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CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are finalizing our maps for the Assembly. Very exciting. We are -- we have some refinements to look at for various reasons of the state. They should posted -- all proposals should be posted up by now. We will be also looking at next steps, after we finalize the Assembly. And then -- so I'll be checking in with -- Commissioner Andersen will be leading that discussion. And with that, let's go to roll call.

MR. SINGH: Thank you, Chair.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Presente.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Aqui.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Aqui.

MR. SINGH: And Commissioner Toledo.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And I am here, as well.

MR. SINGH: Roll call is complete, Chair.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And we have a quorum. Thank you.

With that, we're going to begin by just checking in with our next chair. So after I -- after we complete the Assembly, we're going to move forward with the Congressional maps, is my understanding. And so I want to check in with Commissioner Andersen to -- as she and Vice Chair Kennedy will be leading the next phase. And then also, so we can have a discussion about where we're headed.

Commissioner Andersen.
VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. And yes, I'll be -- I'll be the chair starting tomorrow and for the rest of the week. And so today is Assembly. Tomorrow we jump into Congressional. And tomorrow we'll actually give you the full, sort of how the week's going to lay out. But basically, there'll be a summary tomorrow of what's going on and we will then jump into the entire Southern California. So we'll review what's going to happen and you'll get all the details at that point. So please keep on tuning in.

Anything else you want to say, Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay, great. So thank you very much, Chair. That's just a very short and we'll jump into everything tomorrow.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And I do know that, I think, the final maps committee is also working on a plan and with -- with the chair and that was part of the discussion that maybe we'll have tomorrow, Commissioner Andersen, or as you work through your process.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. It -- yeah. It won't be necessarily a full, you know, blown presentation. But there'll be some changes and things. So we'll give the whole sort of rundown and what happens on -- try to give you an idea of what's going to happen each day, realizing
that's -- depending on how things move, the timing of it, it might either move up or move back. But we'll give the whole rundown this next week. But we will start in the South and then move progressively North.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you Commissioner Andersen.

So with that, I did hear from Commissioners and from the public that, as that we -- that we would like to hear more public comment. So I am going to open up the lines for thirty minutes and we are going to hear public comment from the public on our maps before we hit the road and start working on our iterations -- or rather, refinements for the iterations and hopefully, that will help to give us some additional feedback on these maps. We did receive over -- actually, hundreds and hundreds of written testimony over the last couple of days -- over the weekend. Those have been posted on the Airtable. Commissioners have been reading them all weekend and it's a lot. It's a lot of feedback from all over California. We appreciate it; keep it coming; we will continue to see it. I know staff is posting it as quickly as they possibly can onto the Airtable. But we also want to hear people throughout public testimony form. So we are going to pen the lines for thirty minutes.

Kristian, and let's start hearing public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: So we will -- just to
clarify, Chair. We will be taking calls until what time, please?

CHAIR TOLEDO: We're -- we're going to be closing the lines in thirty minutes, so the people can get into the queue in the next thirty minutes can -- will be heard.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: At what time would you like me to close the lines, please?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay, 1:37.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: At 1:37, we will close the lines. Understood.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

So we're giving the public an opportunity to provide public comment on our iterations that we made public yesterday and that we worked through on Saturday. And with that, we will -- we want to hear from California and hear what they have to say. Also, if -- if there's any public comment on our schedule for the next couple of weeks, that would be appreciated. As well as, I have been seeing quite a bit of com -- public comment coming in from community groups asking for -- to be able to provide comment on the schedule, as well.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Just a moment, I will get ready for public comment here. Stand by.

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 884-6542-9407 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. 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 the queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak and again, please turn down the livestream volume.

And just double-checking, Chair, are we doing one and a half minutes for public comment?

CHAIR TOLEDO: We're doing one and a half minutes, yes.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.
We have a plethora of public who would like to comment. We will be enforcing a one-and-a-half minute time limit, with a warning at thirty seconds and fifteen seconds remaining.

Up first, we've got caller 0569, and after that will be caller 7952.

Caller 0569, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi, thank you. Hi, Commissioners. I am extremely -- my name is Nancy, and I'm extremely upset to see the Assembly map for Santa Clarita. It makes absolutely no sense. Santa Clarita is the third largest city in the county and it deals with issues distinctly different from the City of Los Angeles, like wild fires and public safety power shutoff. Santa Clarita is surrounded by national forest and it should be in an Assembly district with its neighboring communities, and those who share similar characteristics. Putting Santa Clarita with a white affluent area in this -- of the City of Los Angeles I believe to be -- will delete the unique concerns and be -- and we would be ignored, because they will be focused on a wealthier neighborhood that is almost over an hour away. Please put Santa Clarita in its own Assembly district with its neighbor, and not put Santa Clarita with a wealthy -- the
wealthiest neighborhood of -- of Los Angeles that will
drown out our voices.

In addition, I want to add that there -- doing this
will cause an influx of crime, fires, and chaos with the
current Assembly map. We can't be properly represented
against a large, independent --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- municipality of Los
Angeles. The families, businesses, and residents here
will suf -- will suffer with this map and I only hope
that you understand that you guys would be the ones to
live with this for making this decision. Thank you so
much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Up next, we've got caller
7925, and after that will be caller 1965.

Caller 7925, if you could please follow the prompts
to unmute. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi, good afternoon. My
name's Ulysses (ph.) and I'm calling today to ask the
members of the California Redistricting Commission to
please protect the voices of our Latino families in
California by restoring the two Latino communities in Los
Angeles representing, in particular, the communities of
East Los Angeles and Boyle Heights. (Indiscernible) with
the latest maps of iteration there's -- it would,
essentially, suppress the voices of communities that have
tought for so long to make sure that the voices of the
families that are within those communities have been
heard. I believe that restoring those two
(indiscernible) -- those two Latino (indiscernible) would
be an insult to the Latino leaders who have fought for so
many years to overcome historic gerrymandering efforts
that were guided by racist principles to ensure that the
voices of these families were not represented in our
branches of government, preventing Latino families from
making their voices heard on important issues that impact
their quality of life, such as environmental justice;
access to affordable, sustainable housing; and access to
quality education. The Latino --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- community deserves
representation to be in place and we ask you, the
Commission, to have the power today to help preserve
those voices and help empower those families whose voices
need to be heard in Sacramento. And I thank you for your
time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Up next, we’ve got caller
1965, and after that will be caller 0141.

Caller 1965, please follow the prompts. One more
time. Caller with the last four digits 1965, if you
could please unmute. Go ahead.

MS. WALTON: Great. Am I unmuted?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: You are. Go ahead, the floor is yours.

MS. WALTON: Can you hear me, folks? Great, fantastic. Hello, Commissioners. My name is Stephanie Walton and I've been a resident of Oakland's Rockridge neighborhood for seventeen years. I proudly serve as the president of the Rockridge District Association. We represent and advocate for the small business owners in our district. Unfortunately, in your adjustment for a COI in Emeryville, you split another COI, the Rockridge neighborhood.

Rockridge has deep economic connections from our retail district along College Avenue. Rockridge has its very own media market, the Rockridge News, which is hand-delivered to 5,500 homes in our designated neighborhood boundary. Rockridge shares transportation, via the Rockridge BART station, plus bike lanes and bus lines that stretch to Berkeley. Rockridge residents associate themselves as North Oaklanders, meaning our preference would be to stay with the following neighborhoods: Piedmont Avenue, Temescal, Golden Gate, Longfellow, Bushrod, and Santa Fe. These neighborhoods are nestled between Emeryville and Piedmont, and along the Berkeley
border. Most importantly, we want to stay unified as North Oakland and we appreciate you taking our request into consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MS. WALTON: Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Up next, we've got caller 0141, and after that will be caller 3241.

Caller 0141, please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

MR. SANCHEZ: Good morning. My name is Thomas Sanchez, and I am a concerned resident from North Hollywood. My community has been continually been split for years and it was looking like the Commission was going to unify us in one district. The Commission gave directions to do that and it was ignored. The North Hollywood community is made up of three LA city council neighborhoods, NoHo West, Hollywood -- sorry -- NoHo West, North Hollywood, NoHo Northeast, and NoHo North M-C. We have asked to be put in Toluca Lake and you split our community to a CVAP that serves the community being put with Toluca Lake. We should be with other communities, like Van Nuys and Sun Valley, and I ask that you please unite us and all of our community.

Just a note of caution to please be wary of the group VICA that purports to speak for the San Fernando Valley. It is a collection of corporate businesses and
it does not represent the will of our voices and
marginalizes the immigrant communities. Their maps are
made with no public input and no community engagement.
They do not represent the valley.

Please use the November draft maps as a base for
refinement and don't use the current utilization --
visualizations which irrevocably wreck the valley and our
community ties. Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next,
we've got caller 3241, and after that will be caller
2711.

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

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We can hear you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, there. I'm just calling
in on the Congressional maps for Orange County,
especially the coastline. It doesn't make any sense to
split Orange County's beautiful Cities of LA or San
Diego, because none of those communities have anything in
common with Orange County. Because LA and Orange County
are like two different worlds when it comes to how those
communities are operating and how their economies and
tourism go. And the same thing with San Diego. I mean,
San Diego's not even right there at the border. There's
Camp Pendleton and then the San Diego -- the next San Diego city after San Clemente. So keeping Orange County together, especially the beach cities, and keeping inland cities, because I mean, what does an inland city have in common with a beach city? And so we just want the beach cities to stay together. Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. And up next, we've got caller 2711. After that will be caller 4201.

Caller 2711, the time has come to press star six.

Go ahead.

MS. SONG: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Eunice Song, and I'm the executive director of the Korean American Coalition - Los Angeles. It's a nonprofit organization in the heart of Koreatown that has advocated for civic and civil rights interests of the Korean American community since 1983. KAC is a member of the Koreatown redistricting task force, as well as a member of the Asian Pacific Policy and Planning Council, which is part of the AAPI and AMEMSA redistricting collaborative.

Currently, Koreatown, Los Angeles, is not kept whole but rather, we are split at every single state level of redistricting. Please unify Koreatown, as referred to in the shape file previously submitted by the AAPI and AMEMSA state redistricting collaborative. The
COI of Koreatown needs to be kept whole and the community has overwhelmingly supported this, as evidenced by nearly 5,000 signatures to unify Koreatown. Even Los Angeles city redistricting has recognized Koreatown, and the council will vote to finalize it this week. We request the same at all state levels.

Koreatown is made up of, predominantly, of renters, while the neighboring areas are homeowners, and residents have shared socio and economic --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MS. SONG: -- characteristics, and have cultural similarities. They go to the same churches, schools, and same shopping centers, and restaurants. Importantly, the AAPI community of the area share policy concerns.

Koreatown deserves a single elected official --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- as it traditionally has at all state levels. As one of the densest neighborhoods, it does not want its political voice diluted. Please protect our COI by keeping Koreatown whole. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 4201, and after that will be caller 3447.

Caller 4201, please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

MR. WALDMAN: Hi. Stuart Waldman from VICA,
representing all of the San Fernando Valley, except that one guy, I guess. We'd like to suggest some changes, which we've submitted. Woodland Hills and Tarzana are part of the Ventura Boulevard Specific Plan and should be in the same district as Encino, Sherman Oaks, and Studio City. So we'd like to see that part moved into the South SFB district. Granada Hills North and South neighborhood councils have a lot in common with Porter Ranch and Chatsworth. We'd like to see those moved into the SFSCV district. Someone in Tujunga neighborhood council is split. We'd like to see united in the East San Fernando Valley district. As well as for population purposes, you'd need to take some population from NoHo and put that in the East SFV. And then, I'm not sure about the iteration in T-1, because it says that it's Congressional, but I think it's Assembly, and I don't know what the population is. But we'd like to see more of Glendale in one district and we thought that you could add another 40,000 Glendale residents into GLENLA.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. WALDMAN: I'm not sure if that's the case (audio interference). But these small changes are consistent with previous maps that you've drawn and serve the valley well. And you know, they're minor and just a -- I think, a four-district change that would serve people well. So
you don't have the weirdness --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Ten seconds.

MR. WALDMAN: -- that was going on in the current iteration. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 3447, and after that will be caller 9157.

3447, if you could please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

MR. FLORES: Good afternoon. Thank you all for your service to California. My name is Victor Flores. I'm a long-term native resident of Oakland. And just looking at the new iterations of the map, it is concerning to see North Oakland being added into the -- what is currently the Assembly district 18. For those of you that are not familiar with Rockridge, Temescal, Golden Gate, all of the North Oakland neighborhoods have far more in common with Berkeley. For example, Rockridge is very similar to Claremont and Elmwood in social and economic interests, while the rest of the Northern Oakland neighborhoods are similar to South Berkeley. In fact, there is a long-term tradition of BIPOC folks living in North Oakland and South Berkeley, so you have, essentially, one large geographic area with inter-connected families and social networks. You also have transit corridors that run along
those neighborhoods that are inter-connected, as well as USC Berkeley students that either live as under-graduates or graduates --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. FLORES: -- in these neighborhoods and remain there. I think Oakland has done -- is doing good work to build housing and a strong regional economy, so it makes sense to have multiple Assembly members that can take a holistic approach to legislation. So please don't box us in and --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Ten seconds.

MR. FLORES: -- take away our voice. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 9157, and after that will be caller 5825.

Caller 9157, if you could please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

MR. PEREZ: Thank you, Commissioners, for your service. My name is Ruben Perez, and I am a delegate for the 56th Assembly district. And as a resident of the Coachella Valley, I urge you not to divide our vulnerable, under-served Latino communities. The areas of Desert Hot Springs and Cathedral City belong together with Indio, Coachella and the unincorporated areas further East all the way down to the Imperial Valley. In
addition to our natural geographical connection, we share
the same community demographics, as well as the economy,
access to jobs, housing, schools, and other essential
resources. It makes no sense to pair us with areas of
the mountain, which -- with no geographical or cultural
connection; or La Quinta, which is entirely different.
Please correct this mistake and give our communities our
best chance to thrive.

Thank you for your work and consideration of
community input.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next,
we've got caller 5825, and after that will be caller
1486.

Caller 5825, the time has come to press star six.
Go ahead.

MR. NAGLE: Hi, my name is Nico Nagle. I'm a
resident of Oakland, calling in to just quickly comment
on the latest map. I think, as other folks have said, it
doesn't really seem to make a whole ton of sense. First
of all, in the North Berkeley area, it's breaking up a
major COI and you know, it makes those areas of North
Oakland. As I said before, have a lot more in common
with South Berkeley and Emeryville.

In the Southern part of the district, there's also a
breaking up of San Leandro. That's a major community
that -- you know, one relies heavily on having their voice together. They rely on things like transportation --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. NAGLE: -- in the area. And the current drafts -- or the most -- the latest draft seems like it would really dilute those voices in those communities -- communities of color down there, as well. So you know, basically -- but I would urge you to look back on this and --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Ten seconds.

MR. NAGLE: -- as long as you divide Oakland that keeps North Oakland COI and San Leandro together. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 1486, and after that will be caller 9503.

Caller 1486, if you could please follow the prompts. One more time for caller 1486. If you could please press star six to unmute. We are ready for your public input. Go ahead. One more time, caller 1486. Please press star six. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Thank you to the Commission for all your hard work. My name is Leanora C. (ph.). I was born in Rockridge and I'm a
long-time resident. I'm urging you to refer to comment 33192 that provides a specific geography of the Rockridge boundaries. I'm a signer on that letter, but the comments I'm going to make right now are strictly my own, as a resident.

Rockridge and our communities of interest should not be split. Our economic ties, we have a thriving retail district, we have a BART station and many bus lines. We have a community newspaper published monthly, so we have a major media outlet, but a media outlet in the neighborhood. We're delivered to 5,500 homes and that's about 11,000 people. Our preference is for you to go back to draft map 10, the -- of November 10th. It keeps our neighborhood whole and it also maintains our --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- connections with our vicinities. The neighborhoods Temescal, Elmwood, Piedmont Avenue on. So we ask you, please, to go back and consider that map again and keep Rockridge whole --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- as a community of interest.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 9503, and after that will be caller
Caller 9503, please press star six. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Chris, that's spelled C-H-R-I-S, and I live in the garden neighborhood of Santa Rosa. I'm also a new dad, so you may hear my little guy in the background. But thank you for your ongoing efforts for applying the Assembly district boundaries in Sonoma County. I'd especially like to applaud Commissioner Neal for his thoughtfulness about our beloved Santa Rosa.

Unfortunately, Plan F has a problematic split, which I hope can change. Highway 12 provides a clear and appealing shape but unfortunately, using it as a dividing line creates two highly problematic splits of the city. First, Santa Rosa is still recovering from the devastating Tubbs Fire. These fire risks have not gone away and the communities need unified representation. However, they're currently split in Plan F. The risks are most acute in areas East of Highway 101 and on both sides of Highway 12 East of Farmers Lane. Please keep the following together: the areas located just below Spring Lake and Howard Park, and the many senior living communities above Annadel State Park. Fire risks in these portions of Santa Rosa are shared with
communities --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- to the North, so please connect the areas I've just shared, with an end coast district to the North. I urge you to look at the map submitted by commenter 33047, which shows the exact wildfire risk I'm speaking about.

Second, the Latino and POC communities of Santa Rosa are most --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- heavily concentrated in the areas West of Highway 101. Unfortunately, Plan F divides this diverse area and will, thus, dilute our voting power by pairing us with these areas East of Highway 101, which are significantly less diverse. If Santa Rosa must be split, please use the fire risk and cultural --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. And I'd like to thank everybody for speaking at a steady pace, and taking your time with county names, city names, and numbers.

Up next, we've got caller 7331, and after that will be caller 5107.

Caller 7331, if you could please follow those prompts. Go ahead.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi, this is Kim (ph.). And I've actually called before about Santa Monica, and I just want to thank you guys so much for your service to California. Much appreciated.

So right now, in the Congressional district, Santa Monica has been put together with Poway. So I'm calling to urge you to please, please put us back with Venice in the coastal district. So last week, the Santa Monica city council voted unanimously to please put us back with Venice in the coastal district.

I think I just heard Stuart Waldman just called in and I'm urging you to look at his VICA map that offer a sound solution that fixes this and actually, a bunch of other things. I, you know, it puts West Hollywood back together, it puts the valley people back in the valley. Please know that Santa Monica agrees with these VICA maps. I can absolutely email those to you guys, if you want to see them, because I'm sure you're very busy with other things.

So however you decide to do it --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- it's cool, but I'm urging you, please, please, please just put Santa Monica back with Venice in the coastal district. Have a great day, guys. Thanks.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 5107, and after that will be caller 6250.

Caller 5107, if you could please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello. Thank you for the opportunity to give some feedback. I've been living in Laguna Beach and Newport for many years. There's a lot of synergy amongst the beach cities. The problems and issues are mostly the same. I've lived in Orange County a long, long time and I had offices in Irvine, so I'm familiar with the commute from Laguna Beach to Irvine, and from Newport to Irvine.

It's a varied residential and commercial lifestyle of inland versus on the beach would be difficult for one supervisor to handle. The coastal Commission makes a lot of the decisions on housing and commerce on the beach cities, while the issues in Irvine are far different and have no such restrictions. The traffic, the parking, the policing, even the types of commerce differ. When there's, like, some part of the mammal rescue center in Laguna Beach, and when there's, like, rescues, all the cities kind of work together with the beach cities. They understand the beach issues. Our coastal towns --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- often they do not understand what goes on inland, nor have any involvement with the issues that the inland communities have. To have one supervisor handle the same issues makes sense. To ask a supervisor to deal with an inland --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- Irvine versus beach makes zero sense. The communities inland are vastly different.

Anyway, thank you so much for giving me a minute and have a good day.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 6250, and after that will be caller 5181.

Caller 6250, if you could please follow the prompts. One more time, caller with the last four digits 6250, you can unmute by pressing star six, please.

Again, caller with the last four digits 6250, if you could please press star six to unmute your phone. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi. Can you hear me okay?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Great, thanks. My name is Ben (ph.). I actually called in a few nights ago and
being a little bit long-winded, I wound up taking too much time and got cut off. So I wanted to just call back and sort of finish what I was saying, which was, at the time, I was mentioning that I thought that the draft Congressional maps, which at the -- which seem to have split West Hollywood into two different Congressional districts. It really didn't make sense to me as a Los Angeles resident and long-time West Hollywood resident. And it seemed like doing so really sort of harms the political voice of a particularly, you know, under-represented community that has, you know, its own identity in the City of West Hollywood. And as a result, I just wanted to kind of add my voice to what seems like a growing chorus of --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- opinions that would support keeping West Hollywood together, using solutions, such as the one that's been put forth in the VICA maps. And so was just hoping you guys would please --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- consider that, and wanted to get back in. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 5181, and after that will be caller 3270.
Caller 5181, if you could please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners.
This may run to you as conventional wisdom, but the City of Santa Clarita is actually a majority minority city. It's the third largest city in the County of LA, and it deserves to anchor its own Assembly district with neighboring communities like Acton and Agua Dulce, instead of diluting our power by including us with overwhelmingly white and affluent areas of the City of Los Angeles like West Hills and Woodland Hills and Chatsworth.
Please protect our communities of interest by including us with our neighbors, and Woodland Hills with their neighbors. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 3270, and after that will be caller 6628.

Caller 3270, if you could please -- oh, just a moment, my bad. All right. Let's try this again.
Caller 3270, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. Go ahead.

MS. MEDINA: Hello. My name is Martha Medina. I'm part of the Latino community member from Van Nuys and I'm really concerned about these recent maps. I have nothing
in common with the communities of San Fernando and Granada Hills. We do most of our shopping, as a family and community, within the Victor -- Victory Boulevard corridor, and our dining. And that's where we do a lot of our shopping.

I urge the Commission to revert to the draft maps of central San Fernando Valley and put our shared communities, like Balboa -- like Balboa, Valley Glen, and all of North Hollywood, and Toluca Lake, which connects our community. We are not a wealthy or well-connected community, and we ask that you listen to our voices in the community of San Fernando. I have talked to many of my neighbors from other valley communities and we're shocked and surprised by these maps.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MS. MEDINA: We feel like the politicians are gerrymandering, not the maps that are good -- we want the maps that are good for our community. San Fernando is a very diverse community with large Latino and Filipino and Armenian communities, and all these communities --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen seconds.

MS. MEDINA: -- are split. This area needs our attention. And the last-minute nature of these maps has thrown our community into disarray. Please remedy this and use the draft that was created in November as a base
for those fixes.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 6628, and after that will be caller 5277.

Caller 6628, if you could please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Good afternoon, Commissioners. While we thank you for keeping our Imperial Valley whole, I am deeply concerned about dividing us from our strongly linked neighboring Coachella Valley Latino communities. We have a natural, well-built connection to the Coachella Valley communities of Mecca, Thermal, Coachella, Indio, Cathedral City, and Desert Hot Springs. Our priorities align and we share the same culture, economic opportunities, and other vital demographics. I would like to respectfully ask that you please keep Imperial Valley together with these communities we resemble, instead of forcing us together with areas up in the mountain that are both geographically and culturally remote from us.

The proposed map would further disenfranchise us in one of California's most vulnerable, under-served areas. Please, do not make this mistake. We urge you not to separate Desert Hot Springs and Cathedral City from the other Coachella Valley Latino communities.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: And we ask that you please keep our Imperial Valley together with them. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. And again, to those who have called in, if you could please press star nine. This will raise your hand and get you into the queue.

Up next, we've got caller 5277, and after that will be caller 0815.

Caller 5277, if you could please follow the prompts by pressing star six. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. My name is Brian (ph.) and I'm currently residing in the Santa Clarita region. I don't think San Fernando Valley and cities like Encino and Hidden Hills should be together. Those places are almost an hour away and the residents of Santa Clarita would have to drive to another -- other Assembly districts to even get to the Southern part of that district. Instead, I would recommend that Simi Valley and Santa Clarita should be in the same district, so we can protect our rural and sparse communities from wildfires and power shut-offs.

So yeah, Commissioners, I would recommend you put Simi Valley with Santa Clarita, not only for the
protection of wild -- from wildfires, but also the aerospace industry. Our economies are interlinked. And yeah, thank you for your time, Commissioners, and have a great day.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. And we do have quite a few callers; we see your hands. Thank you for your patience, everybody. We will get to everybody. Up next, we've got caller 0815, and after that will be caller 9835.

Caller 0815, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Are you able to hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We can hear you. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Perfect. My name's Alyssa (ph.) and I come from an immigrant family of dairy workers from Portugal, and we live on a dairy East of Oakdale. I wanted to take a moment of your time and ask you to please go with the suggested plan from Friday. That would remove Vineyard from South Sacramento to the Stanislaus Assembly map plan. I agree with the public comments that I've read from people who live in the Vineyard. They deserve to be put with their neighbors in Elk Grove. I also agree with the public comments that I
have read from people who live in Folsom. They deserve
to be kept together, as well.

We should be kept together with our neighbors who we
share so much with, just over the county lines to our
East. I ask that you go with the plan that would draw us
in stretch of West Amador and Calaveras Counties, to be
included with South Sacramento to the Stanislaus Assembly
map. This would be a near perfect compromise that would
make most common sense to those who live here, and also
the people live in the Vineyard and Folsom happy. We
have far more in common with the West edges of the
foothills than we do with either Vineyard or Folsom. By
doing this, you keep all the communities of interest
together --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- as well as the --
as well as the farming and ranching immigrant populations
together, who live in-between the lakes and the East
central valley. We should be considered -- we should be
considered a combined community of interest. Thank you
for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next,
we've got caller 9835, and after that will be caller
3889.

Caller 9835, you know what to do. Go ahead.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi. I am calling about the SCV iteration and the South SSV iteration. Putting any portion of the San Fernando valley in with the Santa Clarita district is less than ideal. But if it needs to be done, then it should be the portions of the San Fernando valley that actually have similar interests with the Santa Clarita. I think the Sunland-Tujunga area is a better match with Santa Clarita than are places like Woodland Hills and Hidden Hills. The two areas are connected by the 210 freeway, but the existing iteration doesn't actually have any sort of transportation corridor connecting Woodland Hills and Santa Clarita, for example.

You can do a population swap within the SCV district and then have South SSV district, putting some of Tujunga in with the SCV map. Then putting Woodland Hills in with the rest of the 101 corridor in the South SSV map. This makes both districts more compact, it reinforces transportation corridors, and it protects communities of interest. It would also not impact the rest of the map in any way. It's a simple swap in two districts and it just makes sense. Thanks.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 3889, and after that will be caller 8174.

Caller 388 -- caller 3889, go ahead.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi. I'm calling about the Santa Clarita Valley and South San Fernando Valley iterations. Since Santa Clarita Valley has so much of the Angeles National Forest, I think it would make perfect sense to add Sunland and Tujunga into the Santa Clarita valley map. And then to add an equal number of population from Woodland Hills into the South San Fernando Valley district. The simple population swap, I think, strengthens the 101 corridor community of interest, and it also strengthens the wildfire-risk community of interest between Sunland and Tujunga and also Santa Clarita Valley. I think, again, this makes both districts more compact, protects communities of interest, and I think it would be a viable solution. Thanks so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 8174, and after that will be caller 1886.

Caller 8174. Go ahead.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Hi. My name is Sonja Rodriguez (ph.) and I work for Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights, CHIRLA. I want to express my gratitude to the Commission and the staff for creating opportunities for public engagement for our residents in California. Today I will be speaking about state Assembly iterations for
12/6/21 in San Fernando Valley. We want to underscore the importance of low-income immigrant communities in the San Fernando Valley around Pacoima.

We appreciate the Commission's efforts to create two federal Voting Rights Acts districts at the Assembly level in San Fernando. We love ADES, that is no longer with Santa Clarita. This map better represents the communities in East San Fernando Valley who will now have a better opportunity to elect candidates of choice.

In order to try to respect as many neighborhood council boundaries, we suggest adding more of Pacoima into AD_CENTRALSSC. This can be done by adding from Glen Oaks Boulevard South to the San Fernando Boulevard, and East San Fernando towards Oxford Street.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: This will strengthen the voice of the communities of interest in Pacoima, as they share many things in common with Panorama (indiscernible). Additionally, for Orange County map ADNOC, please consider moving Fullerton dividing line back up to Chapman.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: (Indiscernible) any further South than West Commonwealth Avenue, because this area is experiencing environmental hazards across the line from
Chapman South into (indiscernible).

Thank you for your consideration and all the hard work. Again, thank you for receiving input.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 1886, and after that will be caller 9287.

Caller 1886. Go ahead.

MS. ROTH: Thank you, Commissioners. My name is Shannon Roth (ph.), a San Pedro resident and coastal San Pedro neighborhood council board member. I'm concerned with the new iterations. On the previous map, San Pedro was in one district, now we are divided into two separate districts. San Pedro is a port community. We would like to keep San Pedro in one district as we previously were, for the best interest of our port community. Please take this recommendation into consideration. And thank you for your work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 9287, and after that will be 9009.

Caller 9287. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi, thank you. My name is Omar (ph.) and I'm calling from the bay area. And first of all, I'd like to say thank you to the Commissioners for all the work that they've done. I know it's a difficult job having to balance all of the various
needs.

But I'm calling about the proposed Assembly maps in the most recent iteration, because they divide Redwood City. And I think it's vital to keep the city unified and to keep it all in one district.

But I'm also calling to say that I support the comments that have come in from some of the community members in Redwood City proposing alternative lines. Because if the city does need to be divided, then it should be along the lines that the community has come together about. On top of that, Redwood City is a majority minority city, and so dividing it really puts all those communities at odds and takes away all of the influence that they have worked hard to have within their own county. So I hope that the Commission looks into those and thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 9009, and after that will be caller 3761.

Caller 9009. Go ahead.

MR. CARROLL: Hi. Can you hear me okay?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We can.

MR. CARROLL: Oh, great. Thank you so much. Hey, Commissioners, my name is Mike Carroll. I'm a member the Irvine City Council.
First, Commissioners, I'd like to thank you for your service. I know exactly what you're going through with these important deliberations, and I know very well what it means to consider the amount of public comment testimony that you're considering. I know it feels like a thankless job and you're unable to meet and address the views that are being stated here today, no question. I am actually here to thank you. You're performing critical, critical work for a state that would, basically, be the fifth largest economy in the world. So in many ways, it's really not a state.

Recently, our city council in Irvine passed a resolution in full support, keeping as one united city, Irvine, when it comes to state and federal electoral districts. We are really happy that the Commission has left our city -- my city -- whole and inland, and no merged it with our neighbors at the coast, particularly, with the state Assembly district that has recently been published. We're grateful for that and many Commissioners, especially Linda, your Commissioner colleague who resides in Orange County, California, here with us, who specifically for the importance of a coastal Assembly district --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Twenty seconds.

MR. CARROLL: -- and a district that kept the City
of Irvine whole and not severed as a community. Irvine
is the third largest city and the sixth largest county in
the United States --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Ten seconds.

MR. CARROLL: -- and we really appreciate your help
in keeping our community together for the benefit of --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next,
we've got caller 3761, and after that will be caller
6065.

Caller 3761. Go ahead.

MR. VILORIA: Yes, hi. My name is Michael Viloria.
I'm a long-time resident of Sonoma County. And I'm
calling about the Santa Rosa area in the Assembly
district region up here. So the split for Santa Rosa is
what I'm calling about. I believe it can be done better
to represent communities affected by fires, that I
believe are -- have been reference in the map that's
submission number 33047. A minor adjustment that I
support would be a proposed division -- to the proposed
division along Highway 12. That some of the areas
they -- around the edges -- should be in the North coast
district. And that area of communities on both sides of
Highway 12 have common interests, including the risks
that are also been mentioned in public input we've --
again, referred to as --
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. VILORIA: -- ID 33047. Thank you. I appreciate the Commissioners' work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. And again, we do have a plethora of callers. We appreciate your patience. We will get to your comments. If you have called in to give public comment and you can hear the sound of my voice, you are in the right place. If you could please press star nine, that'll get you into the queue.

Up next, we've got caller 6065, and after that will be caller 6082.

Caller 6065. Oops, I did it again. All right.

Caller 6065. Let's try this again. There you go.

MR. JONES: Yes. Thank you, Commissioners. This is Douglas Jones. I'm a long-time resident of about thirty years of the City of San Leandro in the East Bay. San Leandro in the -- in this century has been buffeted back and forth on the legislative maps, you know, between the districts North and South. The current formulation of the maps of Senate district 9 and Assembly district 18 have San Leandro as the southmost city in each of those legislative districts. In my mind, that makes the most sense and provides some stability.

We do have concerns that San Leandro looks like it
may be placed as the northernmost City of the legislative
districts to the South. It's just really important that
we not get buffeted back and forth like this from decade-
to-decade. In this way, it dovetails with the concern
that you've heard from a number of residents of North
Oakland, that they don't wish to be moved into a new set
of legislative districts, as well; particularly, the
Assembly district. So we would ask that there be a
reconsideration of --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Ten seconds.

MR. JONES: -- the layout of the legislative maps
here, and particularly, on Assembly district 18,
maintaining San Leandro in -- within the --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next,
we've got caller 0682, and after that will be caller
0177.

Caller 0682. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners.
As a resident of the Antelope Valley, I'm upset that we
were separated in the latest iteration of the Assembly
maps. With that being said, as a Latino, I have to
support it because we deserve representation in the
Antelope Valley and Victor Valley. If this is what it
takes for us to have an Assembly member who supports our
values and interests, then I'm happy that, at least, some
of us will get to enjoy that.

I would like to say, given your schedule the next few days, that we in the Antelope Valley support your current draft of ABSDV. When I hear people speaking publicly about the district, it's always about Santa Clarita, our sister community; or Simi Valley, a wealthy Ventura County community; but what about us? Why are we always the ones who are ignored and on the chopping block? We are a military and defense community that has been separated in order to appease people in Simi Valley for a decade. We're the home of Lockheed, Northrop, Boeing, and a large hospitality industry that services defense contractors. Why is this always forgotten?

Putting Simi Valley --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- with us would mean separating the Antelope Valley yet again. Simi Valley doesn't belong with us. They are not a majority minority community like the Antelope Valley and Santa Clarita Valley are. Your map drafts and visualizations haven't really --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- changed much the last two months. I'm really hoping that you don't change them at the last minute. Please leave them the way they are.
They're cut perfectly along the North LA County line.
Thank you so much for your hard work and happy holidays.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 0177, and after that will be caller 9747.

Caller 0177. Go ahead.

MR. MARQUEZ: Hello. My name is Jesse Marquez (ph.). I am a seventy-year-old resident of Los Angeles Latino community of Wilmington. And our family has over fifty registered voters in fifteen different cities in California. I submitted my public comments on Saturday and I do not see my comments posted on your website.

I do not support any proposed district change if it eliminates an existing district located in a majority environmental justice disadvantaged low-income community of color or ethnic minority community in Los Angeles County. We have fought for decades to have Latino social equity representation in our legislatures. Assembly district 58 is one of those examples.

We also do not support any district change if it eliminates an existing representative who is an ethnic minority -- who is Latino, Asian, Black, Native American, or Pacific Islander. A good example is also Congressional district 33 in our area. And I thank you for this time.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 9747, and after that will be 1874.

9747. Go ahead.

MR. MARQUEZ: Oh. Thank you for moving Florence-Graham into the LA -- 110 LA map. Although changes are not perfect, we thank you for listening to the community. Very important, but we think there is a need for one cleanup in this area.

As you have heard, the mayor of Huntington Park and countless other community members from Walnut Park, we want, like the RR3 (ph.) communities, to remain together. By moving Walnut Park and Huntington Park, even if it's only a part of Huntington Park, together with Florence-Graham in the 110 corridor map. Please see the Latino equality representation map that was submitted today, as this map --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. MARQUEZ: -- will accomplish our request. These minor changes will help to have a unit -- unified voice for our community. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 1874, and after that will be 1960.

Caller 1874. The floor is yours.

MR. TRIGLIA: Hello. I'm calling from northeast Los Angeles. My name is Vito Triglia. And I'm concerned
that the proposed Assembly district N10 (ph.) will shrink the voice of immigrant families in Sacramento. Immigrant families face unique challenges and need their interests protected and I think that the proposed map from ID number 29056 would do that. I support the map from ID number 29056, because it complies with the Voting Rights Act by ensuring that there's two Assembly districts that exceed fifty percent Latino voting-age population, instead of shrinking them into one. Thank you for your work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 1960, and after that will be caller 1528.


MR. MELENDREZ: Hello. My name is Alex Melendrez. I'm a member of the San Mateo County Latinx Dems. I'm in -- located in Assembly district 22. I'm asking (audio interference) that Omar mentioned earlier, I would ask that you would include (audio interference) city whole (audio interference) in order for the Latino population of Brentwood City to have proper representation. As a Mexican American, myself, the importance of a voice for the Latinx community is pretty big. And Brentwood City has been home to the largest concentra -- one of the largest concentrations of Latinos in San Mateo County.
Proper representation for our growing community requires representation and for the community to be whole. So I thank you for your service and consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 1528, and after that will be caller 5410.

Caller 1528. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello. I am calling to speak on northwest Los Angeles. I am a community health worker at clinic. I'm a community health worker at (indiscernible) located in Boyle Heights. Thank you, Commissioners, for all your hard work.

I am calling to urge the Commission that you protect the voices of our Latino families in California, by ensuring that two Latino seats in Los Angeles representing, is Los Angeles and Boyle Heights. What you have done with the latest map (indiscernible) is suppress the voices of our communities that have fought for too long to have its voice heard. I, once again, voice my support to keep two Assembly district 51 and 53 of representing central Los Angeles and East Los Angeles. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 5410, and after that will be caller 5276.
Caller 5410, please follow the prompt. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, thank you. So I'm an educator who has lived in Eastern Stanislaus County for over ten years now. And before you take a vote to complete the State Assembly maps, I really want to urge you guys to just consider making a change. Because I've heard that you're trying to figure out what to do with Vineyard, and I agree that it should be with the Sacramento area. I also agree that it wouldn't be fair to the people who live in Folsom to be put in a district with those of us who live in the East valley, because we're -- with the agriculture and rural areas. I'd like to ask that you go with the compromised plan that would combine the lake country to the immediate East of Stanislaus and San Joaquin Counties. And that would still allow you to keep the higher elevations whole.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: While I live in Eastern Stanislaus, I have many friends who live in the mountains and I agree that the higher elevations should be kept together. My friends who live in El Portal and Mariposa and Sonora, they all have a common interest.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: But my family and friends, who live in San Pedro, Lake McClure, they also
are separate combined interest that's closer to Eastern Stanislaus County. We even have students from those towns here in Eastern Stanislaus County. So please consider this change.

   PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 5276, and after that will be caller 1634.

   Caller 5276.

   UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello. Can you hear me?
   PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. Go ahead.
   UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you so much Commissioners. I want to, once again, by thanking you for all the hard work you have done in drawing the (indiscernible) and trying to create an equitable distribution of them. To that point, as a resident of Coachella Valley, I am deeply concerned about the divide of our Coachella Valley Latino communities. It would be a mistake to split Desert Hot Springs and the City of Cathedral City from -- away from Indio and Coachella, as many of these communities share a strong bond.

   These areas belong together and we are entire -- we are entirely different from La Quinta and the mountain areas to the West that are proposed in the current Assembly maps. Please do not prejudice and disenfranchise our under-served areas. This would undo
years of concentrated efforts throughout the region.
Please keep our Latino communities together in Coachella
Valley and give us our best shot at equitable
representation. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next,
we've got caller 1634, and after that will be caller
8984.

Caller 1634. Go ahead.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Hi. My name is Rocio Rodriguez, and
I'm a resident of Sonoma County. I did use to live in
Santa Rosa and no longer live there, but I do want to
give a comment as to a neighborhood where I did use to
live, very close to Howard Park and Spring Lake. There
have been already several other comments around this.

I do want to state that I was a Commissioner for the
advisory district committees for Sonoma County and have
had many conversations and deliberation around even the
equity -- the question of equity around drawing lines off
of highways. Because of our racial inequities and the
reasonings behind why some highways have been built. So
using Highway 12 is already questionable for me, but in
the interest of, what I understand, is where you are in
your decision-making and how tough it is to draw these
lines, especially down to streets. I just want to voice
support for the comment for 33 -- I'll say it slower --
33047, with putting Howard Park and Spring Lake --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: -- with the North coast area. And that is for the same reasons that others posed, as well, of disaster response and disaster preparedness that happens in these areas of interest -- or communities of interest. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 8984, and after that will be caller 9975.

Caller 8984. Oops, let's try this one more time.

Caller 8984. There you go.

MS. JESTER: Hi, thanks so much. And thanks to the Commissioners for your commitment to the redistricting process. My name is Amy Jester, and I work with the Humboldt Area Foundation and Wildlife Risk Community Foundation, which serve Del Mar, Humboldt, and Trinity Counties. And we regularly partner with the Karuk Tribe and the Yurok Tribe. Particularly, it looks like the Assembly map was redrawn to address some of the things I'm going to talk about here. But just wanted to reiterate the importance of my comments specific to the Congressional map and the Senate map, as well. And I'm commenting on the North coast area and the far northwest region of California.
So I'm calling today to support the plea from the Yurok Tribe, which is the largest in the State of California, to ensure that its entire territory remain in District 2, as opposed to dividing it into two Congressional districts --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MS. JESTER: -- which as -- what the map -- the draft map entails. Dividing ancestral territory of the Yurok reservation will harm the relationship between -- further harm the relationship between --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen seconds.

MS. JESTER: -- tribes and the State of California.
And would be an affront to the Voting Rights Act, as well as the various criteria that the Committee has set before it. We also encourage the committee to --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Up next, we've got caller 9975, and after that will be caller 1212.

Caller 9975. Go ahead.

MS. SMITH: Good afternoon. My name is Susan Smith. I'm a Fullerton resident and a retired educator in the Fullerton district. I just want to begin by thanking the Commissioners for the attention being paid to Fullerton, and all the extra time I know you guys are putting in on our behalf.

I have recently submitted to you a proposal, number
34032, and just want to thank you for considering possible ways to help unite, rather than divide our community. Thank you, again, for our time and consideration of this issue.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next is caller 1212, and after that will be caller 7477.

Caller 1212, please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

MR. BARTZ: Good afternoon, Commissioners. This is Don Bartz, in Phelan Pinion Hills Community Services District. Our organization, as well as Phelan Chamber and several community members have sent you multiple letters and emails concerning our community. We feel strongly that putting in our community in districts with Los Angeles County would cause us to be left behind. We know this from history. Although we have stated in our letters, even though we are on the county border boundary, we feel we cannot be further apart from Antelope Valley or Los Angeles County.

We think this way for several reasons. Primarily, because our residents also do not travel to Antelope Valley for any essential services, which is why there is no major transit corridor linking the San Bernardino County High Desert area to Antelope Valley. There are no cooperative agreements between local governments or corroboration to solve needs, because our needs are
different. We work with agencies in San Bernadino County for public safety, public health, and education issues. Given that you're obligated to look at the community of interest testimony and the respective county lines for districts not under Voting Rights Act consideration, I would ask that you listen to the voices from our area who have been asking to keep separate from LA and Kern County, and the voices from Antelope Valley --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Twenty seconds.

MR. BARTZ: -- who have said they would be with Santa Clarita. This could be done with the non-VRA Assembly seat, as well as in Congress and the Senate. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 7477, and after that will be caller 9387.

Caller 7477. Go ahead.

MS. MCDONALD: Hi, good afternoon. My name is Robin McDonald and I live in the community of interest of Rockridge, within the City of Oakland. I'd like to speak in favor of the draft map which keeps the community intact within a single Assembly district. I refer to the comment number 33192, of which I am a signatory for details. My comments today are my own.
Rockridge is a distinct community defined by its own BART station and transit hub, its College Avenue retail district, and its pedestrian-friendly state. My sense of identity is reinforced by the Rockridge Community Planning Council, which has been active for over forty years and distributes a community newsletter by hand to over 5,500 homes. We also would prefer to be in the same district as our neighboring and similar communities of Elmwood, Piedmont Avenue, and Temescal. Keeping Rockridge intact will allow for the most effective representation of our community of interest. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 9387, and after that will be caller 0515.

Caller 9387. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Santa Clarita Valley in the South San Fernando Valley looks like an afterthought drawn from leftovers of the two Voting Rights district in the San Fernando Valley. These Voting Rights seats must exist, but South Santa Cruz -- but Santa Clarita Valley and South San Fernando Valley needs more of your attention. Assembly district South San Fernando Valley
map ought to include more communities in the South San
Fernando Valley to include more territory in the -- more
territory and less territory that is not. Woodland
Hills, Sherman Oaks, Encino, and Hidden Hills belong
together. They are the South Fernan -- South San
Fernando Valley. The 101 goes straight to the heart of
these communities, so please put them back together and
take out -- take them out of the district that includes
Santa Clarita.

Frankly, combining any portion of the San Fernando
Valley with Santa Clarita is far from ideal, and there
has been ample testimony along these lines. However, if
the Commission feels compelled to do it, the similar
Sunland-Tujunga areas much better --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- is a much better
match with Santa Clarita than are areas like Woodland or
Hidden Hills. Sunland-Tujunga is tied to Santa Clarita
by the 210 freeway, so if there is a natural
transportation corridor --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- there is no -- there
is no transportation corridor from the Santa Clarita to
Woodland Hills or Hidden Hills.

In fact, there is no freeway or even combinations of
freeway connecting these communities. That would
discourage visits from the Assembly member.

Like Sunland-Tujunga, Santa Clarita has
disconnected).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next,
we've got caller 0515, and after that will be caller
3859.

Caller 0515. Whoa, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. First of all,
thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion here.
I live in Grand Terrace. The CTJRC map places my city
with the four set of communities of interest that have a
very different set of needs to be addressed at the state
level. Of particular concern to me is that the map
ignores the fact that everything about our city -- its
police, fire protection, school districts, health care --
are served by governing bodies in San Bernardino County,
not Riverside County where we have been placed. The
needs of the San Bernardino governing bodies present to
the state a quite different set of needs from those by
Riverside, Moreno Valley, Corona, (indiscernible), et

cetera. Also, our school district serves three
communities; Colton, Bloomington, and Grand Terrace. The
map splits the state representation we can expect for our
school district. This is neither helpful for our
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- for the effective administration of our school district. Putting Grand Terrace in a different county, splitting our school districts, will not work well as representation for our community. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. And as a reminder to those who have called in, please mute your livestream audio. This will prevent echo during your call. And another reminder for those who have called in, if you have not yet done so, please press star nine to get in the queue. This will raise your hand.

Up next, we've got caller 3859, and after that will be caller 1001.

Caller 3859. Go ahead.

MS. JONES: Hello. I'm Pam Jones from the Belle Haven neighborhood of Menlo Park, and a resident for over forty-eight years. We are in Southern San Mateo County, bordering Santa Clara County, and next door to Redwood City. You've separated our community of Belle Haven from the rest of our city. Please keep Menlo Park whole.

Don't separate our community from the rest of the city.

It's also important to keep communities of interest unincorporated North Fair Oaks, City of East Palo Alto
with all of Menlo Park. These communities share common historical interest with the Belle Haven neighborhood -- grocery stores, churches, health care to name a few shared interests. Note that the map proposed by Veronica Eskamsey (ph.) keeps Menlo Park whole in the South county district. Also, the Assembly district map -- draft map of 11/10/21, as well as the Congressional district map, keep all of these communities together, and particularly important, is keeping Menlo Park together.

Thank you for your commitment to drawing the lines --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MS. JONES: -- for California.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 1001, and after that will be caller 1681.

Caller 1001.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: All right. Thank you, Commissioners for your time today and for taking public comments. And I hope you'll take a citizen's word as a primary source of consideration.

As a life-long resident of the Coachella Valley and someone whose entire immediate lives in the Coachella
Valley and as Latino, the separation of Eastern Coachella Valley communities all the way to Imperial, from the extremely similar Desert Springs and Cathedral City is deeply concerning. We share the same community demographics, as well as economy, access to jobs, housing, schools, and other essential resources. It makes no sense to pair Eastern Coachella Valley areas with areas of the mountains with no geographical or cultural connection, or La Quinta, which is entirely different.

Please correct this mistake and give our communities our best chance to thrive. Thank you for your work and consideration of community input. Please do not disenfranchise our under-served area further. This would undo years of concentrated efforts to uplift our own region. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 1681, and after that will be caller 4199.

Caller 1681. Go ahead. Caller 1681, can you hear me? We cannot hear you. Could you please double-check to see --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Bueno.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Hey.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We can hear you. Yes, go ahead. (In Spanish, not translated).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (In Spanish, not translated).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: (In Spanish, not translated).

Up next, we've got caller 4199, and after that will be caller 9334.

Caller 4199. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi, there. Thank you, Commissioner. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi, all. So good afternoon. Thank you, guys, so much for your service to the State of California and we do appreciate all the hard work you guys put in.

The Commissioners' draft Assembly map is missing a Latino-majority district that is required to be drawn by the federal Voting Rights Act. I do believe the Assembly district map called ENPENN (ph.) should be redrawn to able to be (indiscernible) Latino-majority district. Instead the draft diagrams parts of too many different communities of interest, which has the effect of splitting our voices that could be better served in adjacent districts.

Additionally -- sorry, excuse me -- we have separate
two communities. Boyle Heights and East Los Angeles, as one is in the City of LA and the other in the County. We ask that you connect immigrant communities in Boyle Heights, Pico-Union, and Alameda, and Penn. We ask that you keep rapidly transitioning neighborhoods of East LA, Eagle Rock, Highland Park, and Echo Park together, as they are vital consequences of gentrification in GLENNLA. We also ask that you comply with the Voting Rights Act by ensuring that two of these four districts, in the GLENNLA and the ENPENN that exceed fifty percent Latino citizen voting age population, not just one. We also ask that you --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- strengthen Black representation in the 110 LA district. Thank you so much for your time and I hope you all have a wonderful day and happy holidays.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 9334, and after that will be caller 6652.

Caller 9334.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi. I'm calling because the split up in Santa Rosa can be done better to represent the communities that were affected by the fires, as exemplified by the map referenced in the
submission ID number 33047. I support a minor adjustment to the Commission's proposed division using Highway 12. Some of the areas around the edges should be in the North coast. In that area, communities on both sides of Highway 12 have common interests, including the fire risks that are mentioned in recent public input ID 33047. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 6652, and after that will be caller 9119.

Caller 6652. One more time. Caller 6652, if you could please follow the prompts. Caller 6652, you can now unmute by pressing star six. If you could please press star six to begin your comment.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hey, sorry about that. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi. Thank you for taking the time to listen to my comments. I just want to express an opinion on the Boyle Heights district map. I think the Boyle Heights and East Los Angeles area should be separated, seeing how East LA has been an unincorporated and Boyle Heights is in the City of Los Angeles. I strongly believe they should be separated, as both communities have different needs. Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next is caller 9119, and after that will be caller 0362.

Caller 9119. Again, caller with the last four digits 9119, if you could please press star six to unmute. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello. Thank you and thank you very much for your service. I'm calling regarding the area in Southern California, in the Santa Clarita area. I'm asking that you please consider keeping Santa Clarita with the Simi Valley on the draft map. It's so important that you look at this, even on a Google map, to see the topography is so much similar with each other versus merging it with Woodland Hills, which is in the valley. So you're, basically, mixing and matching mountainous areas with valley areas. And by considering doing that, in essence, you're -- it's a forty-five-minute drive, and that's on the freeways -- that's on the 405 freeway South and the 101 -- just to get to both ends of those two cities which you're considering. So again, please keep Santa Clarita with Simi Valley on the map -- on the draft map, and keep San Fernando Valley together and not connect it with Woodland Hills. They're completely different topographies and distances from each other, and they overlap. We want to make sure that --
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Twenty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- the Assembly districts
don't overlap each other.

Lastly, I want to mention that it's really important
that the San Fernando Valley remains together in all
legislative districts --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Ten seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- and -- oh. Thank you
so much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next,
we've got caller 0362, and after that will be caller
7590.

Caller 0362. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi. Thank you for the
Commission, for this tremendous job on the redistricting
process, especially to Commissioner Kennedy. Because he
highlighted the adding La Quinta to the district ADSECA
is not recommended. And I agree with that because La
Quinta is full of golf courses and people -- white
people, wealthy people with pools in their backyards, and
that's nothing related to the West -- I mean, East
Coachella Valley in Imperial County. So please don't add
La Quinta to the district because there's nothing in
common, and this will reduce the potential Hispanic
voters from the district. So thank you very much for
your attention and just hope you can listen to the -- to our voices. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. And I think we've got time for one more caller before the break.

That'll be caller 7590.

If you could please follow the prompts. Caller with the last four digits 7590, you can now unmute your phone by pressing star six, please. We are ready for your input. Again, caller with the last four digits 7590, if you could please press star six to unmute. (In Spanish, not translated).

So sorry caller 7590, we will come back to you.

Let's try caller 4527. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. Thank you, again, for taking my call once more. I have called in. I also want to thank you for continuing to hear those of us who live in the East San Joaquin and Eastern Stanislaus Counties. You have heard our voices throughout this process to keep the East sides of our counties together as like communities of interest. I know I speak for many who appreciate this.

In the last meeting where you were debating what to do with Vineyard, there appeared to be three possibilities you were discussing. And one was to keep Vineyard with the East side of San Joaquin and
Stanislaus. Two, to remove Vineyard and split the City of Folsom. Three, remove Vineyard and add portions of the lower foothills in Amador, Calaveras, and Tulare Counties. I strongly urge you to consider option three, which was Commissioner Fornaciari's plan. It seemed this is where the majority of the Commission was considering, and with the utmost respect to Commissioner Andersen, who I believe is right to try to keep the motherload together.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: The Eastern agricultural rural areas of Stanislaus and San Joaquin share much with the lower foothills. My hometown of Waterford, literally, is flat coming in from the West and foothills going out to the East. We have much in common with the lower foothills.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: We are sharing watersheds and vital industries and farming and ranching. Our kids play sports together, go to school together, and we depend on each other for tourism and retail. Please consider this, and thank you, again, for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. And with that we are up against a break.

Vice Chair Andersen, can we please go to break?
VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Thank you very much, Kristian, for reminding us.

And all callers in the queue, we will be getting back to you. We will take our fifteen-minute break right now, so be back at 2:45. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 1:28 p.m. until 2:45 p.m.)

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Welcome back to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission meeting. Thank you very much for all the public who's been calling in to give us their valuable input. We really appreciate you. And at that point, I'm going to turn it over to Kristian to continue on with our public comment.

Kristian.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much, Chair. Again, if you've called in to give public comment and you can hear the sound of my voice, you are in the right place. If you have not yet done so, please press star nine. This will raise your hand and get you into the comment queue. We will be enforcing a time limit of one minute and thirty seconds.

First up will be caller 0303, and after that will be caller 2537.

Caller 0303, please follow the prompts.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi, can --
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi, can you hear me?

Oh, yes, thank you. I just wanted to say that the current Assembly maps in the San Fernando Valley are too far broken to repair. And the last Senate Assembly map in the valley just needs to be scrapped. The communities in the San Fernando Valley are inter-dependent upon each other culturally and economically, and the current maps breakup these long-standing ties. They do not have public support.

The previous Assembly map visualization preserved working neighborhoods and existing alignments better than the current visualization, and we ask that all the working communities of Studio City, Toluca Lake, and all of North Hollywood, Valley Glenn, and Van Nuys be united. Thank you so much. Hello?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 2537, and after that will be caller 0805.

Caller 2537. Go ahead.

MR. AL-DABBAGH: Yeah, hi. My name is Rashad Al-Dabbagh and I live in Orange County. I work for the Arab American Civic Council, which is a member of The People's Redistricting Alliance. I want to, first, thank you all for your work.
But I was concerned to hear mention of the Commission considering dividing the Arab, Middle Eastern, Muslim, and South Asian community of interest that crosses county line between Orange and Los Angeles County by moving the City of Cypress into a different district. As has been mentioned, the AMEMSA community of interest includes Buena Park South of the 5 freeway, La Palma and Cypress in Orange County, and Cerritos and Artesia in LA County. As part of their daily lives, the AMEMSA communities in Buena Park, La Palma, and Cypress cross into Los Angeles County to shop in ethnic markets, dine in restaurants, worship, and access social services in Artesia and Cerritos. This community of interest should be kept whole in an Orange County-based district.

You're almost there. Please don't divide our communities, and please keep Cypress in the district in North Orange County. Thank you for your consideration and all your hard work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 0805, and after that will be caller 6403.

Caller 0805, please follow the prompts to unmute.

Go ahead.

MS. COHEN: Hi, there. My name is Molly Cohen. I'm a resident of North Hollywood. And I just want to say
that the North Hollywood community stretches from Roscoe
down to the 101, and we are really unhappy with the way
that you guys have chosen to draw these new -- these new
district maps. The current Assembly map that we have
seen for the San Fernando Valley are just far too broken,
and these last-minute changes have been extremely
unacceptable. I was trying to call in all Saturday and I
couldn't stay on the line that long. It was really
unacceptable.

I think you really have to go back and look at the
old map that we were able to call in and give public
comment about. I know that my neighbors and I, who are
all renters in the San Fernando Valley, have put in a lot
of public comment. And I really think that you need to
retake a look at the San Fernando Valley. Thank you very
much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next,
we've got caller 6403, and after that will be caller
0968.

Caller 6403. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, good afternoon. I'm
calling about AD NELA iteration map. I'm a resident of
the East side and I'm asking you to restore the two
Latino seats in Los Angeles. Please protect the voices
of Latino families in California, like my own. The
latest map addition -- renditions do not support the voices of our communities that have fought for so many years to be heard and represented. I'm asking that the maps reflect representation of two Latino seats, which are currently represented via AD 51 and AD 53. In failing to restore the two Latino seats would be devastating to our community who has really come a long way around overcoming historic gerrymandering efforts. And the Latino community of Los Angeles deserves representation. And so thank you very much for your consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 0968, and after that will be caller 7312.

Caller -- again. Up next, we'll have caller 0968, and after that will be caller 7312.

Caller 0968, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute. Go ahead.

MR. STAPLES: Thank you. My name is Chris Staples (ph.). And I'm calling about the intersection between the Assembly districts for Berkeley, Richmond, and for Oakland. First, I want to thank the Commission and their staff for doing an incredible amount of work after the census was completely messed up by the pandemic and by President Trump.
My community of interest is the Piedmont Avenue neighborhood in North Oakland, which goes from Oakland Avenue to Broadway, and Highway 580 to Mountain View Cemetery. You've kept us together and that's great, and I hope you will continue to do that. You've done some strange things around us, however.

We are in the rich Berkeley neighborhood. You've reached an arm of the Oakland neighborhood around us to our North, and taken a half of the Rockridge neighborhood and put it in the Oakland district, and you put the other half in the Richmond-Berkeley.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Twenty seconds.

MR. STAPLES: I think you can fix that by taking the Piedmont Avenue neighborhood and perhaps, the City of Piedmont, putting them with --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Ten seconds.

MR. STAPLES: -- the Oakland district. And then having Rockridge go -- lower Rockridge and upper Rockridge, which is to the South of Broad (disconnected).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Up next, we've got caller 7312, and after that will be caller 1258.

Caller 7312. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (In Spanish, not translated).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: (In Spanish, not
translated).

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:  (In Spanish, not translated).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR:  (In Spanish, not translated).

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:  (In Spanish, not translated).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR:  (In Spanish, not translated).

Up next, we've got caller 1258, and after that will be caller 2738.

Caller 1258. Caller with the last four digits 1258, you can now unmute by pressing star six, please. Again, for the caller with the last four digits 1258, you can now unmute by pressing star six, please. So sorry, caller 1258, we will come back to you.

Up next, we've got caller 2738, and after that will be caller 3940.

Caller 2738, if you could please follow the prompts. Again, that's caller with the last four digits 2738, you can now unmute your phone by pressing star six, please. We know everyone has been on the phone a long time. If you could please be alert for when it is your turn to speak.

Caller 2738, we will return to you.
Up next, we've got caller 3940, and after that will be caller 9517.

Caller 3940. Go ahead.

MR. GONZALEZ: Good afternoon. Thank you very much, Commissioners and everyone involved in this important public process. My name is Isaac Gonzalez. I'm a life-long resident of the City of Sacramento and I live in the Tahoe Park community. And while I appreciate your efforts to help out the community of Vineyard and some of the rural districts, I think you have really done a disservice to Assembly mem -- Assembly district 7 in reducing our community in half.

We have much, much, much more in common with the communities of Elmhurst, Oak Park, West Sacramento, and mid-town South Natomas -- Natomas than we do with the residents in Elk Grove and Vineyard. And I believe by cutting our district in this fashion, you are doing a disservice to us.

So while I appreciate all of your efforts to date, I, please, implore you to restore previous drafts of Assembly district 7 to the way that connects it with all the areas around the UC Davis Med Center, West Sacramento, mid-town, downtown, and South Natomas, especially with Tahoe Park and Elmhurst.

Thank you very much for all your important work.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 9517, and after that will be caller 0762.

Caller 9517. Go ahead.

MS. VO: Hello, Commissioners. First of all, thank you for all your hard work. My name is Vanessa Vo, and I'm calling from Huntington Beach, our Little Saigon community. And I was at the senior center this morning and I was told that you are not hearing our collective voices to help our Little Saigon representation in the State Assembly.

I want to call in and hopefully, you will be able to hear me and help our community. Please, please, since today is your last day to work on the Assembly map adding in Cypress and keeping Stanton included in Saigon makes no sense to us, who live here. We don't have any community of interest with these two cities. Stanton has a majority Latino community, and they belong with Anaheim. We do not celebrate Cinco de Mayo of sir and madams. I don't know anyone from Little Saigon would go to Cypress for anything that is Vietnamese-related.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MS. VO: Our community has met and have told you that our community of interest lies North of Huntington Beach, where hundreds have majority Vietnamese American
residents. The border between Huntington Beach, Westminster, and Toluca Lake was shared --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

MS. VO: -- (indiscernible) of this -- of Beach Boulevard and the 45 freeway, and shares a school district for our children. Please make sure you include the inland part of Huntington Beach on the North of Garfield Street in Huntington Beach, to Little Sai --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next will be caller 0762, and after that will be caller 2080.

Caller 0762, please follow the prompts. Caller with the last four digits 0762, you can now unmute your phone. Go ahead.

MR. NORRIS: Hi. This Patrick Norris in North Hollywood. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. Go ahead.

MR. NORRIS: State Assembly districts, and particularly here in the San Fernando Valley, I don't know what has happened to this map. I was looking at it -- I've been following this process. The last month you had it and it looked pretty rational. I'm sure people had, you know, nits to pick with it, but the district was reasonable. And the map, as it now stands, it does not seem to meeting any criteria of compactness or respect for political boundaries, or natural
geography, or anything. Glendale and Burbank are two incorporate -- large, incorporated cities that are all split up with parts of the valley. The South San Fernando Valley district is bizarre looking. I don't -- the only person I've heard that seems to have expressed any interest in this map was the Mr. Waldman of the Commerce Association. Maybe he benefits from it in some way, but I don't think that those of us that live here do. I would urge you, please relook at the San Fernando Valley and make it something that reflects the people that actually live here.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. NORRIS: The San Fernando Valley would be North Hollywood, Valley Glen, Valley Village, maybe Van Nuys; those naturally go together. You could do North Hollywood with Valley Glen, Valley Village, Toluca Lake; that would be a reasonable East San Fernando Valley district. But respect the boundary of a city like --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

MR. NORRIS: -- Burbank and let it be apart. Thank you very much. I hope you'll be able to fix this. Bye-bye.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next will be caller 2080, and after that will be caller 4599.

Caller 2080, if you could please follow the prompts
to unmute. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (In Spanish, not translated).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Si.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (In Spanish, not translated).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Muchos gracias.

Up next, we've got caller 4599, and after that will be caller 2494.

Caller 4599, if you could please follow the prompts.

Go ahead.

MR. MORENOS: Good afternoon. My name is Danny Morenos (ph.). I've live in the community of Buena Park for over forty years. Our community leaders of Buena Park like the modifications that you have done, but would like to recommend some minor cleanup.

In order to fix your high population in the Gateway map and accomplish our continued request of keeping our communities together, we would like to request a cleanup by keeping Florence-Graham, Walnut Park, and Huntington Park, even if it's only part of Huntington Park together in the 110 LA map. This cleanup will help decrease the excessive four percent deviation of the Gateway maps and will also help balance the Latino numbers. Please treat the Latino equal representation map that was submitted today. This map will accomplish this request.

Thank you once again for your time and consideration
of this minor change. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. And as a reminder to those calling in, if you could please mute your livestream audio, this will prevent echo during your public input call.

Up next, we've got caller 2494, and after that will be caller 6968.

Caller 2494. Go ahead.

MS. GUTIERREZ: I am calling to speak on northeast Los Angeles. Hello. My name is (indiscernible) Gutierrez (ph.). I am a community health worker at clinic (indiscernible), located in Boyle Heights. Thank you, Commissioners, for all of your hard work. I am calling to urge the Commission that you protect the voices of our Latino families in California by restoring the two Latino seats in Los Angeles, representing East Los Angeles and Boyle Heights. What you have done with the latest map visualization and suppressed the voices of our community that have fought for far too long to have their voices heard.

I want to, again, voice my support to keep two Assembly districts 51 and 53 representing Central Los Angeles and East Los Angeles. The Latino communities deserve representation and it is your responsibility to protect it. Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next will be caller 6968, and after that will be caller 8264.

Caller 6968. Caller with the last four digits 6968, you can now unmute your phone by pressing star six, please. Again, that's caller with the last four digits 6968, if you could please press star six -- (in Spanish, not translated). Go ahead, the floor is yours. Call --

MR. BARSOUMIAN: Hi, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can, go ahead.

MR. BARSOUMIAN: Wonderful, wonderful. My name is Edward Barsoumian, and I'm reaching out on behalf of the Armenian National Committee of America Western Region. And I'd like to respond to a few unfortunate mistakes on the map, focusing specifically on the fracturing and removal -- separation of the communities of Glendale, Burbank, and La Canada Flintridge, as well as La Crescenta.

Now, looking at the past two iterations of these maps, we found that these are the densest Armenian-populated areas and yet they are being separated. This separation, unfortunately, has tremendous, you know, problems, you know, with what will happen to this community because, ultimately, they share a fire department, police department, and they all attend the same school district. So on behalf of the Armenian
community-at-large, we would really like to request that these three communities be returned and reunited under one Assembly district.

Thank you. That's all I got.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 8264, and after that will be caller 2782.

Caller 8264, if you could please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

MS. OLIVEIRA: Good afternoon, Commissioners. I'm Claudia Oliveira, president of the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council. I'm here speaking in my private capacity on the changes to the Assembly district 53. I, personally, have worked extraneously on resident retention, because it seems as the rest of the city and the state have a hard time understanding the downtown Los Angeles Latino community.

When I saw my district split into three, especially with the visual going right through the middle of 6th Street, my heart dropped. Not only this is dividing the Neighborhood Council in half, but it's also dividing the biz district. I'm sure that you can imagine, by looking at the state of downtown Los Angeles today, how challenging it is for us to advocate for our needs. This division will make us have to jump through hoops every
time we need to work with our representatives to meet the needs of our community. I am urging you to please keep downtown together as a whole, and district 53 the way it is currently.

    Thank you for your hard work. I'd like to yield the rest of my time.

    PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 2782, and after that will be caller 6089.

    Caller 2782, if you could please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

    UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi. My name is Ryan (ph.). I work in Santa Rosa, and I was calling about the North Coast Assembly district. While we appreciate all the work that you have done, and listening to public comments. I share the other thoughts of the commentators about Santa Rosa, and to keep the communities that are more impacted by the fires, and also just natural community lines intact. So if you look at the map, we would like you to add the area North of Sonoma Avenue, North of Stonehedge Drive, back into the North Coast area and that community and those neighborhoods. So please look at that fix for Santa Rosa plan S.

    Again, thanks for all your work and thank you for taking public comment on this.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next will be caller 6089, and after that will be caller 3583.

Caller 6089, if you could please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Commissioners, I'm calling to ask you to please form the same hard beliefs you have about not crossing the Golden Gate Bridge, except into Salton Sea and La Quinta. The Salton Sea and the communities that surround it are some of the poorest communities in the region, so do not tie them to one of the more affluent communities in the region.

La Quinta, what am I talking about? For example, the median household income for La Quinta is $77,839, while it is $53,669 in Indio. Over thirty percent of the population in Indio are on public assistance, while only eighteen percent in La Quinta. Common sense tells you that, more than likely, the residents in La Quinta will be heard, while the poorer communities in Indio and around the Salton Sea will find themselves second fiddle when it comes to their voices being heard and a fair and legitimate representation. La Quinta is a hard no when it comes to the Salton Sea and Indio. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 3583, and after that will be caller 8514.
Caller 3583. Go ahead.

MS. SALLAS: Thank you, Commissioners, for taking comment tonight. Okay, my name is Chelsea Sallas (ph.) and I live in Newberry Springs. I want to urge the Commission to keep our San Bernardino County and High Desert whole and together. At the Assembly and Senate, you split us up and combined us with Los Angeles County. And I believe, at the Assembly level, you could get us out of Kern and LA County by joining the Morongo Basin with the rest of the High Desert.

While we seem far away, our High Desert community has one water master, who ensures our communities are conserving enough water. And we also have one air quality management in the district that monitors our air pollution. These allow our communities from (indiscernible) the Echo Valley to work together on important public health issues. We don't have any overlap with Kern or Los Angeles communities in the visualization for any essential services.

Those communities should be kept with the communities they're similar to, and not with our community. At the same time, it is not beneficial for our community to be sucked into Los Angeles County, because they have very different priorities than us, and oftentimes, we are not in alignment. Please consider
keeping our San Bernardino County High Desert together
and not with Los Angeles County. Thank you for
listening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next,
we've got caller 8514, and after that will be caller
5178.

Caller 8514, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. Good afternoon,
Commissioners. Thank you for all the work that you're
doing with the redistricting maps. I'd like to ask you
to please keep all of Fullerton area together with its
current North Orange County district. It is home to
Fullerton College and Cal State Fullerton, which serves a
large Hispanic community. Many of the students live
North of campus and should be included with the entire
city, instead of being broken apart. I would like to see
that the Latino demographic is not diluted in the area of
Fullerton. This can be accomplished by putting all of
Fullerton together as we know it currently.

Keeping Cypress, also, with the Garden Grove
district will allow for the numbers to balance with
keeping Fullerton in where it is currently. This will
help better serve Cypress, as well, and the Garden Grove
district, as it is a large veteran community, and it is
in --
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- close proximity to the Los Alamitos Base. Also, the Korean community is vital to the North Orange County area, and to the communities of Fullerton and Buena Park. The best way to keep this Korean community together would be to keep --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- all of Fullerton and Buena Park together. Fullerton is not just Korean community on the westside, it is throughout the entire community.

Thank you so much for your work on the maps.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 5178, and after that will be caller 6223.

Caller 5178. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi. Thank you. My name is John. I am a resident in North Oakland, in the small micro-neighborhood of Chester, between Temescal and Rockridge. I agree with earlier callers, in that the new visualization -- I do want to thank Commissioner Yee for really trying to put Emeryville next to our neighbors right here North Oakland. But in doing so in this new visualization, as a people correctly noted, you have split us with our (indiscernible) neighbors to the North in Elmwood and then South Berkeley, especially in the
area that's kind of known as, like, the North Oakland-Berkeley-Emeryville area, and New York-San Pablo Avenue. I do -- I agree with other callers in making a switch. Perhaps, moving that East Bay boundary in North Oakland South to 580. And with other callers with the recommendation to switch it and perhaps --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- do a swap where Oakland takes up, perhaps, Piedmont Avenue, Glen Lake -- sorry -- Grand Lake, which is connected to other, like, their communities -- Piedmont, Diamond. And because the Oakland --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- Assembly visualization also has some of the hills, perhaps even going up to the hills if you need to swap out population. But please keep North Oakland whole with Emeryville and South Berkeley. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next will be caller 6223, and after that will be caller 0563.

Caller 6223. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. Hi. My name is Maria (indiscernible). I'm calling with the Black Alliance for Just Immigration. I live in the Merk Park (ph.) community, but also our communities are located
throughout all of the sort of South LA neighborhoods. And I just wanted to acknowledge that, you know, while we see improvements in most of the iterations that have been released, the community of interest pairings that have been created have reduced Black political voice by packing Black voters in only one of four South LA-based district. This is creating only two Black opportunity districts in South LA, rather than the four that has historically been there. And that can be drawn there if these districts are drawn at twenty-nine to thirty-three percent Black CVAP. I just -- I can't stress or emphasize enough the need for four Black-influenced districts at twenty-nine to thirty-three percent Black CVAP. And that the Florence and Graham needs to be in a South LA district, not with Englewood.

Too, I wanted to speak on the 110 LA district and recommend bringing in Manchester Square, Vermont Knolls, Vermont Vista as --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Twenty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- part of Gramercy Park -- and part of Gramercy Park into this district and out of the 105 corridor, to unpack and better balance that Black CVAP. Also, this district could extend more --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Ten seconds.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- into Downtown LA, as far as up to 3rd, but should exclude Little Tokyo. Just remember Black lives matter in redistricting, as well. It's not exclusive to the --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 0563, and after that will be caller 7682.

Caller 0563. Go ahead.

MR. WOODSON: Hi, Commissioners. This is James Woodson calling from The California Black Census and Redistricting Hub. First of all, I just wanted to say thank you for your hard work over the last several months, and particularly over the last several days, as you work to refine that, based on public comment and public input. I especially want to thank you for the shifts you made in the IE in San Diego to protect under-represented communities to ensure that they were paired together, and not grouped with dissimilar areas.

However, I did want to call and raise concern about your South LA maps. The Black Hub is concerned that the Englewood district in your latest iteration -- AD 105 corridor iteration -- may be unlawfully packing Black communities in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution, which is on par with your equal population criteria, and trumps even your VRA
obligations. We strongly urge you to unpack that
district. We submitted ways that you can do that and
hope you consider the recommendations and ensure your
Assembly map is not at risk --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. WOODSON: -- of being in violation of federal
law. Again, thanks so much for your time, and we look
forward to the rest of your work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next,
we've got caller 7682, and after that will be caller
3995.

Caller 7682, you know what to do. Go ahead.

MR. IBRAHIM: Hi, Commissioners. My name is Rami
Ibrahim. I'm with the Partnership for the Advancement of
New Americans, and I've been living in San Diego for
twenty-one years. I'll be speaking on adjustments to the
Assembly maps for San Diego. I'm calling on behalf of
Black African and Middle Eastern and Muslim refugee
communities in San Diego, in the neighborhoods of City
Heights, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, Southeast San Diego,
Spring Valley, and El Cajon.

Many families, who have historically called
communities in City Heights and Encanto home, have been
pushed East into El Cajon, Rancho San Diego, and La Mesa
in search of more affordable housing. And communities
continue to worship in southeast San Diego, mosques in
City Heights, maintaining community ties in mom-and-pop
shops in their old neighborhoods.

Concerning the maps, in the La Mesa and Spring
Valley map, please bring La Presa, mid-city Normal
Heights into this district, as well as the rest of
Skyline-Paradise Hills, and a small portion of
southeastern San Diego by the 94 that was split.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Twenty seconds.

MR. IBRAHIM: In the CDSY map, take out El Cajon and
move into central San Diego. In the central San Diego
map, please bring El Cajon whole --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Ten seconds.

MR. IBRAHIM: -- into the district to pair with Mesa
communities. And take out uptown Elbow Park (ph.), and
greater Golden Hills and pair with downtown. Thank you
so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next,
we've got caller 3995, and after that will be caller
2313.

Caller 3995. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi. Good afternoon,
Commissioners. I'm calling to ask that you please keep
San Bernardino County's High Desert whole and together.
We want to be able to have adequate representation. And
of course, one of the things that we uphold is trying to keep communities together, particularly communities in the same county. Whether that be by putting -- keeping Victorville out of (indiscernible) and Hesperia whole, because we don't want to cut through those cities in half; we want to keep those cities together. And then also, try to move some of them around the basin into EVHD. It's, again, important that this community has adequate representation, and we please ask that you keep San Bernardino County's High Desert together. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 3434, and after that will be caller 1535.

Caller 3434, please follow those prompts. That's for caller with the last four digits 3434. You can now unmute your phone by pressing star six, please. One more time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Oh, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello? Yep, thank you. Okay. So thank you to the Commission for extending the time for this to -- for the deliberations for the redistricting of the Assembly districts. Hello, my name is Chito (ph.). And the San Fernando Valley maps, I believe, are getting better, but they do have a vital
flaw. The San Fernando Valley is not being kept together. The communities of Belle Canyon, Hidden Hills, and other San Fernando Valley areas do not belong in a seat with Santa Clarita.

These communities do not have the community interests with Santa Clarita. Our education, economic, and lifestyles are different. We would have our interests ignored in favor of Santa Clarita's issues. The Commission can make this right. We're asking that the Commission remove these communities from the district SCV and add them to the seat called South SSV. There they will be with other San Fernando communities that share values and interest.

Since this will over populate the South San Fernando Valley district, the Commission can take Sunland-Tujunga and place these communities with the Santa Clarita Valley district. Santa Clarita and Sunland-Tujunga are part of the transportation hub, including the 210 freeway, and this would make that area more represented.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And adding -- and it would be a sensible move, because it would just be swapping two populations.

Thank you so much. This could help my community and others be more fairly represented with the new
redistricting process. Thank you so much for your time and have a great day.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 1535, and then we will have caller 7223.

Caller 1535. Go ahead.

MR. MALDONADO: Hi. Hello. My name is Tony Maldonado, I'm Latino. Regarding the Santa Clarita Assembly maps, why do you want to silence the residents of Santa Clarita and make them irrelevant? That is what will happen if you take the third largest city in Los Angeles County and force it onto the San Fernando Valley. Santa Clarita is a thriving city and valley that borders into our county. We're a very diverse, inter-connected communities, and no community is segregated by ethnicity or race. I think the San Fernando Valley, which is home to numerous racially and ethnically segregated communities, and with whom we do not want to be connected to.

Santa Clarita is the anchor and largest city between itself and sister Cities of Simi Valley, Fillmore, Moorpark, Acton, Agua Dulce, Gorman, Lebec, and Frazier Park, with whom we want to be associated with. If the area were a county, Santa Clarita will be the county seat. Santa Clarita and our sister cities share many of the same interests, concerns, and services, and our
residents transverse our cities on a regular basis for employment, commerce, and recreation --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. MALDONADO: -- purposes. Santa Clarita connects to Lake Piru and to all the other areas we are connected on freeways.

Regarding public services, we share nothing with the City of Los Angeles. Therefore, please listen to our voice. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 7223, and then we'll have caller 4047.

Caller 7223. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. My name is Renee (ph.) and I'm calling from the San Fernando Valley. I'd like to call attention to the fact that -- that you guys have done a great job in considering racial diversity in drawing these lines. But given the current iteration of the San Fernando Valley maps, you have drowned out and diluted the voices of lower-income families and for tenants, who will have to compete for their Assembly members' time in a backdrop of more wealthy, affluent communities in which you have mixed in disproportionately.

I know this is not your intention, nor was it intentional. I believe it's part of the systemic problem
inherent with the Voting Rights Act that hasn't taken
into consideration socioeconomic factors. Assembly
district 38 is directly impacted when you bring in
Calabasas and Woodland Hills, which are wealthy
homeowners, and dilute that against the voices of tenants
and those who are statistically making substantially less
money than anyone on this Commission makes.

Please do not dilute the voices of those who
struggle financially. Please go back to the 11/10 draft
map.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The latest map contorts and
strains to meet VRA to the point of the absurd. Keeping
communities of interest should mean that the natural
shared commuter shopping and commuter employment
communities are tied together, such as Chatsworth,
Granada Hills, and North Hills. And it means that --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- Simi Valley stays
in Ventura County. It means that Woodland Hills and
Calabasas is kept in the Southern valley. Please, not
one of you -- there's only two of you that make less than
125,000 a year; the rest of you make vastly more money.
Remember back to a time when you were less --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next,
we've got caller 4047, and after that will be caller
1302.

Caller 4047. That's caller with the last four
digits 4047. You can now unmute your phone by pressing
star six, please. One more time for caller with the last
four digits 4047, if you could please press star six to
unmute. We are ready for your public input. So sorry,
we will come back to you.

Again, for those of you in the queue, please be
alert for when it is your turn to speak.

Next up, we've got caller 1302, and after that will
be caller 2515.

Caller 1302, if you could please follow the prompts.
Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:  Hello. Am I being
heard?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR:  We can hear you. Thank
you so much, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:  Okay. Hello. I am a
multi-generational, life-long Angelino and a proud member
of the LA Latino community. I have been watching the
Redistricting Commission go round and round on how to
draw lines at the Senate and Assembly levels. For the
life of me, I can't understand why you continue to pack
Latinos or collapse Latinos' VRA seats. It doesn't make
any sense. For example, I do not understand why lines
are being drawn that put East LA together with Boyle
Heights. By doing this, you are actually reducing two
VRA seats to one. I recognize you have to make choices,
but you are constitutionally required to put VRA
considerations over keeping together communities of
interest.

Please do the right thing and protect VRA seats.
Draw East LA in one district and Boyle Heights in another
district. Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next,
we've got caller 2515, and after that will be caller
6625.

Caller 2515, please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi, I'm calling from
Santa Clarita. I'm calling because I want to make sure
that the Commission does not add Simi Valley with Santa
Clarita Valley. Simi Valley is a separate -- you know,
it's separate area that's better off with other
communities in Ventura County. They don't share law
enforcement, water, fire. You know, economically, we're
not -- we don't have a lot, you know, intertwined as we
do with San Fernando Valley. So San Fernando Valley and
Santa Clarita Valley belong together.

And I will comment a little bit on the Assembly
districts. I do think Woodland Hills kind of goes a little bit too far to the South, but maybe adjust it so that it combines Santa Clarita Valley with North -- Northern San Fernando Valley communities. But please do not put Simi Valley with Santa Clarita Valley. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 6625, and after that will be caller 5391.

Caller 6625, please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Commission, and everyone involved. I just want to say that it's incredibly important that we keep the High Desert together. Not just the High Desert, but San Bernardino as a whole. I believe Commissioner Kennedy worked on doing this, but was slightly derailed by Commissioner Sadhwani.

I ask Commissioner Kennedy that you try once more to be the voice for our -- for us and make sure that we get the High Desert together.

Commissioner Sadhwani, I understand your points, but I ask that you weigh public opinion and please work with Commissioner Kennedy on making the High Desert whole. It's really important to us. Not only is it all one transportation corridor, we all work together out here,
we all live together. It's really important for us to keep together.

Thank you, everyone, and thank you for all your work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 5391, and after that will be caller 7592.

Caller 5391. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. Go ahead, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I'd just like to express my opinion on separating Boyle Heights and East LA. Boyle Heights and East LA are two separate communities. They have different police departments, different water departments; just like the previous caller had said. The two communities of interest that deserve their own representation. They've been doing it for the past twenty, thirty years. We hope the Commission follows map T-1 that was just put up today. It's a good start to keeping those communities in Sacramento with a voice. Thank you. Bye.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 7592, and after that will be caller 0003.
Caller 7592, please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi. Good afternoon. In regards to state Assembly redistricting, (indiscernible) is split between two districts. And in regards to Santa Clara County, thank you for having the Franklin-McKinley School District all or almost all in the Alum Rock district. However, it still seems to me that all of the Santa Clara County districts should be modified.

The Golden Triangle area of San Jose is still divided between two districts, and the West Sally (ph.) communities are still split among three districts. For visualization of my district modifications, based on the November 10th draft Assembly districts, the file had public input 33110 can be uploaded. So that's public input 33110.

So I'm working on a -- I'm trying to have the maps for the -- for my recommended modifications based on today or yesterday's draft plan. I hope to have that submitted later today. But yet, I think the state Assembly districts in the latest visualization for Santa Clara County, I think they all -- they all need to be modified. The Alum Rock district, the Fremont district, the Sunny Tino (ph.) district, the Grotous Cruz (ph.) district. I might be forgetting one or two.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Twenty seconds.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: But it seems to me -- it seems to me they should all be modified. So I'll try and send my latest maps later today. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 0003, and after that will be caller 7170.

Caller 0003, please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

MS. NIMMERS: Hi, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. Go ahead, please.

MS. NIMMERS: Okay. Good afternoon, Commissioners.

My name is Kristin Nimmers. I'm organizing coordinator with the Black Hub, working with local organizations and coalition members in the Central Valley and Bay area. I'm calling to ask that the Commission map put those good Black communities in the Fresno area around Fig Garden Loop West of the 99, and in Old Fig between Bullard and Shaw. These communities are very different from Clovis and borders surrounding, more rural farm working communities and should all be included in the COI Fresno district.

The Hub has submitted an example of small adjustments the Commission can make to its current structure that protect these communities of interest, while also creating the necessary VRA districts. I'd
urge the Commission to look at that submission and ensure
the protection of Black communities in the Fresno metro
area.

Additionally, in regards to the Bay area, the
Commission is still pairing Vallejo with the rest of
Solano, and (indiscernible) Contra Costa communities like
Vessel Island (ph.) and Discovery Bay. Vallejo should be
in the ECC district, paired with Bay Point, Antioch, and
Pittsburg, as they share similar community interests,
amenities, and demographics.

Thanks so much for your time, your hard work on the
maps, and for ensuring the protection of COIs throughout
the state. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. And a
reminder to all of our callers, you're public input is
being interpreted by ASL and live captioned by our
captioners. Please take your time with city and county
names and numbers.

Up next, we've got caller 7170, and after that will
be caller 4607.

Caller 7170. Go ahead.

MR. SHELDON: Hi. My name is Steve Sheldon. I've
lived in Orange County for nearly fifty years. And I'd
like to have the Commission look at the quality of
comments versus the quantity of comments. I'm very
pleased that the recent visualization has Tustin with Irvine, as it should be, but I'm concerned that that might change back, because Irvine and Costa Mesa do not belong together. The Irvine should be in a district with the City of Tustin and North Tustin and perhaps, St. Forbes (ph.).

My concern is that the -- you know, the bulk of the testimony that is out there, the Commissioners, like many have said, that testimony is just to connect with Irvine, yet I believe that's different. I've researched the database and thirty-two people stated Costa Mesa and Newport Beach belong together; the two cities do belong together. The newly-formed People's Redistricting Alliance put up thirty-one comments about Costa Mesa and their executive director, Daniel Ichinose -- and I apologize if my pronunciation's wrong -- put up seventeen of his own comments, putting Costa Mesa with Irvine --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. SHELDON: -- even though Mr. -- even though Mr. Ichinose lives in Los Angeles, not in the area.

I would suggest that we look at this as Astro turfing for really what it is. There is a, you know, Astro turf effort going on to have the Commission look at this from the view that is not -- it is quantity versus quality.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Ten seconds.

MR. SHELDON: Please read my letter -- my letter from Steve Sheldon -- I believe summarizes the situation well. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 4607, and after that will be caller 1595.

Caller 4607. Go ahead.

MS. TRAN: Hi. My name is Yung Tran. And I called last week but I wasn't able to get through, so I wanted to call again. I saw the Assembly district for Little Saigon and I believe that it will dilute Little Saigon and the future growth of our growing community if you don't include part of Huntington Beach into our district. We don't do any shopping or even travel to Cypress or Benton (ph.). Someone called in earlier to ask to keep Cypress with the North Orange County district and we agree with them.

Huntington Beach is important to Little Saigon. The largest minority community in Huntington Beach is now Asian Americans. For our Assembly district, please make sure you add all North Garfield Street, in Huntington Beach, all the way to (indiscernible) Point Street, and not stop at Beach Boulevard. Remove Cypress, Benton, and East Garden Grove. We don't have any community of
interest with these cities. Allow Little Saigon to have
an Assembly member that will represent the heart of
Little Saigon, to include Huntington Beach. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next,
we've got caller 1595, and after that will be caller
4832.

Caller 1595.

MR. NICHOLSON: All right.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Go ahead.

MR. NICHOLSON: Good afternoon. Good after -- thank
you. Good afternoon. My name is Randy Nicholson (ph.).
I've lived in the community of Florence-Firestone for
over fifteen years. I want to thank the Commission for
moving Florence-Firestone out of the 105 LA map and
putting us into the 110 LA map. Although the
(indiscernible) is not perfect, our community members are
happy with the same and want to thank you for putting us
with some of our communities, which I, personally, feel
is extremely important.

We ask for your help with a minor cleanup
modification and ask you to also place our next-door
neighbor, unincorporated Walnut Park and Huntington Park,
in the same LA 110 map. It is imperative to have Walnut
Park and Florence-Graham, which have been together for
the past century, as this map is splitting of
unincorporated islands will diminish our voices and
(indiscernible) that we have fought so hard to be
(indiscernible) over the past thirty years. This cleanup
will also --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. NICHOLSON: -- increase the excess of four
percent deviation that you have in the Gateway map, and
it will also help balance the Latino numbers in the
Gateway map. Please see the Latino equal representation
map that was submitted today, as this map will accomplish
this request.

Thank you, again, for your time and consideration
for this minor change.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next,
we've got caller 4382, and after that will be caller
0590.

Caller 4382. Go ahead.

MS. WERNER: Yes, hello. My name is Rondi Werner.
I've lived in Glendale for over thirty years and I'm a
long-time officer of the Adams Hill Neighborhood
Association in South Glendale, and I'm vice-president of
the Glendale Homeowners Coordination Council. Our member
neighborhood associations, which represent over 100,000
residents are very opposed to spinning off part of
Glendale from Assembly district 43.
Glendale is a charter city that shares common interests, such as the Glendale Community College district, Glendale Unified School District, Glendale Police Department, Glendale Water & Power, and so on. Lumping part of our city in with East LA would create chaos and marginalize the most vulnerable residents in our city. Putting the city would also disenfranchise and segregate residents in under-served communities, people we all want to help. Recent demographic studies of Glendale have shown that there is no racially polarized voting in our city. By dividing our population in half would only cause --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MS. WERNER: -- under-represented communities to lose their voice in Sacramento. Spinning off Sunland-Tujunga, and Las Crescenta in the North would make much more sense. Please leave the GLENLA map unchanged from the 2010 borders. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 0590, and after that will be caller 6667.

0590, if you could please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi. Thank you very much for your time. I am a thirty-five-year resident of Santa
Clarita, and I am calling in in support of the CA 25 draft map that included AV and SCV. We are communities of common interests, which is not true of Simi Valley. And I would like to make sure that we do not add back Simi Valley, because I think doing so simply marginalizes the minority communities in the SCV and the AV. And thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 6667, and after that will be caller 3422.

Caller 6667. Go ahead.

DR. LIEBOWITZ: Hello. I hope you can hear me. My name is Dr. Irving Liebowitz (ph.). I represent Agudath Israel of California. We're an advocacy group in the Jewish community and have been very active in redistricting for quite a number of years. About ten years ago, we worked very hard to create Assembly district 50, which included the Jewish community and gave us a voice, finally, in the legislature. It included the Hancock Park area in Los Angeles, Beverly Fairfax, Pico-Robertson, parts of West (indiscernible), and West LA. That district in your current iteration has now been broken into three parts and we, basically, do not have a Jewish district at all.

We have unique issues around antisemitism and some
other issues that need to be represented, and it's important we are the ultimate community of interest because of that (indiscernible) in clusters around our synagogues, et cetera, et cetera.

In addition, we're looking at other communities of interest around the community. We're concerned about what's going on in the valley. It seems like the valley just became a shuffled deck of cards and as many people have said on this call, needs to be relooked at.

In addition, we're very concerned about what's going on in the Latino community. Boyle Heights and East LA need to be separated.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Twenty seconds.

DR. LIEBOWITZ: The immigrant communities of Boyle Heights, Pico Union, and central Alameda need to be worked together to create the proper Latino representation. The same issues are going on in the African American communities. We are very concerned that the Voting Rights Act is not being followed --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next, we've got caller 3422, and after that will be caller 8143.

Caller 3422, please go ahead.

NATALIE: Good evening. (Audio interference) from the 12/2 to 12/4 (audio interference). By drawing (audio
interference) Latinos EPAP to 56.45 percent. This action will lose the voices of those most vulnerable who need (audio interference) you are attempting to draw. Why would the Commission do that? It simply doesn't make sense.

If you understand the region, you would know about lifestyle, economic, and socioeconomic needs between La Quinta and the poorer communities of color across (audio interference) are extremely different. The median rent in La Quinta is 1,317 per month, while it is 927 per month in Indio. The value of property is even different. For example, the home median value in La Quinta is 398,000 while in Indio, it's just 281,000.

I know there have been a lot of voices (audio interference), but I recommend the Commission remember the criteria and work to create a strong PRA district in which actual Latino representation is possible. Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Up next we've got Caller 8143 and after that will be Caller 9389. Caller 8143. Go ahead.

NATALIE: Yes, hello. Good afternoon. My name is Natalie, and I'm calling from -- I'm a worker at (indiscernible). Thank you, Commissioners, for all your hard work.
I am calling to urge in the Commission that you protect the voice of our Latino families in California by restoring the two Latino seats in L.A. representing L.A. and Boyle Heights. What you have done to our latest map, redemptions, it suppress the voices of a community that have fought for too long to have voices heard.

I want to begin voice my support to keep two Assembly districts, 51 and 53, representing Central Offer A in East Los Angeles. The Latino community deserves representation and it's your responsibility to reserve it. Thank you very much for your time. Have a nice day and happy holidays.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

Up next, we've got called 9389 and after that will be Caller 6959.

Caller 9389, go ahead. Caller 9389, can you hear me? We cannot hear you. You could please press star 6 to your phone. Go ahead. If you could please check and see if your phone is on mute, you're unmuted in the meeting.

MS. GEORGE: Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yeah, we can hear you.

MS. GEORGE: Okay, great. Hi, my name is Barbara George and I live in Newport Beach, California. I'd like to thank the Commissioners for all the wonderful work
that they are doing. And I pray that this task isn't as daunting as it seems.

I'd like for you to take into consideration keeping the coastal cities together in Orange County. As you begin the week redrawing the Congressional maps on behalf of myself and over 1,000 other citizens who have interacted with the Commission, I'm asking you to please hear our voices. Separating the coastal communities diminishes their ability to fight for the infrastructure needed to support their economy and they deserve one representative.

And coastal cities face unique issues that their inland counterparts do not. And they require important working relationships with the California Coastal Commission and the Army Corps of Engineers. And climate is changing and we need a representative to represent all of our coastal interests and protect our beachfront beauty, tourism, and business interests.

We have a lot in common, these coastal communities --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Twenty seconds.

MS. GEORGE: -- and we do not have those things in common with the L.A. coastal communities. And I'm asking you, please, to take into consideration keeping us together. Thank you so much for your time and have a
great day.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

Up next, we've got Caller 6959 and after that will be Caller 1043.

Caller 6959.

MS. WEI: Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Oh, we sure can. Go ahead.

MS. WEI: Thank you. Hi, this is Hung Wei. I'm a council member with the Cupertino and a former Fremont Union High School District board member. I'm speaking to express my own observations in my personal capacity in relation to the Congressional redistricting.

First, I really want to thank you for all your hard work, Commissioners. We in Cupertino recognize that the Cupertino residents have similar priorities and challenges with the residents in cities like Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Milpitas, and Fremont. Therefore, I strongly recommend adoption of the draft map labeled CD Very Sunny Draft.

As a member of the Cupertino City Council, I understand how Cupertino is home to many, many technology workers who commute to and from between Cupertino and the technology job centers within cities such as Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Milpitas, and Fremont. Each one of our
cities is home to technology workers in the thousands and all our cities have a strong shortage of affordable housing, limited public transit system, and much traffic congestion.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MS. WEI: As a result, Cupertino and other cities really need to work together so that we are leaders, and residents can work with our Congressional leaders to resolve, you know, all the problems with our affordable housing and traffic congestion.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

MS. WEI: I strongly recommend that you adopt the CD Very Sunny Draft and thank you so much for your time and your hard work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

Up next, we've got Caller 1043 and after that will be Caller 7369.

Caller 1043. Caller with the last four digits 1043, if you could please press star 6 to unmute. Go ahead. Caller 1043.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. Can you hear me okay?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I can. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, dear Commissioner, I have to make a comment on so-called in the last couple of months. I have spent at least a couple of hour on the
phone waiting today since I wasn't able to make the public comment on Saturday night.

Commissioner Andersen, we appreciate your comment on proposing that of North Califa Street in Huntington Beach should to be added to Little Saigon. And there was a little suggestion to also remove the sentence. Thank you for the comments. This comment make us so excited because it show that you have heard our voices. However, the map that came out today had none of this changes. And also, add Cypress to the map.

It's very concerning that we won't have the rights and the district for Little Saigon at all (indiscernible) no different in this process. Can we are now asking to the map today at all up the Huntington Beach (indiscernible) Street to the end of Seaport Street, keep our youth together and the school district business as opposed together (indiscernible) --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- interest to Little Saigon. Remove station of our Spanish community also with the (indiscernible) is going to grow at the Euclid Avenue lost Spanish community should go to the Santa Anna. We are begging and asking you to give us the rights --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- (indiscernible) to grow.
Thank you very much. God bless. Good bye.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

And as a reminder for those calling in, please speak at a steady pace and take your time with county names, city names, and numbers. That will help with the interpretation and with hearing what you're saying.

Caller 7369 is next and after that will be Caller 2911.

Caller 7369, if you could please follow the prompts by pressing star 6. Caller 7369, we know you've been waiting a long time. Thank you so much. The floor is yours.

MR. UNAI MONTES: Thank you very much. My name is Unai Montes, U-N-A-I, M-O-N-T-E-S. And like other callers, I've been very concerned about what I'm seeing in Los Angeles County and what appears to be a loss of a Latino seat. I think, ultimately, beyond the points that have been made already today, what we need to note is that these areas that are losing an additional vote in the state Assembly are areas that were disproportionately impacted by COVID-19.

It's not just that they are Latino seats because they have high counts of Hispanic surnames. They're Latino seats because they have a high concentration of essential workers, high concentrations of Asian households, high concentration of folks that have mixed-
They are very specific Latino populations, you know, traditionally who have lived on the East side of Los Angeles in Los Angeles County, and to shrink the total number of Latino seats beyond all of the things that we know about the constitutional mandate to maintain those seats --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. MONTES: -- feels fundamentally wrong. It reflects a gentrification of our Assembly. And I don't think we want -- I don't think it's anyone's intention to gentrify our Assembly by removing a Latino seat. So please keep the total number of Latino seats the same if not increasing them from 2010. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

Up next we've got Caller 2911 and after that will be Caller 9823.

Caller 2911, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute. Go ahead.

MS. ERIKAT: Good afternoon, Commissioners and everyone on the line. My name is Jeanine Erikat with the
Partnership for Advancement of New Americans. And I'll be speaking on adjusting Assembly maps for San Diego. Like so many of you today I've been on the line for over three hours. And so when I say that I'm calling on behalf of a Black, African, Middle Eastern, Muslim refugee community in San Diego, that's because so many of them couldn't be on the line for this long. So again speaking in community in the neighborhoods of City Heights, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, Southeast San Diego, Spring Valley, and El Cajon.

Our organization has participated in a very intentional nonpartisan, community-driven process to understand our shared priorities and discuss why we should be kept together. During this process, communities were also able to identify the social demographic characteristics, economic interests, and their shared policy priorities, such as economic development, criminal justice, mental health services, and housing. And you've heard for months the needs of the -- and concerns of these communities.

I'd like to keep it brief and just say that in the La Mesa Spring Valley map --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MS. ERIKAT: -- we want to say -- we want to ask that you bring in La Presa, Mid-City, Normal Heights into
this district and the rest of Skyline, Paradise Hills, and the portion of southeastern San Diego by the 94 that was split. In the (indiscernible) San Ysidro map --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

MS. ERIKAT: -- take out Oakland and moving to central San Diego is very concerning that you're splitting a huge community of interests who's already been historically disenfranchised. Again, bring in -- in the Central San Diego, El Cajon into the district and pair with the Mesa community.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

Up next we've got Caller 9823 and after that will be Caller 5046.

Caller 9823, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, I would like to urge that Boyle Heights and East L.A. be separated as they are two different communities, one being in the City of Los Angeles while the other is in the county.

I would also like to suggest that we do more to connect immigrant communities by keeping Boyle Heights, Pico-Union and South Central together. And in doing this, it will ensure compliance with the Voting Rights Act by ensuring the two districts in central L.A. exceed 50 percent of the Latino voting age population, not just one. Thank you for your time.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.
And up next we've got Caller 5046 and after that
will be Caller 8885.
Caller 5046, if you could please follow the prompts.
Go ahead.
ANDREW: Hi, this is Andrew and I'm calling from
Culver City. I am calling in response to this latest
iteration. As you know, you have a State Senate
district, you have -- and a Congressional district which
ties Culver City to parts of the airport and to East L.A.
And Culver City is at a crossroads between West L.A., the
LAX area, and East L.A. All we are asking, as you did
with your previous iteration, is to make Culver City a
part of the West Side district. And that way you can
also better protect the VRA district in question and
unite the Orthodox community, as was brought up with
earlier callers.
In your previous iterations, if you put Beverly
Hills and the Pico Robertson (ph.) area over in that --
that district with West Hollywood, and then you can take
some of those communities that were brought up around USC
that have historically been part of an African-American
district, and make sure that they have appropriate
representation as well.
There's been a lot of comment --
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

ANDREW: -- about uniting Culver City. Thank you very much. Oh, sorry, there's a lot of comment about uniting Culver City and bringing it together in one district. We just ask that one of these districts tie to the West Side so that Culver City's combined identity can be respected in all of those areas, and united with the Silicon Beach (ph.) community where it shares a lot of tech and environmental resources. Thank you so very much for all of your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

Up next we've got Caller 8885 and after that will be Caller 4590.

Caller 8885, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. Go ahead.

MR. BREWER: Hello there. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. BREWER: Hello. Yes, my name is David Brewer. I live in Victorville, California. I'm recently a current person running for California governor. I have a big concern of the separation of the high desert and San Bernardino going to L.A. County. Most people move from L.A. County to San Bernardino County due to the cost of living and higher taxes than L.A. County. We cannot afford that.
Therefore, I am asking that the Commission sit down with local politicians and redraft the map more suited to current atmospheres and stuff like that to actually bring to the people and allow us to vote on which map we decide is best. Listen to the people. I have been listening to these conversations all night and if nothing else, it says that the people should have a voice in this, whether they like it or they don't. So I'm asking you to please consider going --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. BREWER: -- to our local levels and sitting down and drafting up new maps with our local levels, our mayor, our business, everything. Please consider the people's voice. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

Up next we've got Caller 4590 and after that will be Caller 1143.

Caller 4590, if you could please follow those prompts. Go ahead.

DR. SANDERS: Hi. My name is Dr. Sabrina Sanders and I'm calling from the Long Beach area. Thank you so much for keeping Long Beach together as much as possible, and for your work on the Assembly maps, and for the time that you've put into protecting VRA districts. Equity and racial justice is incredibly important to our
community and to me personally. And I live in Long Beach because of its diversity. My wife and I are both African-American women, celebrate diversity and LGBTQ support that we see in our neighborhood and across all of the City of Long Beach.

Over the past ten years, we've tackled some really difficult issues as a community and we've been lucky to have support from our State and our Congressional officials. Housing and education have been a way of bringing about robust conversations from people in the community across Long Beach, and we haven't shied away from talking about them. Equity has become a component of almost nearly all of our policy debates.

Thank you for keeping our city as together as possible so that we can continue to strengthen our work. And I hope that the progress we're able to make not only benefits --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

DR. SANDERS: -- my community, but all of California. Thank you so much. Have a good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

And up next we've got Caller 1143 and after that will be Caller 8224.

Caller 1143, if you could please follow the prompts. Go ahead.
MR. SWANSON: Commissioner A, thank you for taking my call today and taking public comment. My name's Eric Swanson. I'm the president of Hesperia Unified School District and we're the largest employer in the high desert. And what we are is a school district that helps other school districts around us, you know, all try to make sure that we're -- for the smaller school districts that aren't able to, you know, do the different things themselves.

One of the things that this map will do with putting us together with Antelope Valley is going to be very detrimental to what we're able to do here. Not only does it in the Victorville area split, I believe, around seven school districts, it splits many, many school districts on the Antelope Valley area, too. And this doesn't make any sense. And one of the things we've been trying to do as a school district work very, very closely with the other school districts and to make sure that we're on the same page, making sure that different things are happening, make sure our representation.

The other thing I can see that we've been trying to work out really heavily in Hesperia is, is to make sure our -- our -- our Latino vote -- our -- our Latino community is not being split. By splitting Hesperia in half and the Hesperia Unified School District in half --
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. SWANSON: -- we're splitting the Latino community. This just doesn't make any sense. So we just do not have any connection that works between Antelope Valley and the Victor Valley. If there was, we'd have a big freeway between us. The way the education --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

MR. SWANSON -- the way that everybody works there is completely different. So I would please just request that the -- the Commission come back and reconsider keeping the two areas separated.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

Up next we've got Caller 8224 and after that will be Caller 2252.

Caller 8224, if you could please follow those prompts. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello? Do you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yeah, we hear you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, I'm calling regarding my Little Saigon community. I have call in and spoke already last week, had a listen to the hearing on Saturday night. I want to thank Commissioner Andersen for (indiscernible) in Huntington Beach and Commissioner
Akutagawa for (indiscernible). So I was so excited and looking forward to seeing the new revise Assembly map this morning and none of the suggestions were taken.

I'm very confused. Today is your last day to look at the Assembly district (indiscernible) from our Little Saigon community. (Indiscernible) map and (indiscernible) to see (indiscernible) in Huntington Beach important to keep our children's school district where the Huntington (indiscernible) majority of the Americans live in there. (Indiscernible) everything is (indiscernible) they belong with some (indiscernible) Latino community. (Indiscernible) they belong with Anaheim --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- Anaheim and Latino community. Thank you. Thank you again. And God bless you. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

Up next we've got Caller 2252 and after that will be Caller 5958.

Caller 2252, please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Foreign language spoken).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Up next we've got Caller 5958 and after that will be Caller 0106.

Caller 5958, go ahead. Caller 5958, you are
unmuted, but we do not hear you. Could you please check
to see if your phone is on mute?

JEAN: Good evening, Commissioners. Can you hear me
now?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. Thank you.

Go ahead.

JEAN: Great. Thank you. My name is Jean and I
live in downtown Long Beach. Thank you for your service
on this Commission and for all you're doing for
Californians.

For me, what really stands out has been how much you
all have been able to take in our feedback and really
translate that onto the map. I also work really closely
with the Port of Long Beach and I can't express how
important federal leadership is to our port, especially
right now. We are in a cargo congestion crisis and
Congressional representation that understands the port is
really critical. I know you will be looking at those
maps later this week.

And so I just wanted to add that the Port of Long
Beach and the Port of Los Angeles need to be in separate
Congressional districts. They're competitors in a way
that makes our ports stronger, and especially during the
supply chain crisis, I have two -- having two federal
representatives has been critical. Forty percent of
America's cargo goes through these ports and they're the largest in the country, up 40 percent. So your work in placing both ports with their respective cities is so important.

Thank you and America's economy thanks you. You all have a really big job to do. So thank you for taking the time to listen to us.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

Up next we've got Caller 0106 and after that will be Caller 0784.

Caller 0106, that's a call -- go ahead.

MR. NEVON WATSON: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Navon Watson. I've called today to speak on behalf of Long Beach City College. We are one college district with two campuses in Long Beach, but our district also serves Lakewood and Signal Hill. We mostly engage with you all on the Congressional map especially because education is so heavily influenced by federal policy and because it is so important to us to keep our two campuses in a single Congressional district. We've been consistently engaging with this Commission as a way to look out for our 24,000 students, about 36 percent who are full time. We rely on federal representation and advocacy for our students to succeed.

Thank you for putting both of our campuses in the
same Assembly district. We see that as a good sign for things in the future. Please continue this trend and our -- and -- and our campuses together in your final Senate and Congressional maps as well. Thank you again for all you are doing, and we appreciate you taking into consideration our feedback.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

Up next, we've got Caller 0784 and after that will be Caller 8817.

Caller 0784.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.
The current San Fernando Valley Assembly maps are too broken to repair. In the last (indiscernible) Assembly map in the valley needs to be scrapped. The current maps in the San Fernando Valley break up longstanding and cultural and economic ties that have long been how the Valley has organized itself. We feel this is a last-minute play by Commission staff and local corporate interests to push maps that the San Fernando Valley residents doesn't support.
The previous Assembly map (indiscernible) preserved working neighborhoods in existence alignments better than the current (indiscernible). And we urge you to do the right thing for the San Fernando Valley working
communities. Unite Tunica Lake --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- all of North Hollywood, Valley Glen, and Van Nuys. Over 300 comments have been submitted since Saturday on the San Fernando Valley Assembly maps. And we urge you to fight back corporate business interests.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I appreciate your hard work. Have a great day. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

Just a moment while I check on our schedule. Stand by, everybody, please. We have another minute. Stand by. I'm going to get an update here just a moment. Thank you for your patience, everybody. Please stand by.

All right. Our captioners are going to help us finish these callers before we go to break, everybody. Thank you so much to our captioners. And thank you so much to those who have called in and for your patience. We know that you have been waiting a long time.

Up next, we've got Caller 8817 and after that will be Caller 9575.

Caller 8817, go ahead. We can hear you.

CHRIS: Hello?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yeah, we can hear you.
CHRIS: Good afternoon. My name is Chris and I'm calling from Huntington Beach in Orange County. And I want to thank the Commission for all their hard work so far, especially hearing our comments that Orange County coastal cities are a critical community of interest.

When you start with the Congressional districts tomorrow, my hope is that you don't let Orange County become victims of ripple effects that happen in Los Angeles County. Instead, prioritize our interests.

Thank you for your time and have a great day.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

And up next we've got Caller 9575 after that'll be Caller 9457.

Caller 9575, please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

MS. KAREN DIAZ: Hi, good evening, Commissioners. My name's Karen Diaz. I'm calling from the Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights. We want to commend you on the dedication to serve all the Californians. Today I want to provide feedback on State Assembly Iteration 12.46 and the San Bernardino County. For San Bernardino SBCHR, we love that you strengthen the federal Voting Rights Act district at the Assembly level in the City of San Bernardino. Community input from heartland residents make it clear that they identify more with the urban population in San Bernardino County rather than the rural
communities to our North. So thank you for the
iteration, which has edited to include Rialto in the
Northern parts of (indiscernible). But (indiscernible)
to respect the priorities of the Black community
(indiscernible).

We are proposing minor fixes that suggest having the
City of Colton again and this can be possible by making a
stop with those areas mentioned by cutting along --
cutting along Alhambra Street. In addition to that, I
want to provide feedback on the (indiscernible)
iterations for the high desert (indiscernible).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MS. DIAZ: We appreciate that you've kept the voting
rights of the district, but at Assembly level
(indiscernible) the communities of Hesperia, Lanco (ph.),
Victorville. We sent some written descriptions that
would strengthen this district by --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen.

MS. DIAZ: -- expanding towards Avenue I and Ontario
Road as much as possible. And this could be made
possible by making some cuts in the Antelope Valley side
around Pear Blossom Highway, connecting it to a 138
highway instead of (indiscernible).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

Up next, we've got Caller 9457 and after that will
be Caller 7840.

Caller 9457, if you could please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Foreign language spoken)

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And as a reminder, if you've called in today and you have not yet spoken and you have not yet raised your hand, please press star 9. We are getting down to our last callers. Again, that's for Caller 2211, Caller 2313, Caller 4141, and Caller 4222. Please press star 9 if you would like to give comment at this time.

Up next, we've got Caller 7840 and after that will be Caller 1784.

Caller 7840. That's caller with the last four digits 7840 you can now unmute by pressing star 6, please. One more time for caller 7840, if you are ready to give comment, please press star 6. Thank you for listening, caller 7840.

Now we've got Caller 1784 and after that will be Caller 0230 and that is my last hand. If you have not yet given comment and you wish to give comment, please press star 9.

Caller 1784, please follow the prompts to unmute. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, let me tell you,
Commission that was probably the longest I've ever been on hold, but I can only imagine what the 14 of you have had to put up with for all this time. So thank you for your patience. How do you speak -- I just want to talk about -- go back up to the East Stanislaus, East San Joaquin, and the mountain counties. I heard some callers earlier call in on this.

I'm one of the folks that lives literally right on the border of this -- this area and have property in the high elevation and I have property in the lower foothills. And I just want to say that I want to appreciate Commissioner Andersen. I heard you on Saturday. The motherlode region appreciates you trying to keep everything together sincerely and the hard work and you've been a real voice for -- for our communities.

However, I do want to call and say that I do agree with what Commissioner Fornaciari and Turner I think, Commissioner Yee if --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- I'm not mistaken were trying to do. If you draw a line from San Pedro to Lake McClure, Copperopolis, Chinese Camp, La Grange, and Knight's Ferry, all those communities share interests. And I ask that you consider that compromise. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.
Next up, we've got Caller 0230 and after that will be Caller 8495. And that is my last hand. If you want to give comment and you have not done so, please press star 9.

Caller 0230, please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

MS. O'REILLY-GREEN: Hi, my name is Meghan O'Reilly-Green. I'm the co-president of Starship PTO, the parent organization that serves Orion Alternative School in Redwood City, which integrates students from diverse economic and racial backgrounds.

Redwood City is a very unique area of interest. You know, we have many marginalized communities, which is very different from other cities around us. And it doesn't make a lot of sense to split our district in the assemblies map. In the Congressional map does a lot better in keeping the Redwood City district together. If we're split, then for the proposed Assembly map splits Redwood City so our voices will be diluted on key policy issues related to education.

It's extremely difficult to educate kids from a really diverse background, but we figured it out. And so I'm just asking to express support for the Assembly map submitted by Veronica Esquivez. I ask you to keep Redwood City intact and we'd like you to approve that map submitted by Veronica Esquivez.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MS. O'REILLY-GREEN: And thank you so much. This has been (indiscernible) difficult but you guys have done a great job. So thank you so much for all of your hard work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

Up next, we've got Caller 8495 and after that will be Caller 2313.

And we see your hand, 8565. Thank you so much.

Caller 2211, if you want to give comment, please press star 9.

Caller 4141, please press star 9.

Caller 4222, please press star 9. As you do not have your hands raised, you have not given -- you have not yet given comment.

Also for Caller 8359, if you wish to give comment, please press star 9.

Up next, we've got Caller 8495. Go ahead.

MS. RAHMO ABDI: Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. Go ahead, please.

MS. ABDI: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Rahmo Abdi. I'm a community organizer with PANA. Today I'm calling on behalf of Black, African, Middle Eastern Muslim
refugee communities in San Diego and the neighborhood of City Heights, (indiscernible), San Diego, Spring Valley, and El Cajon.

We live in underserved communities in San Diego, where we're shut out of all decision-making process. We want to bring change in our community by being a unified voting block. The (indiscernible) community experienced high rates of hate and homelessness with families doubling up in the same home to afford rent and having to face and navigate a new environment without language assets. The La Mesa Spring Valley map brings the price down to Mid-City, Normal Heights, into this district, as well as the rest of Skyline, (indiscernible) and a small portion of southeastern San Diego by the 94 that was a split. (Indiscernible) take out El Cajon and move it into the central (indiscernible). In the central, bring El Cajon (indiscernible) into the district to pair with Mesa communities. Take out (indiscernible) Golden Hills to pair with (indiscernible).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

MS. ABDI: (Indiscernible) community together and give us an opportunity to change, to bring change to our community. Our Black, African, Middle Eastern, and Muslim refugee communities are tired of being on the menu. It's time for us to be at the table. Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Fifteen seconds.

MS. ABDI: And please to keep our community together.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

And up next is Caller 2313. And after that is Caller 8565. And those are our final hands before break.

Up next Caller 2313, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute. Go ahead.

MR. NAVARRO CRUZ: Name is Pedro Navarro Cruz and I'm here to support the (indiscernible) plan. I am a resident of Fresno and I know it's very important to keep the South Fresno region together as it has many urban needs that the current AD31 lines dilute.

Also as a Latino male in a biracial (indiscernible) Latino family, I also feel it is important not to only keep Latinos close together, but also among African-American and Muslim families. The proposed AG31 district line in the MALDEF plan lets both communities in an unprecedented way while also combining together Latino communities of interest and a better thought-out manner.

Yes, I please urge you support this MALDEF plan.

There hasn't been many people speaking out for the Central Valley in the Fresno area, at least in this meeting that I've been listening to. Just urge you all to not forget that this is a region in particular AD31,
this is where a lot of the folks that are farm workers live in. And as we know, that agriculture is a major contributor to the California economy. And this is exactly where the -- those folks that work the fields and contribute to that.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Twenty seconds.

MR. CRUZ: So please keep us in mind and thank you all for your service. I know this is a very difficult job you are doing and thank you for listening. Have a good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

And now Caller 8565, if you could please follow the prompts. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Thank you very much for your commitment to the State of California in this daunting task that you guys are faced with. I am a former neighbor, a council member in the Valley Glen community in the San Fernando Valley in L.A. County. And I ask that the communities of Valley Glen, North Hollywood, Van Nuys, Toluca Lake, and Valley Village be united into one district. This was similar to the central San Fernando Valley district until a couple of days ago, where you guys completely turned it upside down and destroyed the Valley communities from being united into one district. Please revert back to
former maps or adjust the current maps to accommodate for that.

And I do understand that the staff has a very difficult task and probably doesn't understand all parts of the state equally. So please take that into account when you're looking at this.

Also looking at the map, you guys have divided the community of Glendale and that is really not --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- the appropriate way to do it. I would actually suggest that you guys move some population from -- GLENNLA can pick up more of Glendale going all the way to the Hill communities, combining all the flats of Glendale into one district. So at least do that if you can't unite all of Glendale (indiscernible).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Ten seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And just unite San Fernando Valley. I did have my parents on the line except they hit the wrong button when they were speaking. You have two others here --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And Chair Toledo, that is all of our raised hands at this time, I defer.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Thank you, California, for being so engaged in this process. We appreciate all the written comments that
have come in, all of the testimony, and those who have
been waiting in line to give testimony.

We are going to take our lunch break and come back
after lunch. But if you want to provide comment to the
Commission, feel free to do so through our website and
through the many platforms that are available to you.
Thank you so much. And we'll see you after our lunch
break. Our lunch is from -- it will go to 4:15 -- 4:45,
rather -- 4:45. Okay. So okay, 5:15 is what we need.
So we'll be back at 5:15.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 4:32 p.m.
until 5:45 p.m.)

CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California
Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are continuing on
with our visualization process. We have our draft maps
posted -- the maps for the State of California. We've
received public comment, a lot of public comment, and
we've been reviewing it all weekend and into the morning
and afternoon. And now it's time to have a conversation
around what we are prioritizing.

We've seen all the testimony. I'd like to get into
a conversation, a brief conversation because we don't
have too much time, about our priorities for refinement.
And so I'll just go around and check in with
Commissioners and see what they've heard and their top
one or two refinement priorities.

So I'll start with the person on my screen, in the main screen, in the room. So that would be Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Andersen, what are your top two refinement priorities? And I'm writing them down so that as we go through, we prioritize the ones that are the top.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. There are a lot all through Southern California. I'm sure other people will say those. So I will say my two will be the -- fixing the Oakland -- the Rock Ridge area and seeing what we can do about the vineyards and the gold country trade.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Vineyard and Oakland. Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Vazquez, you're two top priorities and anything you want to say about the feedback that we've received as well.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you. I would like to continue to think through both South Los Angeles as well as Northeast Los Angeles. Thanks.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you. So South Los Angeles and North -- did you say northeast Los Angeles, NELA?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Correct.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Or the whole region?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: The area of northeast Los Angeles, which includes what's currently visualized as GLENNLA and NELA.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Perfect. Thank you.

Mr. Kennedy? Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: What Commissioner Vazquez said and seeing if we can fix the Coachella Valley a little bit better. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Coachella Valley I didn't even have on.

All right. Let's go on to Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I'd like to take a peek at South Fresno and the Los Angeles area in general.

CHAIR TOLEDO: L.A. Okay. South Fresno and L.A. Let's move on to Commissioner Fornaciari. Top two priorities?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, we heard a lot about the San Fernando Valley today and I think my other priorities have already been said.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I would like to -- I'd like to focus on -- come back to Orange County and the South
L.A. area particularly, too.

CHAIR TOLEDO: South L.A. Perfect.

All right. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. Morgan Heights, Sherman Heights, and just fixing that boundary. That's a quick one. Coachella Valley and Redwood City split.


Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, I would like to revisit the Eastern Sierras, that huge district that we currently have going all the way up to the Oregon border. See if we can do something with that. Also, other things have been mentioned, the Oakland split, rechecking Redwood City. And then one I'll add is the Florence-Firestone. We've gotten so much feedback on that, I'm not sure we can do anything but want to double-double check that.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Sadhwani.


CHAIR TOLEDO: San Fernando Valley. Perfect. All right.

So let's see -- hear from Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, everybody has
already -- I had my top five and you guys have all said
it. I was the -- my top five, but they've already been
done. The East L.A., Boyle Heights, the Florence-Graham,
I had Florence-Graham, the Vineyard, the high desert
area, and the Sierras. So it's all been duplicated.
Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: It's all there and we captured yours
as well. All right.

So we have Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I don't have anything
additional to add, Chair. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Perfect. And then for me it would be
as the high Sierras (indiscernible) to the Oregon border
revisiting that as well as -- actually I would -- I'm
just going to focus on -- that would be my top priority.
Fresno, potentially. There might be a couple of changes
but minor potentially, but I think that's captured
already. All right. So thank you.

Anybody else? Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you. I also agree with
the Boyle Heights question then also that long district
from Inyo all the way to the Oregon border is also a
priority of mine.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

So let's get started. So I think what we're going
to do and I -- no. And so I think what we're going to do is we're going to start with the most populous -- we're going to start with Southern California. So we're going to start with Southern California down near the border, San Diego, and move our way up. And so let's start with Southern California. We have Sivan on the -- in the room, I guess.

    MS. TRATT: Hello, Chairman.

    CHAIR TOLEDO: Virtual room.

    MS. TRATT: I'm in the room. I'm in the house.


    So some visualizations that you have for us, Sivan? I know you've been working on some visualizations.

    MS. TRATT: I don't have anything. I worked with several Commissioners offline and perhaps they would be better to explain those requested changes than I would be.

    CHAIR TOLEDO: So you've been working with individual Commissioners. Those plans are posted as potential refinements --

    MS. TRATT: Yes.

    CHAIR TOLEDO: -- in our handouts, and we will be going through them individually. But let's start with Commissioner Sinay.
Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm trying. I'm trying. Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: No worries.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: If we zoom into them by the 94, there's a piece that's been cut. I know it's understandable just because we had --

MS. TRATT: Oh, sorry, sorry, I lost it. There we go. Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So that, yeah, if -- it would be great to know if -- how many people that is and where we would need to cut somewhere differently. Because this is the area of Sherman Heights so that, you know, this area is one that gets cut a lot. So it would be really nice to have this full all the way up to the 94.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Any concerns from the floor about adding this portion of -- let's highlight it and see how many people live there.

And then while we're doing that, I'm just going to -- here's the schedule that we have for right now. The plan is to go until 6:15 in Southern California. Hopefully, we'll be able to wrap those refinements issues or at least be able to get through most of them, then have a break at 6:15. Then when we come back, we do Los Angeles 'til 7:30 and have a break. Come back at 7:45, work on the Central Valley, then we'd work through the
Central Valley until about 9 o'clock, and we'd end with
the Northern California region.

So that's general -- I mean, some of -- there might
be some areas that take more time than other. I see a
lot more issues in the Southern California region and Los
Angeles region than I do in the Central Valley and
Northern California. But we'll allocate time
accordingly, but we'll try to maintain a fair proportion
of time being allocated to each region.

All right. With that, Commissioner Sinay, let's
look at population. We have 1,371 people in that area.

Shifting it --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: (Indiscernible) it goes up to
5.1, right?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So as was shown in the PDF that
is posted on the website, that would push CVSY into an
over 5 percent deviation. So the question would then
become for the Commission, where to take population out
and create a city split as the rest of the jurisdictions
in this district are kept whole.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. My recommendation would
be to look at Bonita if we could do it -- split in
Bonita.

MS. TRATT: Perfect. So let me go ahead and accept
this change.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: I don't know if other Commissioners have any --

MS. TRATT: And if you want to direct me on streets or we can just start pulling and see how populated this area is.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's hear from Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So in the community maps that we've looked at, you know, Barrio Logan just goes slightly over the bridge. We have it going further over the bridge. Does anybody live there in that area or is that just not populated out there? Where it says Ferry Center. I mean, yeah, I guess it's not that much more than I've seen. There's probably not many people living in the area we would cut. So yeah, let's go to Bonita.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I don't really have a recommendation within Bonita. I'm sorry.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Well, in that case --

CHAIR TOLEDO: This is a VRA area, is it? I see them highlighted in yellow. I just want to verify.

MS. TRATT: Yes, it is.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Since it's a VRA area, can we please put the Latino CVAP on?

MS. TRATT: Yes. The Latino CVAP is on and you can
see it in the pending changes box in this -- where my
cursor is circling.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Apologize. I meant to say Latino
heat map.

MS. TRATT: Oh, yes. One moment, please. I turned
the yellow off so hopefully you can see a little bit
better.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So it looks like the population is
evenly spread out throughout the city.

Commissioner Vinay? Can we zoom out in this
district and see if there's any --

COMMISSIONER VINAY: I don't think that the red that
looked evenly spread is actually the heat map.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, you think that --

COMMISSIONER VINAY: That's a color to differentiate
it like with Spring Valley. I thought it was when you
said that and I was like, wait.

MS. TRATT: Are you talking about this -- the pink
of the (indiscernible)?

COMMISSIONER VINAY: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Let me -- I can turn off the
cities for a second so you can see.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. That would be helpful.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. One moment, please.

COMMISSIONER VINAY: One of the reasons we were
thinking of Bonita is just because it had --

CHAIR TOLEDO: There we go.

COMMISSIONER VINAY: --- a funny little V in it per --

MS. TRATT: Yeah, so I think you're talking about widening this, kind of, tail that is part of the City of La Presa, but perhaps we could take some population from this part of Bonita to make that a little bit more -- or more compact, potentially.

COMMISSIONER VINAY: That -- I like that. I don't know what others are thinking, and it looks like Commissioner Fornaciari might have an idea.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, let's hear from -- no, not at this time. But --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Not a bad -- not a bad --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- so let's -- go ahead Commissioner Fornaciari. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I've got a better idea. I just keep forgetting to put my hand up.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So maybe -- at this time maybe Commissioner Sinay, you might want to suggest an area that -- for us to highlight and we can compare and look at the CVAPs and the proportions.

MS. TRATT: Yeah, so we're looking at a little over 1,000 people. So I have the populations of each census
block. So we are probably only going to need to add a
couple of census blocks from Bonita to get the population
development back under 5. Would you like me to start
adding population?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes, please.

MS. TRATT: Okay. So that technically brings it
within our population deviation. Would you like me to
keep going?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you compare the CVAP what it was
before and what it is now since it is the VRA area?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So it looks like, well, with that
changed in the Logan Heights area, it was at 56.01 and
this makes it 56.04 so very minimal change.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So it's kept it pretty stable.

MS. TRATT: Yes, it's a pretty small amount of
people. It's just this district was already pretty close
to being overpopulated already.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sivan, does it make sense if I
say can we keep what's closest to you? Oh, is that --
that's all the same district. Okay. Never mind. I'm
quiet.

CHAIR TOLEDO: (Indiscernible) --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I would say just do the
minimum, yeah, that piece that --

CHAIR TOLEDO: I think that this is the minimum.
right, Sivan?

MS. TRATT: Yeah, this is --

CHAIR TOLEDO: This is the minimum --

MS. TRATT: -- pretty close to the minimum. Yep.

Yep. And I don't know if counsel wants to weigh in about 4.87 percent, but that's under 5. So my understanding is that that's within your legal range. Should I go ahead and commit this change?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay, this change, are you okay with it? Is everybody else okay with this change? I'm looking for general consensus.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: How do people feel about the deviation?

MS. TRATT: So it was about this deviation when we ended yesterday, so.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Not a big change to deviation, not a big change to population because we're talking about very few people. It's really just a matter of who we're cutting, you know. At this point, it's prioritizing one COI over another.

Commissioner Yee? Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sivan, can you just move into that area that you just highlighted?

MS. TRATT: Yeah, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.
MS. TRATT: Do you want me to turn the Google base map off on?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sure. Yes, actually, I would like to see the streets. I was just trying to see if there was a more defined -- like a main road or something like that -- yeah, like right there. I don't know, I'm just -- instead of a random, put it on neighborhood I think.

MS. TRATT: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I don't know. That would be my suggestion.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, those two would work. I mean people know Briarwood (ph.) and Sweetwater (ph.).

MS. TRATT: Perfect. That, again, changes things very minimally. Should I go ahead and commit this change?

CHAIR TOLEDO: I see general consensus. No opposition. So let's commit this change and let's go to our next change.

MS. TRATT: Perfect. So just to summarize that swap we did, we took about 1,000 people out of the City of Bonita to accommodate moving the boundary to the 94, which would keep intact the historic Barrio COIs.

Chair, which district would you like me to take a look at next?
CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's hear from the floor which refinements would -- any other refinements in this area? We're in the San Diego region at this point.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry, I lowered my hand. But anyway, I've got another little one in Carmel Valley, but it's really -- so I don't know how big it is. So --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's go to Carmel Valley.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I hate to take up time, but --

CHAIR TOLEDO: We're spending time in the Southern California region today.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, so the idea here would be to use the same (indiscernible) Canyon line. And see how much of Carmel Valley from the 5 going East we can capture just to make this area a little bigger where the Torrey Pines Del Mar Heights is. And it's that school district -- I mean, we'll still be splitting the school district, but we'll be adding a few more -- a little bit more together.

MS. TRATT: So Commissioner Sinay, just in terms of moving population, which district are we moving in and out of?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We would be moving out of San Marcos --

MS. TRATT: Okay.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- into the coast.

MS. TRATT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think, yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: San Marcos and into the coast.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, is that San Marcos or is that Central.

MS. TRATT: Yes, there are three districts here. This district --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right.

MS. TRATT: -- here is Central SD. This district here is Escondido, San Marcos. And this district here is the SD Coast.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. So this would be moving it from Escondido, San Marcos towards the coast.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Either of these districts would probably have enough capacity to absorb it. Where is the population you want to highlight?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I don't know -- I don't know how far we can go without the negative getting too negative on either one of them. So if we go to Carmel Country Road, I don't know if that'll work or not.

MS. TRATT: One moment, please.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And the reasoning for this?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: It's a school district and Carmel Valley and Delmar are very close together. But
it's part of -- this part is part of the school district up above it.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So community input regarding the school, just keeping the school districts whole?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: All right.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Or more (indiscernible) --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And for full disclosure, it's the school district my kids are in -- full disclosure.

MS. TRATT: So this brings population in West of Carmel County Road -- or Carmel Country Road. I'm sorry, the label is partially blocked. And then as South as Carmel Mountain Road. This would bring the deviation just under 5 to negative 4.95 percent and an SD coastal deviation would become 3.36 percent.

CHAIR TOLEDO: These are still within acceptable ranges.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I'm kind of thinking -- I'm hearing -- since we're doing it for a school district and the three schools are above the 56, I'm now thinking it might make sense to go use 56 as the South boundary and just capture the three high schools.

MS. TRATT: So how far in -- or just see -- move in --
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: -- (indiscernible) --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: See how far you can go.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Okay. One moment, please.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm sorry, guys. And then this is just a question for my colleagues to think about. We've heard a couple of people say putting El Cajon whole and moving it into central San Diego. So it's just a thought out there if others want to try to put that city whole.

MS. TRATT: So it looks like this area is a little bit more densely populated. So I can continue to add population, but I don't know if there's a major road in here that I'll be able to snap to.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So we're almost at the legal limit -- negative 5.

MS. TRATT: So yeah, right here we're at negative 4.53. And I'll keep adding census blocks here.

CHAIR TOLEDO: 4.76. That's probably as far as we can go.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. And this will --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Have to come back.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And what's that road right -- can you zoom in a little? Sorry.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Carmel Canyon Road.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, yeah. Are we okay right here?

MS. TRATT: We're at negative --

CHAIR TOLEDO: We're okay right here.

MS. TRATT: -- 4.53.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: If my --

CHAIR TOLEDO: We can't hear you. You're on mute.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I know. I just noticed I did that.

CHAIR TOLEDO: No worries.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: If my colleagues feel comfortable here then I'm comfortable here.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's check consensus -- general consensus on making a change that would -- keeps this area within general deviations, no compliance issues that I can see at this point.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, Commissioner Sinay, Cathedral Catholic High School is that -- is the boundary in the middle of it or -- kind of looks like it's in the middle of it.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, it's on one side or the other, I believe.

MS. TRATT: As far as I can tell from this map, it looks like it's in the central SD district.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. That looks about right.

I don't --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So I'm not seeing any opposition. General consensus is to move forward. And so we'll move -- we'll accept this change and we'll move on to the next portion of San Diego, if not -- El Cajon was raised. Is there a general consensus to explore a possibility of putting El Cajon in one district? I think we explored various aspects of this before. And so I'm just curious if there is a desire to explore that. It's a pretty densely populated area.

Looking around the room, Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I think we tried that several different times and ways and so I don't see that happening.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Yeah, we did try various ways so we'll move on to the next potential refinement in the San Diego area. Any additional refinements for the San Diego area at this time? None from Commissioner Sinay. Anybody else?

Not seeing any not -- oh, here, Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Not a refinement, but I noticed several folks called in about Mira Mesa. I just wanted --
CHAIR TOLEDO: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- if we can just take a
double look at that. I'm pretty sure --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- we went back and cleaned
that up on Saturday. I just want to confirm that, yes,
Mira Mesa appears to be as whole as possible given the
deviation issues that we have looked at.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Can we zoom into Mira Mesa just to
verify that it is kept whole.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I believe it's a
neighborhood, so I don't know that we have specific
boundaries. But it looks like we -- I recall we had gone
back to do our clean up to make sure it was whole. So I
just wanted to confirm that. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I have double and triple
checked the legal boundaries and the legal boundaries is
the 15 and so -- and the (indiscernible) we have it. I
think some feel like it's split just because there's that
area on the right, but that's another neighborhood, right
of the 15. But it is a community that's growing. But
Mira Mesa does stop at the 15. So we've covered it. The
other one we have covered that came up as well was moving
La Presa into Lemon Grove and Spring Valley, and we had
already done that as well.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Let's see. Any other -- so it does look like we have Mira Mesa as whole as we possibly can. Any other review of San Diego? I'm seeing, wow, no more hands.

Okay. So let's move on to the next region then. How about we move on to -- Sivan, can you move on to the next region we were working on? Or that Commissioners have been working on?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Would you like me to move to Orange County?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Sure. And I did see various iterations and a visualization for this area.

MS. TRATT: I know that Commissioner Akutagawa had some proposed changes that she had presented.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's ask Commissioner Akutagawa. Commissioner Akutagawa, are you ready to present some of your proposed refinements?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: We can also come back if you're not. You're ready?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I mean, either way.

CHAIR TOLEDO: No. If you're ready, we're ready. We're ready whenever you are.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So I sent six
maps -- they weren't -- they're mostly -- it's
actually -- there was actually real changes to, I think,
three. But the others I sent because I had to pull some
population from some of the ones. This is from using the
QGIS tool to draw my CA district or draw my CA tool. So
let me just start by just explaining where it started.

One, Fullerton; two, trying to bring more of a
ture -- at least as much as possible, not necessarily all
because it's just not feasible population-wise to create
an all-coastal district, but to at least try to bring in
Seal Beach so that it can -- there can be at least some
semblance of an all coastal district.

And secondly, in reading through the COI testimonies
again, I looked at the Lake Forest, Laguna Hills, Laguna
Woods, together with Irvine, and they all expressed more
of an affinity to be in a more inland district. So in
looking at creating more of a true coastal district,
there were some swaps that I made based on it.

I also want to just acknowledge the Vietnamese
community to bring in the Little Saigon area into an
everal coastal district would mean splits -- bigger
splits in the Little Saigon area. And I chose to keep it
as is to preserve, at least, the main core based on the
COI testimony that we have received that Westminster,
Garden Grove, Fountain Valley, and Midway City were the
core cities, in particular.

I did hear what you're saying. I did play around with some different options. It just was not possible to make the population deviations work with the core cities included with the coastal cities. And since those are more inland, I chose to just try to preserve the core Vietnamese Little Saigon COI.

So just to explain, let me just start with the -- I guess also I wanted to acknowledge the Fullerton -- the request from Fullerton to stay whole. I also want to just say we did receive some additional COI testimony this afternoon or this morning about some concerns about South Fullerton. I just -- let me just present what the Latino CVAP numbers look for in that area, which is inclusive of South Fulton. And then I guess what we could do is see if there would be -- but it's not a (indiscernible). Okay.

All right. So first off, let me start with the North O.C. coast. On this particular one that I presented, I was able to move Seal Beach in, keep Huntington Beach whole, move it -- I moved Costa Mesa in. This does break up one of the COI requests. But there was, again, competing COI requests around Costa Mesa, of which we did also hear tonight. But moving Costa Mesa into the NOC coast along with Newport Beach did enable a
little bit more of the population balance that would be needed to also then move Lake Forest, Laguna Woods, and Laguna Hills into a more inland district. It does include Aliso Vejo and Laguna Beach, as well as the Wilderness District.

What that then set off is then I moved -- that left Garden Grove or the GGW District short of population. I did move Cyprus into it. I now realize that it does break up the AMEMSA COI. However, there was also additional COI requests from residents in the Los Alamitos, Rossmoor, Cypress areas to be together in a district. And so bringing Cypress in to the GGW District did allow for those cities to stay together in that particular way.

Then onto the NOC District. With the NOC District, moving Cyprus into the district also then created room for all of Fullerton to be in the NOC District. To balance out the deviation, I also took some small parts of Placentia along the 57 freeway, which are very similar in terms of profile; a lot of apartments, students, other essential and a lot of other low-income workers as well, too. Very diverse in terms of Latino, but also working-class Asians as well, too.

I just wanted to note on this particular one, the Latino CVAP, although this is not a VRA district, it is
very close to Santa Ana. So I was conscious of that. So I want to note that according to the QGIS, the Latino CVAP would be around 41.08 percent. The Agency VAP would become 31.97. Both are much higher than our current NOC District CVAPS for, especially for the Latino community. So I wanted to note that.

I did send the LAOSB only because I had to pull some of the population from LAOSB to ensure that I could stay under the deviation for both NOC -- well, for NOC and then -- so I just try to take just enough out of Placentia to keep NOC under 5 and LAOSB under 5.

And then also I just want to note the last change that I made, and this is the other additional ripple effect. Irvine, I mentioned that I was able to combine Irvine with Lake Forest. I was not able to move North Tustin back in. It was just going to rob the LAOSB District of too much. But Irvine and Lake Forest had also -- I saw quite a bit of COI testimony that they would like to be together with Irvine. That also is the same for Laguna Woods and Laguna Hills. So all the inland cities are together.

The only other split that I had to do was to add the very Northern part of Lake Forest, which is above the toll road, the 241 toll road. I had to take that to put it into the inland OCRC District to balance out the
Irvine deviation. So -- and I did not touch SOC NSD. So now there is balance and I think this creates some of the -- it addresses some of the requests. Although now I realize a MEMSA COI did get broken up and I do apologize for that. And I could not fully accommodate the Little Saigon request, but we were still able to keep the core together. And as I had mentioned, the other alternative would be a complete dismantling of Little Saigon, which I think that that would be worse.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa for that recap. So maybe we should take each one of these at a time, probably starting with the first one we discussed and I believe that was the coastal. If I remember correctly, we started with the coastal then we went to Fullerton.

Remind me if that's correct, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I just -- I mean, either order is fine. Some of the PDFs that I did, I was just doing it as I was doing it. So I hadn't fixed the other areas. So if the deviations look off, it's because I was just doing it as I was going so I don't lose it, so.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So Sivan, can you show us the maps as they were -- as there was general consensus on the maps that are being proposed? Is there a way to
overlap them?

MS. TRATT: This is the only map, the map -- the changes that Commissioner Akutagawa was just talking about she did on her own mapping software.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

MS. TRATT: I don't have those maps. So we would have to walk through and make those changes live.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sivan, I did send the shape files to Andrew.

MS. TRATT: I would still need to make those changes live. I don't have that ready.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's -- is there a way to see what -- I guess not. So let's start with the first one, Commissioner Akutagawa. Your first -- oh, questions, questions. Let's go to the questions first and then we'll start.

 Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair.

First of all, thank you Commissioner Akutagawa for going through this. That's obviously spent a lot of time. I couldn't quite tell in the -- I guess it's the Garden Grove one. So the way it -- the way it looks on your maps -- not what we're actually looking at here, I believe Seal Beach is no longer in and Cyprus is; is that correct? Just for this particular one?
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Seal Beach is in NOC Coast and Cyprus has been moved into GGW.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Did the Stanton coming out of that, would that have helped at all?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No, unfortunately it didn't. I did explore that, too --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Great.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- as a way to also even split Cyprus so that the Northern part of Cyprus could remain an NOC. But what it did is it rendered Garden Grove under deviation and NOC a little bit too over deviation.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you very much. I just -- I was pretty sure you'd done that, but I wanted to voice that for the public who kept on saying well if you just take Stanton out, it'll all work. And unfortunately, some of the things we think look great when you put the numbers on them, they don't actually work out. So thank you very much.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. Mine is a little bit more of a process and what would be the best way. I really appreciate these maps that Commissioner Akutagawa have submitted and yes, definitely wanted to
start working through it. However, I wanted -- from a process perspective, I was asked also to work on the Los Angeles areas, and I have also submitted some maps that actually end up impacting some of this area. And some of the things that Commissioner Akutagawa, you were attempting to do may be done in this other iteration.

And it just did change more districts. It's touched actually 13 districts, but they do all balance. The VRA attorney's already seen it as well and given it, kind of, a thumbs up. So not to say to land on it, but I'm -- so I start with process. So if we make changes now, I just did at least want to flag that there are other changes that I also want us to at least look at before we finalize on something.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And that's the hard part of these. Anytime we make refinements, there's potential impacts from other areas. So I think we got an overview of the potential refinements in this area. And let's hear other folks. But we've have -- we've heard the potential refinements here. It may make sense to also look at the potential refinements around the Los Angeles area that will impact here. Let's think about that a little bit as we -- and maybe if there's feedback from the Commission.

Let's go to Commissioner Fornaciari and Sinay and then we'll get some clarity around process and Sadhwani
as well.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, Commissioner Akutagawa, thank you for this. I did have a question, though, about your LAOSB District that you sent. It's really hard to tell with the colors, but it looks like La Hambra is in the LAOSB.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. I saw that, too. I was assured that it's not so --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Okay.

(Indiscernible) --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was kind of trusting in it.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Otherwise my deviations are really off.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Great. Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay and then Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was just wondering for us and for the public instead of Linda -- I'm sorry, Commissioner Akutagawa talk about it, we could pull up the PDFs that she created just so we have a better visual before we jump into it all.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I'm going to ask staff to do that.

Freddy, can you put them up if they're on our website? The maps that Commissioner Akutagawa has
presented and are posted on our website and we'll need to share them.

MS. TRATT: Should I stop sharing my screen so you can pull those up?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. How about you stop sharing and we'll get Director Ceja to share them. In the meantime, let's hear the rest of the folks who have comment.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, just -- first of all, thank you to Commissioner Akutagawa for taking the time to look through this more closely. There's a couple things that give me pause about these plans. It's definitely preferencing certain COIs over others. I'm not so sure that I personally will agree with the outcome of that.

That being said, from a process perspective as Commissioner Turner raised, when we went through this -- before we started this evening, Chair, you had asked us our top priorities. And from my count, there were seven Commissioners who identified Los Angeles as a priority area, including Commissioner Akutagawa. Only one identified Orange County as a priority area.

So I -- you know, hearing Commissioner Turner that some of the changes in L.A. might impact Orange County, I would argue that perhaps it would make sense to work on
other areas and come back to Orange County before we spend a lot of time here. It sounds like it's going to take quite a long time of exploration if Sivan has to go through each one of these changes and prioritize those areas that more Commissioners had identified first. That doesn't mean we need to go to L.A. right now.

I know you have your own plan, but I remember there was additional cleanup in the Central Valley -- or excuse me, the Coachella Valley and other locations before we even get to L.A. So I'm just thinking about time management and the realistic priorities as we move forward in this process (indiscernible).

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you for that, Commissioner Sadhwani.

And I'll just ask in terms of process, I also am interested in hearing lots of changes proposed for the OOC. Just the thought process about what's driving some of those changes, because that may also help us. It may be that some of the impacts -- some of the changes in Los Angeles might actually help us and the OOC or not, but at least we'll know.

And so I'm just curious if you could just help us think about the process. Why the changes, Commissioner Akutagawa? Why the proposed changes? Is it because of COI and, you know, is it because of balancing the
districts? Uniting -- so just interested in hearing your rationale for the changes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So it is about hearing the testimonies and reading through the COI input. Fullerton -- I also wanted to try to figure out how to make Fullerton work as well, too. So I looked at all of it together. Also, I will say that I've been hearing about, you know, the inland versus the coastal. You know, I think it's debatable for some but, you know, living there, I do know the difference. And I think that even though there are very different coastal cities, Seal Beach is very different from San Clemente, as is Newport Beach, from, you know, even Seal Beach, too, but they are coastal cities. And I think that there are a lot of common issues. And I think as we're looking at climate change, too, I think that that is a concern that I have, you know, and having a -- as we heard from some of those, I think that's why it got me thinking especially to try to make Fullerton work as well, too. I just explore that. Now with that said, you know, I definitely would like to see what Commissioner Turner has done and to see what is -- you know, what she's come up with as well, too. I don't think we need to, like, do it right -- like, make these changes right now.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you so much. And that's
helpful in terms of having the background in terms of the rationale for potential changes.

All right. So let's see where we head next and then we'll come back. We have changes -- there were one, two, three, four Coachella Valley's -- potential changes in the Coachella Valley. So let's go down to the Coachella Valley for now and we'll come back to the OC later.

Probably after we go through Los Angeles, because that was the focus for quite a few folks, and that potentially may have some impacts on the OC. And probably have some alignment in terms of some of the goals that Commissioner Akutagawa's trying to achieve, as well.

So when the OC and the Coachella Valley -- can we have -- we had quite a few people raise this, so Commissioner Kennedy, Commissioner Sinay, how about any hands raised over here?

Let's start with the change that is posted -- Commissioner Sadhwani, do you want to start?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No, I did. I wasn't aware that there was a change posted, so let's take a look at that. I'll just note -- hearing loud and clear, not (indiscernible) that, that's totally fine with me. But my question as I raised last time was then where?

You know, we had had through Desert Hot Springs in our draft and that was removed. So just curious about
where we can go from here.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So we've been looking at options for La Quinta, and Karin can walk us through some of these. She's been -- I asked her to take a look at potential options for La Quinta. And then -- and so as soon as she's available to speak through it, she's been looking at the various options of how we can or not make that work and we can talk through that.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. And to say -- to thank the mappers and acknowledge that yes, I did say if we couldn't have La Quinta fully in the MVCV District, could it at least be made whole? And we do have three options for us to make it whole, but again making it whole in SECA and what we're hearing loud and clear is that the better option is to have it whole but in MBCV. So we're back to looking at how could we make it whole in MBCV.

You know, I come back to maybe the way to do that -- and we need to look at all of the deviations -- is moving Homestead Valley or Homestead Valley and Twentynine Palms and the Marine base out of MBCV into VBHD. I'd also like to look at some cleanup in that area of SECA South and West of Palm Springs. As Commissioner Sinay had mentioned the other day, we are separating Anza from
Borrego Springs. And there are some -- it just seems to me that that area South and West of Palm Springs would better be divided in three different directions -- part of it into MBCV, part of it into SESDC, and part of it into inland OC-RC. I'm happy to go through those ideas.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

Sivan, can you speak to the La Quinta and options where -- because I think you worked through some of these trying to unite La Quinta with the Palm Springs area.

MS. TRATT: Actually, Chair, I was given direction to look at options to make La Quinta whole and all of those solutions are in PDFs that should have been posted.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Got it.

MS. TRATT: But as Commissioner Kennedy noted, those all kept La Quinta whole within SECA. That was the direction that I received. And I went with what I thought would cause the least disruption to those -- to the larger map. I'm happy to talk through what those changes were now, if you would like.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Well, I think what -- I believe the COI's testimony is to connect La Quinta with other resort-type communities, and that was with Palm Springs and others around there. So I think -- are there any options? I think Commissioner Kennedy spoke of a couple of options, and we can go through those to see if any of
those would be feasible.

Commissioner Kennedy, do you want to speak to some of those options to -- are you interested in exploring possibility of keeping La Quinta in the -- with the Palm Spring area? And is that something we're exploring or is it, or do you have other refinements that you are prioritizing?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, that would be the number one objective. Keeping it whole somewhere else is kind of a -- is kind of a fallback position.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: But again, I come back to if we're trying to get La Quinta whole into MBCV and we need to remove population to make room for that, then I would say that what we're looking at is probably Homestead Valley and Twentynine Palms. And I had commented the other day that Twentynine Palms and the Marine base there is some community support for having Twentynine Palms and the Marine base in VDHD because of all of the other military installations in VDHD and the military ties in VDHD.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Perhaps we can highlight some of those communities, Sivan, and see if we have -- if there's a potential for a swap.

MS. TRATT: Yeah, so I've highlighted the portion of
La Quinta that's currently in SCCA and that is almost 21,000 people. So just looking at some of those changes proposed, we have -- and again, I'd remind the Commission and the public that these labels that have population are the pre-adjusted labels just because of the way that the software works. It was not able to update the prisoner adjusted population totals. So these are rough estimates. But just for, you know, sketching in this idea, we have about 28,000 people in Twentynine Palms. I'm not sure how many people are living or were counted as living on the Marine base. And then Homestead Valley about 3,000 people. And then moving those populations into VVHD. And then you'll have to remind me, Commissioner Kennedy, what the next steps after that were.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I was looking at moving Acton and Agua Dulce from VVHD into SCV. And then if we need to move population further, finding space for moving some of those San Fernando Valley communities that are currently in SCV into San Fernando Valley districts.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So it looks like Acton and Agua Dulce together are about 11,000 people. You'd be moving those into an already close to 5 percent over deviated district. So I would like for potentially Jamie to be on just because this is going to impact a lot of the areas
that she's worked on and I'm not sure what those ripple
effects would be through the City of San Diego, but we're
looking at a really big shift in this region.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right. We also have room to
absorb population in the 210 District. I hadn't really
been looking at that so far, but that's another option
that we have.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's hear from Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So what we've been hearing --
if we can go back to the Coachella Valley. And what
the -- this is a VRA district and what the community's
been asked -- what we've heard in the last 24 hours has
been moving La Quinta out and moving towards -- you know,
it's hard to do Cathedral City and Desert Hot Springs
unless we took out a bunch. You know, it's kind of like
a -- it would be a funny loop.

But I just wanted to ask, is there a way that we can
ty, you know, to add one of those areas or -- I mean,
the other one would be Desert Hot Springs, but then
you've got Desert Edge right by there. Well, I guess you
can go through the unincorporated areas. But I did want
to bring up that that was what the community has been
asking for.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's go to Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: We've also heard from the
1 Filipino community, the LGBTQ community, and the Black
2 community that we need to keep Palm Springs, Desert Hot
3 Springs, and Cat City together. So again, we're not
4 going to make everybody happy with everything. And you
5 know, my sense is that if we are able to move La Quinta
6 in with most of the other cities in the valley, that
7 might be the best we can do to satisfy as many as
8 possible without causing more damage in the process. I
9 mean, that's just a personal sense.
10
11 CHAIR TOLEDO: So I -- we're approaching our break
12 at 6:15. I'm going to ask Sivan and Jamie to explore
13 what we've just discussed, potentially shifting some
14 population and swapping some population into other
15 districts during the break and see if there's any options
16 that might be viable. And so if additional clarification
17 on the direction that was given by -- or recommendation
18 given by Commissioner Kennedy is needed, he is available
19 to provide it. And when we come back, we'll recap what
20 was done during the break. All right. So 15 minutes
21 for -- 15-minute break.
22
23 (Recess)
24
25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California
our line drawer, has been working through the break to
ty to find some solutions to uniting La Quinta with the
Palm Springs and other communities.

Sivan, do you have any update on what you were able
to accomplish during the break?

MS. TRATT: I believe that Commissioner Kennedy and
Jamie met offline.

Commissioner Kennedy, I'll have you discuss what you
decided.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. They may just be
continuing to work through this, so let's -- for now,
we'll come back to this, any other changes in this area
(indiscernible)?

Seeing none we'll come back to the Coachella Valley
once we have Commissioner Kennedy back with us.

In the meantime, let's head down to the Imperial
County. I just want to make sure there's no refinements
in Imperial County. I didn't hear any during our
prioritization, but just want to make sure. Any
refinements in this area proposed by Commissioners?

Looks like this area is set. Perfect. Let's go on.

So at this time, because the OC is still -- we're
waiting for Los Angeles for the OC. We're waiting for
some additional refinements in the Coachella Valley.

Let's go to Los Angeles. So we'll need to switch line
drawer to Los Angeles.

MS. TRATT: I think if Commissioner Kennedy isn't back, then Jamie isn't ready either. I do have the sheet file loaded in from Commissioner Akutagawa, if you'd like to take a look at that in Orange County.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, if you have the (indiscernible) files, let's go to Orange County to take a look at the (indiscernible) files. We'll probably still have to go up to Los Angeles given the impact -- the potential impact of the changes down there might impact some of these, but maybe not. So let's take a look at them.

MS. TRATT: Okay. So what I believe I'm displaying in these numbers are the deviations, although I'm waiting for confirmation from Commissioner Akutagawa about the field name. Do these look correct?

Oh, okay. It looks like Jamie is ready. Okay. I'm going to stop sharing my screen and Jamie's going to step in and talk about what she and Commissioner Kennedy discussed. Thank you, everyone.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So we'll go back to the Coachella Valley.

MS. CLARK: Hi, everyone.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome.

MS. CLARK: Hi. Thank you. Good to see you all.

So Commissioner Kennedy and I were in the middle of
working. We haven't found a solid solution quite yet. Some of this stuff just takes more than 15 minutes. And so I guess just kind of listening with half an ear to the meeting while we were in that meeting. And is the request to move on to L.A. right now and then maybe Sivan could work on this trade -- this population trade with Commissioner Kennedy while we're looking at L.A. County?

CHAIR TOLEDO: That is possible. Before we can move on to Los Angeles, could you just please share some of the things that you have tried during the break just so that the public is --

MS. CLARK: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- has an update of what was being done during the break?

MS. CLARK: Absolutely. Yeah. So we moved La Quinta from SCCA to MBCV, which made MBCV O populated. I think it was in the 8 percent, something like that. And we were exploring moving Twentynine Palms and Homestead Valley into BVHD. That made be BVHD over populated by 8.73 percent. And then we were also looking at adding Acton and Agua Dulce into the Santa Clarita Valley-based district, which made that 7.3 percent. We didn't get -- we didn't get much further than that, and, yeah, and then we had just started talking about other potential options and that's where we left off.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's move on to Los Angeles. In the meantime, if Sivan can continue working on some of that -- some of the potential changes to the Coachella Valley. Of course, Commissioner Kennedy is available should he -- should she need him.

All right. Let's go to Los Angeles.

MS. CLARK: I'm just really quickly undoing these changes, which would be really easy for Sivan to replicate on her map. Just so then we're all working with the --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

MS. CLARK: -- the current iteration in Los Angeles County. So sorry that the map kind of went all over the place there for a second.

So this is -- right now what's on the screen is the current iteration from 12/06 and happy to look into this. I also, you know, reviewed this, explore any changes that the Commission would like to explore. I also worked with Commissioner Turner yesterday to create a plan, Plan T-1 I think was what Commissioner Turner was wanting to present first. And yeah, happy to -- happy, of course, to either go over the current iteration or to look at Commissioner Turner's iteration, whatever the Commission wishes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's look at the iterations that
Commissioner Turner has. They have been posted. They are posted on our website in our handout section.

Commissioner Turner, if you could give the rationale and then go through some of the maps.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yep, thank you, Chair.

MS. CLARK: One moment, please while I switch over to that plan. And then this way, if the Commission wants to look at -- it's taking a minute -- if the Commission wants to, like, adjust any of those lines, then you'll be able to. So apologies for the delay and now that's on the map.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. So I'll start with just saying that I've started calling this kind of the all-in district -- the all-in iteration, because it does kind of touch 13 districts. The goal is to increase the strength of districts in Los Angeles that have been historically disenfranchised, individuals that struggle with lack of infrastructure, and economic disinvestment. So the current draft iteration that you'll see, the hope is that we've been able to protect or strengthen VRA districts, it holds much of the Commission's previous direction, and it honors as many COIs as possible.

So what I'd like to do is to give you an overview of what's here in the districts and then have Jamie go through the specifics of the areas.
So being responsive to the consistent input that's received regarding the historically disenfranchised communities in South and Central Los Angeles, this plan actually increases opportunities from two districts to four. This draft keeps areas protected by the VRA in districts with over 50 percent LCVAP. Also these draft iterations, they were already reviewed by VRA Council and VRA Council did not identify any issues with this configuration.

Another point here is that Koreatown, Chinatown, the historic Filipino District, and Little Tokyo's COIs are now all together in one district. They make Lakewood whole. It keeps Boyle Heights with Pico-Union, and it keeps Boyle Heights separate from East Los Angeles, which has been a request of residents of these areas.

It keeps downtown Los Angeles with South Central Los Angeles per public input. It keeps Santa Monica whole, though Santa Monica is split in countywide maps that we've received before. And though many multi-district countywide maps that we've received from public require that Long Beach is split in three or four district, this iteration only splits Long Beach into one.

So that's kind of the high overview. But in order to make that happen, it really did touch more than just a couple of areas. So if we can go through the T-1 now,
Jamie, starting with any area that you want to start
with, we can go through them.

MS. CLARK: Okay. Sure. Thank you, Commissioner
Turner. I'm going to start I think starting in the VRA
areas makes sense. The West San Gabriel Valley and East
San Gabriel Valley districts were not touched in this
iteration.

AD60 corridor changed a little bit. Part of that
was kind of looking at -- it began with there was
Commission direction to maybe have the -- to kind of
combine AD gateway and the 85 corridor, like mesh them
together. We did try that and it made one of the
districts over 80 percent Latino CVAP. So that wasn't
possible, that kind of working with -- I don't know, some
of that -- some of that conceptually led to this after
some rework.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Got the ball rolling.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, got the ball rolling. Thank you.

So AD60 corridor includes Walnut, Diamond Bar, Rowland
Heights, Hacienda Heights. And then the difference is
that it includes Montebello now. So Montebello and Pico
Rivera are back together. And just for population
purposes, Whittier is split here.

And I would also, just a quick note, is that there's
also a non-contiguous little, tiny piece of Whittier up
here. So moving Whittier into a different -- anyway, if Whittier wasn't wholly in AD60 corridor, then they, like, maybe would be split anyway because there's a little non-contiguous piece. Just a note for everyone to know.

AD5 corridor includes La Habra, the Southern part of Whittier, East Whittier, La Mirada, South Whittier, Santa Fe Springs, Norwalk, and Downey. And Whittier is the only city that's split. And the Latino CVAP in that is now 61.14 percent.

And then 85 Gateway, some of the most Northern gateway cities are not in this visualization or this iteration. So that's a difference. But it includes Bell, Huntington Park, Walnut Park, South Gate, Lynwood, which is whole, Paramount, Bellflower, and Lakewood, which is whole. In our previous iteration, Lakewood was split. But in this it's whole. And the Latino CVAP in 80 Gateway is -- in this iteration is 68.18 percent.

Something that maybe we can look at later, which is a smaller change and isn't in L.A. County, is that Commissioner Turner also looked at the split in Fullerton and moved this line to above the colleges. So just a note on that. And that's how Lakewood could be whole.

So those are the VRA areas and then I think that it makes sense to talk about this -- I'm just going to zoom out the map so we can all see to kind of go from there.
and then go kind of counterclockwise to look at the changes, because there is -- it's another L.A. county remix. So there's big changes.

So then looking at NELA. NELA includes Bell Gardens, Commerce, Maywood, and Vernon, which are -- these were moved from 80 Gateway and also 60 corridor. It includes Boyle Heights, which is not with the City of East Los Angeles and then including Chinatown. Tokyo is here with Pico-Union, Westlake, Rampart Village, and Koreatown. So that's NELA. It's negative 2.07 percent deviation.

Moving to GLENNLA, GLENN North LA is now East Los Angeles with El Sereno, Eagle Rock, the Southern part of Glendale, Echo Park, Silverlake, Los Feliz, and this is 4.86 percent deviation.

And then looking at AD West side, a change is -- it's Santa Monica with the West -- some of the West Side neighborhoods, West Los Angeles, Westwood, and West Side Neighborhood Council, Beverly Hills, West Hollywood. In this Mid-City Neighborhood Council is split for population. Includes greater Wilshire and Hollywood areas, including the Hollywood Hills. I would say also that the district with Malibu also includes Bel Air and Beverly Crest for population.

And then looking at N10. This includes Mar Vista
and Del Rey with Palms, Culver City, which is whole, South Robertson, Ladera Heights, View Park, and this is sort of Crenshaw area, Mid-City and West Adams, Jefferson Park, Olympic Park, Pico are all neighborhoods that are in this iteration and includes the Southern area of Mid-City.

Looking at 110 L.A. This includes downtown Los Angeles with Historic South Central, USC, Zapata-King and central Alameda. Florence is in this iteration with (indiscernible) or the 9th District. They can zoom in here. This is including Chesterfield Square, these areas North of 110.

Going to zoom out to 105 corridor. This includes Venice, Marina Del Rey, LAX with Inglewood, Lennox, Hawthorne, Lawndale, the Northern part of Gardena, West Athens, Westmont, and then just East of Westmont, this boundary is at 110.

Going to move on to AD South Bay. This includes El Segundo down to Palo Verde and Rolling Hills. It includes all of Torrance, the Southern part of Gardena includes Lomita. And I'll zoom in here because for population between the two -- these two districts, it includes Harbor Gateway South and Harbor City neighborhood councils and the Northern part of Northwest San Pedro -- oh, yes, the Northern part of Northwest San...
Pedro Neighborhood Council. This is the defense fuel supply point. Zooming in so we can see where that split is.

And then looking at this district that includes Long Beach, it does have San Pedro and Wilmington with the Southern part of the City of Long Beach and also Signal Hill. That is -- for population purposes, those are together.

And then this Northern part of Long Beach is with Carson, West Carson, Compton, Willowbrook, Watts, West Rancho Dominguez. And just a note is that I know that the direction from the Commission was to have Del Amo be the border here for a split in Long Beach. And just for population, it had to be a little bit further South of that. And so this is on Carson Street, roughly -- Carson and San Antonio.

And that -- those are the districts that were changed in this iteration from Commissioner Turner.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you for sharing those proposed changes. Any questions from the floor?

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, it's like finding the right button. Jaime, could you zoom in on the -- could you zoom in on the -- I think it's the NELA District. Let me just start there. I just want to look at the
detail now. Actually, like, zoom in, like, street level. I'm just curious where you cut -- where you cut that.
You said that it includes Little Tokyo, Chinatown, Koreatown, (indiscernible) and I think it's -- but I'm just curious where you put the split for downtown L.A.

MS. CLARK: Yes. Thank you. This is at 5th Street and then up to 4th a little bit. I will put the -- I will put up the COI boundaries of those COI submissions that the Commission received so that we --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No, that's fine. Yeah. As long as you -- as long as you don't go any further up than 4th Street, then you're okay.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. And this is the Little Tokyo COI that the Commission received.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Yeah. I just wanted to make sure about that so thank you.

Then the other question I have is, I guess I'm not sure how much that has to be in, but I notice that Vernon Commerce and Bell Gardens are not in. I thought that they had to be in the VRA District and it seems like to me Vernon, Commerce, Bell Gardens, Maywood have a lot more in common with the Gateway cities than Lakewood and Hawaiian Gardens do. And so I am just kind of concerned about, you know, the choice that was made to keep Lakewood there instead of going North and including those
other cities, which I think do belong more in that VRA District and have a lot more in common.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I just --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's hear from Commissioner Turner first.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I just wanted to name that the district that they're in because of the -- can I still say? Yeah, they were in the VRA District before. Now they're in a district with, I think, (indiscernible). I see that number. I'm not sure how much I can say, but they're in a like district now that didn't bring them any harm. Which is why we had the VRA attorneys kind of look at this area to make sure that we weren't causing -- bringing someone out of an area that's going to be harmed. They're protected still, I think.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Was that the only way?

Only because, I mean, you're still -- Lakewood and Hawaiian Gardens don't have a lot to do with, you know, the other cities, as we've heard. So that's why that was just more of my question.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Oh, Jamie.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. And we have had Lakewood and these in the VRA districts and out of the VRA districts. And ultimately, the Commission decided to bring Lakewood
back into the VRA districts for that Latino CVAP because removing Lakewood from these districts would bring the Latino CVAP really high up.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Jamie.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Just a quick question for counsel about the NEC and Bell. It's a compactness question. That's a pretty thin neck, so I'm just curious in terms of legal counsel's opinion on that.

UNIDENTIFIED LEGAL COUNSEL: Good evening, Chair. Jamie, does this basically follow the city boundaries of Bell?

MS. CLARK: Yeah, that's exactly the city boundaries of Bell.

UNIDENTIFIED LEGAL COUNSEL: Okay. In that case, I'm not concerned about compactness.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you. Especially because it's in the VRA District and compactness falls below VRA.

Okay. Commissioner Andersen then Commissioner Vazquez.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. I have a question, actually, and it's about the ports. So it's the -- a little further South on the map, please. Because we've obviously heard from both areas here and they are, indeed, competitors and have pretty much said
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we don't want to be with each other. And I'm just
wondering if there's the area of Long Beach, which was --
the North area of Long Beach, which was cut out. I'm
wondering if that could be switched for part of the port?
Basically, that area of Long Beach come back into ADLBC
and part of the area of the port go into, I guess, it's
South L.A.

MS. CLARK: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, (indiscernible).

Thank you.

MS. CLARK: So that is possible with population
switches and a configuration like this. I think what
Commissioner Turner was going for, the configuration like
this, is sort of respecting some of the testimony,
specifically with Black COIs in Southern L.A. and central
L.A.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Vazquez?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Excuse me, can I finish up on
the question?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, sure. Certainly, Commissioner
Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yeah, I'm
wondering that area in Long Beach, though, that's --
unless it was -- does that area have to do with the
Compton and that particular grouping? Because I was under the impression that that portion was not and the port actually did want to be with Carson. That's the one -- they wanted to go sort of North in that direction -- the LA port. Is that -- am I missing something on that?

MS. CLARK: Yeah. So I think that part of L.A. -- of Long Beach, rather, is part of the COI. And additionally, you know, some of the input that the Commission has received does try and keep the ports separate. But the way that that's accomplished is basically by putting this Northern part of Long Beach in with the South L.A. District and then splitting the ports, but having the San Pedro area still go with parts of Long Beach and further North. So instead of having two -- Long Beach be part of two districts, it's part of three districts instead of two, is the way that, like, that is accomplished by some of the countywide maps that the Commission has received.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah, no. I understood that. No, I was actually talking about just switching literally that chunk in and the other portion up because it's a negative 4.57 versus a positive 2.57. But again, if there's a punitive interest that has the opposite of that, I'd just like to know what it was. Thank you.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Thank you so much, Commissioner Turner, for putting this together. I like what this sort of composition does for South L.A. Not super thrilled at the idea of San Pedro and Long Beach sharing a district, but I feel like I can live with that.

I would just like to go back to my unpopular opinion that in Northeast L.A., I'm still really concerned about breaking up East Los Angeles from Boyle Heights. Trust me, I have heard and seen and read the COI testimony asking for those two communities of interest to be in separate districts -- wholly in separate districts.

And I understand the reasoning, especially from what I've heard today, is that historically both Boyle Heights and East L.A. have had their own -- what they view as sort of their own representative to advocate strongly for their community. And I totally hear that and that makes sense and I think that's really valid.

And I still am concerned that by breaking up what in this broader region, together with Boyle Heights and East L.A. in particular, that we are breaking up a historically immigrant community. And that just really concerns me given the demographic changes, particularly in income, especially as it relates to the more Northern
parts of northeast L.A. So Eagle Rock, Glassell Park, Echo Park, just even in the last ten years, the demographics of these communities have changed so significantly.

And I am -- in thinking ahead to the next ten years, I'm just really concerned, especially about, you know, communities of Highland Park, Glassell Park, you know, even East Los Angeles, and Boyle Heights are all experiencing the same trend of gentrification and higher income folks moving into these areas because housing is relatively cheap. And I just think in terms of, again, we're looking at state representation, not local or county. In terms of state representation, I just feel like the community of interest in question here for me, as I see it, is housing policy and state housing policy.

And I just feel like thinking of the communities of Boyle Heights, East L.A., and the rest of northeast Los Angeles feel like a community to me that has a huge housing policy interest that I'm really concerned about breaking up.

So again, I hear the community of interest and I'm willing to go the way of the Commission again, because it seems like this iteration does a lot of additional good things in other communities in L.A. But just I really don't like the way Northeast L.A. is visualized in this.
But thank you, Jamie and Commissioner Turner.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez. And if there's any suggestions you'd like to make or modifications, please let us know.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. You know, just a couple of things. Coming back to the Gateway cities and the 5 corridor, you know, I agree with Commissioner Vazquez that, you know, that it, to me, doesn't make a whole lot of sense to group Lakewood with Huntington Park and Walnut Park. And the idea was to look at Lakewood, Bellflower, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, that part and the more northwest -- kind of a northwest/southeast divide of these two districts.

I hear the issue of creating a district with a very high Latino CVAP, but, you know, the reality is that's the underlying population. I don't see that we're seeking to pack anybody. We're just trying to make districts make sense as far as who they're representing. And if there's a super dense, high percentage population in one area, you know, it's almost the opposite, would be breaking that community apart if we didn't have it grouped together. So you know, it's, I guess, a disappointment. If we have to go with it, we have to go with it.
Again, hearing the voices from Florence-Graham wanting to be with Huntington Park and Walnut Park, we hear you again. If we can't, we can't, but we do hear you and we understand you.

And I think finally just -- we've once again cut off Silver Lake from West Hollywood and Hollywood. Again, we hear you. If we have to do it, we have to do it. We don't like it but, you know. And I guess the other thing is Glendale and East L.A., that kind of has me scratching my head. Thanks.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Akutagawa then Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I agree with what Commissioner Kennedy was just saying. With that said, I have some questions again. I just want to perhaps just -- and you may have already talked about this, but what we did hear from the Florence-Graham residents was that they were asking could Walnut Park be placed with them and maybe even a part of Huntington Park, which then may, to my mind, which could open up some room and also CVAP to bring in perhaps Maywood and/or even Vernon whether it's all -- because they share very, very similar kind of challenges, a lot of environmental challenges because of the shipping. There's a big rail yard there. There's also the traffic from the 710. It's very much
industrial. Not a lot of people actually I found out live in Vernon, but the people who do live there face very similar challenges, a lot of low income, again, disadvantaged communities there as well, too.

And I am a little concerned about them being in. Not that they don't share similarities with the NELA cities, but I think there's -- I think to Commissioner Kennedy's point, it's just a question of whether or not they feel that affinity with each other as well, too.

But I mean, it's just -- I mean, I guess I'll just say, I mean, like with many places, we've just had to make some very tough decisions and not everybody is going to be happy. And it's about preserving at least the core of those communities. But if we can, you know, I just want to mention that. So thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Let's go to Commissioner Sinay, then Fernandez, Yee, and Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Wow, Commissioner Turner, Jamie, wow. Yeah, it's not 100 percent. Nothing can be 100 percent when we hear every single COI. I am concerned about the ports, but I'm going to turn it into a positive and say, hey, San Pedro, you're together. You're whole now. So you know, it's just every -- anything we do, we can find COIs that are going to
support it, not support it. We're going to make people unhappy. But I feel like this is kind of -- if you took a big step back on what people have been asking and what our values have been as we've been moving through this. You've done a great job.

And ports, we heard you and I'm sorry. If we're going to say sorry, I mean, I feel like if we're going to say sorry to every single person who's called us and we didn't hear them, we'll be here for a long time. So wow, thank you so much.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I just want to say that we did hear people. We just can't accommodate everyone we're hearing. All kinds of testimony and trying to reconcile it, and to prioritize it, and unite COIs as we are able to. But we are under so many constraints, especially in this area with VRA and other constraints.

Commissioner Akutagawa, then Fernandez. Akutagawa already went, so Fernandez then Yee.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Yes. I just want to thank Commissioner Turner. This is great. I do appreciate being able to separate East L.A. and Boyle Heights. We've actually been hearing that consistently for months now.

And I guess just a comment that if we were to draw this thinking ahead and what's going to happen in the
next ten years, obviously this would look different. But
we have to base it on the census information we have now
and the communities of interest. And I think this is a
very good reflection of what we've heard and what we've
been able to accommodate. So thank you so much.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Yee then Commissioner
Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, just echoing the thanks to
Commissioner Turner for all this excellent work and
hearing so much input and taking it into consideration
and being very skillful and clever and pulling off so
many of our goals.

Nevertheless, I would like to echo Commissioner
Andersen's thought about possibly looking at separating
the ports if we could do it by cutting less of North Long
Beach, which is already, as we heard from Jamie, cut more
than we'd hoped. So that swap or possible to look into
that.

Also want to take one last stab at Koreatown. And I
think, Jamie, we took -- the current boundaries are the
neighborhood council, not the COI input; is that correct?

MS. CLARK: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER YEE: And I believe the COI input is
larger and farther to the South and just wanted to bring
it up one last time just to make sure we didn't miss a
way to honor the COI boundaries.

MS. CLARK: So this is the COI boundary for Koreatown. And just looking at how it's drawn, I -- a couple times have asked the Commission, you know, do you want to follow the COI boundaries or the neighborhood boundaries, given that the COI boundaries split greater Wilshire.

And there hasn't been a solid -- I guess like the last time that there was a solid response, it was for now follow the neighborhood boundaries. And I think last time I asked the question, it was kind of I'm not sure. It was not sure. So that's what the COI boundaries are. And the neighborhood boundaries are here and they are respected to the extent that the census blocks follow the current neighborhood boundaries.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. Well, you know, I'm for being responsive to COI boundaries, COI input. So in this case, at least with AD West Side, it looks like it would improve the deviations as well. So I'd be interested in pursuing that.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

MS. CLARK: I'll look at making that change if this is an interest of the Commission.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: While you're highlighting that, let's
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, thank you, Commissioner Turner and to Jamie for all your work on this. I think this goes a really long way in meeting many of our goals and that's really exciting to see.

I completely agree with Commissioner Yee and, feel like I've raised numerous times, wanting to support the K-town COI boundary. But I was -- perhaps I wasn't shared with -- by other Commissioners. But I agree with you on that, Commissioner Yee.

I feel very uncomfortable about the Long Beach San Pedro -- having those ports kept together. We currently -- we have heard loud and clear from community of interest testimony that they want to be separate. We also have a current crisis at the ports, so having representation for them would seem to be extraordinarily important.

I have said before and I will raise again, I don't see the problem in Long Beach connecting South into Orange County, we've received community of interest testimony both ways on that. And to me that seems like a reasonable opportunity for us to take a look at.

I just want to name some of the odd pairings that do happen in this map. It's not to say that I couldn't live with them, but I just want to at least acknowledge them.
Some of the things like Marina del Rey, Venice, and Westchester, very wealthy, beach-oriented, or coastal-oriented communities being paired with that COI of Inglewood, Hawthorne, Lawndale, and North Gardena.

Again, I could live with that, but somewhat odd.

Pico Rivera, Montebello, all the way out to Diamond Bar, those are pretty industrialized kind of -- and urban neighborhoods going out to fairly suburban neighborhoods. Again, I could live with that. And I did like actually seeing Downey and Whittier together. I think those communities do have very similar profiles and that looks reasonable to me.

And I just wanted to raise I fully support splitting Boyle Heights and East L.A. I've mentioned that numerous times over and that is what communities of interest are asking for. So I just want to be really clear that, you know, is this the greatest pairing ever of Commerce, Vernon, out to Pico Union and Rampart and other places? You know, it's okay, it's okay. And I can most certainly live with it. And I think that that respects what communities are asking for and not our own personal preferences or analysis of these areas. So I agree with this.

I definitely also -- before we move on, though, would like to go and take a look at what, if any, impacts
this is having in the San Fernando Valley. I know last week I asked to see an exploration of what it would look like to further consolidate the Latino community in those districts because we were getting COI testimony in doing so.

But it appears that now that we have attempted to do that, that the communities aren't happy with the pairing of Glendale, too. I think it's all the way out to Ensino or something, which I agree it's a really long stretch and very different kinds of communities in there.

So before we move on this evening, I definitely want to make sure we reserve some time to look at San Fernando Valley. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Let's hear from Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Good evening. I just wanted to also echo the thanks to Commissioner Turner and Jamie in pulling this particular iteration together. I, too, agree that it, I think, accomplishes a lot of our goals in ways that some of the other iterations have failed to do so. And just knowing Commissioner's thoughtful hand, it's evident in the results. So thank you, Commissioner Turner. And thank you also, Jamie.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons. Jamie, quick question. How many Asian, Latino, and
Black districts have a CVAP of higher than 50 percent in the Los Angeles region at this point? I don't have those statistics in front of me and I just wanted to -- for you to enter it into the record so the public is also aware.

MS. CLARK: Thank you for that question. There's one district that is over 50 percent Asian CVAP, which is the West San Gabriel Valley District. In this iteration, there are nine 50 percent-plus Latino CVAP districts. In this iteration, there's 11 if you include the Antelope Valley, Victor Valley.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Sorry. If you include the Victor Valley, that's 11 Latino districts?

MS. CLARK: Eleven 50 percent-plus Latino CVAP districts. And there's no district that's over 50 percent Black CVAP. However, there are four districts that are over 29 percent Black CVAP.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. I appreciate the statistics and the data.

Let's go to Commissioner Akutagawa and Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: My question was on --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Sorry, Commissioner Akutagawa, I think I missed -- Commissioner Fernandez was first. I think she's been waiting.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually, I forgot to put my hand down.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Good.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But I also forgot to thank Jamie. So thank you so much, Jamie. So I think I have to put five dollars in the pot.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I thought you were waiting for a long time. Okay. I probably had a mental note.

Commissioner Akutagawa, back to you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. I just also want to add my thanks to Jamie and to Commissioner Turner. These maps just generally look really good and I think feeling good about what we have here. I just have a clarification question, Jamie, on this Koreatown.

Now, that I'm seeing this, in this way, I see what was meant by Koreatown being split three times. And so I think -- you know, it would -- it's a small area, and then to avoid splitting it in those ways, just like we've tried to, you know, avoid splitting other COIs, I think -- I agree with Commissioner Yee. My only question is -- I will say, you know, that Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council was rather effective in their visualization, and they have the big stop-the-split -- I was curious where was, previously, that split that they spoke about that was so bothersome? And you know, taking off that chunk of Greater Wilshire, is that going to -- it doesn't look like it's that bad, I guess. They may
disagree, but is it that bad?

MS. CLARK: This is the previous Assembly district boundary.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MS. CLARK: So this is the split they're talking about. It's the dotted line.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MS. CLARK: And what's highlighted in red right now are the parts of Koreatown that are part of the Koreatown COI, and moving that area into the NELA district would keep everything within the plus or minus five percent deviation.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Let's look for consensus. I'm looking at the floor. Sorry. I have to look on -- I have two different screens right now. It looks good. It looks good. And lots of consensus. So okay. Let's add it. Great. Let's look at the numbers. Everything looks good. All right. So who are -- Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you so much, Jaime.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, Yee, and then --

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- (indiscernible) discuss that.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I just wanted to thank Jaime for her work with this, and everything. You're phenomenal.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you, Chair. I just --

I wanted to circle back to provide some data, so that it
doesn't come across that this is my personal preference,
or personal analysis, of the challenges faced in
Northeast Los Angeles, which is currently named GLENNLA,
but what is visualized is largely made up of what is
known as Northeast Los Angeles.

That area, in census numbers, reported a decrease in
population across many of these historically immigrant
populations. Echo Park, Silver Lake, Atwater Village
registers the biggest decrease in population, according
to the L.A. Times, of 5.1 percent over the last ten
years, which, again, if you live in, work in, play in
this area, as I do, you would know that that can't
possibly be the case. And so there are other areas,
Lincoln Heights and El Sereno, both recorded a decrease
of four percent. So I just -- I want -- and there are
several quotes in this L.A. Times article from community
members who don't believe that that's because of
gentrification -- that this community is both
experiencing gentrification -- but also has -- because
it's an immigrant population, is a really hard-to-count
population -- and I know that we have to draw lines based
on the data that we've received from the census -- I just want -- I wanted to put some data behind how vulnerable these communities in this region of Los Angeles are, and by breaking up, what I feel, is a very-hard-to-count, hard-to-reach population in Northeast Los Angeles, that we are doing the community as a whole a disservice.

So the community that I'm looking at is not just Boyle Heights and East L.A., whom we have heard from. I hear a lot from Boyle Heights, especially, but I'm looking at this broader community contained in what is currently visualized as GLENNLA. And that is the community that I am concerned we are -- we are not doing right by, by splitting up Boyles Heights and East L.A. And so again, I can live with this visualization. I don't agree with it. But it's not because of my own personal preferences, but rather that the broader community of Northeast Los Angeles is verifiably marginalized and will continue to be marginalized through the next ten years as the economics and the residents of these communities shift. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And let's ask the community. Let's -- community members living in these areas, please chime in and let us know what your thoughts are, even though we've received quite a bit of COI information on -- conflicting COI information -- but the
more information, the better, so please feel free to call
in, or to provide input through our online processes.

In the meantime, any other comments in this area,
before we go to the San Fernando Valley? Commissioner
Vazquez -- or any suggestions on potential --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I guess on the
interest of being constructive, although I can't
imagine -- I think we've already attempted this -- so
it's not even so much that I feel like we need to have
Boyle Heights and East L.A., specifically, together. I
think my challenge is, in practical terms, with how this
is currently visualized are twofold.

One, these gateway cities, Vernon, Commerce,
Maywood, paired with a district that includes Koreatown,
does not make a ton of sense to me. I think it's one of
the odd pairings, as Commissioner Sadhwani said, so that
doesn't quite make sense to me.

In terms of the GLENNLA district, I think Los Feliz
and Silver Lake, in particular, do not make sense in the
GLENNLA district, and if we could, particularly, remove
those two and maybe -- again, get population,
potentially, headed down towards Downtown L.A. through
Chinatown, that might work. But again, I know that these
will have ripples across many other districts, so I --
again -- but I'd also just -- it's not -- for me, it's
not Boyle Heights and East L.A. must go together. It's
that overall Northeast L.A., for me, seems to have taken
a step back in terms of -- again, the demographics and
the historical nature of most of the neighborhoods
currently -- most, but not all, of the neighborhoods
contained in both the GLENNLA and the Northeast L.A.
districts.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez. Any
other comments in this area? Commissioner Vazquez, did
you want to visualize something? Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No, I was just -- in tracking
along with Commissioner Vazquez's thoughts, it seems that
there might be population to shave off of GLENNLA. Would
you happen to have a few suggestions, Commissioner
Vazquez? I'd be interested to hear it. Take me with
you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: It seems like Commissioner Taylor is
willing to go on a journey.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I mean, I would start,
at least on that Western portion -- that northwestern
portion -- and start removing population. I'm not sure
if we can get Silver Lake back with Hollywood and East
Hollywood. That would be an ideal scenario. I'm
imagining Jaime, probably, has some thoughts about what
that -- where that journey would take us, Commissioner
CHAIR TOLEDO: So Jaime, can you tell us how much population we can shave off and still be within a reasonable -- within legal limits? It seems to be about 20,000, to me --

MS. CLARK: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- and to some of the -- my friends around me.

MS. CLARK: So right now, the deviation of AD Westside is .83 percent. With GLENNLA, it's 4.86 percent.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.

MS. CLARK: ERWEIR (ph.) -- yeah, so I guess, ERWEIR -- Chair Toledo, you asked for, sort of like, the breakdown of the CVAPs for different districts. I think that making a change like this could impact those numbers and also would, maybe, split some of the neighborhood council areas. It's something we could definitely try. And I think there is some wiggle room in terms of -- there's definitely wiggle room in terms of this boundary, just in total population, absolutely.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So you think there's a risk that we might lose some of the minority districts in making these changes?

MS. CLARK: Yeah, I think that there --
CHAIR TOLEDO: Or gain additional? I don't know.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, I think that -- I think that in making this change, you might split some of the communities that you have been working to keep together.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Taylor?

Commissioner Vazquez? I mean, Fernandez. And then Sadhwani. Sorry. Lot of hands raised now. Taylor -- or -- okay. Fernandez, and then Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I mean, how many times Commissioner Vazquez and I, our names get mixed up? I was just going to ask, Commissioner Vazquez, is there, like, a certain section of Silver Lake in particular? Because I don't think that we're going to be able to take the whole piece of it. And it -- yeah, so I'm just wondering if -- 'cause it will be about -- 20,000 would be the maximum that we could probably move out into -- if we went to the AD Westside and then, maybe, a little bit to the NELA, but then you're splitting up Silver Lake, potentially, three times.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Let's hear from Commissioner Sadhwani, while Commissioner Vazquez considers that.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I mean, I'm definitely open to some exploration in this area. However, I'll just say -- and again, this is not COI
testimony. This is my personal experience in these areas -- yes, it's definitely a region that's going through gentrification. That being said, there -- throughout this entire area, there's also a large immigrant community, often sometimes less seen than other -- you know, than the folks that are moving in.

There's also a lot of folks experiencing homelessness throughout these areas, and that's a major issue in this area. You know, I don't -- as I've said before, I don't have a problem with this pairing. I think it makes sense in a lot of different ways. But I do think that if we -- because Glendale is at play in the San Fernando Valley districts -- if we take -- I don't know where everyone stands on that. I just know that we had a whole lot of comment on it -- on this new iteration of the San Fernando Valley -- and I think if we have a little bit of a discussion about whether or not folks are okay with it, or they want to move in a different direction, it might, ultimately, answer some of these questions in that GLENNLA district, only because Glendale is currently split. And if we wanted to take a different approach with Glendale, or this -- within the San -- larger San Fernando Valley, then it might lead to some changes there.

I'm not necessarily advocating that -- for that, but
I'm just saying it's worth, at least, having a little bit more of a conversation, or hearing from more Commissioners about their thoughts on the San Fernando Valley piece, because the two areas are very much linked through this cut in Glendale.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you, all. It seems like we can all live with these things. And there might be some potential. And I'm not talking about the San Fernando Valley. I'm talking about the districts that we were just looking at -- live with the districts that we were looking at. There might be some potential refinements. And I think that's what we're --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I appreciate that creative thinking, Commissioner Sadhwani, and reminding me -- and maybe some of us -- else -- that Glendale could -- I think Glendale does, in some ways, change the makeup of GLENNLA pretty significantly. But I'm also thinking -- just in terms of, maybe, making a small adjustment, if things don't radically change otherwise -- I'm wondering what Los Feliz -- what putting in Los Feliz to that Hollywood district would do, if that -- that's -- I know that Los Feliz and Silver Lake like to go together, but also -- anyway, I'm just curious what that would look like.
CHAIR TOLEDO: So are you interested in exploring the possibility of moving 20,000 people out of Los Feliz into the Hollywood -- or into the neighboring districts?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I guess, if we -- yeah, if we can't get all of Los Feliz, it feels like a moot point. But yeah. Are there 20,000 people in Los Feliz? Not that I wouldn't not believe it, but good grief.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's see.

MS. CLARK: So just --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Jaime, can you put the chart -- oh, there we go. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: (Indiscernible).

MS. CLARK: So this changed. Putting all of Los Feliz into the Westside district, would make the deviation of the Westside 5.5 percent.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And so that would take us outside of the deviation.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. And that's not worth -- that's not worth finding elsewhere to get it out of -- but in my opinion -- so thanks for showing.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you for exploring with us. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I'm hearing two areas that -- you know, there's the North part of, you know,
the San Fernando Valley piece. And I've heard several
Commissioners talk about the ports. And Commissioner
Sadhwani did make a recommendation -- or, you know, a
hint -- or whatever we want to call it -- and I would
feel better accepting that this is the way we have to go,
if we could explore what Commissioner Sadhwani was saying
about taking Long Beach and going South. Then I'd be
more -- you know, if it doesn't work, then I'm willing to
say, okay. We tried. And the two ports are together.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So your goal would be to separate
that -- the --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: (Indiscernible) on Long Beach?
Yes. To have them separate as they requested --

CHAIR TOLEDO: So the --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- but -- but --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm one of fourteen. And so I
just want to see where my colleagues are.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Well, you weren't the only one. I
think Commissioner Sadhwani was talking about,
potentially, having more Congressional -- it's not
Congressional. In this case, Assembly. I'm getting my
mouth mixed up -- but potentially having more
representation in this area.

Commissioner Sadhwani, since you brought it up
first, do you want to come to the Long Beach area first, or San Fernando Valley?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I mean, if we can explore in Long Beach, that would be great.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Great.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's start off in Long Beach, since we have two Commissioners interested in exploring Long Beach. Others may be also. And so I'll ask the room if there's interest in exploring the Long Beach -- exploring Long Beach and the separation of these two ports. And I'll go through the room. All right. So let's see. We have -- Commissioner Sinay just spoke.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I do have a question. Before we go down to Long Beach, I'm thinking that, maybe, we should just try to take care of San Fernando Valley, because we got so much COI testimony just saying they, essentially, hate everything about, now, the San Fernando Valley, and if there is going to be additional architectural changes to the San Fernando Valley that can, then, help with some of the things that Commissioner Vazquez has been bringing up, I think it's going to ripple down. And so instead of trying to figure something out in Long Beach, and then have to fix it
again, I'm just thinking we just need to start with San
Fernando and go down.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Good point. So let's -- any other
thoughts on that from the floor?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I would wonder what Jaime
thinks.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Jaime, what are your thoughts?

MS. CLARK: I think that the changes in more of,
like, central and South L.A., were, kind of, contained
down -- you know, down near this --

CHAIR TOLEDO: We lost Jaime.

IN UNISON: Oh, no.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And I think we're losing a couple of
other Commissioners. Okay. I think we got Sadhwani
back.

Commissioner Sadhwani, do you have any thoughts on
starting in the San Fernando Valley, or starting in Long
Beach?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No. I mean, either way. I
think we're -- whichever way we want to move population.
I mean, I'm also just -- I'm keeping in the back of my
mind Commissioner Kennedy's potential swaps all the way
up and over in that V-H-H -- I forget the title of it --
but if we were to make that change to the Acton-Agua
Dulce area, that would also, I would imagine, impact the
San Fernando Valley, so I don't know where's the best starting point for this, because it seems like if we started in the Coachella Valley and moved all the way over, it would be a massive potential ripple. So I'm happy to take -- take the advice of our line drawers, 'cause I think they understand how the maps work.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And I also want to hear from other Commissioners, too, in terms of, are we comfortable in having ripples throughout the Los Angeles region that we just -- we just made changes to and have agreements on? So I want to hear from Commissioners on that, too. There might be. I mean, let's see what the stomach is. Commissioner Fornaciari? Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think Jaime was --

CHAIR TOLEDO: (Indiscernible) --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- saying --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- something --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, sorry, Jaime.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- before she got --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's start with you --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- cut off.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- and then go --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And I want -- I think it's important for us all to hear.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, let's hear from Jaime first, because, hopefully, your internet is stable.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, I'm in.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, awesome.

MS. CLARK: I -- I think that in -- in terms of the -- in terms of the changes to the map for Plan T-1, which is what we're looking at now, those were, you know, South of San Fernando Valley, South of Mulholland. The split in Glendale didn't change dramatically, so we could look at San Fernando Valley.

As Commissioner Sadhwani noted, if there are changes to adding Acton and Agua Dulce to Santa Clarita Valley, that does impact the deviation. And you know, that's -- I think that that's something that we could try, maybe, after exploring other changes; like, maybe, trying to, you know, pull population down overall from the Santa Clarita Valley. Base districts, kind of, make room for those cities. And I would say that that's something, again, that would be, I guess, like a second step to that from -- if -- if -- in considering not changing the entire map of the City of Los Angeles.

And then in terms of Long Beach and moving Long Beach with Orange County, that also sounds like, potentially, big changes, so I -- I think it -- it just, kind of, depends -- like, big changes to the map
overall -- and I think it just, kind of, depends on what the Commission wishes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: You're a trooper, Jaime. Thank you so much for everything you do for us. All right. Let's see. Commissioner Fornaciari, Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, either way for me. It seems like the changes, potentially, to San Pedro and Long Beach are going to be coupled with Commissioner Akutagawa's changes, so we'd have to go through that -- probably that whole thing altogether. And then, as Jaime said, San Fernando Valley, we could probably, kind of, manage that as a self-contained entity. So either way.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So you're thinking two self-contained areas potentially not impacting Los Angeles so much, or we'll see as we go through. Okay. Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to say for the number of ways that we looked at the map to be able to achieve what the initial goal -- at least that I was directed in -- makes me very wary about any major changes that we're doing now.

I think that we'll lose many more of the COIs. I think we won't be able to protect a lot of the districts that we were able to find in this iteration. And I am deeply concerned about doing this, and considering it.

And based on what we can and cannot, you know, consider,
I think the way we currently have them arranged takes into consideration a lot of individual testimony, a lot of the partners' testimony, a lot of the maps that have been sent in, a lot of the previous Commission direction, and I know that we have said, a few different times, we cannot accommodate everyone.

And at this point, I guess my greatest concern is, by going down this path, we're going to just shift who we are going to consider and be able to protect, or at least draw districts to satisfy. So anyway, I'm concerned about making any changes, at this point, that would cause a major shift.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Jaime, I think you were nodding your head. Was that potential changes to COIs, or you think -- what's your thoughts on this?

MS. CLARK: Yeah, I think that -- I think that -- I think that it might be hard to keep the ports -- unless you would wish to split Long Beach into more than two districts, it may be hard to keep the ports separate and maintain some of the districts -- or specifically, the AD South L.A. District, kind of, as it is configured now. And also, you know, I -- there are a lot of ideas, so I guess -- yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: We did do a rundown throughout this
area with the changes that were made. Commissioner Turner did as well. The reasoning for it, very well-articulated by Commissioner Turner, so at this point, let's hear from Commissioner Akutagawa and Sadhwani and Sinay, and see where we explore, or not, depending on the will of the Commission. Let's hear from Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Hey, Jaime, could -- just off the top of your head, or just, kind of, a guesstimate -- oh, where do you think another split for Long Beach would actually occur to try to -- to try to keep the two ports separate?

MS. CLARK: Like, if -- if there were three districts, and that contained Long Beach?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MS. CLARK: The way that I have seen it done by some of the countywide submissions that were made, is that, if I'm remembering correctly, sort of like, this -- this part of Long Beach is with South L.A., and then Wilmington and San Pedro go, I think, up here and are connected with, like, Paramount. For example, cut through here. And then the rest of Long Beach, I think, goes with Bellflower and Lakewood and Seal Beach and Huntington Beach, is how I've seen it.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Jaime, I guess I'm curious. Do you think the San Fernando Valley changes can be localized?
Do you think the Long Beach changes can be localized?

Since we're trying to -- since we're trying to -- we worked so hard on Los Angeles over the last couple of -- it hasn't even been days, it's been months, right? It's been months since we've been looking at Los Angeles and reworking it, and you've done countless iterations here and visualizations, so is there any way that you think we can localize some of the changes that we're thinking, up in the San Fernando Valley, or even in the Long Beach area?

MS. CLARK: I think the -- the San Fernando Valley, you know, swaps could definitely be localized. And I don't know what the -- I don't know what the suggestions are for Long Beach, so it's hard to say.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's hear from the floor to see if there's any suggestions on the Long Beach area, and we can think through those. And I also want to hear how the exploration in the Coachella Valley is having with the Sivan, so I'll get an update on that -- or we'll all get an update in a few minutes. All right. So -- and it -- all right. Any suggestions on Long Beach that are localized changes?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Yee? Commissioner Sadhwani?
COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. For a localized change, I want to try bringing Wilmington down to Coastal San Pedro into AD South L.A., and then swapping that for as much of North Long Beach as it takes to balance out.

MS. CLARK: One moment, please.

CHAIR TOLEDO: In the meantime, let's hear from Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Mine was similar. I was going to say I know that there's been conflicting -- conflicted testimony about North Long -- actually, it's not that conflicted, right? Even the City of Long Beach has said that it's reasonable to split North Long Beach. And I believe the boundary that they've consistently said is Del Amo Boulevard. So to me, if we went as North as Del Amo, could we pick up whatever else we needed by dipping into Orange County?

CHAIR TOLEDO: How about let's explore that next.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Of course. Yes, absolutely. It's actually just - it's not terribly different from Commissioner Yee. I think -- I want to be sensitive, though, because I know that there are considerations that have been raised by historic African-American communities, and I want to -- I definitely want to see what the possibilities are to respect both of those communities of interest, if possible.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

MS. CLARK: So I'm just going to make this switch, so that we can see the impacts on the districts. Both of them would be within plus or minus five percent deviation.

For AD South L.A., the percent deviation would be negative .4 percent, the Latino CVAP would be 47.54 percent, the Black CVP would be 26.19 percent, Asian CVAP would be 10.7 percent, and white CVAP would be 13.26 percent.

For the Long Beach District, the percent deviation would be negative 1.6 percent, Latino CVAP -- I'm sorry. I'm going to slow down for the -- for the interpreters. Sorry about that. For the Long Beach District, the percent deviation would be negative 1.6 percent, Latino CVAP 31.65 percent, Asian CVAP 4 -- I'm sorry -- Black CVAP 14.69 percent, Asian CVAP 14.29 percent, white CVAP 36.85 percent.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much. Let's hear from the floor. It does look, to me, that we are, potentially, fulfilling some essential worker communities and working class and low income communities in this area. But let's hear from the floor. I just want to see if there's consensus on this, in terms of moving forward. So if you're interested in moving forward with this,
please -- I'm just looking for consensus. And I'm not seeing consensus.

MS. CLARK: Chair Toledo, should I revert these changes?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, let's revert these changes. And let's go to Commissioner Sadhwani's proposal.

Commissioner Sadhwani has her hand up, actually, so let's hear from Sadhwani, and then from Yee, and then from Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, before we -- before we revert them, I think what I've been wanting to try for quite some time is, you know, maintaining a portion of North Long Beach with the 80 STHLA, but then looking at how much population we would have to pick up, whether that's portions of -- portions coming out of NOC, which is already underpopulated, or you know, Seal Beach -- something in Orange County, potentially.

The 80 Gateway, I know Lakewood -- 80 Gateway, currently, is slightly overpopulated. I'm trying to see how much population it is that we would actually need to account for. Lakewood previously had been split and paired with Long Beach and was not in that VRA district, so I think that there's -- I'm curious if there's opportunities that can be explored, if we put a portion of North Long Beach back in with the 80 STHLA.
MS. CLARK: Commissioner Sadhwani, just to clarify, would Wilmington and San Pedro be with AD -- the South -- this Compton and Crescent district?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, we're currently somewhat underpopulated. So what I'd like to see is, yes, keep them together, and how much of North Long Beach can we be putting in.

MS. CLARK: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Does that make sense?

MS. CLARK: So start from here and then add areas in North Long Beach to AD South L.A.?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. And I'm curious about what impact that has on the ADSTHLA.

MS. CLARK: One moment, please. So for example, just this --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. It looks like we're having some technical difficulties. And we're almost at our break -- our 8 o'clock break. So let's see if we get her back in a second. While we're waiting for her, how about we check in with Commissioner Yee and Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, I had the same idea as Commissioner Sadhwani. And so obviously, all of North Long Beach is too many folks, so maybe, starting on the West side -- the West of the 710 first.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Yee. Great minds think alike. All right. So let's -- Jaime, you're back.

MS. CLARK: Yes, I hope so. Can you hear me?

CHAIR TOLEDO: I hope so too. We can hear you.

MS. CLARK: Okay. Thank you. So I think I heard to add areas West of the 710 to the South L.A. District.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, please.

MS. CLARK: So this highlighted area is West of the 710, and this would be 1.93 percent deviation for AD South L.A., and for the Long Beach base district, negative 3.93 percent. I'm just going to pull this down. The Latino CVAP for South L.A. would be 57.76 percent, the Black CVAP for South L.A. would be 26.21 percent, the Asian CVAP for South L.A. would be 10.6 percent, and the white CVAP would be 13.09 percent.

For Long Beach, the deviation would be negative 3.93 percent, the Latino CVAP would be 31.13 percent, the Black CVAP would be 14.44 percent, the Asian CVAP would be 14.45 percent, the white CVAP would be 37.47 percent.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you for the exploration. Thoughts from the floor? Commissioner Andersen, and then Commissioner Turner.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I like the exploration. I'd go a little bit more. We still have a percent there. We
could, maybe, add a bit to it from the Gateway area.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I'm looking at -- I appreciate what we're trying to do. I just think that it further splits some of our other historic districts and lessens their opportunity to elect candidates of choice.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Turner. Any further exploration in this area? Suggestions? We're about to go to break. So maybe -- Commissioner Sadhwani, did we want to go to -- try the other options in this area?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm happy to, if there is willingness, or interest from others.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I think Commissioner Sinay had some interest in exploring opportunities in linking the two -- actually, separating out the two ports. I believe it's San Pedro and Long Beach. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Sure. There are other options. I was just going to ask, that area on the East side of Compton -- those two little pink areas -- just curious what those are?

MS. CLARK: That is a census-designated place called East Rancho Dominguez. And it's two areas that are -- oops -- there we go. It's -- they're noncontiguous, but
they're both part of East Rancho Dominguez.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I see. Okay. I'd love to see Commissioner Sadhwani's ideas.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So Commissioner Sadhwani or Commissioner Sinay, you both raised the issue of potential -- of separating the two ports in this area. Any other thoughts on how to do that?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Happy to.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Or other --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I don't know.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- or other exploration in this area. It doesn't have to be that. But I know that was -- that one was raised. How about -- we're going to take our break at 8 o'clock, so let's take it now. And Commissioner Sadhwani, if you could -- you're exploring the possibility of separating these two ports. If you would work with Jaime, over the break, and see if there's any suggestions, any visualizations you'd like to show us, and then, of course, that will be brought back to the public once we come back from break, just for efficiency purposes. All right. Thank you. So we're on break.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 6:13 p.m. until 6:30 p.m.)

CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We're coming back
from break. And we will be going back to the Coachella Valley before we go back to Los Angeles, just for efficiency sake.

We have Commissioner Kennedy and Sivan with us. Sivan is our map -- our line drawer, and Commissioner Kennedy was working on trying to unify La Quinta with Palm Springs and other resort cities. And I hear they have some good news. So let's go through what they have been -- hear what the -- what they --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Explored.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- explored, and also where we're at, at this point. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. And I wanted to explore a number of things. First of all, as the Chair said, was putting La Quinta back with the bulk of the Coachella Valley. I also wanted to look at bringing Idyllwild, Pine Cove, and Mountain Center into MBCV.

We learned, probably late last year, that Idyllwild was one of those locations where if you're looking at a flat map, you know, it could go any number of ways. But if you look at a relief map, you very quickly understand that there are only a couple of ways to get there, one of which is through Beaumont. The other of which is the long way, through Palm Desert. But in either case, it
made more sense to bring Idyllwild into MBCV. So we were able to do that.

We were not able to put Sage, and some of that area, with the neighboring district to the West, nor were we able to get Anza, and some of those areas, in with the SEDC district to the South, so they remain as they were. We did move Sky Valley from MBCV into SECA.

Then moving North from there, we ended up moving Twentynine Palms, the marine base, and Homestead Valley from MBCV into VDHD. We ended up moving Pinon Hills, Fallon, a sliver of Hesperia that is there -- kind of, almost a discontiguous portion of Hesperia -- well, not so discontiguous. But anyway, that portion of Hesperia that divides Oak Hills, we ended up putting that in with Wrightwood and Lytle Creek in the 210 -- so-called 210 District. And so we ended up -- we did not touch Antelope. We did not touch Santa Clarita Valley. And we ended up with the 210 District at a 2.23 deviation, DVHD at 4.99 --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Wow.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- MBCV at 4.98 --

CHAIR TOLEDO: My gosh.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah, it's by a whisker.

CHAIR TOLEDO: By a whisker.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: And SECA at -- let's see,
SECA -- SECA at negative 4.89, maintaining --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Very good.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- 59 percent LCVAP. So it was -- it was an interesting exploration. As I said, I was not able to accomplish everything that I would've hoped to, but I think, by and large, we improved the map on balance.

CHAIR TOLEDO: It does sound like it. Sivan, let's compare the CVAPs for the VRA areas as that is our fiduciary duty and responsibility. So like, for the SECA, that did not change. I think it actually went up. It's now at 59.28; is that correct?

MS. TRATT: One moment while I turn the -- yep, it did go up. It was at 56 percent before.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Great. All right. And then next VRA area.

MS. TRATT: Oh, did you want to revisit the --

CHAIR TOLEDO: No, just the ones that were impacted by these changes, just to make sure that they --

MS. TRATT: Oh, there were no other VRA areas that were impacted.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, perfect. If that's the case, then no other VRA district was impacted. All the
deviations are in compliance. There are -- I don't believe I see any bottlenecks -- or any compactness issues, rather. Can you pull up?

MS. TRATT: Zoom in, or zoom out? Sorry.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Zoom out.

MS. TRATT: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Just so we can see over (indiscernible). I don't see anything of concern. Okay.

We have Commissioner Andersen and Fernandez.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, first of all --

CHAIR TOLEDO: And we --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- I want to say --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- were able to contain it. Wow.

That is impressive. All right, Commissioner Andersen and Commissioner Fernandez. I'm just -- I'm still in shock that we were able to do all of those things.

Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. No, I want to say, wow.

I knew it was going to be tight. I did not realize it was going to be that tight. So it's amazing that you were able to do these things, except the Victor Valley area, which, you know, they're not happy with how the maps, kind of, look.

Now, Pinon Hills, you know, that's an area -- those are now all (indiscernible). Now, they are with
Wrightwood and Lynn -- Lytle Creek, but now, they're with L.A. I mean, L.A., L.A. So I'm concerned about that. You know, there wasn't any other, you know, messing with -- I'm sure you looked at many, many things, but that one, I really wish we could do something else.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner --
VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: And these people --
CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Andersen. Commissioner Kennedy?
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I certainly would like that as well. But I would remind us all that that district does currently include a significant portion of Upland, and a portion of Rancho Cucamonga, so it's not entirely orphaned from San Bernadino County. I don't know what the population balance is between the two counties, but it is not just those Victor Valley communities and the Mountain communities. It is San Bernadino County communities on the Southern border of this district as well. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. Any other questions, or any other parts of the maps that we want to look at before we take a -- see if there's general consensus on these changes?

It doesn't look like it, so I'm going to ask to see if we can all -- you know, the standard I'm using right now is, can we all live with this? And just looking
around -- Commissioner Sinay?

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: I understand why the SECA District went all the way up to Needles, but it does create a district that is huge. And we have heard from the community that they would rather it take, you know, more of the Coachella Valley than go up that -- up to Needles. And I just -- I wanted to bring it up, because this is a VRA district and they do -- you know, and these communities are asking to be kept together in a VRA district, nearby each other. And so I wanted -- you know, just revisit this one more time for those who have asked us to.

    CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay, can you speak to the -- what specific communities want to be protected under the VRA district?

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I --

    CHAIR TOLEDO: Are they currently not --

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, they're not --

    CHAIR TOLEDO: -- in a VRA District?

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- in it --

    CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- currently.

    CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you repeat their names, so we can ask counsel --

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, if we --
CHAIR TOLEDO: -- about it?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- can zoom in, kind of, by the
Indio Hills? You know, it's Desert Hot Springs and
Cathedral want to be part of the VRA district. I don't
know the demographic, but I know -- you know, so I
just -- I want us to be clear. You know, we're creating
this really noncontiguous -- you know, not compact --
it's all contiguous. Sorry. But does it make sense,
considering that other communities nearby -- the Latino
communities -- are asking to be part of the VRA?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay. And
one of the reasons it's not so compact is because it's
rural. And as we know, especially as we worked in the
North, the more rural and spread out, the population is a
little bigger -- the districts -- but each district has
the same number -- or about the same number of people.

Commissioner Taylor, Commissioner Kennedy, and then
we'll ask legal counsel about those communities.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No, Chair. I think you -- no,
Chair. I think you just hit it. In light of what we've
done on other parts of the State for the sake of, we've
sacrificed some elements of compactness for communities
of interest of 445 criteria. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Andersen,
and then Kennedy, and then we're going to go to legal
counsel after that.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. Thank you. I certainly appreciate where Commissioner Sinay is going with this, because if you could add more areas that should be in the VRA area district, you really want to. The only thing I'd like to say is, if the line drawers could give us the population in that chunk of San Bernadino area that includes Needles, because Needles is a little less than 5,000 people, and I think it's the biggest population center in that area, so I would be very surprised if it went more than 6 or 7,000.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen. Andrew, do you have that data?

MR. DRECHSLER: Yes. That population -- good -- good job, Commissioner Andersen. That's 7,018, up in that part, so I will take you as a partner on The Price Is Right.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Kennedy, and then we'll go to Salvador -- or Mr. Perez.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Just a reminder that, you know, yes, we have communitie interest testimony in one direction. We have it in any number of other directions. Here, we have the Black community wanting Desert Hot Springs, Palm Springs, and
Cathedral City together.

We have the Filipino community wanting Desert Hot Springs, Palm Springs, and Cathedral City together.

We have the LGBTQ community wanting Palm Springs, Desert Hot Springs, Cathedral City, and as much of the Valley as possible together.

We have the Valley community at large wanting as much of the nine Cities of the Coachella Valley together as possible. So what we're trying to do is -- as elsewhere -- trying to balance these many competing interests, and you know, I think this does a good job of it.

I'm certainly happy to hear community input on how to make it better, but you know, we have to be able to make it better without making lots of other people worse off. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And Mr. Perez, just in response to Commissioner Sinay's question about Desert Hot Springs and Cathedral City, I'm just wondering if there are those two -- there are -- there was community input about those communities wanting and -- to be part of a VRA district to get VRA protection. I'm just wondering if these areas fall under VRA?

MR. PEREZ: I think, as it's currently drawn, the district satisfies the VRA. And at this point, you have
the discretion to include or exclude those communities. It sort of reminds me of the issue you had with Barrio Logan and this -- the Chula Vista district. So it's up to you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And that -- you know, we try to put as many communities under VRA as -- but there's only so many we can put in, and there's some limitations on those, and of course, there's also other factors as well, including compactness and contiguity.

Any other questions from the floor? And then I'm going to see if there's general consensus with these changes. We did have to balance quite a few community of interest, COIs, and I think Commissioner Kennedy did a -- and Sivan, and the rest of the Commission, did an amazing job of putting all this together.

Of course, it's not perfect. No, I haven't seen a district that is, yet. But it does balance all of the interests that were presented, and it does it quite nicely, I think -- from my perspective -- especially given all the concerns with the neighboring VRA districts that are so difficult and complex. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm sorry. I'm still having a really hard time, though, with this VRA district going into three different counties. I mean, I've been trying to reconcile that all this time, and since we're getting
down to the end, I just wanted to voice it very, you
know, openly that it is a huge district. And when I hear
what has been said about everybody claiming everything --
but this is a Latino VRA district that is unique, because
they haven't had the, you know, Coachella Valley to
Imperial. So I just want to put it out there.

I'm not going to stop anything. I'm not going to
draw a line in the sand. But I do think we need to think
about how not -- how big it is, and what population is
being served here, and is it being served by having that
going all the way into San Bernadino?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Sivan, can you zoom out, so we can
see the whole district one more time? And Salvador, can
you speak to the -- to this very large VRA district? And
just compliance with the VRA. I think you said it. This
district does comply with VRA. Does -- compactness is
below the VRA, in terms of our requirements, and
certainly, this is a very rural community where it's --
where the population is spread out. But can you give any
more insight into this district, in terms of VRA risk?

MR. PEREZ: Not with respect to VRA risk. But as
Andrew mentioned earlier, that's -- that's about a 7,000-
person population in that corner of the district, and I
can imagine that, although you've gotten to this very
(indiscernible) wonderful, tentative solution here, you
might be able to swap some populations and -- and reduce
the -- the size of the geographic scope of this district.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Can -- with that, can we
see how many people are in the district, Hot Springs,
Cathedral City area? I imagine it would be way more than
7,000 people, though. I'm imagining tens of thousands,
right? Maybe sixty, maybe more. Let's see. My eyes are
not going to see that.

MS. TRATT: Yeah, Chair. So Desert Hot Springs is
about thirty-two and a half thousand people, and
Cathedral City is about fifty-one and a half thousand
people.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So we're talking about 80,000 people
here. Commissioner Vazquez? And Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Just wanted to say that I
hear that concern about, sort of, the geographic size of
this district. That being said, I think it's a little
bit -- at least how I view the other, potentially, larger
districts from Inyo onward -- that, you know, these
regions, compared to the rest of the State, are pretty,
you know, low population, much more rural, and I think
less so than, sort of, county affinity.

I think sort of where their geography and the
resource management and the resource -- maybe even -- the
lack of resources, generally, in many of these regions,
probably, ties many of these communities together, more
so than their county affinity, so I don't see, sort of,
an inherent problem with the district moving across three
counties.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez. I
appreciate that discussion. Let's see. Commissioner
Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Just to
remind colleagues that, you know, the main features of
this district -- of the SECA district -- are the Colorado
River Basin, which is the source of -- the main source of
water in this part of California. The Salton Sea -- with
the environmental issues that need to be resolved in
relation to the Salton Sea and the Southern border, those
are the main features of this district. And you know, I
would say that this district pretty well focuses those
concerns and interests. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And with that, let's see
if there's general consensus. I'm moving forward with
these changes. Very impressive work here. And I am
looking around the room.

The standard that we're using, at this point, is,
can we live with it? I feel -- we've been informed by
VRA counsel that the SECA district does protect the
necessary populations. That there aren't -- that there
aren't any compliance issues with this district, at this point. And then we were able to unify quite a few COIs by the changes that were done by Commissioner Kennedy and Sivan. Any -- I'm looking around the room for any opposition. Can we live -- the standard is, can we live with this?

The Coachella Valley was a priority for one, two, three, four Commissioners. That's why we're spending quite a bit of time here. And it's important for us to do so and to ensure fair amounts for this region.

Commissioner Sinay? I think you had your hand up, Commissioner Sinay, or no? Nope. So I'm not seeing any opposition, at this point. Speak now, or we're going to have general consensus. Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, I have to say this. I know it's -- I know what we're -- how many things we've done well. But I have to speak up and just mention it, because we're going to hear about it, and we understand, and we're sorry, but the Victor Valley and you know, those three towns in there, now, they're not with the Victor Valley and they're not in the high desert. They're with -- they are with a great force of area, so -- and it's -- they're not -- they probably have a better say in this than any of the other towns connected to the Los Angeles forest, but I do want to mention it,
'cause we're sorry about that.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen. We try as hard as we can to keep all of the COIs together and sometimes, we have to make difficult decisions. And this is one of these situations. I am looking around the room. It does appear we can all live with this district. And we have general consensus to move forward.

Let's move on back to the Los Angeles region, where we were prior to the Coachella Valley, and in the Los Angeles region. We had Commissioner Sadhwani working with the line drawer to explore the potential of the port cities area and the coastal areas around Long Beach, so interested in hearing some of the progress or challenges, opportunities, what has transpired, if there's any proposals on the table for this area.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. So a big thanks to Jaime. We were able to just see what our options might be to maintain separation between the two ports as well as maintain some of those historic COI -- communities of interest that we have heard from very loud and clear.

So this district does appear to have a neck. However, I want to remind you about the shape of the City of Los Angeles's boundaries. So this potential, or proposed district, includes the top areas that had been in the draft that Commissioner Turner had worked on. It
maintains more of just the North Long Beach areas. It's actually above Del Amo Boulevard -- which was the piece that the Long Beach folks had identified as their community of interest boundary -- runs along the Los Angeles city boundaries down along -- kind of, like, along the 110 and out towards the 110 picking up a portion of the City of Carson -- of West Carson there along the 110 freeway and coming down into Wilmington and San Pedro.

A portion of San Pedro is cut, so I just want to acknowledge that. I'm not sure how folks feel about it, but it was able to keep together the port itself and keep it separate from the Long Beach port, while, I think, doing a reasonable job of keeping together some of the communities of interest that we have heard from in this area. So I offer that as an option.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you for working through that with Jaime. Jaime, can you speak to any impacts to minority, majority districts in this area? Are we still at the same number as previously for African-American, Asian, Latino areas?

MS. CLARK: Yes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Wow. That's impressive. Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani, for working through that. And Jaime as well.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, we were able --
CHAIR TOLEDO: It's difficult.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah --
CHAIR TOLEDO: This is a very complex and difficult area.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Exactly. We were able to contain the changes in that area without going into -- touching Orange County and without touching the VRA district, so I -- you know, I think it -- while it does, then, lead to some splits in cities -- in two cities -- it -- you know, I hope, meets some of our goals. But I'm very curious to hear --
CHAIR TOLEDO: It sounds like it does. Okay. So let's see -- let's hear from Commissioner Kennedy and Sinay.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, good work. A couple of questions. One, the little triangle to the right -- yeah, right -- to the right of where it says, "Los Angeles." That appears to be part of the -- yeah, that triangle right there -- I'm just wondering if we would want to move that into the South L.A. district, since it seems to be part of L.A.?

I also wanted to ask. Do we have a shapefile for, I believe, it's the Filipino community in Carson and West Carson? Because if Carson is already split, and we have
a little bit of leeway on our population deviation -- so I'm wondering if there's any need to bring part of Carson East of the 110 into that South L.A. district as well?

Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much, Mr. -- or Commissioner Kennedy. Commissioner Sinay? And if --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think that was -- you know, building on what Commissioner Kennedy was asking, does Wilmington go up in an arm right here?

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's get Jaime to answer all of those questions.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. So this area is included in Wilmington Neighborhood Council. In the area, in total, there are fifty people. And I believe that the Filipino COI was Carson and West Carson together. I'm looking. I'm not sure if I have that shapefile. I have so many COIs loaded, so I'm -- I'm looking right now. It might take one second.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And then after that's done, Jaime, my question was going to be, if we could zoom into the part of San Pedro where it's cut, just so I could see the streets and stuff?

MS. CLARK: Yeah. So it's generally following the 110. And just zooming in here. This is the 110 to Cabrillo, West 18th, and then to Western.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Would it be able to go down Gaffey, instead of Cabrillo?

MS. CLARK: Let's give it a whirl.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: That's where the community usually splits -- splits where the port, you know?

MS. CLARK: One moment, please. Let me just check that out. Oh, why is --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's just hear from Commissioner Kennedy while we're waiting.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Just, as always, I'm thinking of election officials, and what they're going to have to administer down the road. So you know, to the extent possible, I would say, you know, let's include all of the City of Los Angeles's portions, and not leave them in a different district. Thanks.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. So let's hear from Commissioner Sadhwani as well, while we're -- while we're here. And then we'll go back to this.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I was just -- I mean, I don't know, from a process standpoint, how we want to work on this, but you know, with these kind of changes, we're doing them on fly, in, like, a fifteen-minute chunk, so I'm totally -- if folks are liking the general direction of this, I think it's totally reasonable just
to do some minor cleanup. In those kinds of regards, I think that makes sense. But again, from a process standpoint, I don't know exactly which way we want to go; if we want to do that live, or, you know, send that back to (indiscernible).

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I would not mind having that done off-line as given -- having given previous direction --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- to ensure that we do not start to break up some of the other COIs that we've talked about already, and maintain the percentages and the strength of the COIs that we have in the districts that we were able to create.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Turner. All right. So let's do that. Let's, perhaps -- while -- when we go back to Orange County, perhaps, Jaime can work on this a little bit with Commissioner Sadhwani to try to do some -- a little bit of cleanup -- or whichever Commissioner wants to do the cleanup. It doesn't have to be Commissioner Sadhwani. Whoever is the most familiar with this area -- and if -- Commissioner Sinay, are you wanting to do that, 'cause -- since you brought up some of these things? All right. So how about --
COMMISSIONER SINAY: If it's --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Jaime --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- helpful. I mean, I'm about two miles from that area right now.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So maybe Commissioner --

Jaime, if you'd work with Commissioner Sinay on that when we -- 'cause we're going to go to Sivan soon.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. No,

that's -- I've already spoken what I'm looking for.

Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, excellent. Thank you. Yes. And of course, we have the direction from Commissioner Turner that I agree with. So I'm just looking down on the priorities list -- Jaime?

MS. CLARK: So sorry to interrupt.

CHAIR TOLEDO: No worries.

MS. CLARK: Should I make this change, which is moving the line to Gaffey? And the percent deviations for both districts would remain within plus or minus five percent.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I'm looking at the room. Everyone is fine with this change that I can tell. Let's see.

Twenty -- I'm looking at the data.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Can we see the full
deviations?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Can we see the full deviations, please?

MS. CLARK: Yes. So I --

CHAIR TOLEDO: The data --

MS. CLARK: -- made -- I made the change. And the data is on the map.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And the deviations are 2.08. And the rest of the data is there for Commissioners to see. All right. And then -- so Commissioner Sadhwani -- or Commissioner Sinay will be working with Clark to -- Ms. Clark to see if there's any other refinement that's necessary in that district.

I'm looking through the sheet of priorities for the Commissioners. We did highlight the San Fernando Valley as a priority -- and Los Angeles -- and that appears to be the last priority in Los Angeles, so we probably should go there and take a look. We have --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Sure. Excuse me.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, sure.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Kimberly is asking for some clarity on what's being done, so that she can take the proper notes.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Kimberly, let's see. So no major changes to the iterations. Just minor refinements to San -- so at this point, there were some minor refinements done to the Long Beach area; is that right? Can you just --

MS. CLARK: There were --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- do the changes that were made, Jaime?

MS. CLARK: Yes. Yes. So the changes that were made to Iteration Plan T-1, which was posted online earlier today, is that, now, Koreatown is whole -- the Koreatown COI is whole -- and NELA District -- and the South L.A. District, now, includes Wilmington and San Pedro and splits Carson, and the ADLBC District includes Southern Carson and does not include Northern parts of the City of Long Beach. And those are the changes that had been made to Iteration Plan T-1.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much, Jaime, for that recap. All right. So I'm looking at -- through the priority list for the Commissioners, which is driving where we spend more -- most of our attention.

We do have some attention that needs to be paid to the San Fernando Valley, and then we also have Orange County, which was raised by Commissioner Akutagawa. We -- at this point, because the line drawers -- our line
drawers that are working on Orange County are on the East
coast, and the time difference, I want to go to Orange
County first, finish up Orange County, and then come back
to the San Fernando Valley.

In the meantime, those of you who are -- who have a
priority in the San Fernando Valley, if you could be very
specific with your priorities, and then think through
some of the changes you'd like to see in the San Fernando
Valley. So let's go to Orange County, and then with
Sivan. So let's change line drawers and we'll go through
the Orange County proposals.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Actually, before you do
that --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Let's hear from
Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sorry.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think I need to do a
check-in with them real quick, 'cause we had a question
about one of the shapefiles. So I need to just do a
quick check-in.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's take a five-minute
break for Commissioner Akutagawa to check in with the --
with Sivan, and to do the change, and then we'll be back
in five minutes, and focusing on Orange County, before we
move up to the San Fernando Valley. And then we'll be wrapping up the Southern California, Los Angeles area and moving up to the Central Valley, which is a priority for one, two Commissioners. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 7:59 p.m. until 8:15 p.m.)

CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are now back in Orange County, where I hear we have some solutions -- potential solutions for some of the issues we've been grappling with.

I'm going to turn it over to Commissioner Akutagawa and Sivan to share some of the process -- some of their thinking, what they've gone through, and some -- and explore it, and where they're at now. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I am just going to start out by saying, as I was afraid, the mapping software that I had included La Habra, when it wasn't supposed to, and it just threw off all of my very tight deviations. So we have -- we did have a plan B. And Sivan, if I could just have you present it, perhaps, that would be most efficient.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. Sivan?
MS. TRATT: Absolutely. So for the public and Commissioners, you can see this change outlined in Assembly District Iteration A-1. The gist of the swap is it's contained to two districts, NOCCOAST and GGW. The swap that was made was the majority of Seal Beach. To be more specific, it's the portion of Seal Beach that's South of the 22. And then that was exchanged for population in Huntington Beach. That would satisfy two COIs, at the request of the Little Saigon community, to have part of Huntington Beach kept with the rest of Little Saigon COI, and it would also place Seal Beach in with what is turning out to be the closest to an all-coast district that is going to be allowed with the current configuration. And that's the change.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Sivan and Commissioner Akutagawa. Any questions from the floor? So we have -- the biggest change here is the Seal Beach change. If I'm understanding this correctly, Seal Beach is now with Huntington Beach, Little Saigon, which reflects COI testimony that we've been hearing. Commissioner Sadhwani, any thoughts on -- what are your thoughts on this -- these changes?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. No. Thanks. This is exciting to see. I'm just wondering if we can, maybe, pull out? The --
CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- initial --

CHAIR TOLEDO: No problem.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: The original changes, Commissioner Akutagawa, that you were proposing had cut up Costa Mesa, Irvine. But it looks like those are back together. I'm just, kind of, curious. How does this fit with what we just did in Los Angeles, where Hawaiian Gardens was a part of NOC and Fullerton, under Commissioner Turner's plan, had adjusted where the cut in Fullerton was to include the community -- excuse me -- the college and educational areas? I'm just wondering -- I'm just trying to get a sense of it, in light of all of the other changes that we're making in the region.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Absolutely. I can address that, if that's okay. I have in this orange-ish, red color the original Iteration Plan T-1. Obviously, I don't have the changes that were just made, but it's my understanding that the NOC district wasn't touched in those kind of tweaks, so you can see those overlayed on the current plan. You can see that small change in this district here and where that Fullerton swap was happening. And I can zoom in further to show where that is in Fullerton, again keeping intact those college communities, and the
line drawers are going to merge these two plans that we've been working on, so the changes in orange will be pasted into this Orange County map. Does that answer your question, Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, I think so. So the changes, then, that are being made are just localized to Seal Beach; is that --

MS. TRATT: Exactly. They're contained to --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it.

MS. TRATT: -- NOCCOAST and to GGW. They don't impact any other districts.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it. Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So the majority of the changes are -- actually, most of the -- it really has been localized to the coast area is my understanding, right?

MS. TRATT: That's exactly right.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Let's hear from Linda and -- or sorry -- Commissioner Akutagawa. It's getting late.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I just want to thank the Commission for going on my ride earlier this morning. I really was trying to accommodate and to meet different COIs. I also just want to say, I know that we did get COI testimony that there were residents -- including myself, who is a resident. I would prefer not to see a city split. I live in Huntington Beach. However, we
felt that this was the best way to try to bring Seal
Beach back into a more coastal district. That made more
sense, based on the COI testimony that we got.

Again, I do want to address Little Saigon. I know
that they want to be in a coastal district. We did try
different iterations. But I also want to just say out
loud that, while Little Saigon is the major -- or the
Little Saigon business district is a major area, and the
Vietnamese community is the majority Asian population in
this GGW district, I do also want just say out loud that
we did hear COI testimony from the Pacific Islander
communities.

There are also Latino communities in this district
as well as pockets of Korean-Americans and Arab-Americans
and other South Asians in this district, and of course,
there is various African-American and various communities
from -- you know, of different social economic statuses
in the white community as well, too -- so keeping that,
also, in mind, too -- you know, the bigger picture -- I
think that's what we're all trying to do, and what's best
for the majority of the people, and not just one COI
only, and so there were sacrifices that we all had to
make. And as much as, you know, I think we've tried to
accommodate all the COIs as much as we can, sometimes, it
just becomes very painful that we cannot. And so I hope
that -- as we've been saying, I hope the communities are okay living with it, too. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. I know you worked really hard to balance all of the COIs in this area, and been working very hard with our line drawer to look at solutions, and with the Commission yesterday in public session, and for the last couple of months, at this point, to look at -- through the visualization process.

So I am going to open up to the floor for questions, and then for general consensus in this area.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thanks. I was trying to look back in my notes from public comment earlier today. If we can go back to Southeastern Fullerton? My recollection -- and I may have heard wrong, or I may have written it down wrong -- I recall hearing that the student population, generally, lives to the North of Cal State Fullerton, and by changing to this red line, we would be cutting them from the campus; is that, in fact, the case?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Sivan, can you please look at that and --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thanks.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- answer -- respond, rather?
MS. TRATT: So I didn't hear 100 percent of the COI testimony today -- earlier -- the public comment. I do remember Commissioners asking, yesterday, if there was a possibility of including the portion of Fullerton that's on the East side of the 57 -- and where my cursor is circling.

If I am correct, the deviation of the NOC district, with the proposed changes, is somewhere around 4.85 -- if I'm correct -- and I can get exacts from Yee -- but I don't believe -- I -- I do think that, off-line, we tried to add that population in, and it is too densely populated to accommodate in this district.

There may be other swaps in L.A., or elsewhere, that we could play around with to try and grab that -- the rest of the population, but I can't say, with certainty, what those would be.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Any other questions, comments, or information from the Commission?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I was trying -- oh, I took my hand down some kind of way -- yeah, I had the COI up. I was trying to find it quick enough -- and Jaime may still have it up -- but when we drew that particular line, we were following directly from -- I believe it was someone from one of the colleges -- the -- that submitted the COI that directed those lines -- and I'm just going
to keep clicking here to see if I can come back across it. Jaime, do you have it -- the COI from this area?

MS. CLARK: Hi, I'm so sorry. I missed the question.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: It's the Fullerton -- remember, we had that COI testimony when we drew the line in Fullerton? We moved it up. I think it was North of the campuses or --

MS. CLARK: Yes. The line here is North of the campuses. And the COI testimony that we were looking at was requesting the college -- the line to be North of the campuses and to be separate from the golf courses, or the country clubs, I think, and that is this configuration.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Jaime. So we have something else. That's just what we were going by, but -- okay. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Any other questions for this area? I'm seeing none. Let's look for general consensus on these maps. Sivan, can you go back? Just -- can you zoom out, so we can see all of these changes?

The changes have been localized to the Seal Beach area with Huntington Beach. Other than that, the district remain as we had general consensus previously, so the change that we're looking at is really with the
NOCCOAST district. And I'm looking for general consensus, here, for moving forward. Can we live with these changes? Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sivan, could you just zoom in again? Because in that Fullerton area -- 'cause it looked there was a line going right straight through Fullerton College. And then in another time, it looked like it was fine. And I just want to --

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So let me turn off these lines quickly, just so it won't be confusing. The lines that I'm turning on now are the changes proposed by Commissioner Turner. And let me turn on the Google map. So the lines intentionally go North of both SCU Fullerton and Fullerton College.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And then just one more question. That line is not cutting through Troy High School, right?

MS. TRATT: Can you tell me where Troy High School is?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It's right next to Cal State --

MS. TRATT: Oh, right --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- Fullerton.

MS. TRATT: -- here?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Okay.
MS. TRATT: It looks like --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: What's that --

MS. TRATT: -- it is right here.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, it's a park. Okay.

Okay. Thank you. It looks good.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Any concerns around these changes? I'm looking around the room. All right. We have general consensus to move forward with these. Let's adopt these into our maps. Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I don't fully understand what's happening, because it looks like that proposed change in Fullerton disappeared when the map zoomed back out.

MS. TRATT: I can explain. So Jaime --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

MS. TRATT: -- and I had been working on different computers. So as soon as we are moving on from, and I have the approval of the Commission, I will export the geographic files for the districts that we worked on. Those will then get merged in with the plan that Jaime has been working on in her districts. And that's why the lines were two different colors. So I just turned that off, because I think it was getting confusing for Commissioners, but the -- the red lines are what was proposed in Iteration T-1, and these changes will be
merged with the current plan, which is reflected in the black lines.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you very much for that explanation.

MS. TRATT: Yeah, absolutely.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. I guess, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm sorry. I just wanted to ask. I know -- I think -- sorry. It's getting late. I think somebody asked this question, but I've got to -- I think it didn't sink through. The section of Fullerton that's across the 57 freeway -- that we did get some feedback that that's part of, you know, some of the student housing -- since there's a negative deviation, does it make sense to just, kind of, pick up a few extra people from that area and go across the 57 and pick up some of those Cal State, Fullerton students as well, too?

MS. TRATT: So my --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Or am I --

MS. TRATT: -- understanding is that --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- looking at it wrong?

MS. TRATT: Oh, yeah. So my understanding is that the negative deviation is moving population out of the district that is already negative and so that would push it beyond the legal limit of negative five percent
deviation.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, you mean so if you moved the -- that line East a little bit towards Placentia, you would lose population? I thought we're gaining population.

MS. TRATT: Jaime, could you confirm just what the deviation on NOC, with these changes, are?

MS. CLARK: Yes, I can. Please, one moment. NOC, with these changes, NOC is negative 4.2 percent, and that is accomplished by, in the T-1 Plan, Lakewood being whole with AD Gateway.

MS. TRATT: And what is the deviation of the LAOSB?

MS. CLARK: The LAOSB district, the deviation is negative 4.75 percent.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, okay. I thought I saw it was something, like -- I saw a much smaller deviation, so I thought there was space to pick up a few extra one of those students into that district. Okay.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So as I explained, Jaime and I did try to move this portion of Fullerton into the NOC district off-line --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Uh-huh.

MS. TRATT: -- and without making population swaps elsewhere, that would not be possible, without pushing the deviation of LAOSB beyond negative five --
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: -- percent.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. All right.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- to the line drawers. Thank you to --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Commissioner Akutagawa. We have general consensus on these changes. We're going to move forward onto L.A. Again, thank you for all the work Commissioner Akutagawa has done, here. It's been pretty impressive. And thank you to the line drawers as well.

Now, back to Los Angeles and the refinement that was done at the -- in the areas where Commissioner Sinay and Jaime were working on. Let's take a look at some of the proposals that we have to these lines. My understanding is they do not significantly change any of the deviations, or other criteria, so let's take a look.

Jaime?

MS. CLARK: That is correct. We moved this line from 19th Street South to -- or excuse me. We moved it from West 18th Street South to 19th Street, because 19th Street intersects with Western Ave.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.
MS. CLARK: And then moving North, the line follows South Gaffey Street following the 110 North. That's the only change to that boundary between ADSTHLA and ADSTHBAY. And we included the rest of Wilmington Neighborhood Council, including the disco finger (ph.) -- we decided to call it -- so just to make Wilmington Neighborhood Council more full. And again, this area was fifty people in total.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. I just want to check in with counsel on the compactness issue with regards to that area right there.

MR. LARSON: Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I don't even know what to call it, so --

MR. LARSON: There was a name for it (indiscernible).

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- the little line. The little neck, that's what it is. Thank you.

MR. LARSON: Jaime, could you tell me again what exactly that represents? That's part of the Wilmington area.

MS. CLARK: That is part of Wilmington Neighborhood Council. It follows the boundary of the City of Los Angeles.

MR. LARSON: Okay. Yeah, I mean, there's a very
strong basis for that line, so I think you should be comfortable with it.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. No concern?

MR. LARSON: No.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Perfect. Any concerns with these changes? Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Jaime, just to the West of the 110 below that East, West segment, is that a separate -- exactly -- is that a separate neighborhood council area, or is that part of the Harbor City Neighborhood Council area?

MS. CLARK: So I'm going to turn off the district boundaries. This is part of Wilmington.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. I was just thinking that we could clean up the line by including that, since it's part of the district on the other side of the -- of the neighborhood council on the other side of the 110. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: I think that that causes the ADSTHBAY to drop below the five percent deviation. That's something Commissioner Sadhwani and I tried, also.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So that was tried. And we weren't able to achieve -- while being within compliance requirements. Any other concerns about this area? If not, I'm going to seek general consensus. I'm
seeing no concerns. Do we have general consensus on these minor refinements? Yes, we do. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just want to say, San Pedro, yes, we split you again. But now -- but the two harbors -- yeah, the two ports have been separated. So we tried to do both. But we couldn't do both.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, all. This is -- this looks like we have general consensus for this change. And we'll move forward with the next area of priority. And I have --

MR. LARSON: Excuse me, Chair.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, Dale.

MR. LARSON: I'm sorry. Before we move on. Just for clarification, that -- that the other neck, where it says, "West Carson" on the right, that's all of the City of Carson? That's a city boundary on the right there; is that correct?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Line --

MS. CLARK: So --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Jaime, can you please --

MS. CLARK: Yes. This is the boundary between the City of Carson and the census-designated place of West Carson --

MR. LARSON: Okay.
MS. CLARK: -- and then further West, this is the boundary between the City of Los Angeles and Torrance, and the City of Los Angeles and Lomita.

MR. LARSON: Great. That's great. Thank you so much.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Mr. Larson. All right. So with that, here are the priorities moving forward. So we have the San Fernando Valley, which is next, here in Los Angeles. After that, we're shifting to the Central Valley, where we're going to focus on the South Fresno area. Then the Eastern Sierras. Then moving -- we're going to move to the Bay area, where we'll focus on Oakland -- minor changes and refinements in the Oakland area -- and then Redwood City. Vineyard is -- and Vineyard as well. So those are the areas. So that's the plan for tonight. Let's go to the South Fernando Valley. Thank you. Jaime, can you take us to the San Fernando Valley?

MS. CLARK: So on screen is the current iteration for San Fernando Valley. For the South SFV iteration, it shows Sunland-Tujunga with Northern parts of Glendale, the entire City of Burbank, North Hollywood Neighborhood Council, Greater Toluca Lake, Studio City out to Encino. The Southern boundary of this is Mulholland and San Fernando Valley.
Central SFV iteration includes Canoga Park out to Lake Balboa. It includes Arleta, part of Pacoima, and Mission Hills Neighborhood Council.

The East San Fernando Valley iteration includes Granada Hills, Sylmar, the City of San Fernando, parts of Pacoima, Foothill Trails District Neighborhood Council, Sun Valley area, Greater Valley Glen -- I think this is North Hollywood North and North Hollywood West -- and then Van Nuys, that's North of Oxnard Street.

Finally, we have, in the Santa -- in the iteration with Santa Clarita Valley, the parts of San Fernando Valley. Included in this are Porter Ranch, Chatsworth, West Hills, Woodland Hills, Tarzana, also including Hidden Hills. And in Ventura County, Bell Canyon.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Jaime. We'll open up to the floor, where this is -- where we have virtually significant community of interest testimony, both written and via public testimony. Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I don't have a plan, here. I will say that. I think a couple of things, maybe to get us started -- two options, perhaps.

One, we definitely heard from the Santa Clarita folks that there might be more -- and I -- living in this -- sort of in this area, I do think that there's some (indiscernible) to this, right? That Sunland-
Tujunga, going out that way -- and I believe we had made
this swap in -- I think it was our Congressional maps --
makes more sense to run the district along the 210,
because that's a natural corridor, rather than having it
connect to Porter Ranch, Chatsworth, et cetera.

So I don't know if we want to do this live, or if we
want to work off-line on this. I think, overwhelmingly,
what we're hearing is, we created these maps, because we
had heard from communities on the ground that they wanted
to see us try, at least, to consolidate some of the
essential worker communities, some of -- you know, some
of the more working class components of the San Fernando
Valley. I think in attempting to do that, though, we've
set off some changes in this region that, clearly, folks
are responding to. And I'm wondering -- you know, Jaime,
maybe you can walk us through -- or I don't know if you
have, still, up the draft maps -- or we have them in
District Viewer -- I'm looking at them right now -- but
if there's -- if you have any thoughts or suggestions?
You've been working and reworking these areas.

A lot of what we might be able to do now, given
where we are -- I think one of the big changes was that
split in South Glendale, so now -- now, the Northern --
you know, Glendale North of the 134, or thereabouts, is
in the San Fernando Valley, and that's a -- I'm guessing
a whole lot of population that we are having to contend with, but it allowed us to keep certain COIs in Los Angeles together.

I'm also just noting in the drafts that we're working on, that there's some -- it looks like, potentially, some wiggle room between the 210 district and that district where Glendale currently is in. I don't -- I'm guessing that it's too much population to move it over. But I see that as, potentially, some opportunities for us to make some swaps. But I would be really curious to hear Jaime's thoughts on what's possible in this area, without setting off ripple effects throughout the rest of Los Angeles. And I feel like we have done so much work, made so many refinements in L.A., that I really would prefer to try and localize these changes to the greatest extent possible.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So a quick question for you, Commissioner Sadhwani. What are the COIs that we'd be prioritizing here, and which are the COIs that we'd be deprioritizing? So I'm trying to understand the rationale for these changes and -- just from the COI testimony that we're getting, right?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: What are -- 'cause -- I mean, any time we do this, we're balancing COIs and trying to
balance interests, and oftentimes -- I mean, we just need
to just have the conversation. What are we prioritizing,
and what are we deprioritizing? And so that's the
question on the table -- for the whole Commission to
understand -- because it's such a -- it's a --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- such an interesting area, and we
should -- just need to talk through it, and to figure out
what it is we want to do.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yep. Did you want me to
respond to that?


COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh, sure. So I mean, I
think definitely maintaining that Central SFV. That was
originally the one where communities were being kept
together, I believe. I don't think that that changed
too -- changed slightly in terms of Van Nuys, I think,
from our draft map -- oh, it changed it little bit more
than that -- but more or less maintaining that in the
center part of the Central Valley.

And then I think the concern that we were hearing
is, like, having Sunland-Tujunga go all the way out to
Encino is really connecting very different kinds of
communities, and so I think reorienting -- maybe, even if
it continues to include Glendale, I think some of the
maps that folks have sent us would have that portion of Glendale still going further out into Tarzana and other areas, which it's still pretty far, but I think, perhaps, a little bit better. In any case, they're all more suburban areas.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So I think some of that reorienting that way.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And then for Jaime, there's another question to add to the many questions that have been posed. Would these changes make a difference -- impact the number of Asian, Latino, or Black fifty percent or more -- greater -- it's fifty percent or more majority districts?

MS. CLARK: Yeah. So thank you for that question. And thanks for that input, Commissioner Sadhwani.

So compared to the draft, a big change in this area is that, generally, North of 134, Glendale is included, sort of, in this cluster of districts, and that really changes populations, and it changes what districts -- but to get -- you know, like, how districts fit together.

Also, just something that Commissioner Sadhwani had noted previously, was that the 210, in this iteration, is underpopulated, and my -- I know that what Sivan and Commissioner Kennedy had worked on added some population
to 210. And I don't have that. I don't have that GIS layer just yet coming from Sivan. But I know it's coming. So I would -- I would just say that, right now, we probably wouldn't want to add any population to the 210 district from these areas, because we don't know precisely the percent deviations that's currently in that -- in that district, so making changes really, in general, to these districts would definitely change the number of fifty percent or more Latino CVAP districts in L.A. County. Absolutely.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Would that be a reduction, or an increase?

MS. CLARK: It would be a reduction.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Any other questions from the floor? Commissioner Kennedy, Commissioner Vazquez, Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Three things. First of all, I thought the other night, when we were looking at this, I had asked that the South SFV district extend North up to that horizontal line dividing the 210 district from -- whatever that is. North of that, is at the Antelope district. But that -- so that the South SFV district go up and meet that horizontal line.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Second -- I've lost that one.

The third thing is that -- and particularly if we can't add any population to the 210 -- oh, it was -- it was I agree with Commissioner Sadhwani that connecting Santa Clarita through the 210, rather than on the West side through Porter Ranch and Chatsworth, makes a whole lot more sense.

And third is -- particularly if we can't add any population to 210 right now -- the only underpopulated district in the entire San Fernando Valley is this Central SFV district. And I know that we have to be careful of the LCVAP. So we are really in a very tight corner here as far as what we can do. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I'm going to move to a different topic, so --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: -- this conversation should continue.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, okay. We'll call on you after we finish this. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sorry. I thought Commissioner Sadhwani was next. I know that there was a lot of work trying to get to the fifty percent CVAP, but
we heard a lot of comments from a lot of people who, I guess, seem pretty hoppy (phonetic) mad about some of the combinations that we've made, and I guess the question is -- since this is -- I hate to ask this, but I'm going to ask this -- since this is not a VRA district, at fifty percent, is that high enough anyways, or are we doing more harm by trying to put together communities that don't really belong together in pursuit of something that may or may not be effective? And if not, is there another way to make it work?

And I guess, you know, with what Commissioner Kennedy was saying, maybe that will give us the kind of -- the wiggle room that we need to reconstruct it, so that we can create something that makes sense, but also puts communities together that make sense, because it sounded like -- I don't know by the way people were identifying themselves -- that we heard from a pretty diverse cross section of the San Fernando Valley, and they valued their connections to their communities as much as anything else, so I thought I'd just ask that question.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So let's reach out to Mr. Larson.

MR. LARSON: Thank you, Chair. I just want to -- I think you all know this. We've talked about this. But
we did not find that the third Gingles precondition was met in this area. This is not an area where you have a VRA obligation, so the -- you know, there is no, sort of, is fifty percent enough? That's not a relevant question to be asked here.

Instead, you guys are free to consider the COI and put that you've received a -- and use the other criteria for designing these districts.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum. Commissioner -- oh, Jaime, and then Commissioner Vazquez after that.

MS. CLARK: Just one moment, please. Mr. Larson took the words out of my mouth. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I was going to make, more or less, the same observation as Mr. Larson.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, thank you. Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. Thank you. Is there no consideration to adding Sunland-Tujunga to the 210 district? Would that help to even out the numbers for population? And it sort of meshes, I guess -- yeah -- no -- even out the numbers for population that's the similar communities. I think when you add that to the district, it runs the gamut of social economic levels as well. And there's a certain amount of synergy again -- 210 corridor with adding Sunland-Tujunga to the 210 and
taking it out of South SFV. It might open it up to --
for some other considerations South of that location.

MS. CLARK: So thank --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Jaime?

MS. CLARK: -- you -- thank you for that suggestion.

I am still -- and I'm sure it's coming soon -- I'm
looking for -- oh, I might've just gotten the GIS layer
from Sivan that would include the changes to the 210 that
Sivan and Commissioner Kennedy worked on together, so I
will load that. If you just give me one moment, please,
I will load that into the map, and then we can more
accurately assess the deviation of 210, based on those
changes. One moment.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Jaime. You're the best.
You're all the best. Everyone's the best. Commissioner
Vazquez, while we're waiting.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I mean, this is now
relevant. I am still holding out hope to protect the
political interests of folks in historic Northeast L.A.
And I think, potentially, as Commissioner Taylor noted,
if there's room to move Sunland-Tujunga into the 210
district, in its new form, I would like to see if, at
least, Glendale could be kept whole -- part of the San
Fernando Valley district -- if that's possible.

And also, I just wanted to note -- just to refresh
my memory -- I went through and started reading some of
the COI testimony from Northeast Los Angeles -- and just
want to, again, remind myself and remind the rest of the
Commission that, prior to releasing our draft maps, we
heard quite a bit of conflicting testimony about the
region -- so I read a couple of COI testimonies that
said, Boyle Heights has nothing to do with K-Town. Do
not put us with K-Town. There were several that said,
please keep Boyle Heights and East L.A. together. Don't
put us with Eagle Rock. So there's -- were -- there's a
variety of perspectives in this community. Again,
because it's shifting so rapidly.

So I just wanted to note that I know that recently
we have -- we've heard the -- loud and clear -- the
testimony to separate Boyle Heights and East L.A., but
that's not been universal input throughout our process.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And it's almost 10 p.m.
We still have to get through the Central Valley, Eastern
Sierra, and some minor refinements in the North --
Northern California, Bay area. So I'm not so worried
about the Northern Bay area -- knock on wood -- or the
South Fresno changes, but I believe there will be a
discussion with regards to Vineyard and to the Eastern
Sierra, so the Inyo, Monyo (ph.), Mono district, so just
letting everyone know that, in terms of time management.
And here, in the office, we have -- thanks to Commissioner Akutagawa -- we have some ice cream, so we've been having an ice cream party -- a milkshake party.

MS. CLARK: So I'm -- that's amazing that everyone is having ice cream. I'm very happy for all of you. And --

CHAIR TOLEDO: We wish we --

MS. CLARK: -- I --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- could give you some. If you were here with us, we --

MS. CLARK: And --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm not having any, Jaime.

MS. CLARK: -- we have been having some dessert over here ourselves. And I wanted to let you know that I got the file from Sivan. Thank you, Sivan. And added the areas to the 210 corridor that Sivan and Commissioner Kennedy had worked out -- had worked on -- and so now, we're working with the appropriate percent deviation for 210.

So we have all of the information that we need to be able to make changes to the San Fernando Valley based districts. I -- if you wanted to start with something similar to the draft map, and this is just I -- I think one of the Commissioner's previously asked if I had any
suggestions. And so I can just walk through some high-
level suggestions. And this is kind of just based on,
you know, earlier in the meeting, we were in the meeting.
I was listening to the feedback along with Commissioners
and noted that a number of callers mentioned that they
liked the draft.
So --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

MS. CLARK: -- that's why I just -- I was, like,
okay, let's look at the draft. See what we could do now
that the draft -- or, yeah. Just see what we can do now.
In considering that this -- there is this part of
Glendale that's included with San Fernando Valley stuff.
And we can look at making Glendale whole, and I haven't
taken a look at that quite yet.
So that being said, what is up in green right now is
the draft. If you wanted to go back to something like
the draft, then this, I think, would balance just in
terms of population, the districts. So too -- I'll zoom
in a little bit to the SFV district. You could add North
Hills. Like, going back to this and then adding North
Hills and South SFV, again starting with the draft. And
then, making this line at Oxnard for the POSO crowd. And
also, I think for population, just extending East on
Oxnard and Valley Glen Council as a suggestion.
In the central SFV, if you start with the draft, if you add Arleta and maybe Mission Hills, I think that that would balance population. That might not be possible if you want to include Toluca Lake with this area. And then for the East SFV, if you start with the draft, it would be similar. But of course, Arleta would not be in here. And then, you could add the Glendale area also in this. So those are just some suggestions, if you want to start with the draft, and I think there would be wiggle room.

CHAIR TOLEDO: All right. Let's hear from Commissioner's and see what the thought -- thoughts are. Commissioner Sadhwani, Fornaciari, Vazquez, Akutagawa, recognizing that we are prioritizing some points over others, and we need to articulate what those are.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I think the changes that Jaime is suggesting sound reasonable and just from a processing point, I know we have other parts of the map to get to. I think it -- if we can clarify what our goals are here, and it -- I think to me, the goal is to get closer back towards where we were before in terms of our approach to San Fernando Valley. I think it's reasonable to work offline on this so we can do those other things and then come back to this area after
some -- some potential changes can be suggested.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fornaciari, Commissioner Vazquez, Commissioner Akutagawa, and Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Sure. Commissioner Kennedy will remember this, but wasn't Hidden Hills in a COG with Calabasas and those guys down there or am I -- am I getting it mixed up? Wasn't it like a five city COG down here?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And Hidden Hills was part of it? So we have 10.2 percent is my calculation to play with the spread around in those four districts. I'm wondering if we could put the COG together.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Commissioner -- so that's one priority. Put the COG together.

Commissioner Vazquez, and then Akutagawa, and then Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. My priority would -- would be obviously to keep Glendale whole. I do think Eagle Rock can and -- and probably should probably stay with what is now GLENNLAA. Also, if possible, I would like to, sort of, reunify Silver Lake and Los Feliz with the Hollywood or, I guess, westside district.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: But priority -- in order of
priority for me, it's Glendale whole out of GLENNLA and then Silver Lake, Los Feliz, if possible.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Le Mons and then --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: And it looks like Jaime had a response maybe --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, I didn't hear her.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: -- to tell me that I'm crazy.

CHAIR TOLEDO: At this point, we're just trying to gather priorities. But, so let's gather priorities and see which -- and then we'll get a reaction from Jaime after we have all the priorities.

Commissioner Le Mons, Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah, I'd have a priority for Silver Lake being merged with West Hollywood. Also, Toluca Lake with North Hollywood. Not -- yes, North Hollywood. That's correct. That will be important, because I know the visualization we just saw a moment ago, there was a question that Jaime raised about those two, so I think they should stay together as we make whatever changes that we make. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons.

Commissioner Akutagawa, then Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Can I -- can I just clarify? Is this the previous drafts or is this the
current changes that we had made that everybody hated?

MS. CLARK: This is actually really similar to the
iteration 12.04 and 12.06 that was approved by the
Commission and includes additionally in the City of --
like, South of Mulholland in the City of Los Angeles.
Like, Plan T1, so it includes everything that we've been
working on today. And also, this is very similar to how
it has been the last couple days.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So it's --

MS. CLARK: So this is the one everybody hated,
yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I -- I -- just
checking. I -- I -- I just wanted to -- okay. One other
thing I wanted to just note, piggybacking on what
Commissioner Le Mons said. I think we got quite a bit of
cointestimony about NoHo being together with Van Nuys,
Valley Glenn, and Valley Village. So I -- I'll just note
that as a -- as something that was requested.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. Thank you to
Commissioner Akutagawa for that last part. The other
part is in response to Commissioner Fornaciari, the Las
Virgenes-Malibu Council of Governments is Agoura Hills,
Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Malibu, and West Lake Village.
So it would seem that we might be doing folks in Hidden Hills a favor if we were to group them with the other members of their Council of Governments, if that's possible. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Great.

Anybody else with a priority? I'll just share mine. Mine would be that we not make such a huge -- that we -- if we make any changes, that it be localized to this area and not beyond this area. And -- and that we try as much as possible to respect working-class communities and to keep them as whole as possible, as well as the rural communities.

Let's see. Jaime, let's talk about opportunities, challenges, and what you see -- what you're seeing at this point since you've visualized this area many times.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. I think -- just responding to -- responding, I guess, to some of the -- some of the priorities that aren't -- that I think would not necessarily be in -- just in this localized to San Fernando Valley include -- so I guess, like, thinking about the Glen North LA district, adding Glendale -- taking Glendale out of that district. And also taking Silver Lake and Los Feliz would definitely leave it underpopulated. Additionally, just a reminder that we looked just at adding Los Feliz to the West side district.
and the West side district was --

CHAIR TOLEDO: I think we lost Jaime. We'll wait a couple more minutes. It looks like we're having technical difficulties.

The next break is at 9:45. So it was at 9:45. I think we have a little bit of wiggle room because we took that nine-minute break. But because of the nine-minute break, we're right around the fifteen-minute break.

So let's take the fifteen-minute break now while we wait for Jaime to hop back on. And we'll be back in fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 8:51 p.m. until 9:00 p.m.)

CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California Citizen's Redistricting -- I'm saying foundation. Commission. We're working on -- we're in the San Fernando Valley working through some of the -- some potential changes to their -- our districts here. We've received so much community input regarding these maps. And -- and some conflicting and some just wanting some minor refinements, some wanting larger refinements.

Given that -- that we have two more large areas to go to, I'm going to ask the Commissioner to take -- to work with Jaime offline and to try to reconcile some of this. Commissioner Vazquez has volunteered to work with
Jaime over the next thirty minutes and try to see if she can bring forward some solutions to this, and we'll come back in later today and see what we came up with.

But in the meantime, let's hit the road to the Central Valley. We're going to journey up to the Central Valley and go to South Fresno. Then we're going to talk about INYO_MONO and then we're going to head up to Oakland, Redwood City, and lastly, Vineyard. And then of course, if -- when we have the Los Angeles information, we'll come back to the San Fernando Valley.

Thank you. So let's hit the road to South Fresno. And I believe that's Kennedy?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, it is.

MS. WILSON: It is. Hello.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Hi, Kennedy. I haven't seen you all day. We're excited to have you.

MS. WILSON: No, good night.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Good evening, good night.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Chair, I think I'd asked for South Fresno.

CHAIR TOLEDO: You did.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. And I wanted to lift up, again, the opportunity to unify some communities of interest while maintaining, of course, the Latinx VRA district.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: The request was to try and bring in old fig -- excuse me. Old fig area and college areas South of Willard, North of Shaw (phonetic). They gave very good direction.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And then, also, bringing in the neighborhood West of 99 between Shaw, Ashland, and Hayes. And then there was a secondary, because they both have the same end answer, I'll say with the Kings-Tulare area, putting (indiscernible) in the area, completely in the district. However, in working through with Kennedy, and Kennedy is on again to -- just in case we need to see any of that, these are all things that we've tried to accomplish before, and we were not successful in doing so. They all lowered the Latina CVAP too far in areas that -- where they were areas of VRA districts. And so there was only area, Kennedy, I think that we were actually able to kind of take a look at. I think that was around the 99 neighborhood, if we want to take a look at that.

MS. WILSON: Yes, of course. And --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. It's late. I'm trying to think. Were we even able to make that one work? I think that's still lowered.
MS. WILSON: Yes, it still did lower the CVAP. And so I can go ahead and show you that. But it was a neighborhood that was going from East Shaw to Ashland Avenue to North Hayes. And as far as Fresno is concerned, it would also include -- because of how the district is going down to West Shields, just for contiguity. And so I can go ahead and just show everyone what that looks like. Just quickly. So I'm going from North Hays, Shaw, and including West Ashland Avenue. And let me continue to grab this portion here. And get my pending changes window up for you. Sorry about that, it is not already there. And so as you can see, Fresno -- the district Fresno, goes from a 1.58 percent deviation to a 7.36 percent deviation. So that, numbers wise, isn't possible to bring that in. And then we go from a 53.07 percent Latino CVAP to a 52.53 percent Latino CVAP.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

Thank you. We could just keep looking. We looked at -- at this area a couple of different ways to try and be able to accomplish it. And it just did not work with what -- the constraints that we had. So I just wanted to show that because we've got several community of interest testimony for this area and the kind of feeling that we're not paying attention for the Central Valley area.
We have looked at the Central Valley area and just wanting to be able to show that.

So thank you, Kennedy.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: (Indiscernible) --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Turner for trying to unite some COI's in this area. Although, it's so difficult now that we have so many constraints and so many issues and -- and we've balanced the issues here quite well, although not perfectly as --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, there was -- there was one other area. Kennedy, I don't know if we ever showed --

CHAIR TOLEDO: No.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- which was in the San Joaquin area. There was also community of interest to keep areas together. And I think August, Garden, Stockton, Kennedy, and Morada, it was another area that we were not able to balance in and of itself. I think we were able to bring in Kennedy and not any of the other areas and still keep the deviations that's required.

MS. WILSON: Yes. And we have August that we were able to bring in and keep the deviations balanced. However, adding Morada and Garden Acres was too much.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

MS. WILSON: As far as (indiscernible) --

CHAIR TOLEDO: I feel like we made that change already, right?

MS. WILSON: Correct. We made that change.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, yeah. We made that yesterday.

Perfect. Or yeah, it was two days ago, but it feels like yesterday.

Thank you so much Commissioner Turner and Kennedy.

That's amazing.

We're going to go on to now the Eastern Sierra.

Oh, Commissioner Akutagawa. Sorry, I didn't see you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Just -- just a -- a real quick question. I guess this is maybe a question for -- I don't know who's on. It's Dale or Sal. Just in terms of that, going back to that Fresno area, I believe that there was kind of some joint community testimony for that area. In terms of the VRA analysis, I know that it was said once before that there -- there may be some different voting patterns that are much more -- what is it that they said? Unified voting patterns between not only just the Latino community but Black and Asian communities as well, too. If they were to be added in, would that still be enough to ensure that the Latino
community can elect a candidate of their choice?

MR. LARSON: So are you -- I wouldn't -- I wouldn't want to go -- we -- we do see some -- some crossover with the Black community there. I wouldn't want to go, even so -- much, you know, below that fifty-one percent in Merced, Fresno. You know, if -- if there were some move that instead of having the fifty-one and the fifty-three and brought them both to say like say fifty-two, you know, I think -- I'd support that at this point, and we would go back and look at it more closely.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, okay. Thank you. Yeah, I forgot Merced, Fresno would just go down as well. MR. LARSON: Yes. COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just thinking about just Fresno. So -- okay. Thank you. Thanks for the reminder.

MR. LARSON: Uh-huh.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. Seeing no other hands raised, we will move on to the Sierra's, to the Eastern Sierra's. And I want to see who that was. Let me see. That was Commissioner -- that was actually a couple of -- that was quite a few Commissioners that wanted to raise this issue. Fernandez, Turner, Yee, others as well. Andersen. So let's -- let's -- Andersen has her hand raised.
Then Yee. And we do have a draft proposal from Commissioner Yee, I believe.

So let's go, Commissioner Andersen.

MS. WILSON: Would you like me to pull that up? The draft?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes, please.

MS. WILSON: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Please pull Commissioner Yee's draft proposal. But in the meantime, let's hear from Commissioner Andersen as well.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. I'm sorry. Is this -- is this for the -- the Sierra's or Oakland?

CHAIR TOLEDO: My understanding is it's Inyo to Amador County.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: But we'll see --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. So okay. Well, I haven't seen this but basically --

CHAIR TOLEDO: It's posted in -- in our handouts.

Just for -- for the public. The public and for also for all Commissioners, this was posted in the public earlier today to -- to our handouts earlier today. And it should be accessible to the public and to Commissioners.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Ahh. Well, yes, this is exactly what happened. The way to do that is Alpine,
Mono, and Inyo are about 33,000 or so versus Amador which
is about 36,000. And essentially, you would switch.
Take Amador out of, you know, the CALA_INYO and put
Alpine, Mono, and Inyo in. And so the swap for swap.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I think it --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: What happens there is --
instead of those three counties essentially being
represented -- probably be -- changes are by someone in
Redding, they're now going to be represented by someone
in Fresno. So that's kind of a summary of that.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

We will go to Commissioner Yee who will present his
draft map to the Commission and some of the -- I mean,
I'm really hoping that you'll give us the rationale for
this and explain the reasoning for the changes given that
this is a plan that we've all said we can live with. So
know, as we go in through, I -- I just want to make sure
want to make sure that we're also providing rationale.
So -- and -- and certainly there's strong rationale for
this, as I've been seeing the COI testimony come in. So
Commissioner Yee and then Commissioner Fernandez after
that.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair. Yes, so
Commissioner Fernandez and I did work on this plan that
you see now. And it is along the same lines, exact same
lines that Commissioner Andersen just described. So as you'll recall, in our draft we had a very, very, very, very, very large district. And all are from Inyo all the way to the Oregon border. At some point we were talking about that as a mountain district and so forth. But as we thought about it more, it was really just -- just too big, so, and just too far.

So the swap. The swap is moving Amador North in exchange for keeping Inyo, Mono, and Alpine with Calaveras, Tuolumne, Mariposa, Madera, and part of Fresno. So with the COI testimony, did not find any COI testimony about Amador and Calaveras specifically. There was a handful of COI testimony about Amador and the other adjacent counties, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Mariposa. So we would be breaking that COI. But only in one county, Amador, and keeping Amador whole is the important thing. So then the NORCAL district is only from Amador up. It is still very, very large, of course, but California is a large state, but at least not all the way down to Inyo. And all those counties are kept whole.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Yee. Just a quick question for you and also for Kennedy. Were -- were you able to keep the changes localized to the Eastern Sierra's or were there other districts that you had to take in in order to accomplish this goal?
MS. WILSON: Yeah. So CALA-INYO -- NORCAL and CALA-INYO were the only two that were affected. It didn't go into the ECA or into Sacramento at all.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER YEE: And the deviation actually improved slightly.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Wow, that's impressive.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I -- I see we're all becoming geospatial experts now. Let's see. Let's reach out to Commission Fernandez, then Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Definitely not a GIS expert as Jaime and Kennedy know. But I just wanted to respond because I know, Chair, that you said that the prior -- or the -- the current one we have we can all live with. And I think the majority of us voiced concern about how long this district was. So I can definitely -- this is more palatable for me.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And hopefully it is for the rest of the Commission. And it was good that it was a simple -- a simple change. So thank you, Commissioner Yee, for that, too. And for Kennedy. Thanks.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Yeah, certainly. We all said we could live it. Certainly, we all have some --
not all -- but some of us raised concerns about the --
the -- the district. And hopefully this is a much more
compact district. Certainly, that's a key criteria.

Commissioner Akutagawa, Andersen, Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. First off, I just
want to say thank you for the work on this. And -- and
I -- I feel better about it especially because we did
hear some testimony today that -- that -- that did
express some of the preferences. So I think that that
was helpful. We were just trying to be, as we have been
all along, responsive.

I just have a question in terms of the testimonies
that we've heard about the Native American tribes up in
the North Coast. You had mentioned that all the counties
were kept whole. So was -- can you maybe speak to a
little bit about how you managed to keep Siskiyou whole
and still also meet the needs of the Karuk Tribe, as well
as the other tribes that are in that area.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. So the Yurok are still
whole and Del Norte and Humboldt. The Karuk, we had
actually gotten some changes in testimony. And I don't
know if I can call on Commissioner Kennedy. Perhaps he
tracked that more closely than anyone.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. So --

COMMISSIONER YEE: But this does reflect the latest
COI testimony we received, even though it does not include that corner of Humboldt. They requested to take it out so that they would have a presence in both districts basically.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And I -- I can respond to that. So the Karuk Tribe which we discussed, that -- on Saturday. And we had to make difficult decisions. You know, the first priority would have been to have their -- their reservation with the coast. They also said that if we couldn't do that, they at least wanted the portion of the district and Humboldt County -- to remain with Humboldt County as they have a strong connection with -- with Humboldt County as well.

So that we were able to honor the compromise. It essentially was a compromise and provide them with -- with what they needed. It wasn't their first choice, but it was their second choice.

Commissioner Andersen, Commissioner Sadhwani.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah, I was just going to -- actually, a little bit back on the Alpine, Inyo, Mono. I was hoping to hear from them today because it is sort of, you know, their trade with Amador. I was hoping to hear from in each -- each of those specific areas. A lot of people are, like, well, I don't like the way it looks, but I always like to go with who's being affected.
And unfortunately, I did not see that today. So but this -- those, you know, that -- you heard why we did that. So -- and it was a straightforward one swap for, you know, those three for that one. But -- and -- and I was at -- talking about another -- the next topic so --

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let me just clarify with that.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- I'll --

CHAIR TOLEDO: So that was -- we did not hear from them in public testimony. So they didn't not call in and we didn't receive too much feedback in written form.

That -- I just wanted to make sure --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: That -- that's --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- that the public understood what was meant. All right.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

And you had one more point I think you were going to make.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, that's for the next -- the Vineyard --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- and the -- this area. So just to --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, oh, oh. Thank you.

So let's go to Commissioner Sadhwani.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, thanks. I -- I apologize because there were so many additional drafts that folks worked on that I haven't had a chance to really wrap my head around all of them. In this one, in general, I'm comfortable moving in this direction and that long, huge district never sat well with me. But I also had on my priority list the Vineyard issue. Does this change, pulling in these counties such as Calaveras, Amador, et cetera? Does that limit our options to make changes in the -- to bring Vineyard in with Elk Grove?

My --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- understanding is we were looking at some of those counties as potential swaps.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So Commissioner Fernandez had initially raised that issue so we'll --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- go to her.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. It -- it doesn't impact that. I -- I did not -- it's something to talk about, for sure, but I have a new version that I worked with Kennedy on that kind of just stayed within the SSAC_STANIS, and Elk Grove, and the Stockton kind of. So I did not write -- my version did not include Calaveras, and Tuolumne, and Mariposa. However, that's something
that we should discuss based on the testimony that we
heard today. And also that has been if -- if you've been
able to read the COI in our database, there's been
feedback on that as well.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah, I was --

CHAIR TOLEDO: So yeah, and Vineyard is the next
area to be discussed. And then, after that we will be
going to -- to the Bay Area. No, because -- because of
the -- I'm going based on who is the line drawer to --
are assigned to the things as opposed to, like, regions.

So -- so where are we right now? Commissioner
Andersen, and then Fernandez, and then we'll -- we'll hit
other -- well, then we'll find if -- we'll see if we have
general consensus on these two districts first.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. Thank you, Chair. I
just want to say something that's -- today we have, and I
hope for all the people who are still with us, or may not
have heard that or anything. We had a great thing happen
today that made me proud to be a Californian. The people
in the hills of Amador, Calaveras, Tuolumne heard that
their neighbor in Sacramento had trouble. The Vineyard,
they really wanted to be in. And they all kind of, you
know, I don't know if they did this together or what, but
many of them called in and said, hey, you know, in the
little foothills here, we've got stuff in common with the
guys in the valley and Stanislaus. So why not, you know,
take our area? And you know, that just shows you what
kind of people we have here in this state; it's not in
their economic interests, but it helps their neighbor.
And so they, you know, they offered that up, which I
really want to bring -- bring forward and say thank you
very much. I -- I don't know unfortunately if they
realize the amount they'd have to give up, but it was the
intent there, and I just think that's wonderful. Thank
you.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Well, we love to see neighborly love.
All right. So where are we? We are with
Commissioner Fernandez.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, I'm sorry. I was just
going to -- I was up for the Vineyard. So let's do this
(indiscernible).
CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's see if we have
general consensus on these two districts. These are Inyo
to Amador and then the -- the larger NORCAL district.
Any concerns with these districts?
COMMISSIONER YEE: Inyo -- I mean, Inyo, Mono,
Alpine for Amador.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Thank you.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Appreciate the clarification.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I -- I mean, like I said, yes but so I -- I -- my final yes on this is -- is going to be in conjunction with the conversation about Vineyard. Because I want to see where we're going to go in that direction. So yeah --

CHAIR TOLEDO: So what --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- let's keep moving but yes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So you can live with us but we're -- but also, we're going to talk about Vineyard and that may change some -- some --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I could live with a huge long one that's what, the size of Kentucky or whatever?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I could live with that too.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. I think we all did. We all said we could, but we didn't particularly like it.

All right. So let's go to Vineyard, Sacramento.

MS. WILSON: And shall I go to Vineyard keeping this change?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's -- for now, since we have
general consensus, let's keep the change and let's go to
Vineyard and see -- see changes out there. Potential
changes out there.

MS. WILSON: Okay. Thank you, Chair. Oh, am I
done? I'm going --

CHAIR TOLEDO: You are. You are up.


And --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Actually, you -- it's you and
Commissioner Andersen who raised this issue so --

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- we'll -- we'll have
conversation --

MS. WILSON: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- and discussion.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: All right. Thank you. It --
if you recall, I believe it was on Thursday we tried to
take a journey on bringing Vineyard and -- and it
honors -- what we're trying to do is honor the diversity
of Sacramento and the many cultural communities.

We heard from the -- our Asian, Punjabi, Hmong, and
Black communities and revolving around the schools,
family, college, and business. And when we talked about
this on Thursday, initially the Commission wanted to try
to keep all of the changes within Sacramento County. And
initially, we had gone into Folsom, but after thinking
about that, that's a very inappropriate place to be
pulling -- or population from because that is a suburb
community. And as you can see from the -- the district
below, the STANIS district below, it's a rural community.
So I went back and what Kennedy -- so this was my
iteration for today, but I'm thinking we might go back to
the one I had on Thursday because right now, in order to
keep everything self-contained somewhat within Sacramento
County and STANIS, what I ended up having to do was cut
Vineyard. As you can tell, I cut Vineyard at Excelsior
and Excelsior -- East of Excelsior is more of a --
acreage -- there -- there are homes but it's more of
homes on acreage, so it's not that compact, condensed
community.
And then the only other area that was somewhat self-
contained was what we call Laguna West.
So Kennedy, if you move over to the West -- and that
is not a rural area. It's very condense. I think the
population was like 10,000. It's -- it's connected to --
it is part of Elk Grove and the reason I drew the line
there is there is, like, a train track. So there is a
separation and they do call themselves Laguna West versus
Laguna. But however, based on the testimony today, I --
oh, and then also what -- to come up with some more of
the population that we needed to make up for the negative
ten percent is we went into the STANIS and the San
Joaquin -- oops. Where are you? There. Thank you.
There we go.

The STANIS and the Stockton and what we did -- what
I did was take some of the unincorporated areas of some
of the communities that were already in the STANIS, such
as Lathrop and Manteca and then also Ripon. So we -- so
I cut across some of those areas to come up with the
population that we needed. But however, what I'm
wondering is based on the feedback that we received
today, I believe it would be more appropriate to pull
some of the communities from the neighbors and
potentially Calaveras maybe, Or maybe Amador. I'm not
sure. I looked up some of the towns instead of --
instead of from Elk Grove that is a suburb of -- of
Sacramento.

And also, if possible, trying to keep Vineyard whole
also. So that's -- that's kind of the question that I
want to bring forward is which option do we want to go
with? Do we want to go with combining some suburban
communities with this rural district or go with the input
that we received not only in public input today verbally,
but also in our communities of interest in our database.
We also have some feedback there regarding pulling
maybe -- just like, maybe, Copperopolis. And if you were
to turn on the terrain, you could see that not all of it
is foothills. There is some valley agricultural areas in
there as well.

So before I -- we start making changes, Chair,
should we -- I mean, my -- my recommendation would be to
go with some of the more rural areas which makes sense.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's hear from Andersen and
Akutagawa and then we'll start looking at potential
locations.

Commissioner Andersen, Akutagawa, and then --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. Yes, you
know, I --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- and Turner.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- when I -- when I heard that
offer today, I had a look at actually the area that was
suggested which was from the Don Pedro Reservoir which is
actually at the -- is essentially at the Tuolumne-
Mariposa border, up through Copperopolis, and I believe
essentially following all the way -- that up past Ione in
Amador.

And because Commissioner Turner -- Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Fernandez.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- Fernandez, thank you.

It is late.
You know, she's right. That is the flatter portion of -- and so it is even valley area. However, and I'm looking at the numbers and I -- correct me if this is not -- this is -- as it was wrong, but Vineyard is like 44,000 people. And because of the numbers, which they were, basically all of that had to come from someplace else --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- because there wasn't enough play anywhere. And unfortunately, the numbers in Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne together are, like, 144,000. And so basically, you'd have to take a third of each of those counties. So you would -- you'd go much further in or -- now, if -- considering Amador has actually moved away, Calaveras is 45,000 people. So you'd basically have to take the entire county and it's -- you know, that's why I was saying when I -- I really appreciated that offer. It was wonderful, but I don't think they realized the numbers of -- how -- how large Vineyard is. Because, you know, that's -- they don't think that way. Their entire county is that size. So while I think we should have a look at it, I think we'll be a bit, like -- I think we'll be a bit taken aback --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- by how much we lose.
Because it isn't the valley then at all. It's really --

CHAIR TOLEDÔ: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

And just because it's almost -- we're only a couple -- and hour and so away from midnight -- a little bit longer, but about an hour and a half from midnight, I'm going to enforce a one-minute rule.

Kristian, if you could help me.

And so that we can get through all of the -- the conversation. So all right.

Commissioner Akutagawa and then Turner, Fernandez, and others.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I would like to see if there's a way forward where more rural communities can be put together. They -- I think we've heard lots of testimony that rural communities want to stay together.

Just a question, and I don't know if it was possible to do this. I think we heard quite a bit of COI testimony from the Punjabi Sikh community, saying that they wanted Manteca, Ripon, and -- I forgot. There was one more. They wanted it to -- they wanted to either be with Stockton --
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COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- or Stanislaus. So did the numbers just not work, because they said they didn't
want to be with Lodi. So -- and they're with Lodi.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I think we can -- I think there'll be
a response to that as we go through.

Commissioner Turner, then Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I'm just wanting -- I
just wanted to say I am really glad that we're exploring
this. And while we're working it out, if we can also
look at Little Pocket. I'd like to see where that is to
see if we can bring that in with Vineyard as we're trying
to make this work.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And that community is called Little
Pocket?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you.

Let's -- I have it on my list.

Commissioner Fernandez, then Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you, Chair. I
just wanted to respond and say that my -- my
recommendation isn't to just take from the Calaveras or
the Foothills. I also would still recommend that we take
some of the unincorporated areas in the Stockton area.
So that's going to -- it's not the entire extra five
percent will have to come from the Foothills community.
So I was trying to minimize that as well.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.
Did -- did I hear you correctly that you have a visualization for this version that -- or that you're working on a visualization?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So I have a quasi-visualization and fortunately, Kennedy did take a snapshot of what was presented on Thursday. So that would be for the Sac-Elk Grove, West Sac, and Placer, what that impact would be. And then -- then we would take the information from this iteration that shows where we would go into the unincorporated areas. And then we would actually have to go into the Foothills to -- to pick up more.

So it's -- we're close. Very close. I just wasn't -- I didn't know we were going to go this direction.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Got it. So it sounds like we're very, very close.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Uh-huh.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Akutagawa and Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Just real quick, I wanted to also lift up -- I think is what Commissioner Turner was referring to. There's some Black communities in Sacramento that wanted to make sure that their COI was going to be met. I also wanted to lift up that there is
an Afghan refugee community in Arden-Arcade and Carmichael. And that's been also something that's been part of COI testimony, and I know currently right now they're separate. I don't know if there's a way -- a path forward to bring them together. But just wanted to bring that up too. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

So I do want to hear from Kennedy. But before that, let's hear from Commissioner Fornaciari, and then after that Kennedy to see what she -- what her thoughts are on -- on all of these ideas about -- about putting this -- aligning these interests and these COI's.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Just a couple comments. As Commissioner Fernandez said, it's going to have to be a balance of -- maybe a little bit of -- of those Foothill counties. A little bit of probably -- I mean, the East Vineyard. You know, we saw feedback that East Vineyard is less populated. And I'll just offer, Manteca and Lathrop are not rural communities. They are --
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COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: They are highly populated communities. So this is not a fully rural district anyway and so balancing those trade-offs with --
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COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- is -- reasonable.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Now Kennedy, can you tell us about reasonable trade-offs and how we can put this district together without causing too much of an architectural challenge?

MS. WILSON: So if you are okay with taking from Amador and Calaveras, that is what we did have last time. And you know, before there wasn't as much agreement on it, but this is exactly what we had last time, and we were able to balance it with taking from Amador and Calaveras.

And I'm just putting in Commissioner Fernandez's old -- the plan from -- from Thursday because I didn't have it with your new changes from CALA_INYO and NOR_CAL. So I'm not putting that in. I just am doing the last district and then we'll be able to see -- oh, my apologies. Let me go back on that. But I'm going to put that in. But if we are able to take from Amador and Calaveras, that is what balanced it before.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Does this district that we haven't highlighted, did that include the Little Pocket community?

MS. WILSON: So let's take a look because I know that the Pocket area is right here where exactly Little
Pocket is. You know, I don't have, like, a neighborhood layer. But as you can see, the Pocket area is here. I would assume Little Pocket to be -- I -- somewhere over here. But -- so this is Little Pocket.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, you found it. That's excellent.

MS. WILSON: So there's the big pocket and this is the Little Pocket. So we could explore bringing this area in from Riverside Boulevard inwards.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

All right. So let's see. Hands up. We have Fernandez, Turner, Andersen.

Okay. Okay, Fernandez just has it up in case we need her.

So Turner and then Andersen.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, did we -- Commissioner Fernandez and Commission, did we look at moving Arden-Arcade from West Sac into West Placer to free up some space?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Arden-Arcade from -- I'm sorry. One more time.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Uh-huh. Arden-Arcade, moving it from West Sac --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- into Placer.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, it was -- the
population is too high. It is -- if you look on our
sheet of the -- what is that sheet you gave us?

CHAIR TOLEDO: The reference?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. It's one of the
higher --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It's 95,000. Yeah. And
then Carmichael that is right next to it is 80,000. So
it was -- it was too high to move from one to the other.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much.

Let's see. Commissioner Turner. Oh, you just went.

Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yeah, with the
idea of --

CHAIR TOLEDO: (Indiscernible).

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- trying to minimize how much
of the Gold Country we take, can you go ahead and get
those -- you know, the -- the unincorporated areas, you
know, say between Mather and Vineyard? You know,
actually put that into the rural area and the other one
on the West side of the -- yeah. Just a little further
South from where you are right now.

MS. WILSON: Sorry. I was looking at doing the
Little Pocket edition.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: So --
MS. WILSON: And then I --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh.

MS. WILSON: -- if that's okay to -- or I don't --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay.

MS. WILSON: You --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I missed that.

MS. WILSON: -- were talking.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Little Pocket is going to move into Sac, Elk Grove?

MS. WILSON: Yes, which I was going to also say it's at a 4.84 percent so I can see what the numbers will do.

But that is --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Let's highlight Little Pocket.

MS. WILSON: And one moment please. Bless you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Jane.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Actually, it was my daughter.

MS. WILSON: So taking in the Little Pocket, one block group here, it is -- it does put the Sac, Elk Grove at a 5.1 deviation, which I'm not entirely sure if you are 100 percent happy with the boundaries here. But we could move these around a slight bit if you want to bring Little Pocket in.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And Commissioner Fernandez, then Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.
Kennedy, can you zoom out just a little bit, please? A little bit more. I'd like to see the bottom of this district. Okay, can you move -- okay. Can you highlight what the Sac -- okay. That's the Sac, Elk Grove. Part of it too, right there where you -- go back. Right there. We could potentially move that part out and put it into the STANIS. Or I guess we could also --
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COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- put it into the -- the West Placer. But that section right there that is unincorporated. You see what I'm talking about?

MS. WILSON: Yes.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: That was the area -- yes, that was the area --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- that I was hoping would go to STANIS.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: And also the one down between -- I guess it's Freeport and Elk Grove. That chunk on the West side, that unincorporated area, to minimize how much the Gold Country we take.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Okay, I'm just going to let you know that's sixty people, but we can do that.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Well, I know. It
could -- could be the same area in the hills.

MS. WILSON: So if I do -- do you want to proceed forward with bringing in Little Pocket? I would have to make that change first.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I would like to see it and then --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Can we have consensus of -- on visualizing this? Yes. Okay, let's get it done and let's find the swap. All right. Usually I prefer having a place to swap first.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: There's a neck problem.

CHAIR TOLEDO: But we'll find something. Yeah, there -- I see the neck.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: There's a neck, Dale. Did you see the neck?

MS. WILSON: So I will go ahead in this incorporated area. Would you like it with the South Sac STANIS or West Placer Sac?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I would like it with the STANIS to try to minimize the impact, please. I believe that's what Commissioner Andersen also mentioned.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Let's highlight that area of all fifty people who live there.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Chair, can I --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes, Commissioner Ahmad.
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: -- jump in?

CHAIR TOLEDO: So sorry, Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Ah, no worries. No worries. I just -- I know we're moving along this exploration of committing this change, but can I hear some reasoning as to why this wouldn't be added to West Placer.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. The reason that -- it does make sense to add to West Placer but we're also going to have a negative ten percent in the district right next to it, so we're trying to minimize cutting into the foothill counties as much as possible.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: And -- and when you say the district right next to it, which one are you referring to?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It's the STANIS. It's the Istan (phonetic) -- STANIS --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: The one with Wilton?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Oh, okay. Okay. I just --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And that's all still part of -- like, Wilton is still part of Sacramento County as well.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. But we do need population in there. So let's -- let's commit this change because there's literally -- I believe a hundred people. Oh,
let's do the unincorporated area below that as well.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. To the Vineyard.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That -- that white space right there --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- with probably another 200 people.

And let's find some numbers.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sorry. And while we're doing that, there -- is that an unincorporated area between Rancho Cordova and Folsom? I was just wondering if you could grab that maybe too? But I don't know exactly what it is.

CHAIR TOLEDO: All -- almost 500 people.

MS. WILSON: Yeah. So --

CHAIR TOLEDO: There's -- I think there's a little space right underneath it, too, near Vineyard.

MS. WILSON: And -- oh, yes, here. And it does bring you to a 4.92. Still a little high but that does.

CHAIR TOLEDO: But it's -- it -- it makes -- we'll take a -- let's -- we'll take it.

MS. WILSON: Okay. I will commit that change.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And then what's the next change you're going to propose, Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: There's a little bit of unincorporated area between Folsom and Rancho. I -- I
don't know if there's any population there honestly, but we could try --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Let's highlight it and -- let's highlight it and put it in.

MS. WILSON: Okay. I will do. One moment.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

And if we can start looking for places that actually have more population, that would be helpful. We'll do it but -- seventeen. One person. It's okay. It'll make the lines look pretty (indiscernible).

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, there's only -- I would recommend just keeping it how it is.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I guess -- so let -- let's -- let's not accept this change because it makes our lines look less. So in order to -- so I'm trying to figure out the goal. What's our goal here --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- in terms of how many people we need --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. So --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- (indiscernible)?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- the goal now -- so I -- I guess the Sac-Elk Grove District. So if we go down to the STANIS, right? That -- that's probably about ten -- oh, it's negative 9.56.
So Kennedy, the -- the one I sent today. The iteration I sent today had picked up some of the unincorporated areas in Stockton. So could you please try to -- yes. With the French Camp and then right -- oh, yeah. There you go.

MS. WILSON: They are taken in.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, you already did? Okay. So then --

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- we've got negative 9.56 to find in the --

CHAIR TOLEDO: I guess --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, I'm sorry. One more thing. If we want, we can cut into Vineyard into East of Excelsior because that -- that is --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's cut Vineyard.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: All right. East of Excelsior. Let's see how many people are there.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, and then just -- yeah. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: All right. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: All the way to Grant Line
Road --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Excellent.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- please. Thank you, Kennedy.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's share the pain --

MS. WILSON: So I see Excelsior here, so just this portion here of Vineyard?

CHAIR TOLEDO: And anything that's required for contiguity --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: All the way down to Grant Line please.

MS. WILSON: And that's in Elk Grove?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.


CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And let's hear folks in the queue.

So Andersen, Akutagawa, and Sinay, while we're highlighting this area -- oh, it's highlighted. So how many people are here? We have about a 1,000, almost 2,000 people. All right. So let's commit this change. And let's find another place to find population.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Can I just make a recommendation? I would also include -- you see right there, Kennedy, on the -- yeah. Grant Line, yeah. Thank
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. That's -- let's -- I'm looking around. It looks like we have consensus on this so let's take it. And we still need about 8,000 more people, if I remember correctly. Nope? Okay. How many more do we need? So let's figure out how many we need. In the meantime, let's hear from Andersen and Akutagawa. Kennedy, can you speak to how many folks we need?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: We'd love 20,000.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. We need a lot. So let's find a large community to cut. I'm going to -- I'm accepting ideas from the floor.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I would -- I would consider maybe -- I can't even pronounce it.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Copperopolis.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Copperopolis? Thank you. It's really cool looking though, I'm just going to tell you, the name.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: You can have it.

CHAIR TOLEDO: All right. So let's hear from Commissioner Andersen, Commissioner Akutagawa, and Commissioner Kennedy as we start finding -- as we're looking for 20,000 people to put into this district.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: As I said, 20,000 people's a
lot. Yeah, Calaveras has -- the entire county is 35,000.
Tuolumne has 53,000.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. And -- and -- you're --
you're taking, basically, you know, the chunk of the --
the Gold Country and putting it in the -- in the valley.
Yeah, I'd -- I -- I -- I'm not sure. I mean, you can
take a lot -- a lot of people to -- to get there. You'd
probably have to go all the way up to Murphys and cross
all the way through that down to Buck Meadows which is
essentially the Gold Country.

That's where all the cities area. That's where
the --
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VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- Sonora, and the --
actually, there's that, you know, that cool train thing
there. That's a -- it's a really neat area. But --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you. Any other
communities you'd suggest we cut?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I think if you just
try to connect it. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: We're at 24,000 people. And this
is -- I believe this is something that we looked at
earlier. It was very similar to what we looked at on
Saturday.
Commissioner Andersen --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And it -- oh.


COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I was just going to say right now it's at negative 3.44, but if we can maybe try to minimize it for the -- yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So now -- that's be great.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So if we can keep it to the required number.

And then Andersen, Akutagawa, Kennedy, and Ahmad, and Turner.

MS. WILSON: I'm sorry. What would you -- what cities or -- would you like me to remove? Or what would you like me to remove from, so I know where to start or --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: How big is Copperopolis?

I'm going to get that. Oh, it's 3,400. That might be too much. Uh-huh. Okay, yeah. I -- how about, like, around that area, if you can get rid of that? That would be great. Thank you so much.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Actually, again, it --

Calaveras is the capital of -- the city is the capital of a county. Maybe if you could give that back.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That's a good compromise,
Commissioner Andersen. Let's give that back and find another community. Oh, it has been given back and --

MS. WILSON: Rancho -- this is Rancho Calaveras.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, yeah. I -- sorry. I -- I see that now, thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So we -- we have the population we need to get into compliance. I'm going to let --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Actually --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- could we see the terrain which might help us in terms of where the line goes?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Absolutely.

Kennedy, can we see the terrain please?

And it does look like it's in the valley area. And some -- of course, it's reaching the mountains.

Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Actually, you know, if we could maybe -- excuse me. Pull it back up into Amador a little bit and -- and go down -- down the -- you can see sort of there's a slight ridge just West of Copperopolis, if you could kind of go down that slice.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. That -- that's helpful. Let's try to find population down. We'll take population from wherever we can get it. Thanks for that solution, Commissioner Andersen.
Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I -- I looked at the -- I guess, the PDF of the Afghan community, and they don't take up all of Arden-Arcade and they don't take up all of Carmichael. I'm wondering, Commissioner Fernandez, is there a possibility that we could split Arden-Arcade, Carmichael, and then maybe push it into that West PLACER_SAC District, and then maybe even push part of Rancho Cordova into this? That might make picking up some of that population easier?--

CHAIR TOLEDO: I think we have the population, right? No?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh wait. No, we have the population already.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. We've met population numbers.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, I see. Yeah. So maybe after we do this one, if you want to go back up that'd be great.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Let's see. I think we have population here. I'm going to reach out to Commissioner Ahmad, and then Turner, and then we'll have a conversation about next steps.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I just have a question that I think I need clarity on.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Right now, SAC_STANISLAUS, sits at negative 9.21 as on the map prior --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: -- before these proposed changes. And then Elk Grove, SAC Elk Grove, which is behind the chart now, once that -- there you go, sits at 4.57. Why are we not trying to balance between those two districts?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fernandez and others, please answer -- please respond.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. Initially, my proposal was to do that, but as I was mentioning, the part of Elk Grove that I would cut out is a very -- it's part of the suburb areas. And we did hear input today from the community as well as submitted through our -- in our database, that they would prefer that to be with -- to give up some of the Foothill communities and have the suburb areas of the Sacramento area in their district because the district is more rural.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So we're to keep rural communities a whole.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: So this is based off COI?

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- and trying to keep some of the urban communities out of the rural areas, is what you're saying. You're prioritizing the rural over the urban
areas? I'm just -- is that -- did I get that correctly?

Okay. The -- so that's the explanation and rationale.

Commissioner Andersen, then Commissioner Turner.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you. Could I --

I'd really like to pare it down to as little as possible.

Like, if we could give, particularly above Copperopolis,

I think you kind of cut into half a city in -- actually

in that very area. And then even if we could give the --

we have Rancho Calaveras, the other town next to it. You

know, if we could give that back. Any -- up by Plymouth,

if we could trim that area back, too. I mean, you're

giving over Ione, so I just -- I'm trying to keep up --

MS. WILSON: (Indiscernible).

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Go ahead.

MS. WILSON: Oh, sorry. When I give back Valley

Springs, it goes to a negative 5.26.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So it looks like we -- deviation --

we'd be out of deviation.

MS. WILSON: And that one here, this was a block, a

census block, that does have unfortunately a kind of

funky shape. But this one --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh.

MS. WILSON: -- block, you know, the smallest unit

we can click from, it doesn't go into Copperopolis. It
actually is right on the edge of that city. But it does
make that contiguous unless I were to get rid of this
bottom part.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, I see what you're saying.
And that's alone -- that doesn't do it. No, it's still
5.26.

MS. WILSON: I would have to add back Valley Springs
in which I could add back Valley Springs and get rid of
this down here.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well -- yeah. I'm not sure on
that one. I -- you know, it -- yeah, I guess if you
have -- if you're adding Valley Springs, you know, you
might as well give the rest of that little bit back.
Although, I -- well, except I think, you know, there,
we're giving up -- keeping flat in, and taking hills out
so.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Again, this is --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: That (indiscernible) --

CHAIR TOLEDO: I think this is a compromise so.

MS. WILSON: I could try doing Copperopolis over
Valley Springs or choosing one of them. I'm not sure if
that will do it, but taking Copperopolis out, and then
putting Valley Springs in. I mean --

CHAIR TOLEDO: So --

MS. WILSON: -- so -- yeah. One of those has to go
to meet the deviation.

CHAIR TOLEDO: All right. Let's hear from the floor. So we've heard from Fernandez, Andersen. Let's hear from Turner, Sinay, and Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I was wondering, Kennedy, can we zoom out, so we can see what this district is looking like? And is there -- between Stanislaus, Riverbank -- oh, okay. No, the other district, we're already under as well. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much. Let's hear from Commissioner Sinay, then Commissioner Kennedy, Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So we had received input a couple of times from the Rancho Cordova. Yeah, that one city saying you can split us a little so that you can get it done. Is there a reason why we're not doing what the Mayor -- I think it was the Mayor. Commissioner Akutagawa had brought it up before.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That's a good question. Rancho Cordova, the mayor asking to be split. So Commissioner Fernandez, can you please respond?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: He wasn't asking to be split.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: He was like -- he's willing
to give it --

CHAIR TOLEDO: He's suggesting?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- up. Right.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: He also did not deal with the SSAC-STANIS. He just dealt with the Sacramento communities.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And again, Rancho Cordova is also a suburb. And they didn't want Folsom. And they probably don't want -- I realize if a community is willing to give themself up, but it's the same suburban-type community.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez. Thank you for explaining that and for clarifying.

Commissioner Turner, Commissioner Kennedy, Commissioner Sadhwani. Okay. Commissioner Kennedy and then Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thanks. so we still have some to add to South SAC_STANIS. And -- but I was also wanting to say, if we are adding this lowland population, essentially, Valley population or almost Valley population from Amador, Calaveras, could we -- should we restore Vineyard and Elk Grove to be whole? Thanks.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fernand -- I mean,
Sadhwani and then we'll go back to Fernandez and then Turner.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I'm trying to jump in on this one here. So we're trying to keep Copperopolis, I really just wanted to say Copperopolis. We're trying to keep that whole and out of this district; is that kind of the plan? Maybe? Yeah? Yeah? I mean, can we not take that on? Can we go -- I mean, CAL_INYO is also overpopulated at 3.98 percent. Like, we could have this strip running all the way down into Tuolumne if we wanted to, just to pick up some more of that population and --

MS. WILSON: And taking Copperopolis is all you need to get to negative 4. So either Copperopolis or Valley Springs within these two districts will get you to negative --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani. So let's highlight Copperopolis. I hope I said it right, Copperopolis. And then let's go to Commissioner Turner, then Andersen, and we'll make decisions after that.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I wanted to go back to Commissioner Kennedy's comment because I think we only took part of --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- Vineyard. And if we take the entirety of Vineyard and grab Copperopolis and that
whole area straight down, will we be able to balance?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, that's a great suggestion by
Kennedy, and also Turner. Do -- should we accept --
should we highlight this and then go back to -- so let's
get this highlighted and get a contiguous. And then
let's go and look at Vineyard. And then we will take it
one step at a time.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. On this, could we turn
the tray layer on because --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- actually, he did off -- you
know, he was saying from down Don --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Don Pedro.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- Don Pedro reservoir, which
is --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- which is down at the
boar -- you can see and that is the flat where actually
Ione is actually already up in the hills. It's that kind
of actually where from Comanche Village down through Don
Pedro, lower is still in the valley.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So let's take a look at
that. It's --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, Commissioner Fernandez. Do you
have some refinement?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I would recommend -- why don't -- okay. If we would accept it and then only add more if the Elk Grove, Vineyard requires it.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Does that makes sense?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Give it some back.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's accept it. And then let's go to Elk Grove and Vineyard and begin the process of cutting. And we'll --

MS. WILSON: And why don't --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- only accept as much as we need.

MS. WILSON: -- refinement.

CHAIR TOLEDO: You weren't hijacked.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'm concerned about Plymouth.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Andersen, you're --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- on mute.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. I'm sorry. I'm concerned actually up at the top there, if we could zoom in a little bit --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- you know, Plymouth and Drytown, they'll -- they're on 49. But I'm wondering in
terms of that area --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- have we taken out -- yeah.

I'd rather go like straight across in that area North.

See where we're on the 16, but then -- yeah, essentially
go a little bit North of that to -- no.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So you'd like to --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: That area.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- also -- you'd also like to cut

this area?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, not that huge, but just

from the -- that one is -- straight up. That --
exactly -- that's (indiscernible) meant. If we're taking

a line, I kind of like to make it a clean line. But

we're not -- yep, take the -- yeah, you're headed in the

right direction, Kennedy.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. We'll take every person we
can. So that's about a hundred people.

MS. WILSON: And so this block here on the border

just kind of is a --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh.

MS. WILSON: -- bigger block, so -- yeah.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's go to Vineyard. And

Commissioner Fernandez, Commissioner Turner.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- if you can just -- that piece over there in Vineyard on the East that we took out, could you see what that population is that goes from Vineyard to Elk Grove, please? Thank you. And then the bottom part of Elk Grove. That one's going to be a little bit higher. And I think --

CHAIR TOLEDO: About 2,000.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- we're done.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Outstanding.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'll be like Commissioner Fornaciari. I can't -- he can't go to his hometown anymore. I won't be able to go visit my cousins anymore.

CHAIR TOLEDO: All right. So let's see. I think these -- this area is now complete.

Questions, concerns, comments. Commissioner Fornaciari, I'm going to say general consensus on these.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm not going to be able to visit my in-laws anymore.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, no.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: You're welcome.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: It's definitely a compromise. And not -- no one's terribly happy with this, but let's see --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I think a lot --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- except I think --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- a lot of --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- a couple of people --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- a lot of --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- are very happy.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- of people, a lot of, lot of people made a sacrifice on this one.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I agree with you, Commissioner --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: A lot of people.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Andersen. All right. We're good here. We're going to move on to -- we're actually going back to Los Angeles to see what they were able to accomplish out in the San Fernando Valley, and then we'll come back to Oakland and Redwood City. Yes.

Commissioner --

MS. WILSON: One second while we --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- Akutagawa.

MS. WILSON: -- search our computers. Just one moment.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Before you do that, I had asked about the Arden-Arcade --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- and Carmichael.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Sorry.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: The COI there.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Arden-Arcade, COI. I believe there's an Afghan community.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. And according to the PDF of a COI, I guess, map of the area, it's only -- it looks like it's the Northern part of Arden-Arcade and part of Carmichael. It's not the whole entire area, so just my question is, is there a way to bring in either a portion of Carmichael, or in this case split Arden-Arcade and Carmichael, and whether or not it goes to the Placer District just to keep that COI whole?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I hear you, Commissioner Akutagawa. And if we go back actually several days, that had been my initial suggestion when we started this whole journey of trying to shift all of this population around to get Vineyard in. I think at this point, we haven't achieved it here, but let's keep it on our list for Congress and Senate as we move forward. That's my perspective on it. I hear you, though, and I'm
aware of the COI that we're breaking up but.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I mean, could we just see what the COI looks like? Maybe that will also help, too.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I think there's a lot of population in here, going to set off all --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. They gave some specific boundaries. And it doesn't look that large. That's why I'm pushing it. Otherwise, I would just be happy to move on. But it didn't look like that large, but I don't know if, Kennedy, you have the -- if they sent you a shapefile for this community.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's -- Kennedy, if you have the shapefile, can we take a look at it?

MS. WILSON: I do not have that loaded into this machine. But if you were able to tell me the boundaries, I could --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Akutagawa, do you the boundaries of the --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- the COI?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm just looking for that right now. I had it and then -- now I don't --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I had it, but I can't find it.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- yeah.
CHAIR TOLEDO: So --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: They sent a map. It was on
the -- it was in the database that we got.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Fabulous. Okay.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I appreciate all we're doing,
but I remember we started today's conversation with our
two or three top priorities.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And I think it was actually one
or two priorities and some of us went up to three
including myself. But now, every time we go in
somewhere, we're looking up COIs again and we're starting
back at the what-ifs and adding. Can we stick to our
priorities and really try to get this done because we are
going to be here for another two, three hours if we keep
this way.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: The time to look at --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Thank you. Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- at COIs and all that was
during the what-ifs.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That's true. So let's -- we have
three regions that are still on our priority list. We
have Oakland; we have Redwood City; and we have the San
Gabriel Valley. Let's go back to the San Gabriel Valley where we're having a switch. And then if we are able to get the Afghan community --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I have it now.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- shapefile then to Kennedy, then she can work on it.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- while we're finalizing the San Gabriel Valley and then we can come back to at the end if there's time. All right. So let's try to -- and I think Oakland and Redwood City will be fast. The San Gabriel Valley may not be so quick.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Could we do those then quickly, maybe, please, please? Do Oakland and Redwood City and knock them out?

CHAIR TOLEDO: No, let's just -- let's go to the San Gabriel Valley because that's a --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- that's a more difficult conversation.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: We'll come back.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I might have to check out, guys.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, you want to -- you're not --
MS. CLARK: Commissioners --
CHAIR TOLEDO: -- hopefully, this will be a --
MS. CLARK: I --
CHAIR TOLEDO: -- quick conversation, it'll be here.
MS. CLARK: -- don't know if Commissioner Vazquez is still on.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: She's not.
MS. CLARK: Oh, she's not. Okay. So I will review the changes that she made. And just a quick note is that we did move Hidden Hills with the Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Topanga. So this is the only switch that is not self-contained in San Fernando Valley. And to accomplish that, we moved the line here in Bel Air. It was -- Bel Air was already split in between the Maui (ph.) East -- Malibu East Ventura District, and the Westside District. And we just moved that to include Hidden Hills.
And the rest of the changes are as follows: This is very similar in a lot of ways to the draft map that the Commission got positive feedback on. This in SCV, it includes Santa Clarita Valley with Granada Hills, Porter Ranch, Chatsworth, Northridge. This district is at 1.95 percent deviation.
South San Fernando Valley includes Bell Canyon, West Hills, Canoga Park, Winnetka, Woodland Hills, Tarzana,
and Encino, Sherman Oaks, HoSo (ph.). For population, we included Greater Valley Glen. It also includes Valley Village and Studio City. And that's 3.94 percent deviation.

Central SFV includes the Northern part of Reseda. For population, we had to split that a little bit. And so that's Reseda, Lake Balboa, Van Nuys, North Hollywood, including Greater Toluca Lake. Sun Valley area, this dividing line along the 5 and includes Mission Hills and includes Arleta. And then East San Fernando Valley includes Sylmar, San Fernando, Pacoima, Burbank, this Northern part, the City of Glendale, and Sum Lanta Hunga (ph.).

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Jaime. Can you speak to the changes that were made on the impact to goal? So did this change any of the Black/Asian/Latino majority districts? Are our numbers about the same? Are they different? Did they -- did these changes change the number of minority/majority districts?

MS. CLARK: Yeah. So in Central San Fernando Valley District, the percent Latino CVAP is 50.08 percent. Now, this is the only 50 percent plus Latino CVAP district in San Fernando Valley. So that was a change. And this is not a VRA area per your VRA council. And so --

CHAIR TOLEDO: So we dropped from eleven-fifty --
eleven Latino majority districts to ten with this change?

MS. CLARK: That's correct.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. A conversation -- let's have a conversation about this. Let's -- Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I think these changes seem reasonable to me. The only little thing I was going to add, and full disclosure, I live next door in La Canada (ph.) and used to still live in Glendale. La Crescenta is a part of the Glendale School District. And it seems like -- I don't know what the population exactly is, but putting that little yellow bit of La Crescenta into that district might make sense because they do share a school district. But I have no skin in the game, so if it doesn't happen, it doesn't happen.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner -- any other comments on this?

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Going back to, Jaime, Central South -- I mean, Central San Fernando Valley. I'm looking at -- can we -- Toluca Lake. Yeah. Can we take it out?

MS. CLARK: Yes, and I had received previous direction from the Commission to include Toluca Lake with North Hollywood.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Can we just remove it and see what it does to the deviations and the CVAP?

(Pause)

MS. CLARK: So the -- where's my -- so this would make the percent deviation of South SFV 6.76 percent and the percent deviation of Central SFV 0.1 percent.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Can you put the full block on that shows all of the -- all of the CVAP area?

MS. CLARK: Did you want to see Latino CVAP?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, please. So it went from -- without Toluca, it moved and it's a non-VRA area, but it moved from fifty to what?

MS. CLARK: To 51.27.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. But then we're over. Okay. Six and South -- so then -- okay. I don't have anything else, but I don't like losing the other.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. I don't like it either, but we'll have to see what we can come up with. And let's see with Commissioner Kennedy, Commissioner Akutagawa, and others.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. Just noting that instead of moving towards consolidating the North Hollywood area, which is not just the nor -- the NoHo Neighborhood Council, but Toluca Lake, Valley Glen, NoHo, North Hollywood Northeast, North Hollywood West, Valley
Village, Van Nuys, all of that, just -- it seems to be less coherent than it was. Again --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- if --

CHAIR TOLEDO: I agree.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- we have to, we have to.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Just for clarification, what is the CVAPs for East San Fernando Valley again, especially the Latino one?

MS. CLARK: In this iteration, the Latino CVAP for East San Fernando Valley, is 39.18 percent.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So then if you were to add La Crescenta, it's probably going to go down even more.

Just the Santa Clarita Valley one, I think that that includes -- what are -- what's the cities that are right next to that central San Fernando Valley in that corner? Yeah, like where your cursor is right now?

MS. CLARK: That's Northridge and North Hills West Neighborhood Council.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And what's the deviations for Santa Clarita Valley and -- well, it looks like Central is about two points -- in other words, can you maybe pick up that corner, that North Hills West and maybe even that Northridge area to maybe bring up some of
that CVAP since there seems to be a -- you know, along those edges, it might help bring that up without blowing the deviation?

MS. CLARK: No.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Too many people?

Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: We did get quite a few -- a lot of feedback from communities including -- and I want to say dozens and dozens, scores of feedback from VICA (ph.), which did that do a really good job of putting this together. I'm sure that there might be -- you know, that was business community. That was the community. That was individuals in this area. I'm just wondering if maybe we can take -- if we can take a look at the VICA maps as we develop this. Commissioner Sadhwani, I know you had your hand raised.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. That was --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Then Turner, then Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. That was exactly going to be what I was going to say is -- you know, I think this is one option for us. I see the VICA maps that came in, and I feel like reorienting slightly, having Glendale, Burbank still go --

CHAIR TOLEDO: So --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- westward could be another
option to kind of preserve the communities right there in
the central region of the Central Valley, going up
through Sylmar, San Fernando, Pacoima, et cetera, and
kind of reorienting us that way. (Indiscernible) --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.
I'm wondering if you could work with Jaime over the next
couple of minutes to try to see if there's a way we can
kind of reorient in that direction, see if there's a
possibility. And while we go to Oakland and Redwood City
because I know we may have -- Commissioner Andersen maybe
leaving in a -- no, she's still there. She -- Linda,
she's there.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Oh.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, I don't know -- she may stay if
we're working on Oakland. So -- but I -- but anyways.
So let's go to Oakland and Redwood City and have
Commissioner Sadhwani work on this offline. If
Commissioner Kennedy has a comment, any suggestions for
Commissioner Sadhwani and -- or feedback for Commissioner
Sadhwani, and Jaime, while we're --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. Thank you, Chair. I
don't know, Commissioner Sadhwani, if this is along the
lines of what you were saying, but if we brought that
line that's currently at the 5 to the West, and then
picked up additional population for Central SFV in
Winnetka and Canoga Park, does -- what does that do to our LCVAP in East SFV? I just get the sense that that might help us if we did shift that line West from the 5 and then push the Central SFV District a little bit to the West. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Good point, Commissioner Kennedy. And in the meantime, let's switch line drawers. Let's go to the Bay Area, where we have Redwood City and Oakland to look at. And I know we have maps for those areas that have been drawn, and so -- and for us to look at. I don't think it'll take too long to come back to --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: This, should not take long.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- but -- and so -- but in the meantime, we'll -- if Commissioner Sadhwani could work with Jaime.

Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani, for volunteering.

MS. WILSON: And one moment while we have --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Volun-told (ph.).

CHAIR TOLEDO: I volunteered her. Volun-told.

She's not going to like -- fight back that.

MS. WILSON: -- also -- excuse me. Really quickly.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.

MS. WILSON: Commissioner Akutagawa, do you have a shapefile that you're able to send?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, that's right. The shapefile for
the Afghan community in Sacramento.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I -- I'll try to look and see. The PDF was the only one that I found, so I'll look.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And in the meantime, let's get Tamina, who we haven't gotten a chance to work with all day on -- online. And we're getting closer. It's Bay Area, San Fernando Valley, and potentially taking a look at a little bit of Sacramento and be -- and we'll be done.

Hey, Tamina, welcome.

Oh, she can't hear us.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Good evening, everybody.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Hi, Tamina.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Hey, Tamina. You're so happy and you have so much energy this evening.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Are you in a different time zone?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Are you in Hawaii?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I wish (indiscernible) there.

MS. RAMOS ALON: I'm just trying to be my best.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, thank you. We always appreciate you, and everybody else on staff, and the Commissioners. Let's see. And the public who is sending in so much feedback. All right. So let's go to Oakland.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay. Yes, Chair.
CHAIR TOLEDO: And we have Commissioner Yee, who has his -- who's been able to work on the Oakland area and is doing some cleanup.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. The hometown hero/GOAT. So we received quite a bit of feedback, including calls this morning about the split in Rockridge, that's in North Oakland. You see there in the yellow line what we had, and that feedback was richly deserved. I don't know what I was thinking. So we have moved the line.

The line now goes down Shattuck. From Shattuck over to -- okay. From Shattuck crossing the -- Highway 24, over to 51st Ave. This keeps the Kono community of interest, which is actually also an Eritrean Ethiopian community of interest whole with Oakland. Comes down Broadway, and comes over 40th Ave, which turns into Monte Vista, I believe, and over to the Piedmont border.

Follows the Piedmont border -- Southern border and goes straight up Park Boulevard. Full disclosure, this changes my district all the way to Highway 13, then comes up on the Northern side of Joaquin Miller Park, and then continues out as it was before. So this keeps Rockridge whole.

I want to say about it. It does shift, so all the -- all the Oakland Hills communities go with East Bay. Kaiser Hospital Oakland stays with Oakland.
Children's Hospital actually goes with East Bay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Anything else to point out?

Yeah, the deviations look good. So we feel -- Commissioner Andersen and I feel good about this.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Anything you want to add about the -- add to this, Commissioner Andersen?

Commissioner Kennedy?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Nope. It's great.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Nope. Okay. It's great. It looks reasonable to me.

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Just two small cleanup items. On the Eastern edge of Piedmont, if we could zoom in.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Such an eye you have.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: And some more.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Fine.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Incredible.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: There's a little -- that little speck of yellow on the left side -- on the Eastern edge of Piedmont.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Coming up Park Boulevard.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. Yeah. Is that -- is
there population in -- on the left-hand side of that road, there's a little strip of yellow. Yeah. Is that populated?

MS. RAMOS ALON: There are four people here, and five people here.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah, I would suggest that we move those to join the people on the other side of the road.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Tamina, is that the Piedmont city limit?

MS. RAMOS ALON: The Piedmont city limit is the purple. So it's -- the Piedmont -- the yellow would still be Oakland.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. Okay. Yeah. That's a good move, then. Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: And then at the Northern end of the park on the Eastern edge of this district, I think it was.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Oh, Joaquin Miller, perhaps?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. There's that little -- it almost looks like kangaroo ears or something up at the top there. Again, that looks like part of -- oh, I see. That's all Oakland.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. It still looks a bit odd.

COMMISSIONER YEE: We were going for the park boundary. But the park has actually expanded over time, and so we're thinking that's why it probably crossed over. If we took all of the park, then we would end up with more to the streets to the Northwest, and we didn't want to do that.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So just for counsel, does the neck cause any problem here?

COMMISSIONER YEE: It's not -- it's --

CHAIR TOLEDO: No population there.

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- (indiscernible) park there, yeah. Although, I see a 12 there.

CHAIR TOLEDO: It's unpopulated. Okay. Great. Any other changes for the Oakland area? Any other proposed changes for the Oakland area?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Can we zoom out and just see it again?

CHAIR TOLEDO: And also, I just wanted to ask if the VICA folks are listening -- and I know they are always listening, if you could send your shapefiles to Voters FIRST email, that would be greatly appreciated. Thank you. As we're working through our maps in the San
Fernando Valley.

All right. The Oakland area looks good.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: What's at the top of East Bay?

Oh, that's there that we did.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Rodeo --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I remember.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I got it.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Excellent.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So I recommend we take -- finalize this.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I am looking at the room, in the -- in our portal. Everyone is in agreement, or at least we have consensus -- a general consensus is what I'm seeing. So let's move on to Redwood City. Let's accept it. Let's move on to Redwood City. And then if we have time, we'll go out to Sacramento.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. The one unhappy split we had in Redwood City was -- I'm sorry, in this district was Redwood City. You'll recall, we tried to split the Lamar Hill (ph.) parts of Redwood City from the flats. So this is a proposal to make Redwood City whole. We do that by taking in Pacifica to Half Moon Bay, into South Penn (ph.) and also adjusting that line at Gato Santa Cruz to shift a little bit of the unincorporated
population. And so this makes Redwood City whole.

So wondering if anyone has any thoughts about moving
Half Moon Bay with the South Bay communities of -- you
know, all the way down to Los Altos --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thirty seconds

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- Mountainview.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- to break, Chair.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And it does look like
they're in the county of San Mateo. Did we keep the
County of San Mateo whole? And we do need to go break in
a minute, so --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- you can -- if somebody knows the
answer to that. Well, we don't, right? We have a
portion in -- out of the district, but --

MS. RAMOS ALON: The county of San Mateo is in three
districts, but this actually reduces, it used to be in
four; so now it is back in three.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That's good. So there's one fewer
cut. Looking around the room, any concern about this
change? We're getting a lot of consensus here, so let's
move -- let's accept this change, and then we'll go to
break, 15 minutes. And then after that, we'll go to
Sacramento if we have the shapefiles for the Afghan
community. Thank you.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Tamina.

(Whereupon, a recess was held 9:53 p.m. until 10:10 p.m.)

CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California Citizens Redistricting. We're in Sacramento exploring some communities of interest focused on the Afghan community in Sacramento.

Commissioner Akutagawa and Kennedy, can you please --

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- let -- just tell us a little bit about this Afghan community in Sacramento, and where they're located, and how many people are in this district?

MS. WILSON: So here is the COI; I went ahead and added it to West SAC just because the deviation is lower here. So this would -- bringing it over to West Placer would bring it too far over. We are at a 5.09. This goes out to Manzanita Avenue, in their COI testimony I read, and it said West of Manzanita Avenue. So that's what we took in and followed their shapefile. I think we could explore bringing this in and either putting La Riviera or McClellan Park into West Placer SAC to balance it. That's the short, and that's all I have to say.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you -- what are your thoughts
about the opportunities and the challenges of putting -- of shifting these populations?

MS. WILSON: I think it's, you know, community interest for your decision. But --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

MS. WILSON: -- but making a swap like -- it's at 5.09, so it's not very high. So taking one of these out would do the trick.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So potentially taking out Rosemont or swapping out Rosemont might do the trip -- trick; is that what you're saying, or is it --

MS. WILSON: Sorry, it's La Riviera.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, La Riviera and McClellan Park.

MS. WILSON: Well, I just see those as kind of an easy fix for one of these two to move out. They're both not very big, but enough to bring the deviation down.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So we're looking at La Riviera or McClellan Park as potential swaps. Thoughts from the floor? Linda -- Commissioner Akutagawa, and then Commissioner Fernandez, and then we'll -- oh, my -- my face wasn't showing. Here we go.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'll have Commissioner Fernandez go first.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That's good.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think got my question in,
so thanks.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fernandez, then.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And then Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I would prefer not to move La Riviera, because that's somewhat close to SAC State and some of the housing in that area. Maybe McClellan Park might be a better swap. Is that what you said, Kennedy, was McClellan Park or La Riviera? Yeah, I would -- I would prefer to keep La Riviera where it is. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'll be honest. At this hour, I do not remember what all the communities of interest were, and there were a lot here; and we did a lot of work to make sure we had different communities of interest together.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So my concern would be, if we do anything, it's just going to mess up another one. I just really want us to be careful, because I feel like we worked really hard and really, really, really long in this area, and that we may just do less harm if we (audio interference).

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So Let's go to
Commissioner Akutagawa, then Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think we've been hearing consistently about this particular COI. I think there were some other COIs we weren't able to meet, but I think this seems like this one, based on what I've read, that we can accomplish now that we have the shapefiles, and the addition is a lot smaller than the entirety of Carmichael.

So you know, as much as we can, I think we've tried to make sure that we've, you know, tried to keep the COIs together. And this one seems like, for a refugee community, it would be important for them to be able to be together.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner --

MS. WILSON: And --

CHAIR TOLEDO: I'm sorry, Kennedy.

MS. WILSON: If I may, just from, you know, testimony in courts I've worked with, I have seen McClellan Park, North Highlands and Foothill Farms being a COI.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So the -- so in fact, these would -- it would be appropriate to put McClellan, North Highlands, and Foothill, based on community of input testimony is what you're saying?

MS. WILSON: Yes.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Potentially.

MS. WILSON: That's -- yeah, potentially, but --

CHAIR TOLEDO: That the COIs are aligned. Okay.

MS. WILSON: -- yeah, that's a COI that I have seen.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Fernandez, you have additional testimony or advice --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- suggestions?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: One of those. I'm glad you gave me choices. Can you -- Kennedy, can you please zoom into that area that you have highlighted? I didn't -- I kind of cut the tail end of the boundaries.

MS. WILSON: Oh, yes, of course. So we have here at the top is Winding Way, and then this is Manzanita Avenue going down on the Eastern border, and then towards the bottom we have Kenneth Avenue here and El Camino Avenue. And then just following the COI that was sent in, I'm just following their shapefile lines, but those are -- or this is actually Fair Oaks Boulevard.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Right. The COI I read did say Fair Oaks Boulevard.

MS. WILSON: Yes, and that's my apologies. Fair Oaks Boulevard, not --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- well, and Manzanita Avenue
turns into Fair Oaks Boulevard.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Right. And that's what they -- it was Fair Oaks and Eastern Manzanita, so -- okay.

MS. WILSON: So those ran into each other.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: All right. Thank you. I was just trying to make sure it wasn't running into a major -- okay. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fernandez, what are your thoughts about the swap? And others.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Let me think. I would honestly prefer to keep Carmichael together, but -- because that's one -- somebody's playing, because that's -- that is a separate COI also, is to keep the communities full. So I'm --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Jaime.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- either way at this point. It's midnight.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- so --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It's Tuesday.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- okay. So let's hear from others.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I think I'm going to say the same thing as Commissioner Fernandez. I mean, we've got a lot of testimony kind of saying keep Carmichael
together, keep Carmichael with Arden-Arcade together.
And I guess here we keep parts of both of those together.
And then we've got another -- I mean, I just feel like we
work -- part of why we worked so hard here was there was
this priority to keep cities whole, and that's why we
couldn't do that Viejo. And yes, I'm going to bring up
Viejo again. And so I just -- either way, but let's be
consistent. I mean, we can't --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I just want to remind
everybody that as much as we want to keep cities whole,
they're on the same level as COIs. And I believe what I
read is the reason to keep Carmichael with Arden-Arcade
was because of this refugee community. And so that's
what I read. So anyways, COIs and cities are on the same
level; they're number 4. So that's all I'll say.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Looking for general consensus
here. Okay. Anyone in opposition to this change? I'm
looking for opposition at this point. Or not. Is not
willing -- not able to live with this.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm not in opposition. I'm
just getting -- I just think we need -- I feel like when
I bring up communities of interest, people kind of go
over it really quickly, and it's not important. I do feel that we're -- gotten to the point -- we are in the 12th hour, literally, and it's time, you know -- just let's be more -- either we put in all the communities of interest that everyone brings up, because when another place is -- when they've been brought up, people ignore them; or we just -- you know, this is really pretty late into the process to try to look up every COI that we might be missing, because we're going to be missing them. I mean, you know, we -- San Pedro asked not to be with Long Beach and they asked to be together. They got -- they're not with Long Beach, necessarily, but they're not together. I mean, we've been hacking, and all over the place doing all sorts of things. So yes, let's move forward on this. But let's also agree that it's time not to dig deep into the COIs, but to just move forward.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Ms. Sinay -- or Commissioner Sinay. And you know, it's hard when we're balancing COIs and having to make difficult decisions. I'm looking for general consensus here. No, I don't see anyone particularly loving it or not -- you know, not particularly opposed, so -- or not in opposition, I should say. It's late, so I'm not as clear as I should be.
So with that, I do see general consensus to move forward as folks can live with this change. And it potentially brings together the Afghan refugee community -- or it does bring together the Afghan refugee community. Fabulous. So with that, we will move back down to Los Angeles, San Fernando Valley. It's the last region to be looked up. And so we will -- thank you so much, Kennedy. Thank you for staying with us, for everything you do for us, and for helping us through the Northern California Assembly Districts; really appreciate it. Thank you, Karin, too, for all you do.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just -- hi. Just one moment, please. Jaime is on the way over here. She's just talking with Commissioner Sadhwani.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Excellent. Thank you so much. And thank you all for everything you're doing. And we will switch over.

Kennedy, anything you have to say before you go?

MS. WILSON: Good night.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Good night and have a good evening. Sleep well. Thank you, again.

MS. WILSON: You, too.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So we're going to take a five-minute break so that we can switch line drawers and get a glass of water, maybe some caffeinated drinks, and then we'll
be right back. I do see that -- I do hear that there has
been some progress made in the San Fernando Valley, so
let's keep our fingers crossed. All right. We'll see
you in a couple of minutes.

(Pause)

CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are looking at the San -- at the San Fernando Valley region. This is our final region before we complete our maps. And I believe we have two versions of a map. So I will turn it over to Jaime and Sara to walk us through all of the iterations that they've been able to walk through over the last half hour or so, and to present on the options.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. So I'll just start us off, and then Jaime can walk us through some of the options. I'll just note we were able to identify and find the VICA shapefiles, thankfully. Unfortunately, what we received seemed to be based on an older version of our map, not on where we are right now with different proportions of Glendale, it seemed.

So it didn't fit with what we had exactly. So the -- it -- the proportions were still off, the deviations were still off. So we took a stab at reworking something. Yeah, let us know what you think.

We have two different versions. I think, notably, we
took Glendale, Burbank out of that East SFV district, which is, you know, where, you know, going up to Sylmar, San Fernando, Pacoima.

In that area, you'll notice that that has most certainly connected many of those communities of interest that we've heard from, many essential workers and others.

It does still pair Glendale all the way out to Woodland Hills. We offer two versions; neither is perfect, for sure.

In the one that we're looking at right now -- and I'll let Jaime talk more about it, we are certainly cutting into Neighborhood Councils districts; and we are doing so kind of close to the 101. And I recognize that was not something anyone is asking for. But at the same time, we're trying to work with what we have, and keep the changes localized and meet all of our goals. So this is one option.

And then a second option that we'll -- I'll let Jaime go through this, and a second option that you're going to see in just a second is going to take a look at Woodland Hills, in particular, and bringing that in to that central SFV.

So Jaime, do you want to walk us through some of these options that we looked at?

MS. CLARK: Sure. So for both options, SCV and East
SFV are the same; so I'm just going to sort of show those first, and then move on to the other ones. So Santa Clarita Valley with this is included with Granada Hills, Northridge areas, Porter Ranch, Chatsworth, West Hills, and Bell Canyon.

In East SFV, it's Sylmar, San Fernando, Mission Hills, Pacoima, Arleta, Sun Valley, NoHo areas, Greater Valley Glen, Sum Lanta Hunga, and Foothills Trails, and includes the Burbank Airport. As Commissioner Sadhwani noted, Glendale and Burbank are not with these other communities along the 210.

And as such, this South SFV-based district includes Glendale, North of 134, Burbank, except for the areas around the airport, North Hollywood Neighborhood Council, Greater Toluca Lake, Studio City, Sherman Oaks, South of POSO. And then Encino, Tarzana, and Woodland Hills areas South of the 101.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

MS. CLARK: And then the other version, which I will switch to right now -- one moment, please, while I load that up, basically, is very similar in the South SFV district. And instead of following the 101, it keeps more Neighborhood Council areas full, but it includes -- it includes Woodland Hills with the Central SFV-based district. So you can see here --
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

MS. CLARK: -- Woodland Hills, Warner Center is with Central SFV. And Glendale and Burbank go out to Tarzana.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Jaime. And Commissioner Sadhwani.

Any comments on the floor? And I think we do have three options. So the three options that we have is, one, we have a map that we -- that the community didn't particularly like, but that we had consensus on two days ago.

And then we have these two additional that we're working through. If we could, you know -- and it's getting late, so let's try to see if we can find a consensus on this. And maybe -- maybe the option is that we stick with the ones we have approved now, and that we -- we don't have to make a final decision on these until the 18th of December, but we have general consensus throughout the maps. And it is difficult at this late hour to really make final decisions on this, so -- Commissioner Sadhwani, what are your thoughts?

And the rest of the floor, what are your thoughts? Because -- especially if we're going to be making such important decisions in the final region, trying to redraw this whole area with -- now we -- we've lost a couple of Commissioners as well.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I mean, I'm -- I would be fine to like, let this region sit with anyone of those versions, and happy to continue to work with Jaime. We might -- maybe we'll get additional testimony as well about different iterations. I mean, I think what I'm hearing is that we're -- we are feeling really good about Los Angeles underneath this.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And so whatever changes we make need to be localized here. So I would feel totally comfortable to continue working on this. But I see other hands. So I'm happy to hear what other folks are thinking. And -- yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Turner, Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I think the maps have great potential. And I would just like to understand -- Jaime, could you tell me between the two presentations that were just made, what are the differences, just the high level? I didn't get it. Not what's different from --

MS. CLARK: So the --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- what we've had before; what's the difference in those two?

MS. CLARK: -- so the difference in these two is that in
this version, Woodland Hills Warner Center is almost
entirely included with these central San Fernando Valley
areas that I'm circling with the hand right now --

COMMISSIONER TURNER:  Uh-huh.

MS. CLARK:  -- whereas in the other version that we
saw, Glendale and Burbank go all the way out to the --
sort of the edge of where I'm highlighting with the hand
now, and then these areas, which are North of the 101,
are included in central San Fernando Valley.  So a
difference --

COMMISSIONER TURNER:  So --

MS. CLARK:  -- is that more Neighborhood Council
areas are split.  And in this one, Woodland Hills Warner
Center is still split -- the split is smaller, and it's
with these central San Fernando Valley-based districts.
So yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO:  Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY:  I was going to ask what I think
you just answered at the end, which is, there's less
splits in this version we're looking at right now than
the prior version.  And if that's -- so what I would like
us to think about is actually --

I hear what you're saying, Chair, but I would like
us to throw out the map that wasn't working and maybe
keep two of, you know, these two maps with this one that
has the least amount of splits in the map visualization now so -- the iteration -- the map iteration -- so that the community can give us input on this one. Because I would rather us not leave one in the map tool and continue to get input on the wrong, you know -- on the map that we know they don't like, that at least if we're on the right path or we can find out if we're on the right path, but I don't want to leave the one that they've already been critiquing, and we've already done some work to fix.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yep, I totally agree. I think that's where we cause confusion when we leave too many things out.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And it would be great if we can even say what our favorite of these are, and then just get the community to respond from that. Because the other iterations are posted, they will see them, they'll have that as an option, but perhaps we can say this is what we're leaning towards. And I'd love to lean towards the one with the fewer splits, but one of these two.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's compare the two. And I'm going to look around the room to see if we have consensus. Okay. Let's take a look at the two.
MS. CLARK: So we can't look at them side by side, so just everybody take a good look at this one, and then I'm going to switch to the other version. So just again, highlighting the -- in this one, Woodland Hills Warner Center is with these areas I'm circling, and Glendale and Burbank only go out to Tarzana; so that's the difference, so just commit that to memory, please.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, that's a good idea.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We're all going to be dreaming this map now.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I lost it. It looks exactly the same.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Are you messing with (indiscernible)?

MS. CLARK: No, I'm not trying to.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Now I feel like I'm in the optometry office. Yeah, that's very different.

MS. CLARK: So here is -- again, this district, it's these -- the areas I'm circling are the same in both versions, and then this line goes down and follows the highway, and this district goes from Glendale out to the county border and includes this part of the Woodland Hills area. So basically, this district is longer.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

MS. CLARK: And in the other version, this district
includes this area; those are the differences.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can you put the other one back on?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

MS. CLARK: One second, please.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So while Jaime's doing that, I'll just note, like, Woodland Hills -- from what I know of Woodland Hills, is -- it's pretty different than Van Nuys and other areas in the central SFV area. And we've heard testimony in the past about the differences that exist within the San Fernando Valley, which is why these maps -- you know, even as we were drawing them, we're just trying to find solutions in a -- in the time that we have. They give me a little bit of pause, and you know, so I -- you know, this map that we're looking at here brings in all of Woodland Hills; definitely a different sort of profile from some of the other areas in the central SFV region. But given the Glendale/Burbank piece, right, that we have Glendale to contend with here in this area, we -- Glendale can either go North or it can go West. And so I think Commissioner Vazquez's map had it going North; in this iteration, we have it shifting westward. These are the things that we're kind of playing around with and this was as much as we could do in the time that we had, but certainly, I think -- I
know that we're scheduled on December 18th to come back

to not just Assembly, but Assembly, Senate, and Board of

Equalization, but if there's a desire to continue kind of
thinking about this, I think that could be an upper --
this might be a reasonable place to spend a little time
on the 18th, and we could come back with some additional
ideas for this region if need be.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, and we can also ask the
community to provide additional ideas, including VICA,
who's been so active in this area.

So Commissioner Sinay, Commissioner Fornaciari.

It's best if they use their latest version of the
maps.

Commissioner Sinay --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I would like --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- and Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I would like us to use this
map, and I would also like us to explore it because it
looks like East San Fernando Valley is at a negative, and
South San Fernando Valley is at a positive, if it's
possible to add more of Burbank -- I mean, to make
Burbank more whole. I know that might change it.

And I'm not saying now, Jaime, so you don't have to
worry; I'm just saying as we're exploring. But it would
be great if we could -- I would say this map.
CHAIR TOLEDO: So you're suggesting we balance the two -- the central SFV and the East SFV in terms of population.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes, but very specifically with Burbank.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And very specifically with Burbank. I get you.

All right. Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I was going to say I would go with this map to get feedback on.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And Jaime, we owe you a vacation.

CHAIR TOLEDO: We do, a big one. We'll take you to our next vacation.

Commissioner Sadhwani, and then Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I just wanted to note, responding to Commissioner Sinay, the challenge with Burbank is that it -- it's the gateway to Glendale; so where Burbank goes, if it goes in whole, so must Glendale. So that's the one thing that we're just trying to play around with because of the geography of how there -- the -- those two are so closely connected. And they are, right? I mean, they certainly are very much
connected, also culturally as well, but that's definitely one of the key pieces that we're thinking about.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Kennedy, Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: My own preference at this point would be to continue with the current maps, but ask the team working on it to continue to look at other options and see what other options we have by the time we get back to this on the 18th. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Just a question. Is this 210 over here, where I'm waving my mouse, is that correct at this point, or does that -- that includes the changes that they made earlier. Okay. Okay. Well, that's something to think about. All right. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

Okay. So we need to come to some kind of general consensus on it.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm sorry, did I miss it in the beginning?

Commissioner Sadhwani, were you recommending one of them? And I apologize, you might have said it, but I might have missed it.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I mean, maybe this splitsville one, right, where it's splitting through along the 101, at least those areas are a little bit more connected than the Woodland Hills one -- this one that we're looking at. But I mean, either one, honestly, whatever the Commission feels comfortable with, I'm definitely happy to collect public comment on this area and continue to work with Jaime to think about additional potential options when we have more than twenty minutes to do so.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, I guess at this point I'm kind of leaning towards this one or the other new one only because the feedback so far has been the one we have now is horrible. So I feel if we at least post, maybe we're getting warmer, maybe we're getting colder, but at least that gives us another -- gives us different feedback.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Commissioner Fornaciari, Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I think that, you know, now that -- now this is our constraint at this point, right? I mean, this is the constraint. The feedback we're going to get is within the constraint that we have, and so you know, I think that will help guide us
to get to a better place.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Yee and Commissioner -- and rather, Jaime.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, thanks to everyone who's worked on this. You know, I'm thinking whatever we post, we're going to get feedback, and it's going to be mixed, you know? And if we post the other one, we'll get feedback, and it's going to be mixed. So I'm looking for help how -- and not being personally familiar with this area -- looking for help. How am I going to weigh which side of the mix to fall, you know? What principles, what general things can we say about this area that are going to help guide my thinking? You know, Commissioner Sadhwani just mentioned some things about West Hills, for instance. You know, just looking for some help to make that decision.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner.

Or rather, Commissioner Akutagawa, and then I think we had Karin and Jaime who had something to say, too.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just going to ask Commissioner Yee what kind of -- what kind of help are you looking for that could be helpful?

COMMISSIONER YEE: You know, anything that could help me -- you know, help me lean one way or the other.
I mean, you know, for instance, the Mulholland Drive, you know? But I mean, this is the one input that's been so, you know, clear and consistent. Well, that really helps, right? Because I really just got -- started thinking. I don't know, you know, whatever help is decided.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's see if Karin and Jaime have some thoughts.

I think you're on mute.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. Oh, very sorry. I didn't realize you called on us.

Hello, Commissioners. I just need to just say something, just realistically speaking, about continuing to map on the Assembly and looking at your schedule and of the schedule that we have been working. So when we're not sitting in meetings, we are all working with at least one of you. And for Jaime in particular, that has meant working twenty-hour days right now, or eighteen-hour days. So we're going to Congress tomorrow, and we're going to be mapping with one or more of you on Congress starting tomorrow. I don't know when there is time to continue to work on the Assembly. I just don't know.

There's just not -- we just don't have the capacity. I'm sorry. I mean, we're burning the candles on both ends here, and we're really at the limit. It's, what, 12:37 right now. We've been working since this morning at 9, I
think, in meetings. And I know you also have long days, but, you know, we're going to be mapping tonight. We're putting maps together tonight, and then tomorrow morning it's going to continue. So it's just -- really it's unrealistic to think that there's going to be much more happening on Assembly unless you take some days off. Just wanted to throw that out there. And I know this is not going to be a popular little statement here, and I apologize. That's my job to be the unpopular one, so there you go.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Jaime -- Thank you, Karin, rather.

Commissioner Fernandez, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. And I do agree with Karin, so thank you for that. I think we have to make a decision, because we've got to move on. And if there's something, you know, that comes up that we can change later that's somewhat quickly, that's great, but I would recommend we go with the one right now that's on the screen.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Commissioner Akutagawa,

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, first off, Jaime and Karin, thank you so much for just hanging in there with us. You know, while we're up late, you're up late, and
even later than us, too, so I wanted to first say that.

Secondly, I do like this newer map better than the
previous maps. I think it -- there's pairings or
groupings that make more sense from a city's perspective,
and I think we can try to get some of the reactions from
there, and yeah. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Love, kisses, hugs.

Thank you, line drawers. I think this is the right map
for us to go forward with.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's just get general
consensus if this is the map that we're going to go with.

Looking around the room. I mean, whether we can live
with it -- the standard is whether we can live with it,
right? So let's say we can kind of live with it. I'll
live with it. All right. And I think -- let me just
make sure everyone else can live with it. Everyone else
is asleep, so I think for now we'll live with it, and
we'll decide on the 18th, right, whether this is the map
we're going to take.

All right. Moving forward. So Karin, I will ask
you if you could number the map -- number it across so
that we can try to nest the Assembly's district with the
State Senate.

MS. MAC DONALD: We can do that, and we'll do that
offline. And we will not be able to post that tomorrow morning by 8 o'clock, obviously, so it's going to take a couple of days doing, you know, all the various checks and so forth. So we'll let you know tomorrow a good estimate of when you can expect it, but I'm guessing a couple of days with PDFs and all of that, if that works.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much. And with that, we will be adjourning. Thank you, everyone. Thank you, staff. Thank you -- thank you, Karin and all the line drawers. Thank you to everyone. Thank you to the public who's still listening to us, and to the Commissioners. We will be back tomorrow at, I believe, 11 a.m.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Today.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Chair?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Today. Today. We're back today at 11 o'clock.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Chair?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes, thank you, Commissioner -- yes.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Quick question for Kimberly. The least amount of splits for San Fernando Valley was decided, correct?

CHAIR TOLEDO: We decided to go with the map that had the fewer --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: That's right --

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- splits.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- Kimberly. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: All right.

So we will be moving forward, and we will have --
we'll be meeting tomorrow, 11 a.m., working on the
Congressional maps. Thank you all.

And we will see each other -- get a good night's
sleep, we'll see each other tomorrow.

(Whereupon, the 2021 Citizens Redistricting
Commission (CRC) meeting adjourned at 12:40
a.m.)
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