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CHAIR TOLEDO: Good morning, California. Buenos dias. We're on our second day of visualizations, a very exciting process. We were working on San Diego, Southern California yesterday, and we were able to get through quite a few of the VRA districts in terms of just giving feedback and direction.

You know, overnight I've been thinking about it, and have -- just thinking about our process and really the focus, and the direction, and trajectory of where we're going, and I really do think we need to make many more decisions than we've made. We've given directions, but haven't really made some concrete decisions, especially around some of the Los Angeles regions, the VRA regions.

And so for today we're going to go back, I'm going to use Chair's discretion, and go back to Los Angeles and focus on some of these VRA areas where we really need to make some difficult decisions, I think. We've made some, and we've come up with some refinements, and given direction to the line drawers, but we need to do more of that, and especially in some of the areas that we haven't looked at.

And so that's what we'll be doing today, is going back to Los Angeles area. And from there, as time
permits, we will be going to the other VRA areas, so that will be impacted by that, which likely would be, if we have time, the Central Valley. So we will be doing that today. And so that is a change from our run of show, and so I just wanted to alert the Commission, and the public.

With that, we will do roll call.

MR. SINGH: Okay, Chair.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner 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: Here.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor.
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Presente.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Toledo.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Here.
MR. SINGH: The roll call is complete, Chair.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Ravi, as always. And I think I -- I see Commissioner Akutagawa joined, so she can be present as well.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Hi. I'm here now.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Excellent, sounds good. So I just mentioned that we will be focusing on the Los Angeles region, finishing up some of our VRA work there and giving further direction and -- further concrete direction and making some decisions.
Before we do that, we'll go into a brief closed session just to go over some of the -- go over some of the pending litigation issues that we must look at before we begin this work.
So with that, we will adjourn to closed session -- or not adjourn -- we will recess to closed session, and then come back in an hour. Thank you.
(Closed Session)

CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are coming back from closed session on the litigation exception that was -- no action was taken during that meeting. We will continue on with the visualizations. We will be focusing on the Los Angeles region.

In particular, I just want to thank the public. We've been getting so much feedback from the public, and it's something that we're looking at, and that our -- especially with the feedback from the VRA districts which we've, you know, encouraged communities to give us input on these important and critical areas for fair maps.

And we have received significant input from the -- from Lancaster, Palmdale area, Victor Valley area, and those are areas where the Commission is going to be looking at and focused on for -- we're going to start in that area because we've received significant feedback, and we, after consulting with VRA counsel, we do believe that that VRA -- that that area has VRA considerations as we've been -- as we've been hearing from the public, and also from our own analysis.

And so we will be focused there. And then work through the Los Angeles VRA districts. And if we have time we will be continuing on to the Central Valley this
afternoon.

So we will start with Jaime. Can you please load the Los Angeles map, and go to the Palmdale area.

MS. CLARK: Just one moment.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And I think just for the public, and for the Commission, our goal today is to really focus on the VRA areas to get to consensus on what they look like, the region looks like, and less on the specific aspects of all of the underlying COIs. We need to make sure that we address the VRA compliance aspects, and then once we do that, then we'll come back and do refinement as time permits.

MS. CLARK: So right now on the map, we're showing Antelope Valley here in this area, and Victor Valley here in this area. Currently, the boundary between these two districts is on the county line between San Bernardino and Los Angeles County. Additionally -- I'm just going to zoom out a little bit -- the Antelope Valley District currently includes areas like Tehachapi, California City, Edwards Air Force Base, et cetera.

And the Victor Valley-based District includes northern areas here in San Bernardino County. And I will zoom back into these specific areas.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And if you can specifically focus on the Palmdale area. Thank you very
much. So now, in looking at the VRA considerations, and
I think if Mr. Becker is available perhaps he can give us
a general overview of the VRA considerations in this
specific region.

MR. BECKER: Yes. Thank you. Hopefully my internet
will cooperate and you all can hear me. Can I get a few
nods if people can hear me okay? Okay.

So what we have found is that in Assembly elections,
all three Gingles preconditions appear in that minority
voters in this area of California, and the
Lancaster/Palmdale area, and going across into San
Bernardino County into the Victory Valley area, are large
enough to comprise the majority of an Assembly district,
and that there is racially polarized voting in Assembly
elections sufficient to trigger VRA protections for
Latino voters in this area.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. At this point we are
seeking suggestions from the Commission. I want really
concrete direction on how we can potentially modify this
district to meet VRA requirements.

Commissioner Kennedy, and then Commissioner Andersen
and Fernandez; we'll start with Kennedy first.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Just as a
general principle; and this is reiterating something that
I've said before: Having heard community input on this
at various points throughout the -- throughout the
process, I would urge the Commission to ensure that the
population -- if we do cross the county line, that the
population be balanced between a Los Angeles County
portion and a San Bernardino County portion so that both
elements of the district have an opportunity to elect a
candidate of their choice. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

And Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. To do this
process, could we please have the -- see the CVAP, Latino
CVAP heat map turned on, please.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. In the meantime, while
we're looking at the heat map. Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Fornaciari, Fernandez, it's
all blended right now. Is there any way to overlay --
Mr. Becker had provided us with a -- like, a similar heat
map type that -- just so that we could see -- or I could
see where some of the concentrations are. But I think
that would be a really good starting point for us.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So you'd like to look at the Gingles
preconditions?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Is there any way to overlay
it with this? Or maybe there isn't.

MR. BECKER: Yeah, that's in a PDF and I -- that you
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, okay.

MR. BECKER: But if you want, I can share that, and show that if you think it'd be helpful.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, probably not because we need to be drawing -- the drawings. Ugh, I'm trying to see, obviously the Palmdale side. But then on the San Bernardino side we have those huge concentrations, so I'm just -- I'm thinking out loud right now with the Victorville, trying to link the two, so let me -- let me think about it a little bit more. Thanks. And I think I have those maps so I can actually reference them. Thanks.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. I do want to reference some COI testimony that -- perhaps to give us a starting point, that mentions the cities of Hesperia, Victorville, Adelanto, and Apple Valley that seem to be the core of a High Desert community in the Inland Empire that also are home to significant communities of color. And as we can see from the heat map, they seem to also be quite significantly home to a very concentrated population of Latinos.

Separately, I believe we're -- for population
purposes, if we're crossing county boundaries, and I believe that's what I've heard, just again, a starting place, looking at cities like Palmdale and perhaps even Lancaster as well too into -- also including Sun Village and Lake Los Angeles. Perhaps that might give us an evenly-balanced starting point that aligns with what Commissioner Kennedy mentioned.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That is helpful. Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

And then Jaime, if you would, taking into consideration Commissioner Kennedy's feedback, and Commissioner Akutagawa's feedback, if you could give us some suggestions on how we might draw a VRA district in this area. And what your thoughts are around this. So if you can walk us through the -- and also the potential opportunities, and also some of the challenges.

MS. CLARK: Sure. Thank you for that question. As we all know, you can't draw one district without impacting a different one, so I'm going to zoom the map out to kind of show where these areas have some overlap because -- it slows the map down; I'm going to turn off the heat map with Latino CVAP. So I think that it is possible to have approximately fifty percent of the population in each county without creating huge ripple effects, or without creating huge impacts to the rest of
the state, or large portions of the state, it would be
possible to basically have a switch, or a, you know,
population change just between these two districts,
potentially slightly impacting, actually, the Tulare-Kern
district.

And so I guess I would suggest, first, removing
population from this Antelope Valley District, maybe
assigning this area of western Antelope Valley and the
areas that are currently in Kern County to Tulare-Kern.
So I would first assign that so then you know, basically,
how much population you're looking at, and how much more
you then would need while also looking at the Latino CVAP
in the area that you're picking up.

So first, unassigning a lot of this area, in this,
and then and then working on creating that -- the
district that are under discussion right now, and then
balancing population between the remaining -- between the
remaining areas. That is how I would accomplish that.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And that sounds like a good plan. To
that, if Akutagawa and Fornaciari have any input on that
particular plan, please let us know. Commissioner
Fornaciari or Commissioner Andersen, any concerns with
that plan, moving forward?

Commissioner Andersen, any concerns with moving in
that direction?
VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I have some recommendations of how -- or where to give directions to -- how to start.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh. And that will be excellent.

We're going to ask for concrete direction at the moment.

So Jaime, are you ready to --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'll wait.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So yeah, and it will be very helpful to have very concrete direction on what areas to take out, and when areas to add in, so.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. So could we put the CVAP back on, please?

CHAIR TOLEDO: And I believe Commissioner Akutagawa did give some areas to add and to take out as well.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. I would like to go, but since we're sort of looking at the LA Country right now, sort of get an idea on this one. And then I totally agree with, and grab that same chunk over, that Commissioner Akutagawa said, in the VVHD, and see if those are the same, and we can do switch, sort of.

But in this, Antelope, I would start with the area of -- and I'm kind of thinking of more like a -- not a solid block, but actually more like a C, and leaving the open space of Palmdale, I believe that is --

Correct, just like that, Jaime. It's exactly what I'm thinking. And one quick question, and I don't know
what that is, it's just a large block, it doesn't have
much population in it, but directly over the Los Angeles
County title, that little -- if that has any
population -- yes. I don't know if that has the
population, but if you could grab that section and see
how much population it has.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So Jaime, if you can start capturing
some of this area. Of course, and be responsive to
Commissioner Andersen's question, but if you can start
grabbing some of this area so we can start shifting.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. So if it's okay, I do think the
most efficient way to accomplish this is going to be to
kind of unassign some of these areas first, and then
you'll know how much population you have left, how much
population you'll need to gain -- basically to start
balancing this, and start -- great. Yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: We trust your guidance. I trust your
guidance, so let's move forward with that.

MS. CLARK: Okay. That's perfect. Thank you very
much.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And so --

MS. CLARK: So just one second, I will get that
ready, I'll get it started, grab the areas that you just
mentioned, and we'll see where we're at.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And while you're doing that, we'll
take discussion with Commissioner Andersen, if she has additional discussion around that, and then Commissioner Vazquez.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. So as she's doing that, yes. My idea is to take that, essentially, large C area and connect it with that same area that Commissioner Akutagawa mentioned, Hesperia, not necessarily taking all of Apple Valley, Victor Valley, because there are large sections which are -- you know, are not the same density of CVAP, and we're trying to see how we can make this district.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Vazquez?

And Jaime, let us know when you're ready, too.

Commissioner Vazquez, did you have a comment, question? I think you're on mute, or we can't hear you. I think we're having technical issues. Let us know when your audio is working.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Is your computer on mute too?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Here we go. You all should hear me now. Okay, great. So I agree where this is going. Just wanted to note that I think, to the extent possible, I don't think they need to be completely whole, but I do think that the majority of Lancaster and
Palmdale, specifically, should be included in sort of the attempt at district, sort of, pairing with the Victor Valley, with those sections.

Again, don't need to be kept whole, but I think there's just such a concentration of both population of particularly Latinos in those cities that I think it makes sense for us to try to include the majority of those -- of those two particular cities.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Great. So once we start adding areas, we'll take the -- we'll take that -- we'll take that into consideration. And if you can give that in very concrete direction, as you just did, once we get to that point.

MS. CLARK: So I believe, Commissioner Andersen, this is generally the area you wished to include, and this right now is almost sixty percent of a district; it needs about thirty-nine percent of a district to complete your -- or to meet your population requirements.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: So this, we're trying to get to essentially half a district here, so we can get half a district in the other, put them together, so one district, and then the other -- a district out of the -- since we're taking two districts, trying to make a VRA in the middle here, and the remaining would be the second.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So we're trying to. But it may not
be possible given the -- if we look at the heat map, and maybe, Jaime, you can give us a little bit of information, but when I look at this heat map I see strong concentrations on the Los Angeles/Palmdale area, less on the San Bernardino side. And so it may not be possible to achieve compliance of the Voting Rights Act and also do the half and half. But we can try to get it as close as possible.

MS. CLARK: Yeah --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you give us guidance on how to do that?

MS. CLARK: I would suggest from here, trying to meet your fifty percent CVAP, and then you can, you know, refine from there, once you know for sure that you've got that population that you need.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So that's great. So if you would begin the process of expanding population and getting the population in there. So do we have any concrete direction from Commissioners for Jaime, in terms of what communities to add?

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I would start sort of -- I would aim south, and then we can work -- I would say go up per population. So I'd start with, sort of, Pinon Hills, Phelan, Oak Hills, Hesperia, and
Victorville, and see where that gets us, and then we can start -- yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And I think that is in alignment with what Commissioner Akutagawa and what Commissioner Andersen had said, as well as Commissioner Kennedy. So let's move in that direction.

(Pause)

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Akutagawa, if you have some comment while we're -- while this is being constructed?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. I'm going -- because what I did read in terms of some of the COI testimony, is that Victorville is an important part of this, and I'm wondering if, as much as, you know, we -- I know people don't like to be split, whether it's better to split Pinon Hills and Phelan, and include more of Victorville as well as Spring -- it looks like Spring Valley Lake.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. That will be helpful as we get to refinement.

Ms. Clarke?

MS. CLARK: Thank you. So just what is highlighted on the map is Pinon Hills, Phelan, [Ph-e-lon] -- and I don't know how to say that one, apologies -- Hesperia, Oak Hills, some of the unincorporated areas, and then southern, sort of southwestern Victorville. And the
percent deviation is good, it's negative 1.28 percent, the Latino CVAP is 46.9 percent, so basically some areas with less Latino CVAP concentrations need to be removed in areas where more Latino CVAP concentrations need to be added.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. At this point, are you suggesting we add this area to the district we're creating?

MS. CLARK: I would suggest, potentially, removing maybe starting with some of the southern Hesperia area, from what would be added to this district and kind of working from there. Would it be okay if I made that change?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Absolutely.
Commissioner Andersen, if you have some feedback?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. I like what we're doing here, and what I would like to do is, along with what Jaime is essentially planning on doing, going up a bit north in this section. I'd also like to, in the Antelope section, the northern border with Kern County, I'd like to draw that line down. It would reduce some of the -- but that's population which is certainly not Latino.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. As we finish this process, we'll look at that as well. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: So this area, it'd be negative 6.6
percent deviation, and have a Latino CVAP of 47.23 percent; I could commit this change and then move that border down per Commissioner Andersen's suggestion, and then continue working on this.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Do you think that adding -- moving the border down is going to help in meeting the requirements or -- based on what you're looking at at this point?

MS. CLARK: I don't think that it will hurt.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Perfect.

MS. CLARK: I don't think that there's a ton of population in there, but there is some population.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's -- let's commit this. I don't see any objections. So let's commit this, and then let's look at -- I agree, I don't see a lot of population, so it shouldn't be -- it shouldn't hurt us in our goal. It might help.

So while you're doing that, we'll hear from Commissioner Vazquez, and Commissioner Akutagawa, and Commissioner Fornaciari, to see if they have any concrete guidance on next steps to get us to a compliant VRA district. That also is in alignment with the community input we've received. Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. As Jaime is bringing down the northern border in the Antelope Valley, I would
still like to also go back to that Victorville/Spring Valley area and try to capture more of those areas. Again, I think, going back to some of the COI testimony those -- the Victor Valley -- oh, Victorville and Hesperia were noted. Adelanto and Apple Valley were mentioned, but they do have lower Latino CVAP, so as we're, I think trying to create this, I think we should try to first capture the areas where there's higher Latino CVAP, which it does look like Victorville and Spring Valley -- Spring Valley Lake, yeah.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Yeah, that is the plan. Ms. Clark?

MS. CLARK: Thanks. So the highlighted area is a little over 1,600 people. Making this change would move the Latino CVAP from 47.23 percent to 47.29 percent. Please let me know if it --

CHAIR TOLEDO: So it doesn't make -- it doesn't make too much a difference because the population is so low, is our -- I'm fine with committing this change. In terms of the compactness, it's becoming a little bit more compact. So let's commit it.

All right, let's hear from Commissioner Fornaciari to see.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'll wait until after
Commissioner Akutagawa's change is made to see if that has something --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, good. Let's add Commissioner Akutagawa's changes, and then we'll go on to Commissioner Fornaciari for his direction.

MS. CLARK: Commissioner Akutagawa, is there a specific area you would like me to add?

CHAIR TOLEDO: I believe it was the Victorville.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, the Victorville. I wish you could see my cursor. In looking at the map, it's going -- yeah, you kind of have it, you just might need to pare away some of the areas where there's no Latino CVAP really.

MS. CLARK: Okay. So I will start doing that. This is the rest of City of Victorville. Making this change will make the deviation 9.6 percent, and the Latino CVAP 47.14 percent. I will start removing some of the areas in Northern (audio interference), so it's a lot less populated up there. I'm just going to keep kind of removing some areas, trying to get closer to that needed population.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: What about also going a little bit west of Victorville, like almost straight across you could see -- yeah, exactly, and maybe even up into Adelanto, if -- where are we in deviation right now?
MS. CLARK: Right now we're still at 6.1 percent deviation; adding this area would make the Antelope Valley, Victor Valley District 47.34 percent Latino CVAP, it's currently at 47.29 percent.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And would splitting Phelan and Pinon Hills move -- removing some of that southern parts of it, also help -- I don't know how -- how much population they would have there, and if it would also help raise the CVAP.

MS. CLARK: I think that one -- if I may, I might suggest trying removing them all together, (indiscernible) across the counties through this less populated area, and then grabbing the populations, like here, kind of right in the center of Victor Valley, like parts of Adelanto, parts of Victorville, parts of Hesperia, and seeing where that would get you. If that sounds okay with the Commission, I would suggest that.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: That's sounds good.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That sounds excellent. Let's move in that direction.

Commissioner Fornaciari, did you have any comment on how to get to the fifty percent plus?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, but let's finish this. Okay?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Let's exercise that first, and then I'll see where we're going. Okay?

CHAIR TOLEDO: And Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. Jaime, would it be advisable to -- based on CVAP numbers -- to move Mountain Meadows and Tehachapi, because of their lower Latino CVAP, into the district to the north? So that would be -- because that could help with the proportions into Tulare-Kern?

MS. CLARK: Yeah. Thank you for that suggestion. Right now those are the removed and in the Tulare-Kern area right now.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay, thank you.

MS. CLARK: So I think, yeah. So if this highlighted area was included, it would be joining this Hesperia -- with this area, kind of making a bridge to the Antelope Valley areas. This would be 2.49 percent deviation, and 48.86 percent Latino CVAP. One suggestion is you could try making this change, maybe adding some of this area a little bit, and potentially looking at removing some area right here that's currently assigned to the Antelope District, if you wish.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's move in that direction. Yes.

(Pause)

CHAIR TOLEDO: While waiting for the change,
Commissioner Fornaciari, Commissioner Fernandez, anything, any comment relating to potential changes that will get us to the fifty percent plus?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I thought -- I thought that when we first started, and she took out the area south of Oak Hill, I thought we'd gotten to fifty percent CVAP at that point, but maybe I just wished that we had. I don't know, but it -- I don't know if grabbing some of this Oak Hill might help. And maybe we're getting to the point where this is an offline exercise for Jaime to refine and get us to our goals.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. So we may need to get to -- and we probably do need to get to the point where we give the general input, and give directions for Jaime to get us to compliance here.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I just had a -- I mean, I agree with giving Jaime general direction, but I -- Jaime, I believe when we had the Victorville and maybe Adelanto, it didn't change the CVAP, but the population wasn't that high, so if we don't have to split up the cities, I would prefer to keep the cities if it's really not going to hinder the VRA.

I don't know how the rest of the Commissioners feel, but that could also be additional direction that you
could work on later. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Thank you so much for that. So we are -- I'm happy to work on that offline later today, this evening. I did want to note -- when I turned the blocks off, I did want to note that currently the Victor Valley-based -- or the San Bernardino County-based District, is negative 39 percent, and the Tulare-Kern District is over by 34.58 percent. Would the Commission (audio interference) me to try to join these areas together to make the districts more balanced before we move on?


COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I think that's a great idea. I'd like to -- you know, you had talked, initially, Jaime, that you were hoping this could just be a two-district swap. So if we can do that, I think that would be outstanding.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you give direction for that?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Please do that. I direct you to do that. You know, I mean, I think you understand what --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, I --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So okay, here's my
direction. Work on creating a VRA district kind of in
the direction that we were going using -- using just
those two districts. And if you could come back with
that, that would be outstanding. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. In addition with
that, Jaime, if it helps with your offline there's also
community of interest testimony that may help with that,
keeping these cities together when you're moving,
considering, you know, so with Adelanto, Hesperia,
Victorville, Apple Valley, so any of those that can go
into that district when you're doing the work, would be
great.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I was just going to
say that I am not completely sold that the -- this, like,
current C-shape in what is now the Antelope, the new
Antelope district is helping us with our goals of getting
a VRA district in the center. So my direction is if we
need -- if we need to eliminate that shape, I would like
us to do so in the Antelope district.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. We'll reconcile all the
directions in a moment. Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you. There is some
community input, and again I'm looking at the proportional numbers in order to create a VRA district. Is there some thought to adding California City to that, to that northern district?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

Commissioner Turner?

Okay, so Ms. Clarke?

MS. CLARK: Thank you. So what is on the map right now, I'm going to zoom out, this would just impact the Victor Valley -- the San Bernardino-based district, the Tulare-Kern, and then the northern Los Angeles County area. Moving these areas, which are kind of the rest of Antelope Valley, and northwestern Los Angeles County, and then including sort of the California City, Edwards Air Force Base areas with the rest of the San Bernardino County-based district, that would -- it would leave the San Bernardino County-based District at a little bit over negative five percent.

This is something that, you know, the Commission could -- you could direct me to make this change right now. And then as I'm working on this Antelope Valley and Victor Valley-based district, we'll also, you know, fix the deviation in that area as well, so that you have balanced districts, and a district that is over fifty percent Latino CVAP next time you look at this.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Kennedy?

MS. CLARK: Would that be okay?

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

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Again, I would like to urge us, to the extent possible, to ensure in this area, when we're crossing county lines, that populations are balanced between counties.

Jaime, the other thing is that yesterday, in giving direction to Sivan, she was asked to look at that. The boundaries of what is on your map as SECA, but the southeastern part of San Bernardino County, at all levels, that is tying into eastern Riverside, and down into Imperial County so that we can have a uniform western boundary of that area, which is going to make the administrative portion of this much easier.

So you know, seeing that SECA is slightly overpopulated, I know that's not a densely populated area, but you know, we might pick up a little bit. I just want you to be aware that we do want to adjust that area that's going down into Riverside and Imperial, so that we have a uniform, western boundary with that element. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Thank you. Sivan and I will definitely
collaborate on this to make that possible. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So I believe, Jaime, we're asking about direction to add this area, this space to that district. And am I -- do I hear -- is there any opposition to adding this space to the district?

Seeing none, we'll add this area to the district.

MS. CLARK: Thank you. One moment while the program makes that change.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Then we'll go over our decision points now. What we decided on for this area, and the direction that we were giving to Jaime, and then we'll move on to our next area of focus.

(PAUSE)

MS. CLARK: So that change was made, and we're ready to move on to any area.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Appreciate it. So in terms of moving on to the next area, let's go over the decision points. So what we've decided here is to give -- and Jaime, if you can highlight the area that we're working on, just to help us.

That in this area, the Antelope district where we're at 48-point -- it looks like 48.1 percent CVAP -- Latino CVAP, that we're going to give you, essentially, discretion -- not discretion, but that we're going to direct you to get us to fifty percent plus Latino CVAP in
this general area, and to -- and what I'm hearing from Commissioner Vazquez, and others, is that if we need to change the border somewhat, if we need to even change the backward C, in order to achieve that, that that would be acceptable.

And so that, as long as it's within this space that we're looking at this point, that you have a direction to develop a compliant district for us to make any minor refinements at the end. I just want to make sure I captured that direction correctly, and adequately. And that it's clear to both Ms. Clark and the Commission.

Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. I had one additional point which, if it comes to half a city, or half a city of one -- one-half of a city versus a city, and it doesn't change the CVAP negatively, please keep -- you know, try to go for whole cities where possible.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So where possible, keep --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Where possible, whole.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- communities of interest and cities whole, as long as it doesn't impact the CVAP.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. Also --

CHAIR TOLEDO: But of course, the CVAP is more important than -- yeah.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Absolutely. Also, if we do
cut cities in terms of, you know, which ones we cut, if
you make that sort of look like -- don't just cut out
little, tiny piece of a city, try to make it out so it's
half and half. Try that one first.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Where possible, where practical.
VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Where possible.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. And then Commissioner
Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I was going to -- I
was going to bring up the -- if you don't have to cut a
city, keep it whole. And also, I mean, we're giving you
the discretion, and I hope you understand that that means
that if it's going to look completely different than
this, that's okay, too, because we're just trying to do
it quickly. So yes, I would like to give Jaime that
discretion as well.

CHAIR TOLEDO: The direction is in this area; so
within these communities that we just discussed, it may
look different, but we want to get to compliance, but
that is the direction, that within these parameters that
you're looking at, that we get to a compliant district.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I just, since it
wasn't in your summary, Chair, I do think I heard --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, absolutely.
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: -- and agree that the new -- excuse me -- new VRA district we are creating should be balanced of the two counties (audio interference) when possible, that we should be able to keep -- I'm sorry, about half the district population, and the LA County about half of the population of this in San Bernardino County.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And so where possible, if it is possible to do so, to shift, to be as balanced as possible with the counties' lines, and that -- that was, we're giving general direction in this area right here between the county lines.

Is that clear enough direction, Jaime? Do you need more specificity?

MS. CLARK: No. I understood the direction. Thank you all so much.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I just wanted to make sure. Because you're not the only -- we're also having staff take notes on the reasoning for the direction. It's not just for the line drawers; it's for our recordkeeping as well.

Commissioner Vazquez, did you still have your hand up? Okay. It doesn't look like it.

So for this area that we are creating a VRA district, it will be sort of in this specified area that we've been talking about, and that we will have this back
in the next day or so for -- at that point it would be
minimal refinement. Thank you.

And so that is the decision we made in the Antelope
Valley. With that, we do need to go to the MPH district.
So let's go to MPH district.

Thank you. And in the MPH district, can you go over
the district, Jaime. And then Mr. Becker can go over the
VRA considerations here as well. Or if you want -- let's
start with Mr. Becker, and then Jaime can walk us
through.

MR. BECKER: And this is pretty simple, this is an
area Voting Rights Act concerns where the 3 Gingles
preconditions existed. The Latino CVAP is probably on
the low end of what would adequately protect Latino
voters in this area under Voting Rights Act. So I think
the only consideration is: Can Latino CVAP be increased?
It doesn't have to be a large amount, it has to -- at
least should definitely go over fifty percent, perhaps
even a shade higher, to adequately protect Latino voters
in this area.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And then, Jaime?

MS. CLARK: Yeah, so this includes --

CHAIR TOLEDO: And can you put the CVAP on this?

MS. CLARK: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: The Latino heat map. Thank you. She
has it up.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. So would just like me to describe the areas that are in here?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes, please, and specifically, potential areas that might get us to over the fifty percent.

MR. BECKER: Chair, can I make one more point that might be helpful here as well?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes, absolutely. Thank you.

MR. BECKER: As Ms. Clarke continues. I'll just note the SECA district has -- putting my glasses on -- has the percentage of 50 -- it's at 58.05 percent of Latino CVAP, which is very adequate to protect Latino voting rights under the Voting Rights Act in that area. So there might be -- that's another area where, if that were lowered a little bit, but that -- but it yielded a higher percentage in the MPH district, that would -- that's one possibility among probably some others.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm sorry. I thought we spent time on this yesterday, and gave the line drawer specific direction on -- to take on, or to go off as homework, to bring back tomorrow to figure this out for us. We were going to move Winchester and Hemet into
SW -- well I have it here.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Well, let's hear from --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Is there something -- is there something different that I'm missing here?

CHAIR TOLEDO: So we're getting feedback that we need to increase the CVAP additionally. And so we'll look at that. So let's -- Clark -- Jaime, do you have the instruction that we had yesterday, and can you read that out?

MS. CLARK: So I do not have that, this is Sivan's area. And I do believe that yesterday the Commission gave Sivan direction on this area, that she is working to incorporate, and we will have that tomorrow.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay; sounds good. So given that, and given that direction was made, I think we'll just reiterate that direction is to get us to the VRA thresholds needed to assure that Latinos have an opportunity to elect candidates of their choice in this area.

And with that, we can move to the La Habra area. I believe this is also an area we worked on yesterday that Counsel wants us to focus on. And just clarify direction on that as well.

MS. TRATT: Hi, Chair, this is Sivan, the mapper from this region. I just wanted to come on quickly, I
was listening on the live stream, so I'm, like, two
minutes or so behind. But I was just -- wanted to
confirm that I did get those directions from you all
yesterday, and I do have several versions of changes that
were made, that I was going to present on Thursday,
pursuant to the plan that was discussed.

So I didn't know that we were going to be returning
to this region, but I do have those changes that raise
the CVAP -- the Latino CVAP of MPH to above fifty
percent, and was planning on presenting those to the
Commission during the meeting tomorrow.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Excellent, Sivan. We'll look forward
to that tomorrow. And I believe La Habra is also a part
of your area, if I remember correctly -- Orange County,
or is that Jaime?

MS. TRATT: Yes. That is correct.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you also give us feedback on how
the La Habra is doing, and going?

MS. CLARK: So that was actually an area that I was
working on, so I can -- I can speak to that. We heard
from counsel yesterday that La Habra area should be
included in one of these districts with Orange -- or
correct me -- with Los Angeles County. La Habra is about
thirteen percent of an Assembly district in size, so
still working on exactly how that will work, and if it is
the Commission's direction, then I can present something

tomorrow with that included.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. The direction of the

Commission is to get these -- these areas that are in --

that you just mentioned, into a VRA district to ensure

that they're protected and are able to -- to elect

candidates of their choice.

And with that, since we have -- since we've roughed

our VRA areas, and have made decisions points on all of

these, the goal of course is not to make huge changes to

the VRA areas, but rather to make refinements. I think

we will be getting those in the next day or two for this

area. We have them for the Antelope Valley, we are -- we

have explored them in Orange County, and we'll have

drafts, hopefully, tomorrow.

Is that correct, Jaime and Sivan? Yes, so tomorrow,

and then once we've looked at those, we can make further

refinement as necessary.

And then, with that, we will -- we will be moving on
to the Central Valley, the VRA districts in the Central

Valley. So we do need some time for a change with -- for

change for our line drawers to prepare for that.

So let's take a fifteen-minute break.

(At 1:26 p.m. a recess was taken until 1:39

p.m.)
CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are working on visualizations in the Central Valley, focused on the VRA districts, starting with a global overview of the VRA areas, as well as our VRA considerations and requirements. So we'll start with Mr. Becker, if he's -- if he's on at this point.

MR. BECKER: I am. Thanks. As we've talked about before, we have substantial Voting Rights Act concerns in this area for Latino voters. Throughout the Central Valley and into San Benito County, we have seen Latino voters that are large enough and geographically compact enough to form majorities in districts, and racially polarized voting between Latinos and non-Latinos sufficient to invoke Voting Rights Act protections.

And here we've got several districts that are designed to protect Latino voters' ability to continue to elect candidates of their choice, and they range -- excuse me -- from a high of 57.23 percent Latino CVAP in the West Bakersfield district to 50.94 percent in the Merced/Fresno area. I should also say, we do see some cohesion in some of these areas between, particularly, black voters and Latino voters.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Mr. Becker. And this is an area where we've received significant community input,
significant comment and testimony from the public, specific to our VRA districts in the Bakersfield, Kings, Merced, and San Benito areas. Actually, we've received significant testimony on all of these areas, and it's an area that certainly deserves and merits our attention.

And with that, we'll go to Ms. Kennedy, so she can give us an overview of the districts, where we are now, and some of the work -- some of the -- some of the potential areas we might move into. So if you can just give an overview of the VRA districts?

MS. WILSON: Yes, so starting with West Bakersfield -- I'm going to zoom in quickly to that -- we have a bit of concern, last time we met was in this area of Bakersfield by the Olde Stockdale Country Club areas, and so possibly looking to move some of this out of there, is where we looked at. And we still have we still Benton Park, La Cresta, Hillcrest, down to Arvin, those communities of interest all kept together. And then moving north into Kern County, we also have Wasco and Delano all together.

And then hits a line at the county lines between Kern, Kings, and Tulare, and then moving into the Kings and Tulare District. We have Kings kept whole, and then in -- moving into the County of Tulare, we have carved out population in the northeastern part of Visalia, and
we took in Farmersville, and the entirety of Tulare as well.

And then moving north, it takes a bit into Fresno County, and we have Kingsburg and Reedley a part of this as well, and then continuing north into Fresno. We have the City of Fresno that goes up to Old Fig Garden, and we take Mayfair, and we kept Sunnyside and Sanger together, Fowler, Selma as well.

And then moving into Merced-Fresno, we have the western part of Fresno County, along with Madera County, the City of Madera, Madera Acres up to Fairmead and Chowchilla, and then we have almost all of Merced, but we do have a line that excludes Delhi, Ballico, Cressy, Snelling, Hilmar, Irwin as well, but Livingstone and Montana South are a part of it.

And then moving a bit more west, we have San Benito and the Salinas Valley, and it goes into a bit of Santa Cruz County, and Santa Clara as well, and you can see in Santa Clara, San Martin and Gilroy are taken in as well, Watsonville to Corralitos in Santa Cruz County.

And that is a general overview of what these districts include as far as counties and cities go.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much. At this point, we are doing -- at this point, we're looking at the -- let's start with the southern portion of these districts.
Let's start with the Bakersfield district.

So I will ask Commissioners, in general, is this the -- just like for Los Angeles, our focus here is not so much on the community of interest, but more on compliance with the VRA district, and so -- VRA requirements, and making sure that the VRA requirements are met. And we've received significant testimony from communities in the Central Valley, asking us to ensure that our CVAP levels are at -- are sufficient to meet the ability -- to allow Latinos to be able to vote for candidates of their choice.

So with that in mind, thinking about the -- making sure that these districts meet the compliance requirements; I would like directions, if there is any, from Commissioners. Ms. Fernandez -- Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. In terms of the Bakersfield, I do believe the CVAP number is good. I did have some information on that, but it looks like -- based on the feedback. And I apologize, I was -- I didn't realize that we were going to go through the Central Valley. But as Kennedy mentioned, the feedback has been, in terms of removing Oildale, Stockdale, and Rosedale. But it looks like Oildale is already out.

And the one district, VRA district that I would like
to see us try to get additional CVAP, would be the Merced-Fresno, because I think that one is, like, just at fifty percent. So when we get to that then maybe we can discuss it.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. So Kennedy, you had mentioned one of the country club neighborhoods, and I think it was Olde Stockdale. That's probably already out. But there were others that we were in the middle of working on that we never completed. I'm wondering if this is the best time to work on that, or whether that kind of detailed work should be left for later.

I have census tract numbers, I don't know if you're able to reference areas by that, or whether we should work that out differently.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Perhaps if we give the general direction to -- and Kennedy can work on this offline. But if the general direction is given so that she has the information, and it's in the public record, we have specific --

MS. WILSON: If we -- oh, sorry.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh. Go ahead, Kennedy.

MS. WILSON: I was just going to say, I can do that.
I can handle that over the break with that information given to me, with the tract numbers.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Why don't I go ahead and -- can I go ahead and read them off then?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER YEE: For the public record then?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Please.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. Some of these may already be out, I would have to double-check that, but the numbers are 32.21, 32.12, 28.11, 28.22, 28.23, 28.18, 28.07 -- that's the Olde Stockdale one, 28.04, and then the Bakersfield Country Club which I don't have a number for.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy -- or Commissioner Fornaciari?

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, that's kind of where I was going too. Kennedy, did you have a chance to -- I mean, I didn't know if offline you had a chance to look at this at all, and had an idea of --

MS. WILSON: So I -- oh --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- what the COI -- I mean, so Commissioner Yee gave you the numbers, but kind of where the line would be or something, do you have kind of an idea for us? Or if you --
MS. WILSON: I have a general -- I don't have --
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.
MS. WILSON: -- shapefiles up right now, but the
general line would be still keeping Benton, Parkwood, Old
Stine, and kind of going down this way. It would be
removing more of the area. Farther west of Olde
Stockdale, and kind of down this line, here, from Old
Stine down, is the general area.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Thank you.
CHAIR TOLEDO: And Kennedy, it would be helpful if
you could overlay the Latino CVAP, just so we can see. I
know that slows down the program, but if you can just
provide it so that we can take a look at it, as we're
looking at this area.
Commissioner Turner?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I was going to -- I
don't know the census tract numbers, but I just wanted
to -- Kennedy, I think some of the previous discussion
where we may have failed to give direction, there were
two country clubs up in that area. There was the one
that was mentioned, and I think there was a second one.
I'm wondering if that was some of the census tract that
was given. And then also, the west part of the area that
you're -- that we're talking about removing. What's in
that area?
MS. WILSON: So this is the City of Bakersfield, there are -- there's Pumpkin Center, that's here, and Greenfield, Old Stine, Olde Stockdale. But other than that there aren't any other CDPs or cities in this area.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: So this is it. Okay.

MS. WILSON: This is the City of Bakersfield.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: So that the consideration is separating Bakersfield from east --

MS. WILSON: So I'll zoom out a bit farther, so you can see that.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.

MS. WILSON: This scooped out -- whatever you all like to call this, comes in, and there's other cities and CDPs that are within the City of Bakersfield.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I see.

MS. WILSON: So it would just be separating more of the City of Bakersfield from this part that is more in the center.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.

MS. WILSON: This is still all the City of Bakersfield that goes around this outline that I'm following.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Turner, did you have a follow-up, or?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No. I don't have a follow-up
right now.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: This is a follow-up: Just for our general purposes, so we have an idea where we're going with that. Could you just highlight that chunk and see, you know, so what is the population there, what's the CVAP in it? And you know, if you were pretending to take it out, you'd have the differences.

MS. WILSON: Yes. And I would say -- I will highlight that now, and I will say that most likely will lead to including Shafter into this. It's not already in there, but I will do that.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, I see.

MS. WILSON: Show you what it would do to take this out.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So maybe we can -- we can look at the population numbers now. And then once we have those numbers we'll take a break for lunch. And once we have those numbers, we'll be able to think through some of the changes that -- it will give the Commission time to think through some potential changes for this area.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: And could you lower the box so we can see what the CVAP is? Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Can we also look at the -- Kennedy,
at the African American, and other CVAP? Can you just
read it off? It's a little hard to see.

MS. WILSON: Yes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. For African American,
Asian, and Latino.

MS. WILSON: Yes. So Latino CVAP for West
Bakersfield with this highlighted chunk is 62.96 percent,
so that's with this chunk taken out. And then black CVAP
is 8.26 percent, then we have Asian CVAP at 4.21 percent,
Indigenous CVAP at 0.82 percent, and then white CVAP at
22.97 percent.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And deviation we still would --

MS. WILSON: Deviation, it does -- we have an issue.
We have Tulare-Kern at 17.25, and West Bakersfield at
negative 15.27, and that's when I was talking about the
possibility of putting in that Shafter portion. That's
what's in there in the congressional version as well, but
that is something to look at.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So we're looking for about 80,000
population at this point; is that correct?

MS. WILSON: About, yes. And over the break I can
refine that into the specific blocks, and look at the
shapefiles as well to make sure that we have the correct
line, but this is a general area of that.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Appreciate your hard work on this.
1 Thank you.
2 Commissioner Andersen? And then Commissioner Sinay.
3 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much, Kennedy, that's perfect. And in there, where you say you might add Shafter, I'm assuming that that probably might not be the entire city, or I don't know. But that's Smith Corner, Mexican Colony, I'm assuming that is not part of Shafter, but that is what you'd be adding?
4 MS. WILSON: I'll experiment with adding all of it, or just this part. I can try to put all of Shafter in to see what that would do as well, and still try to maintain CVAP of around fifty-seven percent.
5 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Right. I'm just thinking in terms of that if we have overpopulation in this one, maybe you could shift it up for the fifty to STANISFRES. That's where I'm going with my thought -- thinking there. Thank you.
6 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And Commissioner Sinay, Commissioner Vazquez.
7 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I just wanted to add that I've done additional reading on that part of Shafter, and community input as well. I think it's okay to split that piece. It technically is part Shafter, they pay city taxes to the City of Shafter, I believe, but given the history of racial discrimination in that
particular portion of the city, I'd be okay moving that
portion into a -- into the VRA district.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So why are we doing all of this
if the VRA district -- it was over, and it feels like
we're going more over on the Latino CVAP?

CHAIR TOLEDO: We're working on creating compliant
district that meets all of our requirements.

Commissioner Yee, did you have additional feedback on
that?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. It's a matter of opinion,
but we have gotten input that even though it was at
fifty-seven, that even higher may be more desirable, and
so that's what we're trying to do.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So we are hearing from the community
groups that the VRA -- VRA district in this area would
be -- that Latinos would have a better opportunity to
elect the candidate of their choice if the CVAP were
higher. And we're exploring the possibility; there might
not be a way to do that, and balance for the COIs, and
all the other information that we've already
incorporated, but we're exploring at this point. Thank
you.

So with that, let's now give Kennedy some time to
work through some of these scenarios, and see if she's able to get us to a district that meets all the requirements as given through direction. And we will come back at -- after the lunch break.

Thank you. So we are on recess for lunch.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 1:59 p.m. until 2:45 p.m.)

CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are focused on visualizations in the Central Valley at this point. We do have a map that is presented.

And Kennedy, can you walk us through some of the changes you were able to work through over the break?

MS. WILSON: I sure can. So let's start. Yeah. So I'm going to put on the old lines just so you can see what changes I made. Here's the information you gave me in digging up the shapefiles that were sent in. I used that COI testimony to refine the line here in Bakersfield. And I'm going to turn on the old district so you can see the differences.

So about in that same area that I had predicted, plus a little bit more, so before it stretched out here, did a loop around Olde Stockdale, went out into more Western Bakersfield, there were some changes along this line here as well, and a little bit above Bakersfield
Country Club. And here in River Grove and Goodmanville, it was out there and we refined that a little bit more, and took it in.

And again, Shafter was not included before, but I went ahead and put it all in there, because with it in there I was able to balance Tulare-Kern to a 4.24, and Bakersfield to a negative 2.27, and brought the CVAP to 61.1 percent, still including all of Shafter.

And I'll turn off the old lines, or I can switch however you'd like, but this is what the new version looks like. And let me just turn on the old version. Again, it went further out here, so we kind of took that off and pinched in around the sides here as well, and then took in all of Shafter.

And we went from the 57.23 percent to now 61.1 percent Latino CVAP. And I balanced it here with a 4.24, and a negative 2.27.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much. Can we put the heat map on? And also can we look at the CVAPs for the other ethnicities as well, in addition to Latino?

MS. WILSON: Yes, one moment. So I have this in -- would you like me to just put on the label, or read it off of the pending changes window? What would you prefer?

CHAIR TOLEDO: If you can read it off.
MS. WILSON: Yes. So again, for Latino CVAP we're at 61.1 percent, black CVAP is 7.92 percent, Asian CVAP is at 4.38 percent, Indigenous CVAP at 0.78 percent, and white CVAP at 24.98 percent.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Any comments from the Commission? Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Kennedy, what was the previous black CVAP?

MS. WILSON: Let me pull that up; one moment. So I'm just going in and changing those labels on all of them so we can see.

MR. BECKER: It was 57.23, if memory serves.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: The black CVAP was?

MR. BECKER: Oh, no. Sorry, Latino, my fault.

MS. WILSON: So black CVAP was at 8.16 percent.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Did you say 3.16 percent?

MS. WILSON: 8-point --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, 8.16 percent.

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: 8.16, and now it's 7-point --

MS. WILSON: Yes, it dropped to 7-point -- one moment, let me just turn this the right way. And now it is at 7.92.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. Do we know where the drop came from?
MS. WILSON: I'm not entirely sure where the drop came from, but I would assume, you know, just the areas that we took out probably in Bakersfield here, we took out a quite a large chunk here, and adding -- possibly adding in Shafter; I'm not entirely sure. But those are the changes that we made, that would affect that.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Kennedy, I'm going to call some cities out. The map is jumping around a little bit. And then let me know if they're in or out. So some of those areas were South -- was Benton, and I see that Benton, Cottonwood, yeah, still there, La Cresta, and -- I don't know where it is, then.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fernandez has her hand up. I think you'll go after that --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: My only comment was going to be that it's possible that the number of black -- the black population didn't go down, it's just that Latino went up, so percentage wise, then the black percentage goes down. Does that make sense? In my head it makes sense, but it's hard to say, right; unless we actually see the black heat map, which might be helpful.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's see the black CVAP. And in the meantime let's hear from Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I was just going to mention that I did read a comment in -- a couple -- there
was about three or four comments about Benton Park, and
about an area slightly north of Benton Park, has a -- I
guess a African American community. Sorry.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And is La Cresta -- oh, sorry.

MS. WILSON: La Cresta is not split, it is in there.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Oh. What's south of La
Cresta? What's that carve-out, that area in there?

MS. WILSON: Sorry, one second. I was zooming in
closer. I'm working on putting the black CVAP map up,
one moment.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Ms. Andersen -- or Commissioner
Andersen? Vice Chair Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thanks, Chair. I'm just
wondering if -- because percentages are deceiving, if we
could just see the total number of the black population
and the differences, because it has a -- you know, if you
had a lot more people of just one race, the percentages
would obviously go down. And I don't know that's --
you know, in your total if it has the actual population
numbers, or only has percentages.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Turner? And then --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I was going to say it
looks like right underneath that line that's drawn there.
And I'm not sure, again, what that area is, but I do see
some black population there, right, again, south of La
Cresta. Oh, yeah, right there, that line maybe to the west.

CHAIR TOLEDO: What communities are there, Kennedy?

MS. WILSON: I'm not seeing any other cities. There's La Cresta, East Bakersfield, by Hillcrest, Potomac Park, Casa Loma, Benton Park are all around it, but this is the City of Bakersfield.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: So --

MS. WILSON: I can try adding that back in, if you would like.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No. Just maybe -- Chair, may I?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: At the -- right where the carve -- let me see where this line goes. Maybe if we just play with some of the census blocks there where the black population is, to keep them --

MS. WILSON: I can also work on something like that offline as well.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, yeah, that would be great.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Great. So with that, is the Commission comfortable with this map as it looks at this point, with changes to be made around the area that we're looking at at this point, La Cresta area? Okay. So
let's move on to the next map, the next VRA map, so going north.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Sorry, did Commissioner Yee have a hand up?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, sorry. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, I was just wondering if we might think about moving some population out of Tulare-Kern. You know, 4.24 is okay, but a little high, especially when we've got a negative 2.27 in West Bakersfield. So I know we --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I don't know, Kennedy, if there's any particular neighborhoods, or parts that come to mind easily that might move over and make sense.

MS. WILSON: I can take a look at that offline.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Sure. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. All right, the next VRA district? Any comments on this, any potential changes here? Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Excuse me. I believe we heard that we should be -- in the City of Visalia, if there are people -- population there -- excuse me -- which should be added to Kings-Tulare, if someone else had that actual input.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Any feedback from -- of the
Commission in terms of what parts of Visalia or -- Kennedy, do you have any suggestions on what parts of Visalia might be added to this district and not impact the CVAP?

MS. WILSON: That is -- just as a reminder of what we did last time, I can go ahead and point that out.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Let's do that. Why don't you go ahead and give us reminder of what you did last time, where we're at now, and any potential opportunities or challenges that might arise.

MS. WILSON: So Visalia was a city that you looked at keeping whole, or what parts to cut out and how much we could keep. But we saw -- I can go ahead and turn that heat map on again as well, but a population that you wanted to preserve here in this northeastern part in Visalia and keeping it in the VRA district. And the rest of Visalia did not match with that vision. And that is why we chose to make it this way last time. Looking at those and factoring that in.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I want to appreciate that --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- that reminder. We have been receiving community of input, telling us all sorts of -- providing us with insightful information. And as we go through this, we're really looking at this from a VRA
In compliance standpoint. And if possible, we're also keeping communities of interest whole.

With that in mind, any additional review? Or are we for the most part comfortable with this district?

(Pause)

CHAIR TOLEDO: Hearing no comments, we have a question from the court reporter and then from Commissioner Yee.

Court reporter, do you have a question? Okay.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I am comfortable with this district. Just to confirm, Kings is -- Kings County is whole here?

MS. WILSON: Correct. Kings County is whole.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Very good. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. I am comfortable with this district as well. Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Just one thought. We do like this, but remember how we were talking about West Bakersfield is now at 61.1. And I believe we were trying to get up to our area which is only at 50 -- Merced-Fresno.

I don't know if playing with shifting a little bit of population from West Bakersfield to Kings-Tulare to have its CVAP to go up higher. And then ultimately...
shifting that north. I don't know if that's something that the Commission wants to explore? But I know that we were looking for where we could increase the CVAP for the Merced-Fresno.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: I just wanted to chime in, I think that's a really good idea that Commissioner Andersen just raised. The 50.94 percent is on the low end. So it's a, you know, I can't say definitively it's to low right now. But it's definitely on the low end. Whereas the Benito district next to it is, I think, comfortably protecting Latino voting rights consistent with the Voting Rights Act. I think the Fresno district is likely -- and the Kings-Tulare district currently are also likely in a comfortable range of protecting Latino voting rights under the Voting Rights Act.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So the thought process is to shift some population north at this point. Let's hear from Commissioner Kennedy and then we'll go back to that thought.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. We are receiving feedback in real time to what we're doing, so I wanted to ask Kennedy if we could just zoom in a little bit around Selma and Reedley to understand where the line goes. Okay --
MS. WILSON: Yes. So we have Reedley and Kingsburg are part of Kings-Tulare. And then Selma and Parlier are going north into the Fresno district.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. So we've just received a recommendation to move Parlier into Kings-Tulare, and I wondered what the impact of that would be. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Kennedy, can you look at that area and try to incorporate it and see what the impact would be? It looks like Kennedy is frozen.

So while she's unfreezing, and -- I think she's having some technical difficulties. Hi, Kennedy.

MS. WILSON: Hello. I am back. Onto share. Okay. So last I heard was exploring Parlier back into Kings-Tulare, but I didn't hear whatever else you had said to me.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So if you could highlight that area and -- so that we can consider the possibility of adding it back?

MS. WILSON: I can do. One moment. So in doing so, that is --

CHAIR TOLEDO: She's freezing. Can you read out the CVAPS?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So it looks like --

CHAIR TOLEDO: The deviations?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- by doing so, the Kings-
Tulare -- oh, are you back, Kennedy?

MS. WILSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: You froze up. I was actually going to be Kennedy for, like, two seconds. I was very excited. But you can be Kennedy.

MS. WILSON: My apologies. I don't know where we left off, but I was going to say that Latino CVAP for Kings-Tulare is at a 54.5. So it jumped about a percent. Less than a percent. And then Fresno goes down to a 52.23 from a 53.13. And the deviations in Kings-Tulare rises to a 5.26, which I was saying, puts it in a space to give away population. And Fresno now goes to a negative 1.6 percent deviation.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So Fresno would go down in Latino CVAP. Director -- or Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: Kennedy, can you enlarge that box so we can see the -- the other CVAPS in that district?

MS. WILSON: Yes. So for the black CVAP for the Kings-Tulare, what's being added in is 3.01. And Fresno is at a 7.86. And then for Asian CVAP for Kings Tulare is a 4.21. Fresno is 11.29. Indigenous for Kings Tulare is 1.33, Fresno 1.18. And this is all percents. My apologies. And white CVAP is 35.48 for Kings Tulare, percent. And then 26.74 percent for Fresno.

MR. BECKER: I'll just advise, I mean, this is
nearly a full percentage point drop of Latino CVAP in the Fresno district. I'm not saying that this can't be done. And this would pose a problem for sure. It just gets me into -- it just gets into a little more of a gray area.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's hold off on this now until we can find other solutions that may make it possible.

Commissioner Kennedy, Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. The other part of the recommendation which I did not mention the first time around was to move Riverdale and some of that far western part into Merced-Fresno district. So I don't know whether that would help or hurt. But the idea was that that would at least help with the deviation, if not with the CVAP as well. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's put up the heat map on. Because maybe the heat map might give us a hint as to whether it will help or hurt. In the meantime, let's -- if you could do that, Kennedy, that would be helpful. And let's hear from Commissioner Fornaciari and we'll come back to this in a second.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Just kind of generally, I was going to say, we need to move population, sort of, at this point, west, probably. Try to move population west to build up the CVAP in Merced-Fresno.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Absolutely --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And that was the -- kind of consistent with the suggestion there, so.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Great, thank you. Okay, Commissioner Kennedy, do you have direction on where to add population to the west? I'm trying to remember what your direction was.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, it was to -- the recommendation or suggestion was to move Riverdale from Fresno to Merced-Fresno. And as far as a specific location, you know, perhaps taking that line coming south from Caruthers and just extending it straight down to the Kings County line. I don't know the area specifically.

MS. WILSON: And adding that to Kings-Tulare or Merced-Fresno?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: To Merced-Fresno.

MS. WILSON: Okay. I will -- oh, if, Chair, if that is direction.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's highlight it and see what the impact would be.

MS. WILSON: Okay. So there is a population of 5,519 people. The CVAP actually stays the same for --

CHAIR TOLEDO: For both --

MS. WILSON: For Merced-Fresno. But Fresno it goes up to 53.15. And for Merced-Fresno, it stay at 50.94.
So for Fresno it goes up .02 percent. And then for Merced-Fresno, it stays the same.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

MS. WILSON: And the -- but a change is the -- are the deviations. So we go from 1.92 percent to a 0.8 percent in Fresno.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

MS. WILSON: And then the deviation for Merced-Fresno goes from a 2.45 to 3.56.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Any concern with accepting this change? Any opposition to it?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I don't think it helps.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fornaciari doesn't believe it helps. Any other comments? All right, so we'll not make the change at this point.

Commissioner Kennedy, did you have follow-up, or --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually, I wanted to zoom out a little bit because we needed -- I feel like we need to go to the district east and then push -- because that's the one that's over, I think, right? The Tulare-Kern? And I'm wondering if we have to push the population that way. I'm not sure.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So I think you're right. I think we need to push population towards the west. And it in a
way --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- that also protects the -- the CVAP set where they are, or increases them. Do we have any specific direction around that? Commissioner Fornaciari, I believe you were -- had brought this up a couple of minutes ago.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm sorry, Kennedy, can you -- can you zoom into, like, that Visalia? Yeah, thank you so much.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And I'm going to ask Mr. Becker to also chime in here.

MR. BECKER: Yeah. I don't want to -- I was going to ask to zoom out. But don't do that, because that would be -- that would be more confused after you zoomed in. But I think, I believe, if I'm mistaken the district immediately to the east of Tulare-Kern is significantly underpopulated, even beyond the legal limit, which Tulare-Kern is still in. So before making any decisions about Tulare-Kern, you probably want to zoom out and just make sure I'm right about that, because that would be an easier fix. And you're going to need to find some population, I think it's the VVHD district. Yes. See that, which is currently a minus 5 -- is it 5.37? Yeah.

MS. WILSON: Correct.
MR. BECKER: So that's a natural place where there could be an exchange of population that could solve two problems that wouldn't impact the VRA areas.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: That's the district they're in the middle of working on. And we, you know, we talked about the swap within the two districts, and Tehachapi and those cities were in those two districts previously. So I would expect that those might go back. And that would lower the Tulare-Kern and raise the VVHD.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That is my understanding as well.

All right, so let's go back to the Central Valley, recognizing that if there is any need for additional population, we will have to do refinements later. But I do know that our line drawers are considering those changes.

All right. So pushing population westward, any thoughts on that, Commissioner Fornaciari, since you brought it up last time?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, I was going to do what Commissioner Kennedy suggested. But if you scroll up towards Fresno --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- it seems like maybe around West Park there might be some higher density,
maybe not, that might be a place to look to pull some folks in.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And if we don't have specifics, we can also give general direction --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. That would probably be better.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- to the line drawers and have them work on it afterwards. So if there's not specific -- and this is why I'm looking for specific feedback from the -- from the Commission. If there's not, we can give general direction to the line drawers. They -- we're all pretty much in consensus we want the districts to look like this, for the most part, we're just making minor refinements at this point to push population. Let's see, I think we've heard from Commissioner Fernandez and Kennedy. I'm a -- Commissioner Akutagawa and then Sinay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Wait, so not me?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, I thought you were already heard. So I think -- I believe Commissioner Fernandez had a comment, and then we'll go to Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, my comment was going to be to give direction to the line drawer. But to obviously be very cautious of that 50.04, to try to move that up. And try to push the population from east to west. That was going to be my -- but to maintain at
least the CVAP that we have now, the Latino CVAP in Kings-Tulare and Fresno and then increase the one in Merced-Fresno. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And I believe that's the direction we'll move in, but let's hear from Akutagawa and Sinay and Andersen.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So I -- so just going back to what Commissioner Kennedy had asked about, about moving Parlier into the Kings-Tulare and moving Riverdale into the Merced-Fresno. Can you must remind me what, was the impact to the Latino CVAP again after you did that?

CHAIR TOLEDO: The impact was --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Did it change?

CHAIR TOLEDO: It did change. And that's the what -- it changed in a manner that we did not want to move in.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: But would the --

CHAIR TOLEDO: It reduced the CVAP.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- but when -- I thought when Riverdale was moved out it increased the CVAP?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Slightly.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. The reason why I'm asking is also because perhaps pushing that west, I know the Merced-Fresno district is larger, I wanted to also
look at that San Benito area. And if we could also just
blow it up, I guess, or just zoom in. Not blow it up but
zoom in. Because that would mean moving, perhaps, some
of the Merced-Fresno district into San Benito.
And since San Benito is slightly under populated --
there was some comments about, I think there was some
cities they felt should be included in that San Benito
district, and I'm not sure if that's reflected or not and
if that would also -- if that might reduce some of the
CVAP there but also help up the Merced-Fresno Latino CVAP
as well, too.
And then, separately, in that Fresno district that
we're talking about, I know that we got a lot of
testimony about the Punjabi community. They called it
the Central United community, and just -- I'm wondering
if making sure that they're also included in this
district will also help up the Latino CVAP in the sense
that there's a lot of, just, intermingling amongst all of
the different various communities in the Fresno area.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you Commissioner Akutagawa.
Let's go to Commissioner Sinay.
COMMISSIONER SINAY. Well, first I wanted to follow
up on what Commissioner Akutagawa just said. We know,
you know, earlier we had heard from Commissioner Sadhwani
that she had thought for Stanislaus-Fresno that there
would be that crossover voting for the black vote. But do we know in this area, in this region, if there is Asian crossover voting? Can our counsel let us know?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Mr. Becker, do you have any guidance on crossover voting in this area?

MR. BECKER: Yes. So what we found is, unlike in Southern California, there is a degree of Asian cohesion with Latino voters. It is not as high and consistent as black voters are cohesive with Latino voters in this area. But unlike Southern California where we see much more cohesion between the Asian and white communities, there is some Asian cohesion with Latino and black voters in this area, according to our analysis. All that said, I still -- I still think the Merced-Fresno district here is on the lower end. It may not be significantly possible to increase it. And that's just the way it would be, given where populations happen to reside. But I do think this is an area where, if possible, boosting it a slight amount would likely create a -- slightly more of a safety net for VRA compliance.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Do you have any guidance on where -- or recommendations, having looked at this area so carefully, that you might give to the Commission?

MR. BECKER: So I think there are two ways to do it.
Commissioner Andersen suggested one, which would be to kind of move population -- Latino, shift some Latino population up from -- I forget what it was called, the West Bakersfield district into Kings-Tulare. And then make a commensurate shift of population from Kings-Tulare into Merced-Fresno with the goal of keeping Kings-Tulare roughly where it is now and maybe boosting Merced-Fresno a little bit.

Another possibility would be to try to -- try to add some population from the Benito district.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-hum.

MR. BECKER: Those seem to be the most likely possibilities. Neither one is necessarily an easy fix with these maps. But Benito is at a comfortable percentage right now. West Bakersfield is at a comfortable percentage right now. But Kings-Tulare and Fresno are at percentages likely adequately protect the Latino populations there.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioners Sinay, Andersen, Fornaciari, Turner.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So one of -- we've gotten conflicting testimony about Old Fig Garden. And then there's -- it gets complicated also because there is a Fig Garden Loop. And so Old Fig Garden -- this is one of the areas where we wanted to increase the CVAP for
Latinos. And -- but I'd like to have a conversation because Old Fig Garden is a traditionally black community and therefore because there's crossover voting, that should be okay. But we have heard from the Latino community, asking to take Old Fig Garden out but making sure that we have Fig Garden Loop in.

And then we've heard from the black community, asking us to keep it in. And so I just -- I wanted to, you know, this goes back to the question about the CVAP and the crossover voting.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And I think -- thank you. I think our focus here is to really make sure that the districts have the CVAPS necessary to ensure compliance and to, as practicable and possible, we will certainly try to keep all CVAPS identified together.

Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. I had two issues, and one was, we did a lot of input on Fresno in terms of if we take that out, we'll increase the CVAP. I believe that was -- well, that was exactly what Commissioner Sinay was just saying, but I didn't know if there was some others. And Kennedy, if you remember, or people remember, similar to how we did the country clubs down around Bakersfield. Was it -- were there any areas around like that around -- in the Fresno area which would...
increase it, that also that might benefit Merced-Fresno?
That was one question.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And thank you,
Commissioner Andersen. And we are looking to shift
population up, too, to get -- to prop up the district
that needs a little bit, if possible, additional CVAP.
Commissioner Fornaciari?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Wait, I'm sorry, because my
other question is, instead of going to San Benito, we do
have areas of Madera. And I know we were playing around
with that, with the population. I'm just wondering if --
have the line drawers have already pursued, you know, in
that area. And, actually if you go out a little bit
further --

CHAIR TOLEDO: My understanding --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- because you were saying
move population from the east-west, and see if that
increases anything.

CHAIR TOLEDO: My understanding is we have done some
visualizations with the Madera area. And so there have
been some -- but it's something that we should look at as
well. Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. With regard to San
Benito, the -- if you could scroll over there for me,
Kennedy, please. The challenge with San Benito when it
comes to Merced-Fresno and this context is that the population of San Benito is almost exclusively in Hollister and to the west. So in order to pull adequate population to bump the CVAP, you've got all this area in the middle that's -- it's all white, because there's very little population there. But that's going to be a heavy lift, I think, to go in that direction.

And then, in regards to Commissioner Akutagawa's question about feedback we got about including other cities, those other cities are down to the south -- southwest of that district, around Greenfield, King City, maybe a little further south. And I was going to ask Kennedy to take a look at that to -- when we get there.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Great. Commissioner Turner, and then we will look at potential opportunity -- a way and hopefully come to a decision to try to get the population to where it needs to be.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. There was direction a minute ago when we went back to Bakersfield --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- to shift up. And I just wanted to give some census block information that we received through COI testimony that should not be included in any VRA district. So when we're looking to shift that, if we could -- I'm going to list off some
areas to make sure that we do not include them in the VRA district. And its 32.21, 32.12, 28.11, 28.22, 28.23, 28.18, 28.07, and 28.04. So we do not include those in the VRA districts as we're looking to shift up.

Then I wanted to move back to the area with that Old Fig Garden and the Fig Garden Loop and just ask you to zoom in. Let me look at that, please, because there is conflicting testimony there, as shared by Commissioner Sinay. And trying see if anything -- so if you would circle the difference of the Old Fig Garden Loop as opposed to Old Fig Garden. Does any -- can we identify that?

MS. WILSON: If it's okay to turn off the block level, it might be easier to see underneath. So using this layer, Old Fig Garden Loop is --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Oh, there it is.

MS. WILSON: -- slightly more. So circling Fig Garden Loop and then Old Fig Garden here.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Okay, so Fresno COIs of Fig Garden Loop is split, it says -- okay, I see it. So if there is a way we can at least keep Old Fig Garden Loop together as we are trying to do our CVAP -- our VRA districts, Old Fig Garden -- and that's north of Shaw up to Bullard Avenue, and try to not have it paired with Clovis. Maybe put it into -- yup, maybe Merced-Fresno --
MS. WILSON: I was going to say, this here is Bullard Avenue. So zoom in a little closer. Shaw is right here and it goes up to Bullard Avenue.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.

MS. WILSON: So I'm not sure if there's a difference between the base map that we have, but Shaw up to Bullard is included here. It stops at Bullard, which is right here. And then Shaw is this one that I'm circling.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay, Bullard is good. And then maybe include --

MS. WILSON: Right above it there's that, like -- what makes that loop is West Fig Garden Drive here. But Bullard -- where it's cut -- where it looks cut --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I see.

MS. WILSON: -- in between that, it is -- this is Bullard Ave -- West Bullard Avenue.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. And then the college COI -- Okay. I got it. So West Park and college. And then West Park is where?

MS. WILSON: West Park is further south, here.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. And we have that included?

MS. WILSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Okay, thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Andersen?
VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. It's an idea. I really appreciate all the stuff that we're all trying to find out. Here's a different idea in terms of increasing the CVAP. And it's actually over on the San Benito side if we can kind of have a look. This is for the Merced-Fresno I'm considering here.

CHAIR TOLEDO: It sounds like we have, at this point, two options, right? It's the San Benito option that you're exploring now and then --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: No, no, no. This is something different.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'm saying just add portions of the Merced-Fresno -- the western portion of Merced-Fresno, which is basically white. Now, I don't know if there's any population in it. If it's still all -- if it's still in the terrain level, throw it into San Benito county and see what that does. Basically take out white population.

MS. WILSON: Sorry, was that direction to draw -- to draw?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

MS. WILSON: Okay.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. To actually shift the county -- the line so it'd be on the county. Shift it
into the area -- and you can see that it's sort of all terrain. I don't know if there are any people in it. But it might help -- it might be enough to help. Might not have census blocks done that way, so.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Let's look at that, but --

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: It just looked like it was cutting in too far, but I'll -- let's wait and see what it looks like.

CHAIR TOLEDO: We can take a look. But in the meantime we can have a conversation while that's happening.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. Yeah, we'll look at this. But my only concern is that this will potentially then reduce the Latino CVAP in Benito. And I wouldn't necessarily want to do that, because they keep saying we need a higher percentage.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I was thinking we might be able to grab Soledad.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Mr. Becker, do you have any suggestions here?

MR. BECKER: I think the Benito district is -- has some flexibility there. And I think this is a good idea that's possibly worth exploring. Particularly since Benito is slightly underpopulated and Merced-Fresno is
slightly overpopulated.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Great. Let's explore it. Any other conversation --

MS. WILSON: So now --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, sorry, Kennedy, go ahead.

MS. WILSON: Sorry, no. I was just going to ask if I was going around the general direction, if you wanted it to go more south? I was just picking up the white that was right across in Fresno, but wasn't sure.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. I was thinking in Fresno, but also in that little bit in Merced. You know, essentially try to stick with the areas that do not have Latino voters -- or according to the CVAP.

MS. WILSON: So far this is only 258 people.

CHAIR TOLEDO: It's all mountains.

MR. BECKER: If I may, maybe that area just south of the Merced-Fresno county line that -- right next -- yeah, that area there, maybe increase that a little bit. Got it up to 351.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Or even going south on the mountains -- exactly, in that area around Coalinga.

CHAIR TOLEDO: It's so few people that I'm not seeing a change in CVAP -- in the --

MR. BECKER: It was a good idea worth exploring, but it's -- it seems to be having virtually no effect on the
overall percentages of either district.

      CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. It doesn't seem that there's
      enough population there, Commissioner Andersen, but thank
      you for the idea. Any other -- I believe the other
      idea -- the other option was to shift population up.
      Because there really was only two. One from San Benito
      into this area. The other is from the Bakersfield area
      up.

      MS. WILSON: And if that is -- or I'm not sure, was
      that direction to me?

      CHAIR TOLEDO: No. So that --

      MS. WILSON: Oh, okay.

      CHAIR TOLEDO: -- those are the two concepts that we
      had talked about. It's not direction at this point. But
      it's the two areas where we might be able to shift
      population up to the Merced-Fresno -- is it the Merced-
      Fresno area that needs additional -- if possible, trying
      to increase that CVAP.

      So if any commissioner has any direct -- direct
      guidance, direction for the line drawer. If not,
      we'll -- we can give general direction and keep moving
      forward. Mr. Becker?

      MR. BECKER: Yeah. I just suggest -- I was going to
      suggest some general direction here. I also want to make
      clear, I'm not suggesting that 50.94 percent here is --
is a big red flag. It's more of a -- it's more of an
area that if it's possible to improve would be good to
improve to get into a better position. So this might
get -- this is not an area where sirens are going off,
but it's an area where I appreciate all of the effort to
try to -- to try to improve the percentage.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Appreciate that. Commissioner Sinay
and then Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Going back to the Fig Loop --
Fig Garden Loop. One of the recommendations to keep the
Fig Garden Loop all together was to go -- to use instead
of the -- that one road is to use the river, the -- I
think it's the Kings River? Where is the Kings River.
So it's still not going to the north of that. I know.
And what river is above it? Where it says the Consulate
of Mexico? Is there another -- is that a river, or is
that --

MS. WILSON: That is -- here is the county line --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Okay, but the San Juan
River states -- but there's no river -- San Juan river up
there?

Ms. WILSON: Not that I am seeing.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Turner, were you talking
about this general area as well, your comment?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: I was. I was -- Kennedy, if we follow Bullard all the way across, what's in that area? Is that an area we previously excluded?

MS. WILSON: Previously it was more so about keeping populations. And so we kind of -- we rose to East Bullard to keep more of the Hmong and Sikh Communities together, because before it was just at Shaw. So that's why those kind of rose and took up to East Bullard because previously it was at Shaw. And it never did go all the way across at East Bullard.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. So can we explore, can we look and see what that helps?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Let's explore and see if that helps.

MS. WILSON: And I put the heat map back on as well, and I will try that.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Akutagawa, while we're doing that, do you have any comments?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I just wanted to ask a question. I -- sorry, I'm just kind of, like, not remembering everything again now. If we were to -- I believe -- I thought I had heard from Mr. Becker than the San Benito district number -- the CVAP was comfortable enough and perhaps, I don't know if I'm putting words into his mouth, that maybe it could go a little lower.
Or I'm just thinking that instead of Merced-Fresno going west, or giving up, I guess population to San Benito, what if we were to take some part of San Benito and put it into Merced-Fresno? I know it's already overpopulated, but to bring up the Latino CVAP. Would that help?

And I can't remember if we already discussed that.

I think I'm -- there's been so much that now I just need a reminder. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I think we have. I think we have. If you have any direct direction -- any direction on that. Let's go to this and then we come back to that after --

MS. WILSON: So with this, it does raise the deviation of Fresno and it drops the CVAP, going across East Bullard. So we go from a 53.13 to a 52.04. And we're above deviation.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Kennedy.

MS. WILSON: Um-hum.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thanks for exploring that. We did get feedback to Commissioner Sinay's comments. We did get feedback that Old Fig Garden should not be in the VRA district. And I just wanted to -- can you look at the impact of having it out of the district, and then we can talk about it.
MS. WILSON: Yes. And that is, again, from a previous iteration --

CHAIR TOLEDO: It is from a previous iteration.

MS. WILSON: -- but it does help to raise the CVAP. I will put that up now.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And then while we're -- while we're looking at that, let's have the conversation around whether it makes sense to keep it or to explore other options. Or to keep portions of it. I believe the feedback we got was specific to some neighborhoods in the Old Fig Garden.

MS. WILSON: So I slightly smoothed out the line and put it in there. There's an addition of 5,577 for Fresno. It puts the deviation at 0.79 percent. And it raises the CVAP, but only slightly, from a 53.13 to a 53.52 percent.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Does -- and you're saying it doesn't help with deviation either?

MS. WILSON: No. It does help to bring down the deviation. We move from 1.92 percent to -- with this change to 0.79 percent. However, it does bring the Calaveras-Inyo to 5.11 percent.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Where we do need population at some point, right? Because we're -- anyway --

MS. WILSON: If you're planning to shift things,
moving them --

CHAIR TOLEDO: If we're shifting population up, it makes sense to, because the goal is to shift population westward and upward.

Okay. Any other comments on here? Can we see the black CVAP in this area? And then we'll hear from Commissioner Yee.

MS. WILSON: Yes. So the percent black CVAP with this selection here is 7.75 percent.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Does it go down or up with the change?

MR. BECKER: That's a slight increase, if my memory serves. I think it was around 7.13 or so. Is that right, Kennedy?

CHAIR TOLEDO: So taking it out increases the black CVAP?

MS. WILSON: One moment.

MR. BECKER: No. I'm seeing, actually 7.71. It's about the same.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So it doesn't change the black CVAP, but any -- can we see the black CVAP -- the heat map?

MS. WILSON: Yes. One moment, please.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And while we're waiting, let's hear Commissioner Yee. Sorry, Commissioner Yee, I forgot.

COMMISSIONER YEE: No problem. I was just going to
say I like this change. I think we should go forward with it.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you. This is the African American CVAP, Kennedy?

MS. WILSON: No. One more -- one --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, okay.

MS. WILSON: One other second. Okay. Now it is up. My apologies for that -- waiting.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That's great. And can you zoom them in a little bit so we can all see the neighborhoods?

MS. WILSON: So we don't have a neighborhood layer for this area as we do for, like, San Francisco and LA. But I can also turn on the terrain if that would help as well, to kind of see --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. If you could do the terrain or the -- so it looks like the African American community is centered around the left -- the western portion of this area. Is there any way to see where Shaw is?

MS. WILSON: So Shaw is the line that it is currently going across the top is --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum.

MS. WILSON: The line is Shaw. I have to switch the layers to make sure it's just above each other so that you can see them both.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Can you zoom in a little bit more so
we can see a little bit closer? Our screens are -- or my
eyes are not as good as they used to be.

MS. WILSON: Yes. I can continue to zoom in so you
can see major streets; Ashland Avenue is right where my
cursor is going across. And then Shaw is at the top.
Those are two big street names that we've heard of. So
here is Shaw again. And then Ashland, about two-thirds
of the way down -- or one-third of the way down.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And the black CVAP is -- or the black
CVAP, can you show us right there?

MS. WILSON: Yes. So the way that the layers stack
on top of each other, it's not transparent. So it does
not show through. But actually, give me one more moment
to try to -- so I changed the opacity, but it is hard to
see the colors underneath of this. I can exit the
selection as well.

CHAIR TOLEDO: No. I can see it.

MS. WILSON: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I don't know if other commissioners
can, but I can make it out barely, but -- any direction
on this -- or feedback, Commissioner -- Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I don't know about the
exact boundaries. I know we did receive testimony about
removing Old Fig Garden from this district.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. I was actually just a little bit over -- above this, take out a little -- put a little section of the CALA-INYO into the Merced-Fresno, so it wasn't exactly about the Old Fig.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So -- and we can explore that after we decide what to do with -- let's figure out this area. So at this point we're leaning towards taking out Old Fig, and the question becomes, do we want to keep some portions of -- split Old Fig, or are there any splits that we want to do?

Overall, if we remember, moving this into -- moving this out of this district would improve deviations and it doesn't really change the CVAPs very much at all. Keeps the CVAPs about the same. So that's -- we're probably not talking about a -- well, given the large size of the district, it's probably a sizable community, but not a large impact on deviation. Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to ask a clarifying question. Are we thinking about moving this, if not for population or VRA-related items, then is it for community of interest? Or am I misunderstanding?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, it's for deviation purposes. Because it improves deviation and also moves population
up, and it improves the CVAP as well.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: So it would increase deviation for CALA-INYO?

CHAIR TOLEDO: I believe it does impact -- increase the Latino CVAP slightly.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: But Kennedy, can you please --

MS. WILSON: Yeah. I was just going to say, as far as moving population up, that is -- would be for the eastern part. As far as what can be moved to Merced-Fresno, this doesn't necessarily help that, because you would want this to have a higher percentage of people so that it could move over. So by lowering this deviation, it doesn't help with the transferring of people over to Merced-Fresno.

CHAIR TOLEDO: But it would -- we are looking to transfer some population northward in the Inyo district.

MS. WILSON: And it would help that, yes. I just wasn't sure what -- sorry, I wasn't sure what move -- where you were going. So I just wanted to make that clear about both of those.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. We're thinking of a couple steps later. All right. Commissioner Akutagawa, and then we'll go to Commissioner Fornaciari and Sinay and then Andersen --
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I --
CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, okay.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- I guess I'll just say --
CHAIR TOLEDO: So Akutagawa and then Andersen.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I hear what you're saying about trying to lower the deviation. But I also hear -- well, I guess, I'm just wondering if that's the best place to do it. We did get -- while, I think there was COI testimony to remove it, there was also COI testimony that there is a -- I guess, a black COI there in that particular area. And I know that that's what you're trying to look at. And I'm just wondering if removing it is just not really going to make that much of a difference. And if it's better to leave them there and then to look elsewhere to move population and give us a little bit more of that flexibility.
I think overall, it seems like everything was incremental and based -- the request from the community there was to be included in this district over the other district.
CHAIR TOLEDO: That's correct. That's the decision point here.
Commissioner Andersen?
VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Sorry. Yes. I believe that I was still -- this -- I'm thinking of adding more Hispanic
people to the vote -- to the Merced-Fresno. And in Fresno area, could you up just a little bit and then turn on the -- turn off black CVAP and put on the Latino CVAP. Because I believe that essentially quarter north of the word Fresno, that section there does have a higher Latino CVAP. But if we circled it, you would find out exactly what it was. Because if it's less than 30, it's not going to help us.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Let's hear from Commissioner Fornaciari as that comes up.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, a couple of things. I think that -- the same thing caught my eye that caught Commissioner Andersen's eye. That there seem to be a couple little corners there that had pretty high L-CVAP. I kind of feel like we're getting a little bogged down in our progress in a detail, and that we can put this on the list to kind of come back to, circle back to.

But I think we got to kind of finish up our VRAs and keep this moving, because we got some districts up north that definitely need to be fixed. And I think, actually, you know, we'll get more clarity on our ability to make this move, you know, once we get the other districts more kind of settled in.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, Chair, I was just going
to ask that we not accept Old Fig Garden change for now
so that we can move.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So we don't change -- we won't
accept this change for now. And then we will continue to
look at the change that Commissioner Andersen is
exploring, and then move to general direction to the line
drawers so we can continue to move forward.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: If you want to try -- Kennedy,
if you just took that one square -- oh, well, let's talk
about that. I was actually talking about above the --
above and to the left of Old Fig Garden.

Yeah. That little area right in there, which is
still the City of -- yeah. That little area right in
there. But it doesn't -- the coloration of it looks
like -- could you just outline that and see, it's tell us
what the CVAP is in that area. Doesn't look high enough
to give any help at all.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And at this point, since we're just
making refinements and adding little portions of the --
of the area, we might want to just give general direction
so that Kennedy can work on this offline.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah, that's -- I don't
believe that's worth exploring. Thank you, Kennedy.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Can you remind me, Chair,
where we're trying to move this?

CHAIR TOLEDO: We're -- thank you. So we're trying
to increase the CVAP for the Merced-Fresno area, as well
as push population to the west towards Merced-Fresno area
if possible. And up.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And so those are the two priorities
at this point.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So if direction can be given, I'm
looking for direction for the line drawers. I believe
Commissioner Fernandez had given some direction in terms
of this area. And to prop up the -- if possible, to
explore -- to do some explorations of the -- to try to
get the CVAP up in the Merced-Fresno area.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right, Kennedy, do you
remember -- we started from the -- I can't even remember
on the east -- I don't want to say it's overpopulated,
but possible -- yeah, the Tulare-Kern and potentially
push to the west, one, with the goal of not decreasing
the CVAP in -- oh, you're moving it so fast -- in
Fresno --

MS. WILSON: Sorry. I was trying to move that out
so you can see --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, perfect.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you so much. I appreciate that. Yeah. Trying to move some of that population to the west while at the same time not decreasing the Latino CVAP in the VRA districts. But hopefully increasing the Latino CVAP in the Merced-Fresno area.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Andersen then Sinay. And we're looking for general direction for Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. My general direction on the Merced-Fresno, again, is really trying to look at decreasing the non-Latino CVAP areas. And that could be, you know, from San Benito. It could also be, if you go -- scoot out just a little bit -- or if the map will let you do that. It could also be in the, you know, Merced area, you know -- well, I guess it's a little bit further north. Yes. If there's any population in there. You know, where were kind of trying to add population to create this district. If we can essentially take some of the areas of -- anywhere in the Merced area -- within the Merced-Fresno area that have very low in population, one; and two, low Latino CVAP. And if so, trying to take those out of the Merced-Fresno area, because that would be our best bang for the buck, given how the Latino CVAP around the area is just not very high.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

And so what it's sounding like is, in terms of general direction, I'll summarize and then we'll make sure that I'm capturing correctly -- is that we're pretty comfortable with this district as is. That we are, if possible, and it is -- it looks -- it's looking difficult -- if possible, we would be working to try to -- giving Kennedy the ability to explore around the edges of this district, whether it's adding or subtracting populations, to get us to a CVAP that is a little bit higher.

And with that, I'm going to go to Commissioner Turner to see if she has additional input.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Again, to the COI testimony and the support that we're getting currently, I'll just kind of read it off, and for Kennedy to explore later, not necessarily for now. But for the same area, and I think we were trying it earlier, and that is to try and put Parlier with Reedley, into the Kings-Tulare district, and in the same token, move Riverdale and some of western Fresno into the AD_MERCED to balance the population and keep the western county rural areas.

And then, also, I don't see Terra Bella, but perhaps that'll allow it to be kept whole. So that's just new information that's coming in as well, that if it helps
with shifting that towards Merced. Yeah. That Fresno-
Merced.

    CHAIR TOLEDO: So if it's possible to shift those
and maintain or increase the Latino CVAP and shift the
population towards Merced, to do that.

    COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

    CHAIR TOLEDO: So just want to make sure. Well, the
direction is to work around the edges and try to increase
that CVAP, as well as maintain the direction that
Commissioner Turner gave with regards to the specific
community of interest.

    MS. WILSON: And I would like to note that Terra
Bella is whole. Just --

    CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

    MS. WILSON: -- I think it's right here.

    CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So is that sufficient
direction, Kennedy? We're pretty comfortable with this
district as is. It's just some refinements to try to
increase the Latino CVAP, if possible.

    MS. WILSON: Yes. And so mostly working between
these three, and not going between this county line and
bringing it up, is what I'm hearing.

    CHAIR TOLEDO: And the goal is to shift some
population west, if possible, as well, right? Towards
districts that need deviation. Although, it looks
difficult to do. Challenging, in that other districts are -- the communities where Latinos reside makes it complex, because it potentially reduces the CVAP. All right.

So with that, let's keep moving forward to the next district. We've talked about Fresno-Merced.

MS. WILSON: So are you wanting to move to San Benito, or north, more north in my area, in this northern, inland area?

CHAIR TOLEDO: I'm looking to the Commission for -- we can look at San Benito, if that's -- there's significant COI input from the community.

So Kennedy, are you responsible for San Benito? Is it somebody else?

MS. WILSON: I will switch. She's right here, and we can -- there's no break time needed.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, excellent. So why don't we do that? Let's switch, and we'll go to San Benito, given that that's also an area with Voter Rights implications.

Oh, it's Tamina.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).

CHAIR TOLEDO: And thank you so much, Kennedy. You've been, as always, awesome.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fornaciari?
Good morning, or good afternoon. Feels like the morning, still.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Hi, Tamina.

Thanks.

So I just want to comment on this district. I think, in general, it looks good. It could use a little population. Some of the feedback -- I mean, so it's kind of a minor tweak, and I don't want to get down a rabbit hole chasing this, I just want to throw it out for general thoughts. We did get some feedback that the Salinas Valley as a whole is a community of interest, and the folks that live in the Salinas Valley would like to be part of the VRA districts around here.

And so you can see, if you go a little further south, you have a number of small little towns there, San Lucas, San Ardo, Lockwood was even brought up, could be part of it. So I would -- I just offer that I'd be interested in kind of exploring that, what the impact would be of doing that, maybe down to Bradley.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So can you give a specific direction there?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Sure. Extend the southern portion of the San Benito District down to the county line, sort of following the river there. Not that far,
not all the way to the coast. Just --

CHAIR TOLEDO: And is it really focused around
the --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Around that river.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Around the river. So around the --
and it's capturing those communities with --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah.
CHAIR TOLEDO: -- the highest Latino CVAP?
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I'd just be curious
to see what it's doing with our CVAP. And what it's
going to do, I mean, part of my -- part of my concern
here is that you got the Monterey coast that's already
low, and we're going to make it lower. And so I wouldn't
want to make this move without everyone being comfortable
with it.

And where did the Latino CVAP go? It went down.
That's weird. That's kind of weird.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So the Latino CVAP goes down --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Down.
CHAIR TOLEDO: -- to 55.98.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Down .1 percent.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Could we put the heat map on, Tamina?
Sorry to interrupt, Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: No, no. That's fine. I
mean, we'd have to -- we'd have to kind of extent that,
obviously, to the county line to the east to make it contiguous, but.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So we're talking about 3,000 people.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).

CHAIR TOLEDO: Well, the highlighted area is 3,000 people.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, but that's just a few more people.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) curiosity kills the cat.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Also kills our time. But yeah. If you can just kind of fill it in quickly and rough it out. I don't know. I'm kind of, sort of, on the fence here.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).

CHAIR TOLEDO: Would it make sense to add, and it's probably not a lot of people either, the area to the left? I keep worrying about taking population out of the -- out of the neighboring district.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So we're getting to a point where it's getting uncomfortable, and we got to figure out how to add population back to Monterey. We'd have to get that from the north. I don't know if that city --
CHAIR TOLEDO: Santa Cruz?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: No. Let me get it real quick. I don't know how much -- I don't know how much value Prunedale is adding. Oh.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I like this one. Thank you, Tamina.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. That's really good.

MS. RAMOS ALON: This is just to show you how many zero population blocks there are around here, and kind of where the people reside, so you can see an area that may look big only has five people. And that's why you're not really getting the increase in the CVAP that you were expecting.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. It wasn't really about CVAP, it was just including these folks in the district. But again, it's hurting the Monterey coast a bit.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So given that we're not seeing any increase -- I know that there's community of interest -- community of interest testimony suggesting we add these populations, but at this point, since it's not really making a difference in the population, it could potentially impact our population numbers.

Just wondering if this is a change that the Commission is interested in continuing to pursue, or if
we are interested in moving on, or looking at other
alternatives?

So we'll go to Commissioner Akutagawa, and then
Commissioner Fornaciari after that.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Can you zoom in on
Soledad? Is that included in the district, or not? This
might be just a small refinement, or a small change
that -- okay. No, they're included, so that's okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: It looks like it is.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. Yeah. Yeah.
There was just -- some of the testimony seemed -- they
seemed really mad that Soledad was separated from them,
and given some of these small cities and separating them
from the bigger ones, it may seem like it would be an
easy fix, but no. This is okay. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I think that may have been a
reference to the other maps, I think the congressional
and State Senate, or congressional, I believe.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Maybe this is
something we can think about, because Monterey is so
negative already, maybe this is something we can think
about with regard to the congressional district when we
get there.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. It may be something we can do
in the State Senate map, which is bigger, or the congressional map. It doesn't look like it's possible at this point, although we can keep thinking about this in our minds and try to look at different options as we do our homework. So we can come back to this in refinement, because it is -- it would be refinement. We're talking about not too many people. But at this point, it doesn't look like it's making an impact. Perhaps, once we shift population down to Monterey, it may be possible to do this.

So Commissioner Akutagawa and Andersen, if you're okay with this, we will --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Actually, I just had a quick question about the, was all of Soledad in, and it didn't -- it actually looked like there was more that was not in, if we zoomed in, or was that the river?

CHAIR TOLEDO: I think it's the river.

But Tamina, can you also --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Could you go just a little closer, please?

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- put on the Latino CVAP so we can -- the heat map to see if there's any population we missed?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Okay. The only area --

MS. RAMOS ALON: That's the river.
VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you. It is the river.

The only area I would think is -- I don't know if that would help at all, but at least would be -- I believe it's around Greenfield, this little bit -- the next town south, if any of that population would help. It doesn't have a whole lot of population, but in the little city, it sort of does. Oh, it's fourteen people. Oh. So it's just a thought for later. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So it would need refinement. Okay. So it looks like we're comfortable with this district. And we're going to take a look at the State Senate maps and the congressional maps and see if we can address these -- keep these communities whole in those maps, where we have more ability to do so, because these are districts that aren't quite so big.

So let's keep moving north. Okay. So we're entering Merced-Stanislaus.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay. Well, that would be back to Kennedy. We're just going to switch chairs again. One second, please.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you for -- thank you for the help, Tamina.

MS. WILSON: Hello.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And welcome back, Kennedy. All
right. So let's see. So we've talked about Merced-
Fresno.

MS. WILSON: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And we've given direction on that.

Can we go to the next district in the Central
Valley?

MS. WILSON: Yes. Next district would be Stanislas.

And again, from last time, we were tinkering with the
border, and previously, Stanislas was split into three.

We cut that down to two. This keeps Modesto down to
Turlock and the west side of it together, and then,
Hughson up to -- and then Salida, Del Rio, Riverbank,
Oakdale, up to Knights Ferry, and Valley Home are pushed
out of this district.

And that's just a general overview that I don't know
if I was supposed to give, but that's what is in this
district here.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I appreciate the overview. And our
break is going to be in two minutes, but in the meantime,
I would like Commissioners to think about these are areas
where we've received significant public input around,
especially the Modesto area, and so as we break for 15
minutes, if you can come back with your thoughts and
specific direction in this area.

It's not a VRA area, so we have a little bit more
discretion, but it is important that we get this area right for the public and the communities that are in this community.

So we'll be back in 15 minutes, and we'll be looking at the Stanislas District. Thank you. So 4:30.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 4:14 p.m. until 4:30 p.m.)

CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are continuing on our visualizations for the Central Valley. We are now focused on the Stanislas region, with a particular focus on the Modesto area.

So any general direction here from the Commission?

What I do look -- and what stands out a little bit here is that the deviation is -- the deviation numbers stand out.

Commissioner Fernandez, and then we'll go to Commissioner Turner, and then Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.

On the Central Valley, it's hard for me to discuss this piece until we get that whole ECA portion done, because it could impact what this looks like. Remember, we talked about that? About maybe looking at that? So that was kind of what my focus was more on, the Sierras.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Okay.
And then, Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And that may be a good idea -- thank you, Chair -- because we've received a lot of testimony about this area, particularly as it relates to Modesto, so I'd be willing to look at ECA first because I think it's absolutely going to have a ripple impact if we really start to consider making some of the changes that would perhaps include moving Tracy into Stanislas area, in with Modesto and some of that area, so it would be some of that type of architectural change.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So I think we've gotten pretty good feedback from Stanislas on this particular district for Assembly. The negative feedback we've gotten is really focused on the congressional district going up into the hills. I'm pretty comfortable with this, but we do, I think, need to go back and revisit that ECA district and get that finalized before we can continue north, because that's certainly going to impact, I mean, the areas that --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Sure.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- we have to work here in the valley are still in the finalizing far north in the Sacramento area, but the ECA is going to definitely
impact that.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So I'm hearing what seems to be a consensus on moving on to the ECA.

Akutagawa, then Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Can we just see the -- just the larger area? I'm just trying to get a context for this, too.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Absolutely. Can we get this -- zoom out?

And then, Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And I apologize. It's not actually called the ECA on this one. I was looking for the name of it. Is it the CALA-INYO? Yeah. Is that the one?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hold on.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. It's ECA in the other maps. Yes. It's the CALA-INYO.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.


CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

MS. MAC DONALD: So just one moment, please.

CHAIR TOLEDO: We'll be going to that region. It's in more of the Sierra region, the mountainous areas.

So while we're waiting, just some discussion in
terms of the general direction. We really do need
general direction, or rather, specific direction on how
to move and how to deal with this area.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

And so how I was looking, I was looking at the terrain,
so if at some point, we can also look at the terrain.
And I was thinking more of this, if fellow Commissioners
are in agreement, the CALA-INYO would be more of a
mountainous, Sierra-type district, and my recommendation
was to move from south to north, so from Inyo going up.

So that was going to be my focus.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So if we're thinking about a anchor,
what would be your anchor?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So my anchor would probably
be Inyo, in part, and then, if we're building a mountain-
type district, some of the counties would be divided
because some of them have the mountains, like Tulare, and
Fresno, and Madera, most of Mariposa is mountain, so some
of these counties will be split based on those ranges.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So we have the terrain layer
here.

And so what I'm hearing from you, Commissioner
Fernandez, is that we would get -- we would have Inyo
County in this district, Mono County, and go up as much
as we can? Is that what you're suggesting, or can you please clarify?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So what I was suggesting, because if we go up that way, we're going to go into Oregon, I think, or Washington, to try to get that population, so we're actually going to have to go into -- you see Tulare's got the mountains and Fresno, Madera, Mariposa, I was -- that would be my suggestion, but of course, I would definitely welcome other opinions.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So now that we have Kennedy back on, can we look at the district as it is right now? It's difficult with the terrain layer. Can you show us what the district looks like now? So the district --

MS. WILSON: So I can tell you that -- oh, sorry --

CHAIR TOLEDO: It's all right.

MS. WILSON: -- I could just go over the counties. We have Inyo, Mono, Alpine, and then, we do not have Amador. It's cut between Amador and Calaveras. Calaveras is a part of it, Tuolumne, Mariposa, and then, parts of Madera right up -- there's Chowchilla, Fairmead, Madera, Parkwood that it kind of cuts off of, and then, we have this northeastern part of Fresno and Clovis, as well, and Fresno.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So Commissioner Fernandez, your direction would be?
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: We would -- wait. Hold on.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Because I do see the mountainous areas are already in this district.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Some --

MS. WILSON: The one not in this district that she mentioned --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Was Tulare, huh?

MS. WILSON: -- is Tulare. However, there's not very much population, because that's all, again, this is where the Sequoia National Park, Sequoia Forests are, so that there's not very many people.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. But like, I -- I'm sorry. I need to see the boundaries again. It just isn't as clear. I have my other map at home, unfortunately, that has all of my notes. But I think, right now, I think some of the borders that we have, like in Fresno, Madera, Mariposa, may need to be moved --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- towards the mountains. That's what I mean, in terms of refinements.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, I'm good. Sorry.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. The
testimony that's been most helpful and persuasive to me is the testimony from various persons that has said, essentially, divide along the crest. On the eastern side of the crest, go fairly far north, and yeah, eventually, you're going to hit a road that -- a major road that crosses the mountains to be able to pick up population. So no, we're not going to go all the way to the Oregon border, we're going to go far enough to hit a major road to cross the mountains and pick up the population.

So and then, everything to the west of the crest is separate from that. Just as far as ease of transportation, as well as, I think, a different set of concerns, generally, so. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Absolutely. I'd love to see that visualized, and see what that does. Exactly what Commissioner Kennedy just described, based on the desire to separate the mountainous communities from kind of flatlands, and so if we could -- and I would perhaps leave the southern border alone. Inyo, Tulare, we're already worked that through, but starting at the crestline, where that divides in Fresno, and cut up, straight up from there.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Well, not straight, but follow the terrain.

CHAIR TOLEDO: All right. So we have direction from Commissioner Kennedy.

Kennedy, if you can start looking at that?

In the meantime, we'll take input from Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Andersen.

MS. WILSON: I'm not too sure --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm also in the queue.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, and then Commissioner Akutagawa as well. Sorry about that.

Kennedy, you were saying?

MS. WILSON: I'm not too sure about what the direction was.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's get Commissioner Kennedy to give the direction, and --

MS. WILSON: And if I may make another point?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Absolutely.

MS. WILSON: Is just that we have this district built here, so before making it what it needs to be, I have to add these portions to that district, and then continue shifting things around. So it would have to start with moving these counties into another district, and then maybe moving some out to get to what he was saying. Just so that you understood the process of --
CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes. And so I do understand that you'll need to shift population first and then -- in order to be able to go back.

Commissioner Kennedy, do you want to give the direction?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'll make a recommendation.

CHAIR TOLEDO: How about you make a recommendation and then we'll see if we all agree? We'll make the recommendation and then we'll get comments from the Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right. My recommendation is that we start with Inyo County, Mono County, Alpine County, we continue going north to the east of the crest, until we hit, kind of, the Tahoe region, which connects west towards population, and that is where we drop down to get the population that we need to fill that out as a district. We're not going to go past -- I'd say we're not going to go past Plumas in any case. There's no need to.

And then things to the west of the crest, that would essentially be a separate district or joined with Valley districts.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Which would be -- which would be difficult, because many of those are VRA Districts, right? So but possibly, there might be a separate
district --

    COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. Yeah.

    CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

    COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you.

    CHAIR TOLEDO: And I think let's go to Commissioner Akutagawa, Fornaciari, Andersen, Fernandez, and specifically, any comments on this suggestion.

    COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So I want to just say that I think what I'm hearing Commission Kennedy say, reading through some of the COI testimonies, there's kind of mixed results, but at the very least, there seems to be this kind of east-west divide from the crest of the Sierras, and that those to the east would prefer to be with more of the eastern sides, and then, those to the west and the foothills would rather be with the Valley floor, is just some of the general themes that -- just based on what I just quickly skimmed through again, there's new ones coming in.

And so I think there's not going to be a whole lot of population. I think that's the question where, perhaps it's more general direction to give to -- I don't know if it's Kennedy again. I apologize. I'm not sure who's doing the mapping right now, but general direction to say, if possible, use the crest going east and add to this district going further north.
I know that there's some people that are not happy about going too far north because of the distance, but in more sparsely populated areas, these might be the best ways possible to keep some communities of interest, even if they're further apart. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So if I can kind of paraphrase, it looks like what we're going is putting 33,387 people up into what is currently ECA, all on the east side of the ridge of the Sierras, and then CALA-INYO, which is the foothills, or the west side of the peak, down to the foothills, and down to the Valley, is going to be a little negative, and we can probably put Amador to the south and come out about right.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay? So I mean, I guess this seems like a reasonable approach to me. Just want to make sure I understood it.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And thank you for providing the clarification.

Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Well, thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari, for saying that. It is a very small group.
In terms of where the first road is that goes over the hill, it's actually 120 at Tuolumne, up the back side of -- into Yosemite. And that is kind of what they were talking about, because it's Mono, and they basically share the back side of Yosemite.

Anyway, if we do this, though, what I'd like to -- I'd almost like to start, yes, we know we want Inyo, but if we start at the north and kind of work that out, I think it's going to work out for a lot of things. The issue here is, is CALA-INYO, there's the -- Mono's part of the Fresno, there's the Mount Yoruba part of Madera, and there's a little tiny bit of (indiscernible) and Mariposa, and then, you're already in the foothills. So unless you want to try to add that stuff to STANIS-SSAC, to create another district there, you've lost the mountainous area.

Because remember, these are areas that they are saying, we're completely different than the Central Valley. Our farming is different, it's the Gold Country, that sort of thing. And to create another district here, I don't believe Amador have -- I don't have the number right in front of me, but it doesn't have enough to completely change that. So I understand where we're sort of going from. I'd almost rather start at the north, and work it out through the Assembly to (indiscernible)
follow, and come on down the side.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Um-hum. Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. This was very
different than what I was looking -- I was looking more
at the entire -- not east-west, just all of it, in terms
of the mountainous areas. But if this is the way you
want to go, I guess we can go that way. It just
doesn't -- I don't know. I think I'm getting tired now.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. We keep talking about the
crest, and the east side of the mountains, and the west
side of the mountains. Is that the county lines there?
I don't know, and I don't remember my geography lesson
well enough. I mean, the eastern parts of -- thank
you -- Tuolumne, Mariposa, and Madera, so forth, they're
mountainous, but on the west side of the mountains, which
we had some testimony the other day that that was fine.
It's the crest. So is that the crest? I mean, it kind
of looks like it right now, looking at this, more or
less, in which case, I like Commissioner Fornaciari's
proposal.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I put my hand up just
to be in the queue in case I wanted to say something
different, but I actually like the way this is, and perhaps, to start adding in population across the crest to see where it is and how far it needs to go.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fornaciari, is that your direction, or was that your recommendation, rather?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, technically, this is Commissioner Kennedy's direction, and I just paraphrased it.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Well, it's the Commissioner's direction?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So here's the challenge, Commissioner Fernandez, is we have a pocket of population in Fresno, and a pocket of population there in the bottom of Madera County that has no place to go, right? I mean, unless we can figure out a different place to put them. They have to go somewhere. And there's very little folks in the foothills, so I mean, for me, this is kind of a compromise, where we get the east side of the hills going north in the direction they want to go. I know the folks in the foothills aren't -- well, some of them are, some of them aren't. We've heard some testimony where the folks in the foothills like to come down to the Valley, but I mean, unless we can think of another way to deal with that population in Fresno and Madera County, I'm not sure there's another answer.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. Commissioner Fernandez, can you respond?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm not necessarily responding to any of that, I just feel that we're being inconsistent in terms of, we're going to go along the crest, and then once we get to El Dorado, Placer, whatever, it doesn't matter. Right? We're going to take the whole county. So I was trying to be consistent in terms of defining a mountain area, so that's -- I was just trying to be consistent. That's kind of analytical way of thinking, but if this is the way the majority want to go, we'll go along for the ride.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's -- since Commissioner Kennedy made the initial recommendation, I'd like to hear his thoughts on that, and then come back to the queue.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. The idea has never been necessarily to stick with entire counties. I mean, colleagues will recall that I've been saying for a long time that Placer County is, in many ways, two counties. You have a mountain area, which is, I think, Supervisors Dist 5, essentially, and you have Sacramento suburbs.

And yes, I understand that eastern Placer County has a relationship with western Placer County, but it also, to me, makes sense to, once you get to Alpine, to go
ahead and extend that area that we're talking about up through Truckee, and then look at compensating for population on the other side of the ridge.

You have one area along the Nevada border, essentially from -- what is that -- Floriston, northeast of Truckee, all the way down the Nevada border, and then we have another district on the western side of the ridge going all the way down, and keeping as many of the foothill communities as possible together on that side of the ridge, but I'm not proposing that we necessarily maintain counties or necessarily split them. We need to do what we need to do to make this work. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fornaciari, was that your vision as well?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, I took a quick look yesterday. I'm kind of questioning my capability in QGIS --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Me, too.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- since I was so far off in the CVAP on San Benito, but my quick, kind of, look, if we just took the mountainous regions of all these counties, we would literally go to the Oregon border to get enough population to make this work.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And then, that, I mean,
then the outcome would be a complete revision of the rest of our map.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So let's go to the queue and see if there's other thoughts in the queue and then come back. Oh, Commissioner Kennedy wants to clarify.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Again, I'm not advocating going any farther north than that existing northern line of ECA, just northeast of Truckee. If we get that far and we don't have enough population yet, we'd take a left turn, and head towards the population.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. I think I understand the recommendation from Commissioner Kennedy. It's slightly different than the recommendation from Commissioner Fornaciari, and we'll figure out which direction to move in.

Commissioner Akutagawa, and Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I'll offer some, hopefully, some additional clarification.

So is it possible to look at -- can you show the, I guess, the highway lines along this eastern corridor? Because some of the COI testimony that I have read through previously, and just skimming again through what's come in more recently, and refreshing my memory about this, the main corridor is the, I believe it's the 395.
And there's one COI testimony that I want to point out. It notes that the only passes that are accessible for crossing the Central Sierras for much of the year is US 50 and I-80, which, I believe, is up in that area where Commissioner Kennedy is talking about making that kind of left turn. This particular COI testimony also mentions that in, specifically, the eastern ridge of the Sierra Nevadas in Nevada County, Placer County, and El Dorado Counties including the Lake Tahoe Basin and Truckee, could be part of this particular district, and I think that may also alleviate some of the concern that Commissioner Fornaciari is talking about.

And what it does do is, it enables not only those who share a particular type of interest, in terms of recreation and mountain, and frankly, I mean, it's not well-populated because people very specifically want a certain type of lifestyle experience living in some of these communities. And also, it's not too different than those who are asking for a specifically coastal district in various parts of the state, so I'd like to just offer that as direction to look at.

And as, I think, Commissioner Kennedy had noted, looking to see, at least, if we can go to the eastern ridge of, in this case, it would be Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Placer, and Nevada Counties, and then seeing how
much more we need to go to pick up population, trying to keep in mind as close to possible the kind of COIs that would share similar interests with parts of, at least the northern part of this Central Sierra area.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And I think that's in alignment with Commissioner Kennedy's recommendation. There is, also, the concern about the Fresno population that needs a home, and so there is some populations in the south that would need a home, and we'd have to make sure that it gets covered.

Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. (Indiscernible) people --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Are you in support of this idea, or a slightly different, or what's your thoughts?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, there are two different things going on here. We're talking about, essentially, a COI interest which is based on highways. The eastern ridge, up 395, down through Tahoe and El Dorado.

But what most of the people in the area are -- their issue is, it's the mountains. It's the fire districts they share. It's the water districts that they all are concerned with. It's recreational use of mountains as
opposed to, let's just say, logging use of mountains.
And that is throughout the area.

Now, Mono and Inyo definitely have other issues, but
they also know they have no people. And so they've
thrown out several different ideas of combinations they
can be in together, which is in the mountain area.

And we did hear, absolutely, several people say,
let's just go up the ridge, but again, this is 33,000
people. If you just go straight up the ridge, I mean,
you're -- El Dorado has 200,000, and I can't remember
what Placer has. I mean, you'd have to take those
counties and stuff. You can kind of get there, but it's
a backwards way of getting there.

When I think we -- I think we're kind of sort of
stuck with Fresno, because -- this portion of Fresno,
because I don't see how we can get away from it and
connect it to anywhere. But let's not then make --
separate it out twice, I believe, because you're -- this
whole area needs mountain people who can look after those
particular issues. And remember, the fire went rip-

CHAIR TOLEDO: So if you have any specific direction
on that? We're all in agreement with what you're saying.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, we're saying two
different things, so that's why I wanted --
CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, okay.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- to make sure. Now, if we are in agreement, then I think we have to kind of go with what Commissioner Fornaciari said. It's not -- I don't like it, but then, what do we do with Fresno and Madera? I think we kind of, sort of, have to do that, almost.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's check in with Commissioner Fornaciari and see where he is at this point.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So a couple things. I mean, if we simply made this -- if we simply move the red up into ECA and Amador to CALA-INYO, we'd be about a wash in population, and that is going to also, in a lot of ways, define what we do further north, and what we're able to do in Sacramento. So I just wanted to lay that out there. I guess that's all I have at this point.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Do you have a recommendation, in terms of a path forward?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, I think we could -- I mean, I think we can make this, if this is the general consensus of the Commission, I think we can make this move. I just, recognizing that it's going to impact what happens up north, and I'm not sure what that looks like, because we just have to play that out.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: For the portion of -- CALA-
INYO, it's not a VRA area. For the portion of Fresno that was left -- can we zoom in -- is there a possibility that we -- because it looked like that other side went almost all the way into Fresno. Okay. So that's, then, Clovis? Where's the line?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah, it's Clovis. Clovis, Fort Washington.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. What I was trying to see if we took Fresno and moved it, but it goes further than what I'd want to -- okay. That's the pocket.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And it would impact the CVAPs in the neighboring VRA districts.

Commissioner Fornaciari? Okay. You're not the queue anymore?

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: So at least to try to move things forward at this point, if we can zoom the map back out, what I would be looking at is, we extend Inyo, Mono, Alpine, and then, kind of along the crest, or as close to the crest as we can, to take in that little portion of ECA that is right under where it says ECA, that we not go any farther north than that. What is the population in that? We look at how far west we might have to go in Placer, and then, Amador, El Dorado, or most of El Dorado, most of Placer would go into -- would replace --
we'd basically be doing a switch, with those areas replacing Inyo, Mono, Alpine, and the Lake Tahoe area.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. That sounds like we have a consensus to move forward with this exploration, so I'd like to explore this, Kennedy. If you could take that recommendation and highlight those areas?

MS. WILSON: So I just went forward to doing that, and I'm not sure if everyone was able to see the deviations while that was up there, but CALA-INYO, this portion of Fresno, it's at a negative 2.78, so it's still in acceptable ranges. Obviously, I'm not sure if it's where you want it to be, but it's not creating a bubble or anything. It's in the range that it should be, and then this is at a 4.45.

So getting rid of all of that will definitely be a -- it'll be a lot of what's making up the population already, and maybe a better way -- I mean, I don't know. We can do whatever you want, but I think that we would end up expanding pretty far as it is, and maybe taking some out first, if you want to lower it to around zero, but it's still in the deviation, and I think taking all of that out, it's going to be a lot that you have to take out. It'd be (indiscernible) --

CHAIR TOLEDO: And maybe we don't have it all out.

And so do you have any concrete direction on this,
Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I think Commissioner Andersen has --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- or she can correct me if I'm wrong. If Amador and Calaveras want to be together, and I think I just saw the population of Amador, it seems like moving Amador from ECA to CALA-INYO might be a reasonable measure.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So with that, I'm going to ask Commissioner Andersen to take over for a couple minutes while I take a break, and move this forward. It would be great to get to a consensus on where to move this district forward, and I think we're getting there. I think it's coming along.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. I'm sorry. Am I speaking as this or as taking over as chair?

CHAIR TOLEDO: You are.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: As chair.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Right. So well, okay. I will speak on this. Basically, yes, Amador is 36,000, and I believe you said Alpine, Mono, and Inyo are about 33,000, so you'd switch those out. But you still also have Sacramento in here. Folsom and parts of Sacramento,
I think Arcade, are now up with Lake Tahoe for population here, which I am not sure anyone was considering here. But let's hear from other Commissioners, please.

Oh, sorry.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: You're the chair, Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. I'm sorry about that.

Commissioner Sinay, please. Oh, no. She's passing right now.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I was just going to say this swap would even it out, but yeah, I mean, that's kind of the thing. The population driving this whole thing is all really in Sacramento County. A little bit in this, what's this, next to Cameron Park, it's El Dorado Hills, I think? Is that right, Alicia? The pink thing? So the population center that is anchoring that whole district is in Sacramento. So is that the outcome that we were looking for with this change? I guess that's the question I want to lay out to the Commission.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. On that one, is this -- let's get some head shakes. Is this yes, this is what we're thinking, or no, this is not what we're thinking?

Okay. I can see some yeses and not -- let's see. I'm seeing -- okay.
Let's go with, who is a yes on this? One, two, three. I'm seeing three hands; is that correct?

So how many on the nos? Ah. I'm getting four fingers from Alicia. Sorry, from Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I have four votes.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh. Four votes from Commissioner Fernandez. So how many on the no on this?

One --

MR. BECKER: Chair, maybe one option is to see if the line drawers can explore this, and you can come back with whether they work or not. I don't know if that would help move things along.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you for that, Chief Counsel.

Kennedy, have we explored this before?

MS. WILSON: I'm not entirely sure of the direction, what you would like to explore.

As far as these being pushed out this way, that also comes from keeping Elk Grove and Sacramento and that kind of thing, was pushing population north and pushing it to the west, and so that is how these cities or CDPs in Sacramento County were pushed out west, and that's -- because before, it was a little too much farther in, so we started to push the line out, and that was a part of the direction that we had last time.
And I also wasn't sure if that Amador direction was something that I was supposed to implement or not. The changes are up here. Deviation goes from negative 2.78 to a 4.63 positive, and ECA is at a negative .96.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay.

MR. BECKER: Chair, I think you have some hands as well.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Obviously, I'm not supportive of this zero percent.

And because what I started out as a concept of a mountains, I don't know if any of you have been to Sacramento, but we have no mountains. There are no mountains in Sacramento, and now, we are pushing part of Sacramento into this mountainous -- so Amador-Calaveras, they would be more appropriate to be with that other -- with the mountainous districts, and potentially, if Kennedy can zoom out, some of the counties further north.

But then again, now you've got this huge district for an Assembly. I realize for Senate and congressional, we're going to have huge, but -- and when I say huge, I'm talking about miles. I remember comments from -- reading some input about individuals upset that they had to drive 30 miles, and we're talking about probably 400-plus miles
here from one end to the other. Again, very few actually ever visit their assembly people, but still.

So anyway, that's -- and even Tuolumne. Tuolumne could theoretically go into this mountainous -- again, not highly populated, but I am opposed to having communities that are not mountainous in this district. And the whole purpose of the district, I believe, is what we agreed to, would be a mountainous-type, which have similar communities of interest with the forest management, and water, and ecological issues.

So again, I would not want to have the Sacramento area in there, and then go further north. But also, as I mentioned, some of those counties, Amador, Calaveras, Tuolumne, maybe Mariposa, they may be more appropriate to be in that district. Thanks.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I am uncomfortable -- I know I said do that left turn, affirming what Commissioner Kennedy had suggested, but I am uncomfortable with including the more suburban areas of Sacramento. I agree with what Commissioner Fernandez just said.

I also want to note, it looks like, from the visualization, or what we're seeing currently right now,
that some of the crestline of the Sierras is not included, and that the cuts are all at the county lines, and I'm wondering how much of a difference -- I don't think it'll make that much of a difference. I went back to the October 27th and November 2nd visualizations for this area, and what I saw was that it did include Amador, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Mariposa, and the Yosemite part of Madera.

And so in the case, I believe it was Mariposa and Madera, at the very least, and it looks like part of Calaveras and part of Tuolumne, it was cut. The county was cut, and it got that ECA district to just about under 2 percent, minus 2 percent, roughly, deviation, and that included the counties all the way up to Nevada.

I think we can also -- I believe we can go up even into Sierra to make sure that Truckee is also included with that Lake Tahoe area, and then that might get us the kind of population. In the visualization that we saw, I believe, also, El Dorado and Placer was also cut so that the more suburban areas, and therefore, the more, I guess, bedroom communities of Sacramento were not included in this district.

And so perhaps it's either going back to a previous visualization and starting there and doing the tweaks, that might make it easier. I'm happy to give that as a
general direction to Kennedy to start from, and looking at just ensuring that we're including the mountainous regions, the crestlines going east.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: So okay. To summarize that, basically, you're saying, go Inyo, Mono, Alpine, just the crest -- essentially, the crest of El Dorado, crest of Placer, up to Tahoe?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No, I'm also saying let's include Inyo, Mono, the crestlines, like let's say, from Yosemite going east, and so we'll split Madera, split Mariposa from the crestline, split -- actually, I may be wrong. I think Yosemite is in Tuolumne. My apologies.

So split Tuolumne, split --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Tuolumne, that essentially is the crestline. The county line is the crestline around Tuolumne. And then, it's -- yeah -- you would basically kind of continue a little bit up through Alpine kind of in that direction, so --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Where is the 395 on this?

MS. WILSON: 395 follows in -- it starts at the corner between Alpine and Mono. Let me zoom in a bit closer. So I'm circling where it kind of comes in from Nevada, and then goes through Mono, kind of coming to the county line, and it goes here, not so much in the middle of these counties, but more towards the ridgeline, I'm
assuming is what that geography is.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, okay. So actually, it looks like we may already be following the 395.

MS. WILSON: Yeah. The 395 --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, we are. Yes, we are.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Kennedy, do you want to sort of clean this up a little bit? Because we -- basically fifteen minutes, and then we're going to public comment.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. I think we're getting confused here. All we've done so far is essentially switch Inyo, Mono, and Alpine for Amador. So we did have Calaveras to Fresno, plus Alpine, Mono, and Inyo, and we're just moving Inyo, Mono, and Alpine into the ECA, and Amador from ECA to CALA-INYO.

The issue of Sacramento suburbs going out to Tahoe, that was always there. That's not something that we just created. That's been there. And I don't see that necessarily as all that unnatural, given what I've heard about people from Sacramento going out to Lake Tahoe.

If we want to try to find a way to trim that closer to the Nevada border, I'm okay with trying it, but it seems like we are at least within acceptable bounds at
this point, and all we've done is exchanged Amador on the one hand for Alpine, Mono, and Inyo on the other. And people in Inyo and Mono realize that they're never going to be the dominant force in this district, but I think they will feel that they have more in common with people in this district than they had in the district that they're currently in. So that's where my thinking is on this. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Commissioner Sinay, and then we'll just do a quick through this.

Commissioner Sinay?

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I mean, basically, are people from Inyo, Mono, and Alpine County going to have a representative in Fresno or in Sacramento? That's the choice we're making right now. There's just not enough people to make a district.

And kind of to Commissioner Akutagawa's point, the main difference here between the 27th is those VRA districts is driving everything we're doing now. And we didn't have those VRA districts. And Fresno was totally in a Valley district, as was the parts of Madera County that are now not in a Valley district. So that's the big change that is being driven by the VRA.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. And we did also
make changes after we did the VRAs, up through -- which
has created that other district.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you. What Commissioner
Kennedy said makes a lot of sense to me, based off of our
criteria, as well as COI testimony I've read. Thanks.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. And I realize what
Commissioner Kennedy said. I also remember what I said
when we adopted these draft maps, where this was one area
that I wanted to revisit because of the Sacramento
communities were in with the mountains, and then also the
vineyards. So I realize it's an easy swap. I'm still
not happy with it, just as I wasn't happy with it on
November 10th.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And I just feel we're
mixing very different communities at this point, and --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- that's why I was
offering some of the other mountainous communities, or

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner
Fernandez.
Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Vice Chair. I just wanted to understand the step two from Commissioner Fernandez for the -- going back, remembering what you were initially trying to accomplish.

I do see, and I'm in support of the current swap. That seems just like a swap, but you are indicating there are other areas up at the top. I mean, I'm wondering, is that another discussion that we can have and what's prohibitive about this for that, if we can do that?

I know. Too much this for that. So I like the swap. The swap is good for me, and I hear -- what I'm hearing and reading in what you'd said, and maybe I just would like you to reiterate, is that there are concerns about mixing communities, and land use, and the people that's there further up north, that you weren't comfortable with before that may impact this or may not, but I'm trying to understand the other part that you're concerned about.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: The part I'm concerned about right now?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Well, so the --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sorry. I guess --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- Amador is a swap with those other areas. But you just indicated that there are other
places in Sacramento further north that's mixed in with the mountainous communities, and I wanted to have you talk a little bit more about that to see how it's impacted by Amador.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'd have to -- I'd have to have Kennedy zoom in to --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah.


Where are we? Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Okay. If you just give it a -- just a very short on this, because I want to wrap this up so we can move forward.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. And we can discuss it later, that's fine, after the public comment, if we want to. What I'm saying is -- so November 10th, we did what we did to try to get the drafts out there, which is -- I completely understand that part of it.

But as you get -- Kennedy, could you move a little bit -- just move it a little bit -- yeah -- move it the other way. Sorry. It was going to be my down, your up. I wasn't sure which way we were going with this.

But I would say, probably the borders of Sacramento County, those are more of what you would call your flatlanders, because somebody liked to give it that term. And as we move up north, you have your Auburn, your
Newcastle, those communities are more with the mountains, does that make sense?

But they're also -- it can be something where you're swapping. We're going to have to go in and swap, but I'm just saying, at this point, how it looks, I would recommend moving the Folsom, Rancho, all of those areas would go in, possible, with Roseville, and then the other communities, which are more in the mountains, and that includes, also, Placerville and Cameron Park.

Although they're somewhat attached, that's where you start going up the grade. And then that's where you've got Auburn, and Newcastle, those areas as well. Go up the grade. So what I'm trying to keep together would be those that are what you would call the Valley versus those that actually start going into the mountains.

Does that answer your question, Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: So with the swap with Amador, if that did not occur, what you would be saying is to continue up north and grab more of El Dorado instead of Amador?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So what I'm saying was I wasn't excited about the current map to begin with, regardless of it being Amador or whatever, because I still have the issue with the Valley communities being lumped in with the mountainous areas, so regardless of
Amador in or out. Does that make sense?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It was just knowing that we were going to have to come back and rework it.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right? So it's being reworked a different way that I had envisioned.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Ah. Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you. Thank you.

And I just want to just -- I'm going to do a quick summary here. I believe we've sort of made a change that is not -- it's an idea. It has a lot of areas that still need to be worked out.

At this point, and I want to hear from other -- what I would be suggesting is that we leave this, and tomorrow, we actually start on, realizing we still have this Fresno issue, but actually start sort of sorting out things possibly from the north, and then we could lock those in, and understand where we can and cannot make our changes in the whole rest of the map, because we did do a lot of changes in this area and said we're all going to come back to it.

And so I don't believe there are enough people who are really excited about this to lock this in, but I'm --
that's what I'm sort of proposing that's what we sort of might do for this evening, but I want to hear from Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thank you. I do have a question, I think probably along the lines of what Commissioner Fernandez was saying. I think Commissioner Fornaciari had a good point. He said the eastern -- the Sierras, these mountain communities, I mean, part of why they've been really advocating for a district that would just be the mountain communities is that they feel like, ultimately, if they're paired with a larger city, that's where their elected official comes from, and regardless of whether they see them or not, the general sense that I've received from their testimony has been that they -- when an elected official is based in a larger city, they just feel like they're completely ignored, and that that person, said elected representative, just focuses on the issues of the larger cities.

So with that in mind, what I'm hearing from Commissioner Fernandez is trying to limit it to the mountain areas. Is it that bad that we would go further up? I mean, I know I'm contradicting my earlier statement about going up and then turning left, but maybe, kind of along the lines of what Commissioner
Fornaciari was saying earlier about just going up to the Oregon border, is that a bad thing? Is that something that anybody or everybody would be uncomfortable with?

In doing so, would that then -- it would mean restructuring the far north areas. I believe we're already looking at some because of the Siskiyou and trying to keep some of the tribal nations together, but in doing so, would that enable us to put somewhat more like communities together, versus putting what seems like right now very suburban, urban communities with more mountainous communities?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. I believe that is an issue which we are discussing, but we can't have that long discussion right now.

And so Commissioner Kennedy, I'm going to give everyone, let's say, like, a minute or two here.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I'm perfectly happy to take another look at metropolitan Sacramento. I think we need to. I think that might actually be the better starting point tomorrow, is let's work out metropolitan Sacramento. It's a large population center. We know there are diverse communities in the area. We are trying to respect communities of interest to the extent of our ability, while not violating higher priorities. But I think that would be a
good place to start, and I agree. We need to do some
work there. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Thank you. I wanted to
say there is a lot of draw and a lot desirous of being in
a mountainous area that has very few people around, but
our first criteria is equal populations, so you have to
know that you're either going to have to deal with a
large district with lots of travel, or you're going to be
dominated by a closer, more populous area, and you may
not have representation.

It's going to come -- I don't know how you do it
differently. It's either going to be like communities
that will be large geography, or you're going to be
paired with a closer community that has more people in
it, and so we'll have to make a choice. It's one or the
other.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. Sort of to piggyback on
what Commissioner Turner just said, we have to fall back
on our criteria. And I know I've been wanting to be
appreciative of criteria number 5, compactness, because I
believe that leads itself to accessibility.
Communities of interest is criteria number 4, and so I had to -- I might be leaning towards Commissioner Kennedy's suggestion, in that this like community might outweigh the compactness of what I would like, but I have to recognize what the criteria is laying out for us.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

I'm sorry. Commissioner Yee had his hand up. Am I not seeing it?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I put it down. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, okay. All right. Well, I think we have a lot of things to think about this evening, and come back kind of with, maybe bright ideas, bushy-tailed, bright ideas, and at this point, I believe it's -- oh, Commissioner Akutagawa. Sorry. I thought I'd seen (indiscernible).

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Chair, could we just give general direction to Kennedy, given the discussion, and perhaps come back to us with maybe some options?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'm sorry. For continuing --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: For this --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- (indiscernible)?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: For a mountainous area, or --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Yes.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. But not including
anything in CALA-INYO?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Well, I mean, there's two proposals, right? Keeping it completely mountainous and how far up does that need to go, and then what would that do, and then the other ones that we're discussing, trying to, I guess taking in more of the, I guess, the suburban Sacramento areas.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Sorry. I'm going to jump to -- I'll be back with you in a minute, Commissioner Ahmad.

Kennedy?

MS. MAC DONALD: Hello, this is Karin, actually, Chair Andersen. Thank you so much.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

MS. MAC DONALD: I just wanted to let you know, so the idea, generally, was that if you give direction to come back with something, that the mappers would have the next day to work them out, so there is limited work that can be done if you want to go back to Kennedy's area tomorrow morning, but she can, of course, try to implement some of the direction that you have already given. So just wanted to let you know that.

And then, also, since you -- today was supposed to be the Northern California day, and you did take some of that time, quite some time, to work on Southern
California, continuing to work tomorrow on this is probably actually keeping you on the schedule, but just moving things around a little bit, but also --

CHAIR TOLEDO: The schedule for tomorrow is -- the schedule for tomorrow is to go back to LA.

MS. MAC DONALD: Right. That's what it was, but today was supposed to all be Northern California, and I just wanted to say that, if you would like for Jaime and Sivan to come back tomorrow afternoon, perhaps, that's totally possible. So just let us know what you decide to do so we can schedule accordingly. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. We might end up, actually hitting LA and just doing it in reverse. Maybe LA in the morning, and this one in the afternoon, but we'll let you know.

Now Commissioner Ahmad, you had your hand up?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah. I think I just want to be careful on the task that we send our line drawers on, considering that there are two kind of diverging points on the table right now, and the impacts and the ripple effect that would have on the neighboring districts.

I just, I'm thinking about if I were to go home and map this, I would be a little confused as to where changes could be made in neighboring districts that would be acceptable to the Commission, and where it create more
work for us, and we would all have to backtrack.

So I don't know if I'm comfortable sending them on a specific mission at this point, given that the Commission has not landed on a very clear direction at this point regarding this area.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you for that.

And Kennedy, do you also want to ask about -- talk about that?

MS. WILSON: I'm sorry. I (indiscernible) my hand.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: That's all right.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I just wanted to mention the idea of going all the way north to the Oregon border doesn't really help because there's just not population there, and there's not a ridgeline there, either, so. I mean, I would love for that to work, but I don't think that's an option.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Oh, Commissioner Fornaciari? I don't see it.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think there is -- I think there is a way to do that that's reasonable, within kind of the design of the districts as we have them now, but we can explore that on Friday, I guess.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: When we come back to this.

Great. Okay.
With that, what I would like, actually, Kennedy to do, which I think might help, is if you could just give us, even just examples, even snapshots or something, of what we have done in this area, because I think some of these, we might go, oh, yeah, you did that in this case, like the 27th, or the 2nd, or the 7th, if that's an easy thing to show us.

But otherwise, I agree that I think it's a little confusing in terms of something for you to go back with, or -- how do you feel? Did you get direction?

MS. WILSON: I have -- yeah -- I have the 27th, the 7th, and the -- November 7th, November 2nd -- November 2nd and 10/27, I have those loaded in my map currently.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Great. So then we might have a look at that. I don't know if that's -- if you might be able to think, do those help us in what we're talking about, or not for tomorrow. And you also have some assignments in -- let's see. You don't --

MS. WILSON: In the -- yes. In the --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: You do.

MS. WILSON: -- I do, in the Fresno area, which I was playing around with, and did find that if -- I don't know how the Commission would feel about it, but I could show it tomorrow, of moving West Park in here and bringing this up to 51 and this staying at 53.
VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Great. All right. Thank you. I think we'll -- I think we'll be doing that. At this point -- let's see. Kristian, could we go ahead -- we're going to go ahead to public comment, and could you go ahead and read the instructions, please?

MR. MANOFF: Sure thing, Chair.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Sure, Chair.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, Katy?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Here I am.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: You're welcome.

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 to enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed, it is 88465429407 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound key. Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star 9. This will raise your hand for the moderator.

When it is your turn to speak, you will hear a
message that says, the host would like you to talk, and to press star 6 to speak. If you would like to give your name, please state and spell it for the record. You are not required to provide your name to give public comment.

Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call. Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak, and again, please turn down the livestream volume.

There will be a two-minute public comment period, with warnings at thirty seconds at fifteen seconds remaining.

And we'll be starting out this evening with caller 0203. And up next after that will be caller 2232.

Caller 0203, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MS. VALENCEIA: Hi. Good evening. My name is Maria Stella Valencia (ph.). I am a Santa Ana resident and a community organizer with Orange County Congregation Community Organization. OCCCO works with congregations and community leaders across the county on the issues of housing, immigration, and education.

I'm very concerned about yesterday's discussion about Orange County and breaking up communities of interest. I would like to highlight the importance in
minimizing the cuts within the City of Fullerton. It is important to keep communities of interest intact, specifically, with South Fullerton and West Anaheim. Some of the similarities between these two communities are that there is a dense population of Latinx, low income, immigrant, mixed status communities.

A lot of the struggle that they share is that they're rent-burdened. You know, they do tend to work a lot of low-income jobs, and this is an opportunity for the Commission, at the Assembly level, to create a VRA district with these two communities, and also being able to create another VRA district with -- with centering in the City of Santa Ana. Again, the same community of interest that they have and keeping in mind that these are communities that are rent-burdened.

And there are numerous maps that have been submitted by the community that have shown the --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. VALENCIA: -- Commission that they can comply with federal Voting Rights Act in Los Angeles and Orange County and keeping communities of interest whole. So please use these as road maps to achieve this balance. Don't break up our communities unnecessarily.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. VALENCIA: Thank you so much for your time and
attention.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

All right. Now we will have caller 2232. And then
up next after that will be caller 4109.

Caller 2232, if you'll please follow the prompts to
unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. ASATO: Okay. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. ASATO: Awesome. My name is Kayla Asato. I am
with Orange County Environmental Justice, and I kind of
want to mention the exact same community that was
mentioned in the previous call.

Communities of interest in Orange County for Orange
County Environmental Justice are environmentally justice-
impacted communities, like there are in Santa Ana, like
there are in Anaheim and Fullerton. And a lot of times,
these incomes are low income. They're Latinx. They're
rent-burdened. They are impacted by police brutality.
They want a lot of things, and we need to keep them
together.

So there are VRA districts centered around Santa Ana
at every level, including Assembly, and we are very
thankful for that. We also wanted to note that the
Commission has the opportunity to create, at the Assembly
level, create a VRA district in Santa Ana, and an
adjacent Latinx influenced-district centered around South Fullerton and West Anaheim.

The current district layout is mildly okay. I think there could be a few tweaks to it. The areas of West Anaheim that are being centered are very thankful -- like, we're very thankful for that, but we think that we could alter lines just a little bit. So thank you very much. Just wanted to point that out, and keep our communities together, alter the --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. ASATO: -- things a little bit for -- to maximize the community interest. And thank you very much. Have a great rest of your night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we will have caller 4109. And up next after that will be caller 5056.

Caller 4109, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. This is Margaret (ph.) (indiscernible), and I'm a little bit frustrated, because I spent a lot of time and effort into figuring out some suggestion, which I know that you've been deluged with public input, but please, please, look at my PDF that I sent in. It's in the airtable under ID number 29343.
You absolutely should not need to put Sacramento in with the mountains. I was -- I've just been focused on figuring out congressional districts, but I was able to figure -- to -- and you'll see it on -- if you look on page 3 of the PDF that I sent in, it -- I was able to create two mountain districts, and these are congressional districts, and so certainly, you could figure out Assembly districts that would work much better for communities of interest, but I was able to draw a congressional district with zero deviation that included Mono, and Inyo, and Alpine, part of El Dorado County, all of Placer, and all of Nevada County, and then, also, the City -- most of the City of Folsom, and Sacramento to make a Congressional District, and then I was able to make a separate mountain district that included the rest of El Dorado, all the other mountainous, rural --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- counties down through to the Fresno area, dipping into the Valley to take some of the rural areas.

So I encourage you to please look at that. I have a lot of other suggestions in there about how you can draw some of the Central Valley districts better, and -- and also, take some of the other community of interest keeping problems that you seem to be unnecessarily
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we will have caller 5056. And then up next after that will be caller 5314.
Caller 5056, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.
MS. CHANG: Good evening. My name is Susan Chang (ph.), and I'll be commenting on the draft maps in Orange County, specifically, the Irvine, Costa Mesa, and Tustin area.

Today I wanted to comment on the communities of interest in Irvine, Costa Mesa, and Tustin. Irvine and its surrounding areas have changed and grown so much in the past decade. I wanted to emphasize that it's so important that we keep the communities of interest there together because of the common challenges that immigrant communities face, such as access to affordable housing, transportation, and environmental justice. These parts of Orange County should be drawn together, especially keeping Irvine whole, and with Costa Mesa and Tustin.

While the congressional map generally looks good in Orange County, the division of Irvine and splitting of Irvine, Costa Mesa, and Tustin COI are major concerns. It's extremely important that we keep disproportionately immigrant communities whole and together, especially as
one of the fastest growing major cities in the state.

At the Assembly level, I thank you all for keeping Irvine, Costa Mesa, and Tustin whole and drawn together in this district. Please keep this disproportionately immigrant district together. It would be great if the other maps could reflect something like the Assembly map.

Numerous maps submitted by the community in LA and Orange County have shown that it's possible to comply with the federal Voting Rights Act and keep our communities of interest whole. Please use these maps as a road map to achieve the balance. Thank you for your time, and have a nice night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And now we will have caller five --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Katy?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: May I break one -- just one minute. For the public, we really appreciate all your comments, all your input. I just want to make sure everyone knows the lines will close at 6 p.m., so if you do want to call and get in line, please do so now. The lines will be closing at 6 p.m. If you're in the line, if you're in the queue by then, we will listen to you. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you, Chair. And
right now we will have caller 5314. And up next after that will be caller 3321. Caller 5314, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. WILSON: Hi. Thank you so much, Commission, for hearing me. My name is Stephanie Wilson (ph.), and I'm a resident of Simi Valley. For the second year in a row, Simi Valley was subjected to power shutoffs on Thanksgiving Day. We realize that these are really important to save lives and to save property during a fire zone. We share this fire zone with Santa Clarita, and we appreciate the fact that Santa Clarita has the same representatives that we do. It is important for us that this fire zone be maintained. I don't have to tell you how disruptive it is, especially on Thanksgiving, to have your power shutoff. And when it's -- it's efficiently handled, we know it's going to come back on in a -- in a reasonable time, and we know that it's being turned off at the correct time.

Our neighbors in Santa Clarita also have their power shutoff due to the wildfire concerns for the past two years just like we did. This is one of the biggest issues facing both of our cities. Our power is shut off all the time here. We realize it's important, we like it to be efficient, we need a representative who will focus
on this issue and also focus on the shared values that we have between Simi and Santa Clarita. So we would like to keep Simi Valley and Santa Clarita together in the same legislative and congressional maps.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. WOLSON: Thank you so much for hearing me.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 3321. And up next after that will be caller 4199. Caller 3321, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. CHADQUIN: Hello. My name is Ana Chadquin (ph.). I am with Latina Health Access in Santa Ana. Latina Health Access has been proudly working alongside community residents for over twenty-seven to improve the social determinants of health in our city. I appreciate all your long hours you and the line drawers have put into balancing so many diverse communities of interest throughout the state.

Santa Ana is primarily composed of low-income and mixed immigration status Latinx families. They are extremely hard-working families with many employed in essential jobs that are unfortunately often overlooked and underpaid, yet they share a very strong sense of community. The city includes numerous communities of
interest including immigrants, low-income families, families without medical insurance, mixed immigration status who share the same needs for equitable and affordable housing and need for social services and resources.

I also want to note that there are VRA districts centered around Santa Ana at every level including the Assembly level. Once again, the Commission has the opportunity at the Assembly level to create a VRA district in Santa Ana and an adjacent Latinx-influenced district centered around South Fullerton and West Anaheim who will share the similar -- who share similar communities of interest of Santa Ana and numerous community interest and concerns.

All in all, I want to point out that numerous maps have been submitted by the community have shown that the Commission can comply with federal Voting Rights Act in Los Angeles and in Orange County and keep our communities of interest as whole. Please use those maps as a roadmap to achieve this balance. Thank you for your time and have a great night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 4199. And up next after that will be caller 0969. Caller 4199, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.
MS. ALEXAWITZ: Hello.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

MS. ALEXAWITZ: Hi. Can you hear me? Hi. Can you --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. ALEXAWITZ: -- hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we can.

MS. ALEXAWITZ: Thanks. Thanks so much for considering my comments. My name is Katie Alexawitz (ph.). I'm a Simi Valley resident and business owner. My concern is that Simi Valley is a very unique city in Ventura County and it's extremely different from and should not be in the same district with Thousand Oaks, Westlake Village, Calabasas, or Malibu.

First of all, Simi Valley and Santa Clarita total sales per capita was similar at $13 to $15,000, but on the other hand, total sales per capita was $22 to $25,000 in Thousand Oaks and Calabasas, and almost $36,000 in Westlake Village, so well over double. But more importantly, Simi and Santa Clarita are also way, way more diverse than T.O., Malibu, Westlake, and Calabasas, which means we deserve similar representation in our districts.

Simi's Hispanic population is twenty-six percent. Santa Clarita's Hispanic population is thirty-five percent.
percent. On the other hand, Hispanic population is only nineteen percent in Thousand Oaks and only nine percent in Calabasas, Malibu, and Westlake. So those are just a couple of the very many key differences that distinguish Simi from those more -- sorry -- from those more, like, rich and coastal cities, and I think that explains why Simi should not be in the same district as those -- as those cities but actually should share a district with Santa Clarita. I really appreciate you taking this into consideration. I know you're doing your best and I don't envy your position, but we really appreciate it. So thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 0969. And up next after that will be caller 2567. Caller 0969, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MR. KASKLA: Hello. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. KASKLA: Okay. Great. My name is Taavi, spelled T-A-A-V-I. I am calling on behalf of United Domestic Workers, the in-home supportive services union. A significant number of our members belong to the Latinx communities of Santa Ana, West Anaheim, and South Fullerton. For this reason, UDW encourages the
Commission to use these areas to create a VRA district to empower our Latinx voters. UDW members need proper representation because a lot of Latinx families depend on the (indiscernible) program for income and, most importantly, for keeping loved ones at home where they receive quality care.

Numerous draft maps that the community's already submitted to the Commission recognize the importance of creating a Latinx VRA district in Santa Ana, West Anaheim, and South Fullerton. UDW highly encourages the Commission to use such maps when creating Assembly and other districts. Please keep these Latinx communities of interest together. Thank you for your time and thank you for what you are doing.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 2567. And up next after that will be caller 9290. 2567, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

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

Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 9290. And up next after that will be caller 8488. 9290, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. ORR: Hi. My name is Adria Orr, and I'm calling from Advancing Justice Asian Law Caucus on behalf of the AAPI and AMEMSA State Redistricting Collaborative. During your discussion of the Fresno area earlier today, I was disappointed to note the Punjabi Sikh community of interest straddling Highway 99 in West Fresno which represents the largest Punjabi Sikh communities in this area is one of the fastest growing in the country
continues to be cut into three different districts.

There were many members of the Punjabi Sikh who called in last week to raise this issue, and our Collaborative also submitted a letter yesterday morning with written feedback as well as a map with proposed lines aimed at keeping this community as whole as possible. We know there are many competing interests in this area, including VRA considerations, but we believe it's possible to reduce the negative impact on this community while respecting those other interests.

We have two recommendation to this end. One is moving the portion of the boundary that follows Shields Avenue slightly south to Quinton Avenue. And two is for the boundary east of Highway 99, recommend keeping it along the railroad until it hits Herndon Avenue rather than cutting through small neighborhood streets. These changes are demonstrated in our submitted map. Thank you for all of your time and effort in this process as it continues.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 8488. And up next after that will be caller 4795. Caller 8488 --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: One -- one minute. One minute, please, Katy.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Hold on one moment.
VICE CHAIR ANDERSON: It is -- it is five minutes to 6, so the lines will be closing at 6. If you wanted to call in and make a comment, please call in now. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you, Chair. Caller 8488, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. My name is Ethan (ph.), and I have been a resident of Huntington Beach for eighteen years. And I'm calling to express my disagreement with Commissioner Sadhwani, and I think it is a sentiment shared with most of Orange County.

We do not see LA and Orange County border as fluid, and I worry about your continued idea that there's some sort of interconnectedness with these two cities and counties. We do not see it the way -- that's the way Orange County could be connected with LA. And I believe that the Commissioner said that they would -- that they should start in LA and see how that ripples into Orange County. And I don't think that is a fair way to approach the Orange County congressional districts. I know that you have so many things to consider, but I hope you can revisit the way that you're looking at the Orange County congressional districts and keep these cities together.
Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 4795. If you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. And one more time, caller -- ope. The floor is yours.

MR. HUDGENS: Hi. Thank you very much. This is Terry Hudgens (ph.). I'm in Huntington Beach, and I've been coming to Huntington Beach since 1957, and I became a resident fifteen years ago, and I have a couple of comments about the map that contains -- or -- or incorporates Irvine into a district with our cities here to the north, and I do not agree with that from a social and cultural and developmental standpoint.

I see a much more logical approach to be the inclusion of Huntington Beach, Seal Beach, Fountain Valley, and Westminster, which has been the fact for the many years, and it has really developed over the last ten. I would point out that there's a strong affinity between the -- the beach cities. Recently, most of us went through the oil spill, and it particularly significant to see the congressional delegation, the local legislators, and cities and so forth, and emergency personnel work together to take care of mutual -- of the mutual impacts that resulted on the beach cities that would not obviously include anything if Irvine were --
were part of this district. So -- so --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. HUDGENS: -- from a state beach perspective and a local beach perspective, Sunset and Huntington and Newport have some real con -- congruity.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. HUDGENS: Secondly, I would point out that the Asian community has also moved into Huntington Beach and become integral through Fountain Valley and Westminster. So I appreciate you allowing me to comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And Chair, I believe at this time we are up against a break.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Thank you, Katy. And I -- I just want to tell all the callers in line, the lines are closing I think just about now. But if you are in line, we will get to you. Just, you know, follow the -- follow the wonderful prompts that our amazing video people are giving -- giving you, and we will have to take a break right now. It's a required fifteen-minute break, so we will be back at 6:15. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 5:59 p.m. until 6:15 p.m.)

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you and welcome back, California, to the Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are in public comment right now, and we'll be -- if
you're in the queue, we'll be -- we'll stay until we hear everyone. Thank you so much for calling in. Katy, could you please take over?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I will. Thank you so much, Chair. All right. Now we will have caller 2072. And then up next after that will be caller 5137. I'd also like to remind all those that have called in, by pressing star 9, it helps manage the queue. It will raise your hand, so please press star 9 to raise your hand if you have not done so already. Caller 2072, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. CRUZ: Hello Commissioners and public. Thank you so much for allowing us this opportunity to speak. My name is Lourdes Cruz (ph.) and I am the proud product of the Fullerton College community and I also am the proud product of Cal State Fullerton where I received a master's. And the reason why today I'm here speaking to all of you is because my understanding is that there is talks about splitting Fullerton.

And as somebody who -- who attended Cal State Fullerton and Fullerton Community College and someone who taught at the Fullerton College level as well, I am a little bit puzzled and concerned the -- that there is
because, one, is a small city, and then also because when
you talk about Santa Ana and Fullerton, you -- as I'm
sure you're aware with the data -- Santa Ana already has
a community college district, that there are about three
colleges in that district.

And north Orange County community that has Fullerton
College already has their -- their community colleges.
So I am here today to please ask you to reconsider and I
support strongly a VRA district anchor in Santa Ana, and
I'm also asking you to please draw a second and separate
district anchor in Fullerton --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. CRUZ: -- and with Anaheim because those
communities are different. Thank you so much for your
time and please do not split up Fullerton.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we will have caller 5137. And up next after
that will be caller 9099. Or I apologize. 9009. Caller
5137, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by
pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Can you hear
me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right. Thank you. Good
evening, Commissioners and staff. My name is (audio
interference) and I am from Fullerton, a thirty-five year resident. I've worked with different organizations, and I'm also part of the district that was suggested that gets cut out of Fullerton to be part of a different legislative district, what -- what's currently AD55.

I'm calling in to strongly oppose some of the changes that were suggested in north Orange County today. Fullerton is not a big city. It makes up less than a third of our Assembly district. Not one of the community groups suggested even a single split in the City of Fullerton at all. And -- and yesterday, you -- and yesterday, I believe you suggested splitting it into three different -- three different districts. That -- that in itself makes no sense to anyone who lives here. It doesn't really make any sense to anyone.

The congressional that was pro -- that was approved, or that's being approved, has Fullerton all together in the same congressional district and I would hope that you keep Fullerton all -- all together in -- in one Assembly district. I do support a sec -- drawing a second and separate district anchored by the bulk of Fullerton and West Anaheim. Please don't split up Fullerton in the ways that you've already discussed. As someone who does live in that part of the district, I would literally be cut off from the rest of my city --
MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- if the current map as proposed is -- is kept. So I would please ask Commissioners and staff to please keep the City of Fullerton all together. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 9009. And then up next after that will be caller 3979. Caller 9009, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.

And caller 9009, one more time, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. And caller 9009, there appears to be some type of connectivity issue for you at the moment. I do have you down as a retry. Ope. There you are. The floor is yours.

MR. CARROLL: Oh hi. I apologize. Thank you so much. First, I just want to thank the Redistricting Commission. Really appreciate all your work. I'm an Irvine City Council member. My name is Mike Carroll. I know a little bit about the detail regarding public comments, and this is obviously very, you know, detailed as far as getting all this information. But I just wanted to put in this information for your all's perusal.

At our last meeting, the City Council passed a resolution in support of keeping Irvine, our city of
310,000 residents, as one united city. In this resolution, our City Council stated unequivocally our desire to keep Irvine whole in the creation of congressional and other districts to protect the interests unique to the great city that I am privileged enough to help represent.

At Monday's Commission meeting, one of our Commissioners on your Commission mentioned the idea of anchor cities as a focal point for districts, and the Irvine City Council and I one hundred percent supported Irvine being an anchor city for a completely inland district that is separated from our good friends on the coast. Our issues and our needs are distinctly different from those of our coastal cities, and I believe that is of significant importance that we keep the two separate for the betterment of our constituents. And on behalf of the whole of the Irvine City Council I'd like to thank you for all the hard work that you've done so far. I -- again, as a council member, I cannot imagine -- I know personally what it means to --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. CARROLL: -- to take in all public comments on hot issues, and this is very -- you're at that -- you know, basically at the go time, and I can truly empathize with everything you're going through, and I just thank
you for your service, appreciate your --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MR. CARROLL: -- consideration of my testimony today on behalf of the City of Irvine. Thank you very much.

Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 3979. And up next after that will be caller 2990. Caller 3979, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.

MS. FIFITA: Hi.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

MS. FIFITA: My name is -- hi. My name is Melenaite Fifita. I am with Pacific Islander Health Partnership. I am a Tongan patient navigator, and I want to make a comment on the draft maps in Orange County. To emphasize the importance of keeping communities of interest together for VRA compliance purposes, there are prominent Tongan and (indiscernible) to the Santa Ana with members who are underserved and medically uninsured. And I've navigated Pacific Islander patients to the Serve the People Community Clinic in Santa Ana where there are VRA districts centered around Santa Ana at every level including the Assembly.

And the Commission has the opportunity at the -- at the Assembly level to create a VRA district in Santa Ana
and an adjacent Latinx-influenced district centered around South Fullerton and West Anaheim. Our nonprofit is based in Garden Grove and serving Pacific Islanders that are low income and live in multi-generational households in West Garden Grove, Westminster, West Santa Ana, and north Fountain Valley.

The majority of our community are service workers, own small businesses, and earn low-income wages as compared to the beach coast communities. The beach coast communities like Seal Beach and Huntington Beach, they do not face the same challenges that my community experiences. Numerous maps submitted by the community have shown that the Commission can comply with the federal Voting Rights Act in Los Angeles and in Orange Counties and keep our communities of interest whole. Please use those maps as a roadmap to achieve this balance. Do not break up our communities. I'd like to thank the Commission for the --

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

MS. FIFITA: -- opportunity to speak and all your hard work. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 2990. And up next after that will be caller 0565. Caller 2990, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is
MR. CREFFIELD: Thank you. Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Mark Creffield, and I'm calling from the Greater High Desert Chamber of Commerce. In addition to serving as the CEO of the Chamber, I was also an appointed redistricting commissioner for San Bernardino County. As a commissioner myself, I firmly understand that tough decisions need to be made as you come closer to your deadline.

Unfortunately, I was incredibly frustrated to watch your draw an Assembly VRA district encompassing Los Angeles County communities of Palmdale and Lancaster with San Bernardino County communities of Victorville and Hesperia. As someone who understands VRA consideration, VRA districts need to be compact and adjacent. There is no major transit corridor to drive across this proposed district. It would make just as much sense to draw the Antelope Valley with the Los Angeles County San Gabriel Valley as this proposal to draw a VRA Assembly district with Antelope Valley in San Bernardino County.

Moreover, as we are two days away from the Commissioner's goal to complete Assembly districts, I am appalled that we are suddenly adding a VRA district at the eleventh hour. How is this a transparent process for the public and business community if we are suddenly
making significant architectural changes at the last
minute? Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we will have caller 0565. And up next after
that will be caller 6321. Caller 0565, if you'll please
follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The
floor is yours.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. JONES: Hi. Good evening. My name is Jennifer
Jones, and I am a resident of Simi Valley. And the
reason I'm calling in is, first off, thank you,
Commissioners, for all of your hard work and listening to
the public comments for the past several months. And I
do appreciate all of your service in regards to this. It
must be a difficult job.

With that being said, I would like to keep Simi
Valley whole and Santa Clarita whole, and I would like to
keep them in the current Assembly and congressional
districts. Both Sim Valley and Santa Clarita, we share
first responder resources for fires since we are prone to
wildfires due to the Santa Ana winds. We have the same
geographics. Both cities are surrounded by mountains.
The house median prices are pretty much the same. We
have a high Hispanic population. Santa Clarita has a
high Hispanic population.

And most recently -- actually last year and this year -- due to the Santa Ana winds, both Simi Valley and Santa Clarita were subjected to the public safety power shutoff. And well, you know, it -- it was very unfortunate that it happened on Thanksgiving Day, and that just seems to be something that looks like it's going to be continually happening, and we really appreciate our current Assemblywoman who is actively listening to the residents and trying to find some sort of resolution to this so it does not happen on holidays so our --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

MS. JONES: -- food doesn't spoil. So thank you very much for taking time out of your evening to listen to my comment, and I hope you had a wonderful holiday.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 6321. And then up next after that will be caller 6988. Caller 6321, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. Can you guys hear me okay?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 6988. And up next after that will be caller 5944. Caller 6988, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MR. KAZEE: Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.
MR. KAZEE: All right. Thank you for taking this call in. Appreciate all the work done by the Commissioners. My name Facil Kazee (ph.). I'm a resident of Fullerton, and my comment is in regards to the redistricting proposal for north Orange County including the City of Fullerton.

It seems like a proposal or a number of proposals are suggesting dividing the city into two or three different Assembly districts and just wanted to make a point that it doesn't make sense on a number of levels. One, it compromises the representational integrity of our city, it's small businesses, it's underserved communities, and -- and logistically and practically, it would make representational advocacy very difficult for the -- for the City of Fullerton and for the residents of Fullerton.

I'm a physician in this community. I -- I treat people from across this area specifically within this -- the city where St. Jude Hospital is one of our large institutions. I'm part of charitable service groups that work through -- with nonprofits, including the local Rotary Club. I've had a chance to be on a commission serving Fullerton residents, and all that really takes a strong representation and access to our representatives which will be diluted and compromised if the city's
divided into as many districts as it's been proposed.

So I hope you can take that into account, and -- and listen to the number of voices that have been represented here in terms of maintaining our integrity. And I appreciate, again, all the work you're doing, and it's an arduous task.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. KAZEE: So I appreciate it and thank you for comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 5944. And then up next after that will be caller 7173. Caller 5944, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

And one more time, caller with the last four digits 5944, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. I do apologize, caller 5944. You appear to have some type of connectivity issue at the moment. We will come back to you. Caller 7173, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MR. TIFFANY: Good evening. My name is Bob Tiffany, and I'm a longtime resident of Hollister in San Benito County of the Central Coast area. I'm also an elected member of the San Benito County Board of Supervisors.
I just wanted to say how important it is that San Benito County remains connected with Salinas, Watsonville, and Gilroy as it currently is in the Benito map draft. Earlier today, I heard briefly the idea kicked around of moving San Benito County into the Central Valley. This would have a huge negative impact on our community.

First, San Benito County is geographically connected to the Salinas Valley and Central Coast whereas there is a major mountain range between San Benito County and the Central Valley. Furthermore, and most importantly, all of our community interests in San Benito County, especially in terms of Latino populations, agriculture and farm workers, housing, and transport -- transportation are shared with the Salinas Valley area.

So I strongly urge you to keep Benito Assembly district draft map as it currently is with the entirety of San Benito County remaining connected to the Salinas, Watsonville, and Gilroy areas. Thank you for your time and consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 6722. And up next after that will be caller 0706. Caller 6722, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor --
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. Can you hear me okay?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Perfect. Commission, thank you so much. I'm going to go ahead and keep this short and sweet. I want to thank you for your work once again, and I am calling because I want to urge you to keep working to make better, more effective Latino VRA Assembly districts in the Central Valley, specifically in the Fresno/Madera/Merced area.

In Fresno, I know you have heard conflicting input on the neighborhoods of Old Fig Garden and Sunnyside. These county islands should not be included with the southside Fresno Latino VRA districts. Including these areas is what it is hurting your Latino CVAP in the Fresno draft. Consider joining cities of Chowcilla and Madera with southside City of Fresno plus Sanger, Fowler, Selma, Parlier basically following along Highway 99 and taking in the southeast part of Fresno County. Also just a helpful little hint of mine, it's [Par-lee-er], not [Par-lee-aye]. Unfortunately, it doesn't have that French sound like some have been pronouncing it.

Continuing forward, the Merced/Fresno Latino VRA district needs to increase Latino CVAP but do not cross
over into San Benito County for the Assembly. There are more than enough Latinos in the Central Valley to create four strong Latino Assembly VAR (sic) seats. These are complicated puzzle pieces but keep working to get it right. Thank you so much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 0706. And up next after that will be caller 1986. Caller 0706, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. OAKS: Thank you. Good evening. My name Jennifer Oaks (ph.), and I just wanted to reiterate some of the things said by an earlier caller regarding confining portions of the High Desert in southern California with the community of Palmdale. I was born, raised, and lived in the San Bernardino County High Desert, and I wanted to say I was really disturbed to see the Commission today use our High Desert as a population base for an Antelope Valley seat.

Our community is completely different from Antelope Valley. We don't share any real connection at all. There's no major transit corridor, and in the map you drew today from Palmdale to Hesperia, I'm not even sure how you'd get from one end of the proposed district to the other without driving outside of the district. It
really does not make a lot of sense at all. It would almost be just as easy a drive from Palmdale to the San Gabriel Valley through the forest as it would be driving across the High Desert.

I'm also concerned about the lack of transparency the Commission showed. We are almost a year into this process, and at the last minute, you start completely carving up my community. Please look at other options to keep our San Bernardino County High Desert whole and not just meet behind closed doors and make these dramatic changes. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 1986. And up next after that will be caller 4521. Caller 1986, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Alissa (ph.). I'd like to talk about the FRESNOTULARE congressional district. The City of Fresno does not belong in the FRESNOTULARE congressional district draft. As a resident of rural Fresno County, I understand how different the city's urban population is from the rest of the district's rural communities.

The City of Fresno should be included in a district
like STANFRESNO where will share representation from the
Fresno County Board of Supervisors and Fresno County City
Council and not disrupt the FRESNOTULARE district's rural
communities of interest. Instead, the FRESNOTULARE
district should include more of rural Kings or Tulare
County which are far more similar to the rural
communities in Fresno County like mine. Thank you for
your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we have call -- I apologize. I didn't know she
was done. All right. Now we have caller 4521. And up
next after that will be caller 3580. Caller 4521, if
you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing
star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. ALLEN: Hi. Good evening. This is Deborah
Allen with the City of Rancho Cucamonga, and I would like
to respectfully request to please not split the City of
Rancho Cucamonga into multiple districts. Rancho
Cucamonga has a strong sense of identity and has
historically been mostly in all one Senate, one Assembly,
and one congressional district.

The proposed congressional, State Assembly, and
Senate district maps unnecessarily split Rancho Cucamonga
and our community into different neighborhoods,
diminishing our community power and our opportunity for
strong representation. Thank you for your consideration for this request and have a nice evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 3580. And up next after that will be caller 3739. Caller 3580, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MR. FELCHIER: Hi. First of all, I just wanted to say I'm really sorry if my voice is messed up. I got my booster shot last week, and so I have a flu. So I'm sorry my voice is going to be all messed up. Anyway, my name is Larry Felchier (ph.), and I live in Simi Valley, and I want to thank you guys so much for all the work that you're doing, all the Commissioners here.

In the current mapping that you have with Simi Valley, you've placed us with Agoura, Thousand Oaks, and Calabasas, and Malibu, and we really have nothing to do with those uber-wealthy areas. As you know, Simi Valley is a very working-class family, and we're very much aligned with Santa Clarita. And as we have stated beforehand, some of the other people, that we have the same shared power grid. We have the same shared forest. Many of the people that we have here that work in Simi Valley travel up to Antelope Valley to the aerospace. There's a very strong connection that we have.
We have a very diverse community with a lot of Latinos here, which we would not have if the new lines were drawn including Calabasas, Thousand Oaks, and Agoura. And we really have nothing in common with, you know, like, the Kardashians of Calabasas or the uber-wealthy -- you know, the rocks stars and stuff that live in -- in the -- the areas out there.

So I just would like to specifically request that you keep Simi Valley, Moorpark, and Santa Clarita together and -- and draw it up so that -- so we can keep the same VRA district which is majority Latino and has the proper representation that we currently have. And it would just be a shame that Simi Valley, being at the very end of Ventura County, to be batted around as it always is, especially with so much change that's gone on with this COVID the last two years, to have one more change for both our kids and our elderly parents. So thank you very much. I do appreciate you hearing all of our competing --

MR. MANOFF: That was two minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 3739. And up next after that will be caller 6511. Caller 3739, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commission. Thank you for your work. I'm calling in about the Fresno area Assembly draft maps, specifically Fresno and Calaveras-Inyo drafts. I want you -- I want to urge you to keep working to make strong Latino VRA Assembly districts in the Central Valley, specifically in the Fresno area. It seems like a big issue is the community of interest input that is almost working against your Latino VRA obligations.

I think you can keep the AAPI community together and whole, but instead of adding them to the South Fresno district, you should explore adding them to the Calaveras-Inyo district. It's not perfect but it is a compromise that keeps communities whole. If you work on switching around some of these communities and neighborhoods in the City of Fresno, I bet you could make the Calaveras-Inyo district smaller so that it is just North Fresno, Clovis, and eastern Fresno County all the while respecting AAPI (sic) communities. Plus, the South Fresno district would have a solid Latino CVA -- CVAP of working class and rural Latinos. Thank you for your hard work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 6511. And up next after that will be caller 6472. Caller 6511, if you'll please
follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The
floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.
I am calling from the San Fernando Valley, and very
simply, I'm requesting that you please keep the Valley
together when crafting the legislative districts. In
fact, you could make the San Fernando Valley into a
couple of majority Latino VRA districts to represent the
community fairly.

My community just wants you all to be focused on
this critical matter because we have unique needs here in
Los Angeles and we need our representatives to be a
hundred percent invested in the San Fernando community
proper (audio interference) Valley. So please listen to
all the callers asking for this and keep the San Fernando
Valley together while making it into two majority Latino
VRA districts, a huge community of interest in the State
of California. And I thank you all for your time and
work on this matter.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we will have caller 6472. And up next after
that will be caller 6188. Caller 6472, if you'll please
follow the prompts -- ope. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. Hi. Thank you,
Commissioners, first and foremost. Oh yeah. Thank you
so much for all your work on kind of this Herculean task.

So again, I wanted to thank you for -- for all that you're doing there in drawing these lines.

My name is Jesse (ph.). I am born and raised in West Anaheim, went to Cal State Fullerton, live in Anaheim, have a young son in Anaheim, clearly have roots to this community and is dedicated to this community. I'm calling just to kind of reiterate what a lot of other speakers kind of from this area discuss, and that is really trying to keep as much of Fullerton together and joining Fullerton with West Anaheim as its own Assembly district and then Santa Ana as its own.

Considering these are major population centers, they rightfully kind of deserve their own, and they would still be kind of Voting Rights Act district compliant. So then with that, just to reiterate one more time, we'd like to have -- I think it's best to have an Assembly district with West Anaheim kind of supplemented by Fullerton and Santa Ana as its own. But thank you so much for your time and have a great evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 6188. And up next after that will be caller 0282. Caller 6188, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Can you guys hear me?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you. All right.
Hi. I'm Brad (ph.). I was raised in Long Beach, and I
know you -- it's been a long night for you guys so I'll
just make it quick. I just wanted to share my concerns
that part of LA County being washed out by Orange County
in the congressional map proposal would kind of drown out
the -- the voices of people -- of concerns of people in
Long Beach. And I -- I think it's best for both
communities if we kept it -- kept them separate in terms
of districting. I thank you guys for what you're doing
and have a good night.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we will have caller 0282. And up next after
that will be caller 8224. Caller 0282, if you'll please
follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The
floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. I'm a
resident of Los Angeles County, and I'm concerned that
our southern county cities are being washed out in Orange
County. Orange County and LA have different ways of
live, and it would be a shame to combine our counties in
the next decade of congressional maps. There are just
too many differences between our communities to justify making places like Long Beach -- and with Long -- Long Beach and with Huntington Beach. Thank you for the consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 8224. And up next after that will be caller 1031. Caller 8224, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. The floor --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.

Hello, Commissioner. My name is Stephanie (ph.). I'm a longtime resident in Orange County. I'm calling to thank you for what you are doing. I appreciate all your hard work. If you have not heard the recent County Board of Supervisor redistrict map that were approved last week on November 22nd by the Orange County Board of Supervisor that (indiscernible) belong to Westminster, Midway City, (indiscernible) Los Alamitos, portion of (indiscernible) and Huntington Beach. The County had accessed through the social service program (indiscernible) in the county
and the area of (indiscernible) or not.

This clearly confirmed that the County acknowledged that Huntington Beach does, in fact, belong with Little Saigon where they share social service, governmental and healthcare service, and especially education.

(Indiscernible) on the Senate map so use that map as a guide when you draw the line for Assembly and congressional map in (indiscernible) Huntington Beach.

Thank you all for listening and happy holiday. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 1031. And up next after that will be caller 4725. Caller 1031, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Angela, and I am calling from Lake Arrowhead, which is an unincorporated mountain community in the San Bernardino County National Forest. First of all, I want to thank the Commission for their hard work to ensure that our community is represented in the State Assembly.

Furthermore, my family and I have lived in Lake Arrowhead for about five years, and I am concerned that we are currently being drawn into a district whose
population is in Pasadena, California. I just looked at Google Maps, and it is two hours one way and seventy-two miles to the population center of the Assembly district we have been drawn into.

I am requesting the Commission to include Lake Arrowhead with the San Bernardino County High Desert communities of Hesperia, Oak Hills, and Apple Valley. We share similar small-town values, educational needs, rural living, and other (indiscernible) located in San Bernardino Co -- County. Sorry. Thank you for allowing me to speak on behalf of including Lake Arrowhead with the San Bernardino County High Desert.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 4725. And up next after that will be caller 0526. I'd like to ask the public if they could please be sure to speak at a steady pace and take time with county and city names and numbers. It helps our interpreters.

Right now, we have caller 4725. If you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. And one more time, caller with the last four digits, 4725, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. I do apologize, caller -- ope. There you are.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.
Hello.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Oh. Hi. I'm Morgan, and I'm a Los Angeles resident. I'm concerned that there's talk of combining Long Beach and Orange County into one congressional district. I think that these two districts have pretty different cultures, and I think it would harm Long Beach to combine with Orange County. I believe that the poor city of Long Beach would be greatly harmed by having to weigh the competing interests of the OC cities. And yeah. That's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 0526. And then up next after that will be caller 2893. Caller 0526, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Hello.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi. My name's Jonathan and I'm from LA County. And I just wanted to say that, like, to be honest, the only things that Long Beach and Seal Beach have in common is the word beach in their name because our community in LA County is reliant on the Port of Long Beach for economic stability. So separating it from the rest of the county in the congressional map
hurts us here in LA because this port fuels tens of thousands of jobs in LA, and if it gets taken away in the proposed maps, it'll only add another layer of bureaucracy to keep our area economical afloat. So please keep LA County and Orange County apart. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 2893. And up next after that will be caller 3889. Caller 2893, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.

Caller 2893, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6, the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello. Hello. My name is Harry. I live in Fullerton. I've lived here for twenty-two years, and I -- thank you for this time. I want to ask you not to split Fullerton up into different Assembly districts.

We in Fullerton are a very diverse community, but we have common problems. We share the same crumbling roads, the same crumbling water system. We depend on state funding for our solutions to homelessness for our shelter in Fullerton, for preservation of our -- our library, and for open space in Fullerton in Coyote Hills, and we work together on this. And we -- we depend on -- on the same -- same funding for -- for these problems. And I
want to say I've lived in San Diego County, in L.A. County, and when I moved here twenty years ago, I found out that there's such a thing as North County. When you're north of the 91, you're in -- in North County. And it's different than -- than being --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- south of (indiscernible). We should remain together so that we can work together with our representatives.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you. Bye-bye.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 3889. And up next after that will be caller 1007. Caller 3889, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I'm calling about the neighborhoods of Acton and Agua Dolce. I just wanted to say that -- that we are part of the Santa Clarita Valley, not the Antelope Valley. For many of us here, we shop, work, go to the doctor here in Santa Clarita. We would like to be, and if you could please put us, in the same districts as Santa Clarita Valley. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 1007. And then up next
after that will be caller 5590. Caller 1007, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours. Ope. Caller one -- ope. There you are again.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

Hello.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: My name is -- hi. My name's Chris, and I'm a resident of Newport Beach. I have an issue with linking up together with Irvine. Our communities are completely different. There's no reason to bring the coastal districts of Orange County and connect us together with the inland areas of Orange County. Coastal Orange County has an economy based around tourism, and our economy's not connected to that of Irvine. Our needs on the coast would be washed away if we get connected to Irvine. Please considered separating Irvine away from the coastal Orange County district.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 5590. And then up next after that will be a retry of caller 5944. Caller 5590, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MR. KRIZ: Okay. Hello. My name is Father Dennis
Kriz. I'm pastor here at St. Philip Benizi Church in southwest Fullerton. Please keep Fullerton intact. Dividing this city into three Assembly districts would deprive the city of effective representation in the California Assembly and create a new layer of confusion when trying to coordinate projects between the city and now various Assembly members, each representing parts of various other cities as well.

Assembly members will not necessarily want to support projects that claw outside their districts, and yet the city -- with a city like Fullerton, for instance, will not necessarily be able to locate projects within supportive Assembly members' boundaries. As it is, Orange County is already infamous for the crazy whack-a-mole game in which county government and its constituent thirty-five cities each blame each other for inaction. Now, you -- you'll now add this new layer of institutional confusion where a city like Fullerton is represented by three Assembly members but each of those represent -- Assembly members represents several other cities as well. This guarantees a mess that will -- where everyone will suffer. Even south -- South Fullerton's Latinx residents as the district will now be attached, you know, to a district, you know, dominated by Santa Ana and it's concerns there. Please keep Fullerton
intact. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will be retrying caller 5944. And then up next after that will be caller 0045. Caller 5944, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Commissioners. A little break from Orange County here. I just want to talk about the Assembly lines and the VRA district in Bakersfield you guys drew earlier today, just wanted to comment the lines you guys did were spot on, pretty much perfect job moving the country club sort of areas out of that VRA district. I hope next week when you guys dig into the congressional seats that you guys match that -- that same stuff and take those same communities out of the VRA district that -- that's connected to Kings.

Also, full disclosure, I'm not from Mono or Inyo, however, I did work there for a very long time, and I'd just like to say the City of Ridgecrest in eastern Kern is very much in the consciousness of that -- that entire area. There's about 25,000 people there. They actually share a community college system together, and there is a -- I forget the name of the mass transit system, but there's a bus system that runs all the way up to Mammoth lakes from Ridgecrest. They do a lot of recreating
together and whatnot. So maybe a solution to that problem, give you guys a little bit of wiggle room up to the north that you guys, you know, put Ridgecrest in (indiscernible). So good night. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 0045. And up next after that will be caller 5138. Caller 0045, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.

MR. MENDOZA: Yes.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

MR. MENDOZA: Yes. Yes, Commissioner. My name is John Mendoza (ph.). I live here in the City of Pomona in the 35th Congressional District and 20th Central -- Senate District. And I'm just asking you to, please, keep us, some of the cities that are in the Santa Ana watershed above Prado Dam that extend up to the north hills to the foothills and also inside the Chino Basin cities which include Pomona, Chino, Chino Hills, Ontario, Montclair, those cities all in one district.

We have a severe water crisis and it fragments it when we don't have elected officials that are zeroed in on a particular region, you know, dealing with that water issues. That goes up and down the State of California. So I just wanted to put that forward. Recently, Riverside County came under pro -- protest because they
only decided to have one Latino district. I don't -- I
don't know how Chino Hills is going to fit into that if
they get shifted over there into the Riverside County.

And another issue is that here in Los Angeles with
your redistricting process, people are -- are -- are
saying -- are -- are -- are crafting lines that say let's
go fifty miles within from the ocean inland so that, you
know, people that have -- don't have a voice with the
ocean could have, you know, a voice. Well, when you
start crafting lines, you know, and you put --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. MENDOZA: -- you put these -- you put these in
front of the people, then they -- the lines, you know,
you -- you fail to start dealing with the -- the problems
in your regions, like, which is going up and down the
state with the watersheds, with the -- the mountain
people, and so forth. So --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MR. MENDOZA: -- I just wanted to share those
comments. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we have caller 5138. And then up next after
that will be caller 0682. Caller 5138, if you'll please
follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The
floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.
I will not burden you with the congressional discussions on Assembly day, but I -- I'm sure you guys are all tired, and God bless all of you for your hard work.

I'm calling in on, again, San Joaquin on Stanislaus line. I know you kind of worked your way around the San Joaquin district today and the -- and that you guys took a hard look at the Stanislaus lines. I just wanted to call in because I heard one Commissioner earlier say there was all this testimony on the Assembly and the Senate lines and then, I think, Commissioner Fornaciari -- Fornaciari, you know, caught it that, you know, everything you're hearing out of the Central Valley is -- is -- is -- you know, negative or otherwise, is -- is the congressional lines.

We're -- we're all very happy with these three seats in particular that are touching San Joaquin and Stanislaus County. Pretty happy with the Senate lines. You know, I mean, I don't anybody got everything they wanted, but everybody got something and it -- it's common sense. It's contiguous, so we just strongly encourage you, those of us that live on the east side of those counties, to -- to -- to keep -- keep it intact as -- as much as you can.

We all understand that some changes are going to
have to happen and -- and you guys got some stuff that
you got to work out, but in the northern part of the
Central Valley, you know, the -- the complaints are few
for the state lines. We understand you guys got work to
do congressionally there, but one doesn't necessarily
have to affect the other and -- and I just want be a
caller again tonight that says --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- you guys have done a great
job of hearing everybody in the Central Valley, in the
northern Central Valley, especially on the state lines.
So best of luck the rest of the way and happy holidays.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we will have caller 0682. And then up next
after that will be caller 7592. Caller 0682, if you'll
please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.
The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners, I'm
calling in regards to AD draft ANTELOPE and CD draft
AVSCV. I'm a nearly lifelong resident of Palmdale. I
understand the immense responsibility that you have, but
what happened today to the Antelope Valley's Assembly
draft is wrong, and I hope it's not telling of what's to
come for our congressional draft based on how often we
seem to have the wrench thrown at us. For years,
Palmdale and Lancaster have begged to be united. We are quite possibly the most similar cities in California. I, along with a majority of our citizens, am begging you to keep the Antelope Valley completed united.

Regarding our congressional draft, please just leave it alone. It is exactly what the Antelope Valley and Santa Clarita Valley have been asking for nearly a decade. A large majority of public comments have been in support of the draft, and I agree. Many of the people who keep calling in from Simi Valley are only asking to be kept with Santa Clarita, in part, due to political grievances that the current congressman has made very public. Simi Valley sits in a different county and is fifteen miles from Santa Clarita.

Also, contrary to what a previous caller said, they are, in fact, very different as far as demographics speak. Why should we allow Simi Valley as a gerrymandered enclave of AVSCV? They deserve no special treatment yet continue to get it. Simi Valley drowns out the voices of BIPOC in the Antelope Valley, and it's not fair. They are an outlier in every way, including from our Santa Clarita Valley brothers and sisters.

Please stop allowing Simi Valley, a wealthy, white, Ventura County community, to -- to dictate the -- the issues of black, indigenous, and people of color in north
LA County. It's downright racist and we've put up with it for too long. No more. Thank you, Commissioners, and thank you, interpreter, for your hard work and happy holidays.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 7592. And up next after that will be caller 8571. Caller 7592, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours. And one more time, caller 7592, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, everybody. The draft State Assembly and congressional districts for Santa Clara County should be improved. In regards to State Assembly redistricting, the Golden Triangle area of San Jose's divided between two districts. While West Valley communities Campbell and Saratoga are in the South Peninsula district, West Valley communities Los Gatos and Monte Sereno are in another district.

The Franklin-McKinney school district area is -- is split between two districts. It should be completely in the ALUMROCK district. The ALUMROCK district, however, should not include the Rose Garden neighborhoods. It should, however, include the Latinx-majority Gardner neighborhood. I should mention that there is a multi-
group proposal for the ALUMROCK district, however, I cannot support this particular proposal, in part, because it splits the various neighborhoods of San Jose. It'll also split the Franklin-McKinley School District area. I hope to send my proposals as far as State Assembly and congressional for Santa Clara County, hopefully, in the next day or two. And in regards to congressional districting for Alhambra, Monterrey Park, North El Monte, Rosemead, and South San Gabriel, one possibility would be for these communities to be in CD 210. In exchange, areas that are in the Kern CD 210 could be transferred to the CD, I believe, it's CORINA (ph.) district, but I'll -- I'll try to send the -- the info in writing --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- within the next day or two. Thank you so much and have a good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 8571. And up next after that will be caller 9835. Caller 8571, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MR. BOWMAN: Commissioners, my name is Chris Bowman (ph.). Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes. Hello.

MR. BOWMAN: I served in the same capacity that you did in 1995 in San Francisco when we drew the district lines for supervisorial districts which have been in place since 2000, so I don't envy your task. I've been looking through the public comment section, over 32,000 individual public comments. That's a lot to go through.

I submitted a twenty-three district -- Assembly district plan which covers thirty-four counties from north of San Joaquin and Tuolumne County all the way to the Oregon border. And the twenty-three districts are completely contained within those thirty-four counties with the exception of the eastern communities of Contra Costa County which are next to San Joaquin County. You can -- at 32167, that's the comment number on your website.

Unfortunately, I was not able to get the maps. I submitted the maps on the 24th through the statewide database but was not able to wed my comments with the maps, so hopefully, the staff will be able to let you see the plan. It addresses a number of the issues that you've been dealing with and wrestling with, including the issue about what to do with Tahoe and --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. BOWMAN: -- and the central Sierra. You can
add -- in my district, you -- there's enough room to add
Inyo and Mono to it. I don't know why you would want to
do it because the highway's -- the overpass -- or rather
the --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MR. BOWMAN: -- pass is closed sometimes six to
eight months. But please take a look at my plan. It's
32167. Ask the staff to show you the maps. I think
you'll like what you see. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we have caller 9835. And up next after that
will be caller 3018. Caller 9835, if you'll please
follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The
floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. Thank you for taking my
call and thank you for the work you're doing. I
apologize for any ambient noise. I'm fighting my commute
on the 5 South right now, as I'm sure many people are. I
wanted to call -- I know we're working on Assembly lines
this week, but ahead of congressional lines next week,
which I think is -- is the plan, I wanted to talk about
Orange County and the City of Irvine.

Irvine's the second largest city in the county and
it-- all the various neighborhoods are all very similar
to each other unlike some other cities it's size. I'm
asking the Commission to consider keeping Irvine contiguous in the congressional lines instead of splitting it up amongst multiple lines. That's all I've got. Thank you so much. I hope you guys have a great evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we've got three -- caller 3018. And up next after that will be caller 2003. Caller 3018, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.

And one more time, caller 3018, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. I do apologize, caller 3018. There appears to be some type of connectivity issue for you at the moment, but I will come back to you.

And right now, we'll go to caller 2003. And up next after that will be call-in user 1. Caller 2003, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you. Good evening, Commissioner and public. My name is Sarissa (ph.), and I live in the San Fernando Valley. I'm disappointed to see that we still don't have our own respective VRA districts here in San Fernando. Numerous
people have called to ask for us -- our own pair of
majority Latino VRA districts to equitably represent our
community here. We need you to focus on this matter and
not jeopardize our community of interest.

Other groups like VICA have called in the past to
ask you all to make these districts for us and keep the
San Fernando Valley together when making these maps. It
makes sense for us, and I know I'm not the only one who
feels this way. Commissioners, please listen to all of
the Latinos speaking to you when we ask you to create
these VRA districts for the Valley. Thank you for your
time and have a wonderful evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we will have caller -- call-in user 1. And up
next after that will be caller 3422. Call-in user 1, if
you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing
star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. ZALIS: Hi, Commissioners. My name is Kelly
Zalis (ph.). I'm from Newberry Springs, which is in the
San Bernardino County High Desert. I just want to say
that I was really frustrated today watching you guys
split up the High Desert. I'm concerned that this a
pattern, and it really seems like you have consistently
been using rural areas in our county as population grabs
for Los Angeles County, areas like Alta Loma, Lake
Arrowhead, Wrightwood, and now the High Desert are being
drawn into Los Angeles districts that we have to drive
outside the district to get the population bases.

I just want to respectfully remind the Commissioner
that you are not the LA County Redistricting Commission.
You are supposed to work for the whole state, and our
region is one of the fastest growing in the state. Our
voices should be growing and not be sacrificed for LA
County. Please work to give the Inland Empire and rural
counties like mine a voice and thank you for your work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we will have caller 3422. And up next after
that will be caller 6058. I'd like to invite those that
have called in and not spoke this evening to please press
star 9 to raise your hand in case you wish to give
comment. And now we'll got to caller 3422. If you'll
please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.
The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. Good evening. Can you
hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Perfect. Good evening. I
definitely have -- have been listening in to the
conversation. I was listening the conversation around
the Coachella Valley last night. Here's the deal. You
are drawing an artificial line splitting the Latino community. You are artificially splitting Indio, which is sixty-nine percent Latino, from Thousand Palms and Cathedral City, which are fifty-nine percent Latino.

You are artificially deciding the community protected under the Voting Rights Act should have their vote diluted. You're artificially deciding which cities are part of the Latino community versus listening to the Latino community itself. You are artificially deciding the rights of the wealthy and that they should be placed ahead of those of the -- of the vulnerable. The whole point of the VRA is to give those communities like mine the strongest opportunity to vote in those who represent our interests. Do not lose sight of the course. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 6058. And up next after that will be caller 3018 as a retry. Caller 6058, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6, the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello? Yes. I live in the City of Cypress for over twenty-five years, and I'm speaking on behalf of many residents of Cypress. The City of Cypress has a strong connection with the cities of Los Alamitos, Seal Beach, Rossmoor, and we are like
sister cities where we share many common interests, we shop at each other's cities, attend each other's festivals and churches, sports activities. The cities are so intertwined we don't know where one -- one ends and the other one starts. Los Alamitos cross over with Cypress or many Cypress kids go to Los Alamitos school and vice versa.

So I'm asking if you to please keep the City of Cypress together with its sister cities and community of interest, Los Alamitos, Seal Beach, Rossmoor, as well as Huntington Beach. I'm also requesting the Commissioners to please not break the county line between Orange and LA County and keep Long Beach and Orange County separate. They are way too different and one has nothing in common with each other, and they don't belong in the same district. Mingling them together will -- will be detrimental to Orange County and Long Beach. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller four -- oh, I apologize. We have caller 3018 mas a retry. And up next after that will be caller 4379. Caller 3018, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you, all, for let me speak on the
issue of San Fernando Valley's VRA districts. I've heard numerous people and groups call in before asking you all to give the San Fernando Valley two majority Latino Assembly districts and I'm still waiting to see them. What am I missing?

I don't understand why the Antelope Valley's Assembly districts have been rearranged, for example, while the San Fernando Valley still does not have equitable representation for Latinos. Latinos here are a huge community of interest and we long to see proper representation. Please listen us and keep the San Fernando Valley whole while creating two VRA districts like the one that (indiscernible) brought forth to you all. Thank you, Commissioners, for your time and please do this for the Valley.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 4379. And up next after that will be caller 5552. Caller 4379, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I'm a resident of LA County, and I am concerned that the Commission will try to link more of our county with our neighbors to the south in Orange County. I've lived in LA for years, and I can tell you that our lifestyles differ tremendously,
so please keep Long Beach with the rest of LA and out of OC. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 5552. And up next after that will be caller 3241. Caller 5552, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello. Good evening. My name is Griffin (ph.) and I am calling in regards requesting that we keep Irvine whole and separated from the coastal region of Orange County. Irvine is better suited to stay in the inland part of Orange County as it has very different needs than places like Newport Beach. The economies are not connected at all. These connect -- these communities should be able to keep their autonomy. Combining them together will put both regions at a disservice. Thank you for listening and have a nice night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 3241. And up next after that will be caller 5410. Caller 3241, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi there. I -- I've called -- I've been listening to this Commission for a
while now today, and I'm hearing the same thing that I'm concerned about is that Orange County might be looped in with Long Beach in the coastal district and that doesn't make any sense. And then we've seen consensus so far of people calling from Long Beach worried that OC would drown out their voices when we're concerned about the exact opposite happening.

So with that consensus, you know these communities are completely incompatible to be looped in together, and so keeping LA and Orange County separate is the best decision you can make because it just makes sense, you know? Why loop in two areas that have almost nothing in common together? So that's -- that's what I wanted to say is that these communities are incompatible and there's just mutual consensus on both sides of the aisle, LA and Orange, on this issue.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 5410. And up next after that will be caller 2931. Caller 5410, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I was just calling to -- just as a reminder to point out to the Commissioners that the negative comments you've been hearing about Stanislaus County and -- and the Modesto area tonight
are -- they're really focused on the congressional map, and these negative comments are not focused on tonight's focus, which is the State Assembly and -- and the Senate maps.

The -- you know, really, the Assembly maps are -- are fine just the way they are. You guys have listened to us. You've heard the people of Stanislaus and San Joaquin, and you've heard our needs and our request for -- for the Assembly maps, and the lines that you have currently, they -- they provide us with the appropriate representation for our community. And I know that you guys have worked really hard on these maps, and -- and you -- I really feel like you've done a great job.

So please keep the map you have and leave Stanislaus and -- and San Joaquin Assembly drafts just the way they are. I really feel that, you know, we often get overlooked here in the Central Valley, but with these State Assembly maps, they actually make me feel like our community has actually been heard and -- and that means a lot. So I just wanted to thank you all for -- for your hard work and your late nights and thank you for hearing me out.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 2931. And up next after that will be caller 9805. Caller 2931, if you'll please
follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioner. I haven't called before and I have new information that I want to share. I want to bring to your attention on Orange County (indiscernible) article yesterday that talking about redistrict and have (indiscernible) from residential the suggestion from the community. (Indiscernible) article (indiscernible) up Little Saigon do (indiscernible) Huntington Beach to be considered part of their community.

You have done this with the Senator district but not the Assembly and congressional. We are asking again -- again, we are asking to -- you to include in either on at least half of north Huntington Beach, entire city of Huntington Beach into our community. For Assembly, remove (indiscernible) and (indiscernible) Euclid Street and up on part of Huntington Beach if part up north (indiscernible) Avenue and Huntington Beach (indiscernible) and up on a part of Huntington Beach (indiscernible) Avenue and Huntington Beach. Little Saigon need to include following city: Huntington Beach, Westminster, Midway City, Los Alamitos, Rossmoor, Seal Beach, and part of Garden Grove. Thank you for all your time helping with giving Little Saigon two
representatives for the next decade and thank you for
your hard work on congressional and have a good night.
Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we will have caller 90 -- 9805. And up next
after that will be caller 5816. Caller 9805, if you'll
please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.
The floor is yours.

MR. DODVAN: Good evening. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. DODVAN: Thank you very much, Commissioner,
again, for taking my call. My name is Bobat Dodvan
(ph.). I live in Woodland Hills, California for last
thirty-seven years. That is in San Fernando Valley. I
would like to ask to please consider the proposal
submitted by the Valley Industry and Commerce
Association, VICA, for Congress.

Right now, my own congressional district has Santa
Monica in it. That is just amazing. That's way on the
other side of the mountain. That should not be there.
The VICA map puts Santa Monica back into coastline
district and Venice. Also, it puts ninety-two percent of
the population of my district -- the Malibu, San Fernando
district, North Mulholland Drive in San Fernando Valley.
It keeps also the Northridge together and also unites
West Hollywood with the West Side council -- council of the government.

The VICA plan, that is again Valley Industry and Commerce Association plan, is a balanced shift that solves the remaining problem of our full district all at once. I would like to thank you again, and I would like to ask of you to check out the VICA plan. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 5816. And up next after that will be caller 8037. And those are my last two hands for the evening. For those that have not spoke this evening, if you please press star 9, this will raise your hand indicating you wish to give comment. Everyone will get a chance to speak but it makes it a little easier to manage. Please press star 9 if you wish to give comment and have not spoke. Caller 5816, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you. And thank you, Commissioners. My name is JT. I'm a resident of Laguna Niguel and I have been for about twenty years. I lived in Orange County for the last thirty-five years. I'm calling to voice my displeasure of having Irvine added to our current district and express my agreement with the Councilman from Irvine in that the Irvine has
little in common with the Orange Coney -- Orange County coast cities and would dilute the issues of both those communities.

I've had the privilege of helping underprivileged families and seniors throughout Orange County through a couple of program, volunteer programs, and I've seen the services that -- that they provide, and firsthand, they're extremely different. The needs of the coastal and the needs of the inland communities are markedly different.

There's also been testimony throughout this Commission and this hearing about keeping Irvine whole. I'm in complete agreement with keeping Irvine whole. The only that is accessible is if Irvine is made the focal city of -- in the district that does not involve those coastal cities. The coastal cities have common issues, common problems, common habitats of interest, and we would like to keep those respected and considered when -- when redistricting.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So thank you very much and please keep the -- the coastal cities in -- together. Thank you. Bye.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 8037. And up next after
that will be caller 6789. Caller 8037, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I'm calling about the SEALBREA district and the coastal Orange County district. At one point, the Commission discussed how it was important to keep these districts compact yet the SEALBREA district is quite the opposite. I think it would make sense to build an actually compact district that includes Seal Beach, Los Alamitos, Rossmoor, Little Saigon, and Huntington Beach. There's really no reason to separate these neighboring cities and keeping them -- keeping them together would really better empower the Vietnamese voters in these cities. I think the Commission should focus on this change in the next map. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 6789. And up next after that will be caller 0247. Caller 6789, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MR. TRAN: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Vincent Tran. I'm a resident of Palm Valley, and I'm part of VietRISE, a nonprofit organization based in Garden Grove. So we implore you to keep West Santa Ana
west of the Santa Ana River with the neighboring Little
Saigon cities of Westminster, Garden Grove, and Fountain
Valley in both the congressional and State draft maps
similar to the layout of the Assembly draft map.

There's a large concentration of Vietnamese living
is West Santa Ana for a predominantly mobile home
residents, seniors, and low income. The large
collection of mobile homes within West Santa Ana
should be keep together with Westminster and Garden Grove
which also has a large concentration of mobile home parks
that are predominantly occupied by Vietnamese residents,
and the fac -- fracturing of these communities into
different districts would further weaken their voices and
potentially result in the displacement of low-income
senior Vietnamese refugee residents.

In addition, keeping these cities together also
respects the historical growth of Little Saigon whose
origin lies in, you know, West Santa Ana and later moved
onto Garden Grove and Westminster and Fountain Valley.
West Santa Ana continues to be an important gathering
place for the Vietnamese community due to a large
concentration of Vietnamese churches and temples, many of
which were built in the early stages of the development
of Little Saigon, and -- and over the past few months
there have been many maps --
MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. TRAN: -- submitted by the community which shows the Commission can comply with the federal Voting Rights Act in Los Angeles and Orange County while also keeping our communities of interest whole. So please use this map as a roadmap to achieving the balance.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. TRAN: One last thing to note is, you know, we don't have any common -- shared interest with Huntington Beach and Newport Beach and Seal Beach, so please keep Little Saigon separate from those coastal cities. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we will have caller 0247. And up next after that will be caller 3434. Caller 0247, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MR. DE LEON: Hello. Good evening. My name is Manny De Leon. I'm a resident of Irvine, a UC alumni, and a community organizer with the Orange County Asian Pacific Islander Community Alliance, OCAPICA for short, an organization based in Orange County dedicated to centering and uplifting the needs of the AAPI community in Irvine. I'm also personally organizing with the overlooked but significant population of Filipino-
Americans in and around Irvine.

I'm here tonight to comment on yesterday's discussion about breaking up communities of interest in Orange County. Irvine is one of the fastest growing cities in the state which has been fueled by ongoing growth by its immigrant communities. With a growing number of Asian American Pacific Islander and AMEMSA residents, the City of Irvine has similar communities to the City of Tustin and also how to an emerging low-income population with needs similar to those of the Latinx communities in Costa Mesa.

And the proposed draft Assembly map addresses and respects these communities of interest and we ask to please not break them up. Numerous maps submitted by the community have demonstrated that the Commission can comply with the federal Voting Rights Act in Los Angeles and Orange Counties while keep key communities of interest like Irvine and Costa Mesa together. Please consider integrating the aspects of the -- of the submitted maps to comply with the VRA with centering the voices and needs of our communities. Again, thank you so much for all the work you've done and good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And(183,976),(766,999)
right now we're going to caller 3434. And then up next after that will be caller 4852. Caller 3434, if you'll
please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.
The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello, ma'am. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes. Okay. Thank you.

So hello. How -- okay. So my name is Gino. I live in Simi Valley, and I'm calling you to please keep Simi Valley in the same district as Santa Clarita when making these next legislative maps. A lot of people have called asking for us not to be with Santa Clarita because we're in separate counties. I even heard a previous caller talk about how it was white people controlling indigenous, black, and Hispanic communities when, in fact, that is not true.

Simi Valley actually has a very diverse community, way more diverse than any of the other communities in Ventura County and way more similar to the demographics of Palmdale, Lancaster, and Santa Clarita. Simi Valley actually has a twenty-eight percent Hispanic population compared to other cities like Calabasas which only has eight percent Hispanic population. So what he said is just flat-out wrong and Simi Valley deserves to be with the other diverse groups in the Antelope Valley and Santa Clarita region.
Also, we don't have a lot of -- in common with Agoura Hills, Calabasas, and Malibu. Even though those happen to be in LA County, it doesn't make sense because they're on that -- we -- we aren't near them. We're on the outskirts of the City --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- of Los Angeles, and we are not one of these coastal communities. So my case to you is to please keep Simi Valley and Santa Clarita in the same district and not to put us with these other communities on the coastline. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And at this time, I'd like to give caller 4852 an opportunity to speak. Please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, Commissioners. I'm -- I live in north San Fernando Valley, and I'm the president of Global Punjabi Forum, and I am part of the large Sikh community in San Fernando Valley. We have four Gurdwara and one temple here. The San Fernando Valley should be majority Valley district. You have mostly done that already, so I wish to say thank you. In fact, you draw three good majority Valley district.

One district contains Burbank and Glendale. One district contain east Valley, east San Fernando Valley.
And the third district contain Valley west and some San Fernando Valley. And if you can correct one thing, please do not put Santa Monica in San Fernando Valley -- with the San Fernando Valley. Santa Monica by the ocean should be district with the ocean community. The San Fernando Valley -- sorry Valley Industry -- Industry and Commercial Association has a plan to contain Santa Monica with the coast --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- and keep (indiscernible) with the San Fernando Valley. Please keep San Fernando Valley from the -- separate from the Santa Monica -- completely separate. This is very --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- important. Thank you.

Thank you much, please. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And Chair, at this time, that was our last caller.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you so much, Katy, for --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: You're welcome.

CHAIR TOLEDO: -- for everything you do, and Kristian and all staff, and the public, of course, for keeping us -- for providing the -- the feedback and the guidance that you have provided, the testimony.

We will continue tomorrow at 11 a.m. We'll be
continuing on in our visualizations and moving -- moving north. I -- we will have some visualizations back from our line drawers, and we are focused -- we will be looking at those and reviewing those as we continue to move on through our maps. So we will look forward to seeing you all tomorrow, 11:00. And thank you and have a good evening.

(Whereupon, the Review Public Input/Line Drawing Meeting meeting adjourned at 7:41 p.m.)
CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 19th day of December, 2021.

___________________________
CLAUDINE METOYER,
Court Reporter
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

_______________________
TRACI FINE, CDLT-169

December 19, 2021