all I have to say. Hope everyone has a great day.
MR. MANOFF: Thank you.
Up next we've got caller 8245. And after that will be caller 0073.
Caller 8245, please, follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. OVERSTREET: Hello, there. I want to echo again, Thank you so much for all of the work that you're doing really creating a space for the community to call in and let you know what their needs are, and I hope you'll be responsive.

My name is Blair Overstreet (ph.), And I live in the San Diego community Of City Heights, and I've lived there for several years. And City Heights, and National City, and Paradise Hill belong in the majority Latinx district, along with Barrio Logan And the greater Logan Heights.

These communities really do share values and are up against, you know, similar issues and have similar thoughts on how to solve those, including environmental justice, housing insecurities, lots of gentrification and displacement, immigration, and economic justice.

So please keep my community of City Heights in the Latinx majority district. And thank you again for all the work that you do.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.
Up next, we've got caller 0073. And after that will
be caller 0234.

Caller 0073, please follow prompts. Go ahead.

MR. AI: Hello, Commissioners. My name is Mike Ai (ph.). I am here on behalf of the Equality California, the nation's largest LGBTQ plus civil rights organization with hundreds of thousands of members state wide.

I'm calling about the MBCV Assembly District map. I'd like to think the Commission, particularly Commissioner Kennedy for uniting the LGBTQ plus community in the Coachella Valley and the MBCV district.

The Coachella Valley is home to a historic and vibrant LGBTQ plus community, which includes many of our LGBTQ plus elders in California, and now, the first generation of people living with HIV to live into their senior years.

Thank you again for keeping the LGBTQ plus community united MBCV.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 0234. And after that will be caller 7258.

Caller 0234, please follow those prompts. Go ahead.

(In Spanish, not translated)

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

(In Spanish, not translated)

MR. MANOFF: Gracias.
Up next, we've got caller 7258. And after that will be caller 4554.

Caller 7258, please follow the prompts. That's caller with the last four digits, 7258. You may unmute your phone by pressing star six, please. One more time. Caller with the last four, 7258, please press star six to unmute. I'm so sorry, caller 7258, we will come back to you.

Up next, we've got caller 4554. And after that will be caller 8298.

Caller 4554, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. Go ahead.

MR. PULLEN-MILES: Good evening, Honorable Commissioners. My name is Robert Pullen-Miles. I'm the mayor of the City of Lawndale.

I want to take this opportunity thank you for hearing and listening to the voices of the parents in the communities in the cities of Lawndale, Inglewood, and Hawthorne, and Lennox.

In our community, we know that education is a big equalizer. By keeping the cities Inglewood, Lawndale, Hawthorne, and Lennox in the same Assembly District, you are in fact ensuring that our children are together.

As previous parents and callers have stated, these school districts (indiscernible) -- and our goal is
simply to lift children out of poverty. We work so well together. Even one on Lawndale's school is physically located in the city of Hawthorne, and our high schools service several communities that overlap.

Our families and our kids deserve to be in the same Assembly District, and I know with your leadership that that will be (indiscernible).

Once again, we are grateful that you are putting our children first by keeping the cities of Inglewood, Lawndale, Hawthorne, and Lennox together.

And I thank you for your patience. And I thank you for your service on this Commission. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 8298. And after that will be caller 7175.

Caller 8298, if you could, please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

MR. GONZALEZ: Hello. My name is Juan Gonzalez (ph.), and I live in North Ridge in San Fernando Valley of LA. Thank you for taking my call and letting me share my thoughts.

As other callers have shared, the Latino community in San Fernando Valley is important to my neighborhood and nearby communities. The Commission has shown that you understand that, and thank you for drawing a Latino
Voting Rights Act Assembly district here in the San Fernando Valley in your initial maps.

However, as several people have shared already, it is possible to draw two VRA Assembly Districts in the valley. And if you draw two Assembly Districts, you can nest those inside of one of the VRA Senate District.

Please, don't limit my communities ability to elect a representative of our choice, and draw two majority Latino Assembly Districts in the San Fernando Valley.

Thank you, again, for your hard work, and I hope you will protect the voting rights of my community. Thank you so much.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 7175. And after that will be caller 3241.

Caller 7175, please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

MR. PAYNE: Thank you.

Good evening, Commissioners. This is Jeremy Payne (ph.) calling on behalf of Equality California.

Want to thank you for your work to unite the LGBTQ plus community by putting Hollywood and West Hollywood in the heart of LA's LGBTQ plus community together in the same district today.

However, I just want to remind Commissioner that there has been overwhelming COI testimony that the LGBTQ
plus community in West Hollywood and Hollywood West of the 101 freeway should not be paired with Glendale.

Hollywood and West Hollywood share homelessness and housing interests with central LA areas like Greater Wilshire and Korea Town, interests that Glendale does not share.

Given the changes made today, we would encourage the Commission to move Mid-city West and Greater Wilshire into the Glenn and LA district, and then move (indiscernible) out of Flintridge and the city of Glendale North of the 134 freeway out of that district as suggested by a number of Commissioners.

Doing so would better unite the LGBTQ plus community and other communities of interest in Hollywood, West Hollywood, and central LA, by keeping us separate from the city of Glendale, as supported by significant COI testimony.

So thank you so much, and we look forward to seeing the updated maps.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much.

And just a quick reminder, our lines will close at 6 o'clock.

Up next, we've got caller 3241. And after that will be caller 7976.

Caller 3241, if you could, please follow prompts.
Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, there. Recently, I've been listening to the redistricting Commission in your meetings, and I've noticed that on the Orange County coastal district that there's been a lot of back and forth where some support, but a lot of citizens have been calling in, and they just want Orange County's beach cities to stay together versus being split up with other counties or being put with inland cities, and I think that you should listen to them because you are a Citizens Commission in that you're supposed to listen to the citizens.

And keeping Orange County beach cities together makes the most sense because, I mean, in reality, if you really look at it, none of these communities outside of Orange County have anything in common with each. And so like L.A. has different priorities. I mean, someone from Keep Long Beach Together just called in. People in San Diego have nothing -- there's literally fifteen miles of nothing in between the nearest town for Orange County. And so it doesn't make any sense, and so I just think keeping Orange County together, like all the other citizens have been saying, just makes the most sense.

But thank you. And hopefully, we get that done. Have a nice night.
MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 7976. And after that will be caller 5647.

Caller 7976, please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

MS. CAMPBELL: Hi. My name is Winky Campbell (ph.), and I've lived in the East Bay Alameda County for many years. Yesterday, I heard a caller from Albany, who talked about your Commission being ready to be okay with undoing a change and going back to an earlier draft, and I urge you to do that. Another caller talked about taking the time to intentionally reflect on the lines you've drawn. They were both right. Older options of your maps may actually be better. By pausing to look back after you draw is the only really way to really know what you did. The two suggestions from yesterday's callers are particularly important as you move from draft maps to final maps. You might spend an hour drawing something this week and determine that you fixed a problem you were trying to solve.

However, when looking at the big picture, you may realize that your Commission created several worse problems, and thus, the only prudent course of action is to change it. Newer is not always better. But you can only figure that out if you allow yourself time to do so, which is why you need that reflective time, not to reflect on the draft maps -- you had two weeks to do
that -- now you need time to reflect on this week's work, time after you've finished the plan, to stop before you jump into a new set of maps. If you look at the districts you've drawn, review them systematically and deliberately. Are they what you actually what you want to be in your final maps? You probably didn't know that moving Albany was a bad idea until you moved Albany, and I suggest that you go back to an earlier iteration. And you can't know what this week's Albany is going to be, but you can know that your schedule needs to allow time to at least --

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

MS. CAMPBELL: -- talk about the changes you've made. Thank you very much for your time and for allowing us to participate. Good-bye.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 5647. And after that will be caller 8224.

Caller 5647, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, and thank you for this opportunity. I want to say thank you to the Commissioners, the staff, and the consultants that are helping redistrict our entire state at so many different levels. I've had the honor of serving on two
redistricting Commissions -- one for the county and one for my City of Redwood City, so I totally understand the complexity. I'm here to urge you to please keep Redwood City whole in the proposed Assembly San Mateo District -- currently Assembly District 22. The draft map that you guys are working on draws lines through communities of interest, including historically underrepresented groups, like immigrant and Latinx communities. Removing that area of Redwood City dilutes the power of the Latinx community in the proposed district by splitting thousands of Latinx people from the current lines of Assembly District 22. As a Latinx person myself, I ask, please, do not split Redwood City, and keep it whole within the rest of San Mateo County. As a former member of two redistricting Commissions, I understand the complexity and difficulty in finding population balance, respecting communities of interest, and keeping cities and counties whole. In the spirit of the Voting Rights Act and the Fair Maps Act, I am identifying the historic neighborhoods of Palm, Woodside, Roosevelt, Eagle Hill, and Farm Hills, as communities of interest and ask that you keep them whole within Redwood City, and Redwood City whole within San Mateo County. I urge the 2020 California Citizens Redistricting Commission to keep Redwood City within the proposed AD_SANMATEO map. That
clearly expresses the will of the residents of Redwood City and furthers the goal of equity for us all.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So thank you very much.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And up next, we've got caller 8224. And after that will be caller 2931.

Caller 8224, if you could please follow the prompts by pressing star six. Caller with the last four 822 -- go ahead.

MS. NGUYEN: Okay. Hi. Dear Commissioners. My name is Stephanie Nguyen. I'm calling in regard to the Little Saigon community of Orange County. I have made several comments about the process, so I just want to thank you all for listening to our comments.

(Indiscernible) on the Senate map. Please, don't make any change for the Senate district, with just a few minor change to the Congressional and Assembly maps to have a true representation of Little Saigon. That is to add inland part of Huntington Beach to the map. There are a lot of Vietnamese-Americans in Huntington Beach that border on Fountain Valley and Westminster. Not sure if you are aware, on November 22nd, the Orange County Board of Supervisor approved their redistrict map. They acknowledged that Little Saigon belongs in the City of Westminster, Fountain Valley, Los Alamitos, Rossmoor,
Seal Beach, Huntington Beach, Midway City, and portions of (indiscernible) district. This clearly shows that the county acknowledged that Huntington Beach does, in fact, belong with Little Saigon where they are sharing social service, government programs, healthcare service, and education. Please reconsider. Thank you for listening.

Thank you so much for your hard work.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 2931. And after that, will be caller 0682.

Caller 2931, please follow the prompts by pressing star six.

MS. TAI: Hello, Commissioners. My name is Laura Tai (ph.). I am calling again regarding about Little Saigon community of interest. And thank you for everything you are doing to make it right for every community of interest, especially your attention to Little Saigon. I didn't know if you hear that the Orange County Board of Supervisors approved their redistrict maps last week. They included Huntington Beach in with Little Saigon. This is what our community have been asking for. As you know, the county -- the community interested healthcare and social service. And ADGGW draft map. Please add the inland part of Huntington Beach to include in Huntington Harbor where we're next generation Vietnamese-Americans have been moved to. So
up North (indiscernible) Street in Huntington Beach, the whole City of Huntington Beach, like (indiscernible).
You need to take out Santa Ana East of Garden Grove and Euclid Street. This can be another district since it doesn't have any interest with our Little Saigon community. That is what the county did as well.
Congressional map at Huntington Beach and remove Artesia and Saratoga. Thank you for your time. Have a good night. Bye-bye.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.
MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 0682. And next after that will be caller 7208. Caller 0682, please follow the prompts. Go ahead.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I wanted to call in as a resident of Palmdale in support of our current Assembly draft and Congressional draft maps. For far too long, residents of Palmdale have been expected to be lumped with communities far too different from our own at every level. I support your current draft of AD_ANTELOPE and AD_SCV. I appreciate you not bowing to public political pressure and remaining independent. Palmdale wishes to be united with the rest of the Antelope Valley in our Assembly district and with our brothers and sisters in Santa Clarita in a Congressional district without Simi Valley. All of your
drafts for our area have been very fair and correct a
wrong that was done ten years ago. Thank you for your
hard work, and happy holidays.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller
7208. And after that will be caller 1013.

Caller 7208, please follow the prompts. Caller with
the last four digits 7208, please press star six to
unmute your phone. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. Good evening. This
is Edna Luncy (ph.) longtime resident of Fullerton. I am
very, very surprised about the discussion they had this
afternoon, you know, talking about the North Orange
County, how it's going to be split the City of Fullerton.
I don't know how this was treated. They were talking
about La Habra and suddenly they decide to divide the
City of Fullerton? Fullerton is a city of -- we are only
150,000 people that we live here, which it's been split
already once. And this afternoon, one Commissioner
suggested splitting the city three ways. Another
Commissioner insisted on splitting off South Fullerton,
which is heavily Latinx community, to put it with Santa
Ana. No one has suggested putting South Fullerton in the
Senate and Assembly district with Santa Ana. And nobody
is addressing the Asian-American Advancing Justice or the
Black Redistricting Hub. Nor the Orange County Civic
Engagement Table is simply not required to comply with the Voting Rights Act. It's simply a community of interest, not recent whatsoever. It is splitting a city in a way that nobody had suggested that you should do. If this never has to happen -- if you need to split North Fullerton, which is heavily Korean, that is one thing --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- but keep the rest of Fullerton with Anaheim. Make that the anchor for our district. Please separate districts anchoring Santa Ana. You can consider combining them in larger Senate districts --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- but splitting up Fullerton in the ways that you discussed today in the Assembly map is simply inexcusable. People don't have to accede to comply to this. Please, listen to us, I ask deeply to the Commission --

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And we are up against a break, but before we go to break, I would like to one more time invite those who have called in to please press star nine to raise our hand. That'll let us know that you have called in to give public comment. Again, please press star nine to raise your hand. We will be coming back after break to take your input. Chair, I defer to
you.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: We are ready for break.
Let's do it.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 6:10 p.m.
until 6:25 p.m.)

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And thank you,
all for waiting through the break. We are in public
comment time, and so we see the hands. We thank you for
that. A reminder that public comment is two minutes, and
we are now in the hands of Kristian.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much, Chair. And again,
we would like to invite those that have called in to give
public comment to please press star nine. This will
raise your hand for the comment moderator and get you
into the queue. I'm also going to invite Commissioner
Fernandez to invite the queue to raise their hand in
Espanol.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Gracias, Kristian.

(In Spanish, not translated)

MR. MANOFF: Gracias. All right. First up, we've
got caller 1013. And after that will be caller 3406.
Caller 1013, if you could please follow the prompts
to unmute. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. Thank
you very much for all the work that you're doing. I
wanted to thank you for hearing and listening to the voices of parents and community leaders and students in our effort to keep the Cities of Lawndale, Inglewood, and Hawthorne together.

Our community has worked really hard over the last couple of years to make sure that our children continue to have a good education, and by keeping those cities together, you're keeping the school district together and allowing them to continue to have a good education. So I wanted to give you guys a call to thank you. Our families and kids deserve to be in the same Assembly district, and that's something that I know you guys are working towards that. And I wanted to give a special shout-out to Commissioners Sadhwani and Commissioner Yee for making sure that our cities are kept together. And Commissioner Yee gave a really good example where we can take out the City of Gardena completely and incorporate the City of Lawndale. That way we'll keep the Cities of Lawndale, Hawthorne, and Inglewood together. Again, we are very grateful that you are prioritizing our kids and keeping those cities together. So we really appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 3406. And after that will be caller 4149.

Caller 3406, please follow the prompts to unmute.
MS. CORALES: Hello. My name is Julie Corales. I am a resident of the Barrio Logan community in San Diego. I'm a lifelong resident of San Diego. I have lived in Barrio Logan and in City Heights, and I'm calling to ask the Commission to place the Community of City Heights in the Latino majority district -- the Latinx majority district -- to group it together with Barrio Logan and the South Bay. These communities are intertwined. They are the heart of our Latinx community. We shop together. We celebrate together. We go to the same events. And we need to be -- we need to be joined. We realize that City Heights has an important refugee community, but it is predominantly Hispanic, and we need to be together. Placing us with folks out -- East county affluent folks, predominantly white folks -- would disenfranchise this very special community. City Heights is urban. It is not suburban like the other communities that it is grouped with in the map. And it has very unique needs. These communities -- City Heights, Barrio Logan, Logan Heights, and the South Bay fight for similar issues: Economic justice, racial justice, immigration issues, and we need to have joint representation as we fight for our freedoms, really. So I urge the Commission to please keep these communities together.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.
MS. CORALES: Do not siphon away City Heights and place it with communities that it does not have much in common with. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 4149. And after that will be caller 0205.

Caller 4149, please follow those prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Commissioners, again, for spending so much time on such an important issue. I know it's a lot of feedback to take in. I am calling in regards to the Assembly districts in South L.A. I'm really concerned that one of the four seats that have traditionally been in South L.A. has been eliminated, drastically reducing and minimizing the political voice of South L.A., which is one of California's most vulnerable communities. And definitely one of California's largest black communities. And in doing so, in eliminating one of these districts, you've essentially passed black voters into two districts in South L.A. My suggestion would be to shift AD_110LA Northwest as far as Westward to include areas East of the 405, including Culver City whole. That would allow for, again, a district based in Crenshaw, and then it would also allow for an additional district to the East that should include downtown Skid Row and other parts of South
L.A. in that area. Again, I think it's really important to include Skid Row, which is mostly black -- right? And faces a lot of similar issues on housing, criminalization, et cetera.

At this point, I think it would be helpful to move AD_105COR, again, West, to include LAX. I think as callers have mentioned, having Inglewood-based district that includes Lennox, Hawthorne, is really important.

I'd like to --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- note that other submissions that we've seen, it is possible to group parts of Gardena into that district, which I think is important. There's really strong black communities across Crenshaw, and I think that --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) have shown some strong splits there. So again, we should have another fourth district to the East of that that includes Western Compton. Again, we'd really love to see four black -- a strong South L.A. district that balances black population, and don't pack and don't eliminate political voices in South L.A. Thank you very --

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.
Up next, we've got caller 0205. And after that will be caller 5778.

Caller 0205, please follow the prompts. That's caller with the last four digits 0205. Please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. One more time for caller with the last four digits 0205. You may unmute your phone. Go ahead. The floor is yours.

MS. CRAFT: Hi. Good evening. Sorry for the delay there. A little technical issue on my part. thank you for the opportunity to share my comments this evening. My name is Tiffany Craft, spelled T-I-F-F-A-N-Y C-R-A-F-T, and I am a longtime resident of the City of Irvine. I wanted to briefly talk about the Assembly maps for Irvine where you have the city combined with Costa Mesa and Tustin. To me, it would make more sense if Tustin, North Tustin, Northern Irvine, and Lake Forest were together in the same Assembly district rather than with Costa Mesa where we have little in common. The areas along the foothills and the 241 corridor have common interests, school districts in some cases, and public policy priorities. Please consider changing the map to include the foothill communities in one Assembly district so that the needs of our community can be addressed fairly.

Thank you for your consideration, and I look forward
to seeing Lake Forest with Northern Irvine and North Tustin/Tustin in the next iteration of your maps. Thank you for your commitment and your service to the community. Have a wonderful evening.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And again, we'd like to remind those who have called in tonight to give public comment to please press star nine. This will raise your hand. This is for caller 1461, caller 2567, caller 2638, caller 4047, caller 4201, caller 4328, caller 5273, caller 8742, caller 9006, caller 9786. And to caller 7258, who we were unable to connect with earlier, I see you're still connected. But if any of you would like to give comment, please press star nine. We will be trying your lines, but by pressing star nine you might get ahead in line. You might not have to wait as long. Again, that's star nine to raise your hand.

Up next, we've got caller 5778. And after that will be caller 0223.

Caller 5778, please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

MS. MARTIN-MILIUS: Chair, Vice Chair, and Commissioners, thank you so much for the opportunity to speak. I'm Tara Martin-Milius, that's M-I-L-I-U-S. I'm in Santa Clara County, a former Vice Mayor and councilmember of the City of Sunnyvale. Former neighborhood leader and continue to be active in the
community. I am speaking as an individual. I'm in favor of redistricting to keep Sunnyvale whole, and strongly support the CD-BERRY SUNY draft Congressional district map. Our Sunnyvale City Council has also unanimously voted to request support of Sunnyvale in one Congressional district, one State Assembly district, and one Senate district, with like composition of cities such as Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Cupertino, Fremont, and Milpitas, which all have similar interests and needs, including regional concerns of economic interest, living standards, transportation facilities, work opportunities. My ask is that Congressional, State Senate, and State Assembly redistricting consider the whole of Sunnyvale to be a community of interest, lessening the issues across district confusions and conflicts and affects. Sunnyvale is part of the high-tech economy and should remain with the other high-tech neighboring cities, such as Fremont, Santa Clara, Cupertino, and Fremont and Milpitas. We're all linked by income, housing, immigration status, all regional issues which are more easily addressed by remaining in the same district. We -- the cities in this district, all have a high number of Asian-Americans, East Asian and Asian-Indian descent, which allows for connectedness --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.
MS. MARTIN-MILIUS: -- similar language services, and language access, interest in immigration issues, and cultural-specific social services. I hope you can keep Sunnyvale whole and all of us together in one district. Thank you, all, for your dedication to this redistricting process.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 0223. And after that will be caller 2567.

Caller 0223, if you could please follow the prompts by pressing star six. Go ahead.

MS. BROWN: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Natasha Brown. Thank you so much for taking the time to listen to all the public comments. I know it is not an easy task. I would like to take the time to specifically talk about downtown Los Angeles and Skid Row. On both the Assembly and Congressional levels, we see that downtown Los Angeles and Skid Row are not in core South L.A. districts. Skid Row is a community at risk of losing political power resulting from gentrification that's aimed at attracting higher-earning, wealthy residents. Due to this, it's a community that needs to be protected by being grouped with similar communities who share the same concerns. These areas are home to black communities of interest that mirror each other's concerns around gentrification, affordable housing, and
I would like to make some recommendations for adjustments that would make this possible. At the Congressional level, I would recommend placing downtown Los Angeles and Skid Row in the CD 10 CORE draft district. And at the Assembly level, I would like to recommend creating a fourth black opportunity district East of 110 L.A. that would include downtown Los Angeles and Skid Row, pairing it with South L.A. neighborhoods. I hope you take these recommendations into consideration as it pertains to downtown Los Angeles and Skid Row. These adjustments would allow the black residents --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. BROWN: -- to effectively organize their communities, make their voices heard politically, and flourish. Thank you for your time, and have a good evening.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 2567. And after that will be caller 9786.

Caller 2567, please follow those prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you for all your continued work on the maps. I'd like to reference the Fresno-Tulare Congressional district map. Hanford is a hub for smaller Kings County
communities. Residents from Corcoran, Kettlemen City and other rural towns often travel to Hanford for shopping and entertainment. College of the Sequoias and West Hills Community College campuses in Kings County attract Kings County high school graduates and community members continuing their education. They are communities of interest. Kings County has a dominant Latino presence throughout and the county should be kept together to ensure the Latino community has fair representation in Congress. I urge you to keep Kings County whole. Thank you for your time.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 9786. And after that will be caller 4328.

Caller 9786, please follow those prompts. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. I live in the Angel's Camp area in Calaveras County. I've heard numerous callers asking for the Sierras to be kept separate from the Central Valley, specifically, Stanislaus County and the current ECA Congressional draft. I strongly disagree with these callers. As a resident of the Sierras, my community has a strong relationship with the Central Valley and Stanislaus County. We do our grocery shopping there. We have medical appointments there. Essential services we rely on are based in Stanislaus. Many of our resident's jobs
are also based in the Valley. Residents in the Central Valley also travel and vacation in our Sierras. There is a clear connection between the Sierras and Stanislaus County and Central Valley as whole. I strongly support the current Congressional draft map and ask for the Sierras to stay with Stanislaus County.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 4328. And after that will be caller 8742. Caller 4328, if you could please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

MR. ICHINOSE: Yeah. My name is Daniel Ichinose, and I'm research director at the Orange County Civic Engagement Table. I also worked to support the People's Redistricting Alliance. We appreciate all your hard work, recognizing the diverse interests the Commission and line drawers are working to balance. We're happy that the Commission is prioritizing VRA compliancy. It's important that you get it right.

I have to admit to being confused by your discussion of Orange County this afternoon, which discussed breaking up a key COI in our county to comply with federal law. Last month, you received numerous public map submissions. These were submitted by talented folks with deep ties to communities and decades of redistricting experience of statewide maps from Asian-Americans Advancing Justice, the Black Census and Redistricting Hub and MALDEF, and
Southern California regional maps from the People's Bloc in Los Angeles. The People's Redistricting Alliance in Orange County, and IE United in the Inland Empire. Community members and organizations, demographers, and attorneys spent months working on these maps. It all began by assessing Gingles 1. How many districts can be drawn in which targeted racial groups make up fifty percent or more of a district's citizen voting age population? In areas where these majority/minority districts can be drawn, does racially polarize voting exist? The statewide maps you received from Advancing Justice, the Black Hub in MALDEF, as well as the line regional maps from the People's Bloc --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. ICHINOSE: -- in L.A. and the People's Redistricting Alliance in OC all demonstrate how VRA compliance can be achieved in Los Angeles and Orange Counties while maintaining the integrity of communities of interest on both sides of the county line. So please, please consider these maps --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. ICHINOSE: -- which will save you considerable time so late in this process, and prevent communities from being broken up unnecessarily. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And again, we'd like to
invite those that have called in who have not yet spoken
to please press star nine to raise your hand.

And I'd like to, again, invite Commissioner
Fernandez to please repeat the instructions in Espanol.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ:

(In Spanish, not translated)

MR. MANOFF: Gracias. Up next, we've got caller
8742. And after that will be caller 2638. Caller 8742,
if you could follow the prompts. Go ahead.

MR. PARKER: Thank you for your work to improve the
redistricting process. My name is Allen Parker, and I'm
calling about the Congressional and Assembly districts
for Simi Valley, Santa Clarita, Canyon Country, Antelope
Valley in relation to San Fernando Valley. I think it
would be better to keep as much of the San Fernando
Valley in contiguous districts as possible and not mix it
with Santa Clarita. The San Fernando Valley is part of
the second biggest city in the U.S., and Simi Valley,
Santa Clarita, Canyon Country, Palmdale, and Lancaster
are suburban towns outside of L.A., so a representative
can't properly represent a merged district if they are
that different. They have conflicting priorities.

Previous Congressional visualizations kept Santa Clarita
and the Antelope Valley whole, but to add population, it
makes more sense to push West and include Simi Valley
rather than taking a section of San Fernando Valley to the South. The San Fernando Valley, including Porter Ranch and Granada Hills shares different concerns and issues than the Santa Clarita Valley. Thank you for letting me speak.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 2638. And after that will be caller 4201.

Caller 2638, if you could please follow the prompts. That's caller with the last four digits 2638. If you could please unmute by pressing star six. One more time for caller 2638. You can now unmute your phone by pressing star six.

I'm going to invite Commissioner Fernandez -- oh, no. We have unmuted. Thank you so much, caller 2638. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. I'm calling from Sonora. I've lived in Sonora my entire life, and what I've found in these maps is that we do participate in Stanislaus; we do go down the hill for our medicine, for our groceries. We go to the Valley. I've heard a lot of people complaining about breaking up Stanislaus or doing different things with Stanislaus to remove the mountain communities from it to make it -- keeping Stanislaus whole. I totally disagree with that.

The previous districts we've been in prior to this
ECA over the last ten years, our main focus has been Sacramento. We don't go to Sacramento. We come to the Valley. As I looked at this district, I do find it unusual that the Lake Tahoe rim is the only (audio interference) that's been separated, and you don't have -- a contiguous area of Lake Tahoe has been separated into two districts. I find that very odd. And I heard the complaints of the folks over in Mono County as well as the Mammoth area, and we certainly -- us people here in the foothills and the mountains -- we don't go over the hill, and they should be kept in their own district. The Alpine County down through Death Valley -- that should be a separate district. So I just ask that you take a closer look at where people live, how the road systems work, and understand that there may not be much in comparison between just the rim of Lake Tahoe. That should be kept whole with Truckee and the surrounding communities, as well as the fact that from Mariposa, Oakhurst --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- Sonora -- we all go down the hill to Fresno, Clovis, Madera, Merced, Modesto, and breaking up Stanislaus County makes some sense for us. Thank you very much.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller
4201. And after that we have caller 9006.

Caller 4201, if you could please follow those prompts. Go ahead.

MR. WALDMAN: Stuart Waldman from VICA. Thank you for letting me speak today. I was unsure when the San Fernando Valley would be discussed. I understood that Glendale being placed with West Hollywood today was discussed, which I agree with previous callers, it seems like an odd pairing. And I appreciate that you've been talking about VRA districts. And I agree with the previous caller that the San Fernando Valley, which is home to over 760,000 Latinos, deserve two Assembly districts. We've submitted a simple four-district swap that could just be plugged right in that creates two districts for Latinos that are over fifty percent CVAP. But that being said, if you're making no changes at all to the San Fernando Valley, we're happy with that, too. So just keep walking. Thank you for all you're doing, and I'll talk to you later.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 9006. Please follow the prompts to unmute. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello.

(In Spanish, not translated)

MR. MANOFF: Gracias. And now as we do not have any other raised hands, we are going to try folks who have
not yet spoken. Up first, we're going to try caller 1461. And after that we're going to try caller 4047.

Caller 1461, if you'd like to give comment, please press star six to unmute. Again, that's caller with the last four digits 1461. Please follow the prompts to unmute.

Commissioner Fernandez, could you please invite caller 1461 to unmute by pressing star six?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

(In Spanish, not translated)

MR. MANOFF: Caller 1461, thank you so much for listening. Next up, we're going to try caller 4047. You can now unmute by pressing star six. Again, Commissioner Fernandez, could you please invite caller 4047 to unmute by pressing star six?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ:

(In Spanish, not translated)

MR. MANOFF: Caller 4047, thank you for listening tonight. And next up we'll try caller 4 -- or, I'm sorry -- caller 5273. You can unmute by pressing star six. I want to thank you also for listening tonight. And we're going to retry caller 7258.

Caller 7258, if you'd like to give comment, please press star six. All right. We want to thank you for listening as well. And again, if you are unable to
connect with us tonight over phone, you can contact the
Commission in a variety of other ways.

Chair, the queue is clear.

TEMPORARY CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Kristian, for
the excellent job you and your team always do. Thank you
to all of the callers that's called in today to give us
additional public comment and your community of interest.
We thank you for your time. I'd like to thank all
Commissioners. And actually, I'm going to -- our Chair
is back in. Do you have --

CHAIR TOLEDO: I think you're doing a great job.
And so we'll see each other bright and early tomorrow at
the time allotted. And we'll be reevaluating our
schedule tonight based on our first day of
visualizations, and we'll try to continue to move in this
process. Of course, we need to get to a decision point
and move forward more efficiently. And I know it's hard
because this is important work, and we all are committed
to fair maps. And so thank you to the public. Thank you
to everyone, and we will see each tomorrow. This meeting
is in recess.

(Whereupon, the Citizens Redistricting
Commission (CRC) Meeting adjourned at 6:55
p.m.)
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