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CHAIR KENNEDY: Good morning, California. Welcome to today's meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. I'm Ray Kennedy, the current rotating chair.

Ravi, would you please call roll?

MR. SINGH: Yes, sir. Thank you. 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: I am here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Present.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Akutagawa.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Fernandez.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Presente.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MR. SINGH: And Commissioner Kennedy.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I am here. Thank you so much, Ravi.

MR. SINGH: You're welcome.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Today's run of show: We're looking approximately a twelve-hour day today. There will be an opportunity for announcements. We will have a brief business meeting. There's at least one business item to bring up. After the business meeting segment concludes, we will jump back to Congressional districts, I have spoken with the mappers, we will start with the Central Valley, followed by San Jose, and then any other iterations that we might have time for.

I'm not counting on having anymore at this point, and we do plan to do the same, jump back to Congressional districts tomorrow morning as well. So if we do not finish going through Congressional district iterations that are ready this morning, we will get back to them tomorrow morning.

After the 11:00 break, we will go back to Senate
districts, starting with Central Valley, looking at our explorations there, then hopefully moving to Sacramento, then this afternoon getting to the San Francisco Bay region, and hopefully making it to Northern California later in the day, during the last mapping session. We'll then have a 6:30 break, followed by public comment starting at 6:45.

So that is the run of the show. Hope to be concluding by 9:15 at the latest. So are there any announcements from Commissioners or staff?

No announcements. Okay. So we have a business meeting matter. As I understand it, there is a policy ready that has been posted for approximately thirty-six hours for public review. Is that with Legal or is that with Admin and Finance?

CHIEF COUNSEL PANNE: It's actually with the Public Input Subcommittee.


COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I'm stepping forward, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: So just a brief background. Commissioner Fornaciari and I met with Chief Counsel Pane to review our Public Input Policy. We already had one in the handbook that we had approved previously. However,
we wanted to revise it to make sure that it encompassed
everything that we've been doing with public input, and
the practices that we've been following, particularly
during this increased amount of public input we've been
receiving. So the policy has been posted. I hope
everyone has had a chance to review it. Nothing in there
should be a surprise. It is how we've been conducting
our input process throughout.

And I guess I will turn it over to Commissioner
Fornaciari, and then Chief Counsel Pane for any
additional items. And then questions if folks have them.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well said. I have nothing
to add. Thanks Commissioner Ahmad.

CHIEF COUNSEL PANÉ: So to that point, if the -- if
the subcommittee wants -- would like this, we could
schedule it for a vote, and we would meet our motion, and
go through our process. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I move that we approve the
Public Input Policy as reflected on our website.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I second. Pedro Toledo.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Discussion. Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

First of all, if it is an amendment or a revision, we
should probably note that somewhere in here that it's an
addendum, or revision, or whatever you want to call it.
And just wondering if it's a typo, 1-A, where it says, "At each", should it be "agendized meeting"? Is it a typo?

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez. Yeah, we can certainly make that -- change that typo. And to your earlier point, because the contents are different, I think -- believe this is probably more of a revision, only because the topics that were covered in the proposed handout are additional to, and slightly change one aspect of the previous policy. So I'd recommend having one policy and this would be the new revised policy.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. And then just my other, on 1-A-I, I guess, second line, I believe you left out the word during, and at least once during each agendized meeting. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I'm just curious about the two-minute -- up to two-minute limit. It just caught my eye because I -- you know, there were times in the past where we did have longer comment periods, depending on, you know, the stage of the work we were in. I just wanted to hear that this is actually a decision to entirely limit all comments in all periods to
no more than two minutes.

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Yeah. To your point, Commissioner Yee, there have been usually what public bodies do, is given the usually the -- very voluminous public comments that can occur, it's very common for public bodies to say, you know, we need one minute for each speaker, or one and a half minutes, or two minutes. This would be putting a cap that it wouldn't be longer than two minutes, but it does provide the chair with flexibility to do less than that, if need be, given how many people are in the queue.

CHAIR KENNEDY: But never more than that.

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: But not more than that. It's a ceiling of two.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes. Sorry about that, and just one more thing. In here you put a two-hour limit on public comment. And we have been going past two hours. So I'm just wondering, is this two hours going forward? Or what the process is here, because I'd really like to hear all comment. Thank you.

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Yeah. I don't know if the subcommittee wants to weigh in as well. But I'll leave it to them.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Commissioner Fornaciari?
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So we -- yeah, we haven't had a specific -- I'm going to address two things, right? Commissioner Yee's comment about longer time for the public to speak. I think, you know, for public comment, I don't believe we've gone over -- over two minutes. In other contexts, you know, for specific public input we've gone longer, but for public comment I don't -- I don't think we've gone longer than two minutes. And so this just codifies, you know, what we're actually doing.

So the two-hour time limit, we were just trying to -- you know, there's where we have the option to create a time, what's the term, time --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Time, place, and manner.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- time, place, and manner restriction. So we just wanted to be able to sort of, you know, manage public input, you know, in a way that we can balance the time, time for us to do the work we need to do, but also time for the public to provide input. So that was the thinking behind that.

I don't know if Anthony or Isra has anything that they'd like to add.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Nothing more to add.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And --
CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Just the one thing I'll add to that is, Marcy did a -- our Outreach Director did a sort of a preliminary analysis, and it was on average, around an hour and a half in some -- a lot of the time, less than that, but certainly taking into consideration the increased public comment where we're doing -- and now we're talking an hour and a half of actual public comment. You take away the break part, you take away -- you know, once you actually start, an average, about an hour and a half of public comment.

And this would be two hours. So it would be a little bit longer than that. So trying to balance that, and that's just a little bit more of a policy call, but certainly taking into consideration what's happened in the past that's -- the two-hour mark is more -- certainly more generous than what has happened in the past, generally, on average.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chief Counsel Pane.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I think, given that on average, we are able to see and hear for everyone that has called in, I mean two hours seems like a reasonable amount of time, and perhaps there might be language added to two hours, and give the Chair some discretion as well to -- for those circumstances where we may need to
continue just seeing -- to continue to where we may still have hands raised. And it's important not to cut off where the Chair determines it's important not to cut off the discussion or the input.

So maybe giving the Chair a little bit more discretion to be able to go beyond the two hours, as necessary, would be acceptable? Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair.

Thank you for revising our public comment policy.

And we have used the words public input and public comment to mean different things. And I'm curious -- well, I think for this Public Comment Policy, we should then define what we mean by public comment, because we do have both.

And then, you know, because we want that flexibility for public input -- yeah, I mean, as we said some -- a lot of our public input sessions were very different than our public comment. And so I just want us to make sure that we are being consistent, because even when earlier we said, well, yes, we've done that differently for public input, and then -- and then we started talking about public comments, and someone said public input, when I think they meant public comment, which is okay,
but I think for a policy, we do want to be clear if we're -- if we have -- since we have differentiated it throughout.

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: So to your point, Commissioner Sinay, yeah, they are different terms. Public comment is specifically referenced in the Government Code. Public input is a term that is somewhat defined in our Commission statutes. And the Commission has previously differentiated those terms.

You'll recall that the Commission has -- took a previous policy of three minutes for public input, and that's when they were -- when you were doing a different phase of the Commission process. The Government Code allows public bodies to regulate time, place, manner restrictions for public comment. And so this policy is in line with the Government Code referring to public comment.

So you would be regulating public comment. As I understand it, as applied to this part, or what's remaining for the Commission, what's at this point is public comment for the rest -- for the remainder. But generally, yes, you have previously defined public input and allocated a time, place, manner restriction for that to be three minutes. This policy does not address public input, it addresses public comment.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right. My comment was just --
we might just want to put a sentence in the very
beginning just -- saying exactly that and defining what
public comment is.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, I just
wanted to echo Commissioner Toledo's thought about adding
some discretion for the Chair, maybe under 1-A, perhaps
saying, will ordinarily occupy up to two hours. I mean,
I think if we're coming up on two hours, and only two
more people in the queue, most chairs would just take
those, you know.

But by the language here is like we couldn't, you
know, at least by the letter of the law, letter of the
policy. So some discretion for the Chair to go longer as
circumstances dictate.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. Given the
discussion around this, I would like to revise my motion
to say approve -- I move to approve the revised Public
Comment Policy with amendments, as noted, for the
remainder of our Commission meetings. I can send you
that in writing, Alvaro. Thanks.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner, Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I think on Commissioner Yee's point, I wonder if there also needs to be just a brief sentence, or some language that also says that at the -- either the Chair's discretion that if there is quite a bit more public testimony waiting to be given, that another date and time will be rescheduled. I think we've talked about that, that after a certain time, if we just need to, you know, extend it into the next day, or reschedule for another day, we'll just capture everybody's contact information so that they can, you know, give their testimony. And I didn't see that. And I'm just wondering if that should also be included in there, with the Chair's discretion. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Chief Counsel Pane.

CHIEF COUNSEL Pane: So I -- just a quick point about the discretion. Can certainly work with that, but I would, frankly, want to get a clearer understanding of what that discretion looks like. Sort of an open-ended discretion of the chair isn't really a time, place, manner restriction.

So you know, certainly we have a motion on the -- on the floor and it's been seconded, but if we would want to
go back and substantively alter what -- to include
discretion, and sort of the limits of that discretion, I
would want to go back and rework that policy, if that's
the Commission's will.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chief Counsel Pane.
Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I'm wondering what
might be some options to rework, to allow us to hear --
to go beyond the two-hour time frame, should we want to
do that. Is it something like giving the chair an
additional -- the flexibility of an additional -- an
additional fifteen minutes, or fifteen-minute increments,
or something like that, or something else.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo. I
could also imagine in those situations requiring a vote
of the Commission to extend the public comment period
beyond the two hours.

One issue that came to my mind is if we -- you know,
this is just theoretical, but if we had a large number of
speakers requiring, and/or requesting interpretation, and
we needed to give them twice as much time, then we would
effectively be reducing the number of people we could
hear from.

So I'm wondering if we might want to include a
provision saying, the two hours would be calculated on
the amount of original input, excluding any time required
for interpretation. Chief Counsel Pane?

CHIEF COUNSELPane: I think we -- I think we could
certainly add that. I would -- even if the Commission
didn't or chose not to include that, I believe that would
be the application of the law as current -- as currently
under the law would require that anyway. We would,
effectively, go beyond the two hours for that specific
limited purpose that's already in the law for that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: All right. Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I would like counsel to
reconsider that response with the thought process that
the two hours that we determined would be above and
beyond what we've already done, would have already
included in any interpretation, or translation. And all
of our public comment has already had that baked in.

And we've set a limit based on that total. And so
now it looks like we're taking that total and giving
additional time, and has nothing to do with whether or
not people need the translation. I just feel like the
calculations that were used already had that included in
as part of it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Akutagawa, is your hand still up, or up
again? Okay. Please go ahead.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So on the point about discretion. Is it better to then say that should there be X number of people, or the expectation is that the -- based on the number of people in the queue, it will go beyond a fifteen-minute time frame. A new -- you know, a new -- the remainder of the people in queue to make comment will be rescheduled for, you know, the following day or something like that.

And if, instead of using that discretion language, you know, being very specific about how many people in queue has to be -- you know, has to be there to trigger, you know, just the idea that we cannot go beyond the two hours, and that we just need to schedule. Versus like, okay, if there's two or three people, I think we would -- we'll know that that will take less than fifteen minutes.

I just want to ask about that. Maybe that -- being that specific may be helpful to what Chief Counsel Pane spoke about, where it doesn't require a complete reworking of it, but just inserting, you know, language that adds that specificity of when additional time needs to be triggered for -- to take that public comment.

Thank you.

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: So to that point, I can give you at least a few examples. But one example that comes
up with another state entity, they've allocated up --
it's an up-to a certain amount for public comment. And
the theory behind that is they average what they
typically have, and usually you'd increase that a little
bit more to gauge what would, otherwise, be appropriate.

But in that case there is usually that hard -- that
hard stop, so in -- so if we talk about discretion, it
gets difficult to say, well, it's two more callers, if
it's four more callers, if it's -- so it may be worth
figuring out what the Commission thinks would be the
right amount of time for public comment. The Government
Code does allow public bodies to limit the total amount
of time for public comment.

So it's a question of what is that total amount of
public time for public comment. And as on an average
you've done about an hour and a half, maybe a little less
than that, the theory then was, well then we'll add it --
we'll add an additional thirty minutes for a total of two
hours. But we're never going to know if it's two more
people, or four, you know, it's always going to -- it
could always be different.

So that's sort of the theory behind having the total
amount behind it is to kind of capture the situations as
best you can, what we think public comment has been, what
we think it will be, and that's what we would go by.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chief Counsel Pane.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I mean, given, you know, the thought that has gone behind this, and also our limited amount of time over the next, I think -- I think Commissioner or Chair Kennedy referenced hours, right, we have hours to complete our work over the next couple of weeks, I do think a cap would be -- is probably -- would probably be something that would be prudent, given that we have so many ways for the public to give us input, not just through -- through our -- through coming on to giving public testimony over our live sessions, but also through the various means of doing so.

So given that, I'd be like -- I started off being a little bit uncomfortable with the -- with the ceiling. But the more -- the more that I think about it, the more that I understand all the thought process that went into coming up with a two-hour time frame. I'm more and more okay with it. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. In terms of -- I don't know what the outreach director used in terms of averaging, if she went all the way back to when we 1st started our meetings, but obviously, in the last
few weeks, it's been more than two hours. So that's my
concern is, it has been more than two hours, sometimes
three hours, so I mean, it has to be at least three
hours. Two hours, I mean, even in our run of shows we're
allocating two one-and-a-half-hour blocks. So that's
three hours in my opinion. So I'm saying a minimum of
three. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.
I will join Commissioner Toledo in this. We have very
few hours remaining. And I think, you know, we have to
look at the balance between getting our work done, and
taking public comment. I think that, you know, we
have -- we have successfully managed to balance that.
But as the hours tick down, and we have fewer and fewer
hours remaining, saying three hours is taking up a
rapidly increasing percentage of the time available to us
to complete our work.

And I believe that two hours is reasonable in that
context. We are not trying to cut off anyone in
particular, any views in particular, we want to continue
to take public comment, but we must focus on the amount
of time remaining to get the actual work done.

That said, I'm not comfortable with the chair being
the only one with discretion on this. I think that, you
know, part of the purpose of establishing a policy is to
limit any sort of discretion. And to the extent that there might be occasions where some amount of discretion might be useful or important, I would -- I would again propose that it require a vote of the full Commission.

Thank you. Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you, Chair. I agree. I hear what -- I hear what you're saying. Hours are precious, time is precious. But I think I would have to lean towards Commissioner Fernandez's line of thinking. I think we have to go minimum, the two-hour or ninety-minute blocks, that's what we've sort of have it set up for, and work from there. Yeah. I think two ninety-minute blocks is reasonable.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. This conversation was not as fast as I was hoping. I want to remind myself that we have until December 27th to get our maps in. We don't have a meeting scheduled for beyond December 27th at this point, so just wanted to remind myself of that first.

I am ready to vote. If there is a strong opinion to increase the two hours to two ninety-minute blocks, fine, let's do that and move on. I want to get to mapping. Thanks.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I'm fine with two ninety-minute blocks of that -- that would come out to three -- or I wouldn't say two -- I would just say three hours max, I mean a three-hour cap. Although I thought the two-hour was reasonable, but if more -- if the three hours seem -- are more aligned with our practice at this point, I'm comfortable with that. I can fully support that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I suggest an amendment of, as such, two ninety-minute time block, time limits -- two ninety-minute combined time limits -- you know, would be our limit, yeah. I propose in there, instead of where it says two hours, I propose the amendment of making that two ninety-minute block -- ninety-minute blocks as our maximum.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Let's see. So here is what I -- I just want to make sure we're clear. There are a couple of typos that we need to fix. And I would propose we don't say two ninety-minute blocks, because we
may start in the middle of one of our ninety-minute blocks. So I would just offer three hours. And other -- and those would be the two amendments that we would capture here is what I'm hearing. Is that correct?

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: That's what I'm taking note of so far. Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari. Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I withdraw mine, and accept -- ninety minute -- and accept Commissioner Fornaciari's.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So the original motion was made, I believe, by Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So do you accept the amendment?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes. The three hours.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Second --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Let's go.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Second was by whom?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: That was myself. And I accept the amendment, the friendly amendment.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Okay. So we've
discussed it. We now must take public comment before we vote.

So Kristian, could you please issue the instructions, and begin taking public comment on this item?

MR. MANOFF: Yes, Chair.

In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone for the motion on the floor.

To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the live stream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted enter the meeting ID number provided on the live stream feed, it is, 85932989398 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound. Once you've dialed in, you'll be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star nine, this will raise your hand for the moderator.

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

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

Chair, would you like me to enforce a two-minute time limit on comments?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

MR. MANOFF: Very good. For those in the queue, we do have a couple of people who have called in -- just a moment. We are going to lower your hands. If you would like to give comment on the motion on the floor, you will be invited to raise your hand again. All hands are lowered now. If you'd like to give comment on the motion on the floor, please, press star nine.

We're going to allow some time for people to consider if they want to give comment on the motion on the floor. Again, if you want to give comment on the motion on the floor, please press star nine. And we do see those hands. Thank you very much.

As the Chair said, we will be enforcing a two-minute time limit on comments on the motion on the floor.

First up, we have caller 3995. And after that will be caller 2829. Caller 3995, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hey, good morning,
do embrace a longer public comment period. There is a lot of people who do have to wait on these for a really long time. Some people wait up to like four hours, having to -- especially like last week, before there was a solid procedure in place. So I really do hope that you embrace public comment and leaving, whether it be two ninety blocks -- two ninety-minute blocks, or just three hours of public comment. I do hope that you embrace that motion. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

Up next, we've got caller 2829. Please follow the prompts.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: Hello, Commissioners.

MR. MANOFF: The floor is yours.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: Hello, Commissioners. This is Renee Westa-Lusk. I guess I need some clarification. I'm rather confused about this discussion, because I think there needs to be a distinction between public comment, I guess, that you would give at a business meeting, versus, I don't know what you call the comment that you're getting when you have the line drawing sessions, because like all yesterday was line drawing, it wasn't a business meeting.

And you had this segment of three hours -- almost three hours from 6:30 to 9 last night. Is that public
comment, or public input? So I'm confused about limiting this. If you could, please clarify. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much for your comment.

One more time, for those who have called in, if you would like to give comment for the motion on the floor, please press star nine.

There are no more hands at this time, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Kristian. Chief Counsel Pane, would you like to respond to the last caller?

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Yes. This, what we're doing here is public comment. Public input was a specific designated time in the phase, as I mentioned briefly. Right at this point we are not -- to my understanding, the Commission has not asked for public input, they've asked -- they've been asking for public comment. So I wanted to just clarify that point. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: But this would reply -- this would refer to or cover public comment on business items during business meetings as well as public comment on the maps.

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: So I would argue, and you can look at the agenda, but every agendized meeting is -- I would argue is a business meeting, in a sense. Even line drawing is part of this Commission's mandate. And so -- and as you can refer to on the agenda, it is one line -- line drawing is certainly one of the items on the agenda
for the Commission meetings.

So it's -- and we -- as noted, Bagley-Keene requires public comment for every agendized item. And so this would be one of those items where you would all take public comment from.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much. Executive Director Hernandez, are you ready to handle this vote?

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes. We are ready.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Please proceed.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I was hoping to have the motion read one more time for understanding of where we ended.
DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Sure. The motion -- as noted, the motion to approve revised public comment, referring to the 12/16/21 handout policy, with discussed amendment as noted for the remainder of the Commission meetings.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And the discussed amendment was three hours instead of two.

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: And as well as fixing a couple of the spelling typos as well.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fernandez caught a little typo there.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: (Indiscernible)

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Very well. I'll continue with the call. Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Vazquez?

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fernandez?
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Just for clarification, so there's no option to go beyond the three on current policy, correct?

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Commissioner Fernandez, to your point. If this policy were adopted, there would be a cap of three hours devoted to public comment for each agenda item.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: No.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Abstain.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: The motion passes. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Executive Director Hernandez.

Are there any other business items that need to come before the Commission at this point?

I'm not seeing any. We are now turning our attention to iterations that have been prepared and posted for our Congressional maps. So Kennedy, it is over to you. And you were working with Commissioners Fornaciari --

MS. WILSON: Sadhwani --

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- and Turner on this? Or this is Sadhwani and Toledo?
MS. WILSON: Correct. There's a lot of iterations going around. This one is Sadhwani and Toledo.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

MS. WILSON: So where we left off yesterday was we went through the three iterations, we had the one where we split the -- in Fresno and swapping 5,000 between each other, and then we had the next two, which have the arm in Fresno/Kern, and a big difference between them was just how we put out the extra 17,000 (sic) people.

And so one way was splitting through Clovis and North Fresno, and we left off on the -- just taking parts of Fresno. And I can zoom in a bit closer for you to see that. And this would be the iteration for us -- STCD4 (ph.).

(Pause)

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So are we just thinking about this right now? Is that where we are?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry. Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. So I'm sorry. The population that got moved is 17,000? Oh, okay, because I thought it was yesterday --

MS. WILSON: Sorry.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- one hundred --

MS. WILSON: It was 117-, my apologies, 117,000.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. And because we're
moving 5,000, the 117- came from where?

MS. WILSON: So before it was 5,000 just because we kept the same configuration of all three districts, and only took out Old Fig Garden. Here, we took out Visalia, parts of Tulare, Lemoore, Lemoore Station, the northwestern part of Hanford, and that was a lot more people, and put that into Fresno/Kern to get the deviations to where they are.

So before, when we didn't have this arm, King, Tulare, Kern was at -- I believe it was around fifty-eight percent. However, Fresno/Tulare was around fifty-one. And so to get this back up to fifty-three we had to take out more parts. And that is why it's a bigger shift in population.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you. And the only difference between version 3 and version 4 is what part, how the 117,000 was taken out.

MS. WILSON: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. And 3, it's part of Fresno and part of Clovis, and 4, it's all part of Fresno?

MS. WILSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Could you please tell us, you know, for each -- for version 3, you know, where's the downtown in each of these cities? And you
know, what percentage of the city has been moved to ECA?
Like, say, do we know where the downtown is in Fresno, or
the --

MS. WILSON: And I'm turning on the terrain map so
we can take a look at where the splits were. And so
again, one thing we were able to bring in that we didn't
have in other iterations was Fig Garden Loop, and in with
Old Fig we have a cut here at North/Shaw Avenue. Here is
going across Blackstone, up to Bullard Avenue, North
First Street, and then the 99 is right here, so it's a
little bit more west. And this road here is the North
Santa Fe Avenue, and it kind of goes around to Fig Garden
Drive, and up to Herndon Avenue, and down to Shaw.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you. And
could -- just on this one, can we see the difference in
Fresno, please, from 3 to 4? Or I'm sorry, which, this
is 4. And in 3 what are -- when it's close like this,
what does 3 and 4 look like?

MS. WILSON: Yes. One moment, and I will turn it
on, and you can see them together. Or so this is 4. And
let's turn on 3. So they take the border, from the
Fresno/Tulare stays the same, it's just how we take out
the 117,000.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you, yeah. I'd
like to know, you know, sort of what -- what parts of the
city are -- like particularly in this version, so what portion of -- what's the population in Fresno? And what's the population in Clovis that goes to ECA?

MS. WILSON: Clovis, let's check that right now. I know Clovis entirely has around 120,000, but I can see the exact number of people that were taken out from each in one moment.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you very much.

(Pause)

MS. WILSON: Sorry, I had both lines on, and that was confusing me, so now I'll just put these lines on.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Well, while we're waiting. Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. Yes. And so I wanted to just support the STCV4 iteration that went -- that was displayed on yesterday. Thanking Commissioners Sadhwani, Toledo, and Kennedy for showing them. We got a lot of good feedback on that through our public comment on last night. I like the non-pairing of Clovis, and I think this version honors most of the COIs that we've received. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

MS. WILSON: So this is slightly a few blocks off, but it's around 104,000 people here. Oh, and you asked for --
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. Yeah.

MS. WILSON: -- for each one. Okay, sorry. Hold on.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Yes. I also prefer version 4. However, my concern is with the STANISFRESNO, that's the only district where the Latino CVAP actually went down. So I just want to make sure. I think this was brought up yesterday that it has been reviewed by our VRA counsel, but I just want to confirm. It just seems really low to me. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. We will be asking counsel for their thoughts on this, momentarily.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. And so with that, I wanted to just frame this a little bit more. So if we go back to our draft maps. Is there a way to go to our draft maps, Kennedy, the ones from back in November? I'm sorry. I'm having a technical glitch so -- with my laptop in the Commission Office.

So if we go back to our original draft maps, you'll see that -- because that really was the -- while we were drafting these maps back in November, we did our best to get CVAPs while honoring all of the COIs, and all of the
criteria. And our CVAPs in the southern region were — and Kennedy can show us what they were. I believe the Latino CVAP in the Kern district was — Kennedy, can you — I can't see them on my screen, so if you could just —

MS. WILSON: Yes. I am pulling it up right this moment. And also for Commissioner Andersen, we took around 70,000 from Clovis, and around 37,000 from Fresno. It's not an exact number, but around there.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. Yeah. Thank you very much, Kennedy.

MS. WILSON: And then to Commissioner Toledo. In STANISFRESNO, we had 51.66 percent Latino CVAP, Fresno/Tulare was at 53.16 percent, and KINGTULAKERN was at 55.5 percent.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And if you could also highlight the African-American or the Black — the Black CVAPs as well, just because that also colors our thinking around all of this. So when we — when we were working through these back in November, and putting these together, we actually, during public meeting, during that session where we developed this, we asked the public for feedback on the CVAPs.

I mean, actually, it was Mr. Becker who went on record, and wanted the public to comment on whether these
CVAPs were -- were at the range that would allow for
the -- the communities to elect candidates of choice.
And we did receive quite a bit of feedback from the
community saying, no, the Kern -- the Kern/Tulare
District was not sufficient, and that the Fresno --
Fresno/Tulare District could be -- if we could -- an
increase in that CVAP would be preferable.

We went back in iterations to try to maintain the
compactness, maintain the COIs, maintain everything that
we had talked through, and while also trying to increase
the CVAPs for Latino and African-American communities in
this area. And it was a challenge, we would -- and
Kennedy, and Commissioner Turner, and Commissioner
Sadhwani, and myself, we all, in different iterations,
with different versions, and different times, tried very
hard to do that. And we'd raise it in one area, and it
decreases another.

So the two areas that came -- that the community
has -- the community groups have consistently said are
the challenges, the Fresno/Tulare District, and the --
and the King/Tulare District, but particularly the
King/Tulare District. And after looking at different
versions, and essentially putting the first two criteria
first, equal population of VRA, which is our obligation,
less concern on the COIs.
We started venturing on saying, whether we could increase the CVAPs by reworking this a little bit more. And that did mean creating the -- what is being called an arm into the Lemoore area through Visalia. And so that does raise some compactness issues. Of course, compactness is way below in priority to equal population, and also to VRA.

But what this did allow us to do, and what you'll see is it allowed us to get to the CVAP in King/Tulare, at a level that is more aligned with what the community groups are telling us that they would like to see. In the Fresno/Tulare, while the Latino remained the same. And that was a big win for us because just keeping it at that level while also raising the Kern/Tulare was very, very difficult, and almost impossible while maintaining the shape that we had prior. Actually it was impossible.

We were able to maintain the Latino CVAP, but increase the African-American CVAPs. So the Black CVAPs actually goes up by bringing in some of the Black -- additional Black COIs, and putting them into that district.

Yes, to Commissioner Fernandez's point. The district to -- STANFRESNO did go down slightly, but it is slightly, and there's still comfort with that level from the community groups. And that's what we're hearing.
And even within our own analysis.

And so this, what we have now, and in your iteration 3 and 4, are pathways forward to getting to the CVAPs that would -- that would likely give Latinos an opportunity to elect the candidates of their choice. And also meet our obligations under the VRA, equal population, and all of the other factors, because we did follow them in a manner that was compliant, and so -- and with legal advice throughout this whole process.

Certainly, I mean, there's always risks, and there's risks to not doing this, there's risks to doing this. And I think what we -- we as a Commission have to do, is we have to do the right thing for the people of the Central Valley, for the people of California, and to have fair maps, and do it in a process that is -- that is compliant.

And I believe that's what we have done here. We have done this in a compliant manner, and we're doing it and with the -- with the view that we want fair maps for all of California, and that these maps would meet our VRA obligations for the region. And how we do the -- how we shift populations up, or east, that's really up to the Commission. And we have some options and certainly -- and some preferences across the group.

I think Commissioner Sadhwani and I, I don't want to
speak for her, but I really don't have a preference
between 3 and 4. We just wanted to make sure that the
group had the opportunity, as a Commission, to speak
through, through those issues, because really our charge
was to try to see if we could raise the CVAPs in
alignment with what we had heard from both the community
groups and our legal -- through Legal.

So we believe we have achieved that, and now it's --
we have to figure out how to -- how to contour the
districts. And so that would be, you know, that's the
discussion that we're having today. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

I get the sense, Commissioner Sadhwani, as the other
part of the team on this, would like to add a few words
to that.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No. I was just going to
say, I second everything that he -- that Commissioner
Toledo so eloquently laid out. And I actually don't have
a strong preference between 3 or 4. I see them as
accomplishing the same goals of building stronger VRA
districts, which was the goal that we had in doing this.

And we just simply wanted to provide two different
options for the Commission, as well as for the public to
provide feedback on. So thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much.
Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Uh-huh. Thank you. Yes. I do have a strong preference for 4. I also have personal experience in the area, and happen to know for a fact that African-American Coalition Partners work tightly with the Latino Coalition Partners in the area. And so I don't have any concerns that that would be the right thing to do, and that there would be the work together.

But I also wanted to say that -- oh, and from the long session last night of hunting and pecking in this area, trying to find census blocks that will increase it, I would be extremely shocked and surprised if you can find anything different or higher in the area that would serve all of the needs.

But I also wanted to say, Commissioner Andersen asked a question about Downtown Fresno, and she wanted to know where that was. And of course that would be, you know, responded differently depending on who you ask. But it's loosely and roughly Highway 99 to the west, Divisadero to the north. It's First Street to the east, and then Ventura. So it's through that area is downtown, roughly, for Fresno. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you, Chair.
Actually, I was -- I liked Commissioner Turner's, about
the hunting and pecking idea. The STANIS -- the FRES
(ph.) also dropped, did concern me, but I don't want to
have to send anyone back to hunting and pecking. But I
was kind of surprised going up into Tracy, if that would
help at all. And I -- but again, I did not look at this.

But I'm just wondering around, in Madera, you know,
where sort of tend to be looking around, you know, in
this area, around in Stanislaus, but I'm wondering, you
know, around Chowchilla, or you know in that border, if
we couldn't have -- that was an area that we could have
increased the CVAP in that area.

Again, I didn't do the hunting and pecking, but I
didn't know if we were looking in the CVAP in this area,
because I know we all -- we've tended to focus north, but
I don't know if that was worth -- worth doing.

In fact, with the version 3 and 4, I was really kind
of hoping Clovis, you know, would possibly go up with --
instead of Fresno. But I see you can't do that, because
you'd leave Fresno isolated. And then looking, you know,
this is our current version -- well, it wouldn't have --
it wouldn't have done too much.

You know, I don't want to cut up cities like, poor
San Jose, had to be cut for VRA, in a funny, funny way,
which separated the city. But I see that this does not
actually do that for Fresno. Um-hum.

Yeah, my concern is that, you know, yes, I think most people are going with 4, and I just want to be on record to say, you know -- I'm the voice for the Sierras, and they'd really, really like to have a voice in the Sierras. And that could be, you know, up by Lake Tahoe, it could be in the suburbs from Sacramento. But here, you know, there'd be about 117 people -- about 117,000 from Fresno. And I don't know what the number is that's also in the Central Valley from Stanislaus, you know, the Modesto, et cetera.

If it's -- if it's over 500,000 I'm very concerned, still. But I'll support whichever of these options. And you know, I'll probably go with 4 as well. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair.

Commissioner Andersen, the two areas that you mentioned that might be helpful for increasing the Latino CVAP are already in the -- in that district. Unless I'm not seeing the maps correctly, but my understanding -- my eyes are saying that they're in there.

My question is, Commissioner Turner, you've worked really closely with all this area, and you've been on the ground for a long time, and you said you strongly support
number 4. And we keep hearing 3 or 4 might be good. But you didn't tell us why you strongly support number 4, so I was hoping I could learn a little bit more from you.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Actually, I did. I said 4 separates Clovis out from the Old Fig Garden areas. And that was just from COI testimony that we've asked -- that has been asked for in every draft, of every type map that we've put out. And so to me, the distinction there just made it easy to be able to accommodate that, as opposed to going the other direction, because short of that, there's not a lot of difference.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. I had heard that, but I didn't know if there was more than that. So thank you so much.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay, and Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. And just to piggyback on Commissioner Andersen. Our hope had been to -- to try to include more of Clovis, but it did get us into contiguity issues, as you pointed out, with Fresno. And so this, this cut in Fresno would be very minor, I believe, if I remember correctly, Kennedy, it was only 17,000 (sic) people going up, if I remember correctly, to
ECA, if I remember correctly. Please advise.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Kennedy?

MS. WILSON: 117.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: 117, a little bit off, a little bit off. So it is not as minor as I thought it was.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I just want to confirm all the districts are balanced now, right?

MS. WILSON: (Nods yes).

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, great. Thank you so much. And thank you, thank you both, I don't know -- all three of you for doing this. I appreciated having different options, which is great. And I know a lot of time went into it. So thank you so much.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you, everyone. We have another iteration to consider that is the iteration that Commissioner Yee and Commissioner Ahmad have worked on for San Jose.

Before we do that, I would like to go into a brief closed session. So we are -- we are due for a break at 11:00. I don't think the closed session will incur into
that. Worst-case scenario is we should be seeing public again by 11:15. We might be back earlier, but 11:15 is the most likely at this point, I would say, after our fifteen-minute break.

This would be a closed session under the pending litigation exception. And we will report any action taken after we return from our break. So thank you, everyone.

(Whereupon, a closed session discussion was held, and a recess also taken from 10:34 a.m. until 11:33 a.m.)

MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much, Chair. We are in closed session on the live stream. For Commissioners and Legal, if you could please follow that link, I include the mappers also just in case. And for the rest of the staff, you're on break, and we'll keep you posted on the return time. Thanks everybody.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you everyone for your patience during our closed session and our break. We did not take any action in closed session. And in keeping with our run of show for the day it is now 11:30, and we will resume our work on the Senate Districts.

And for that we are going to Kennedy for a review of where we are in the Central Valley and any iterations that are posted and ready to present.
MS. WILSON: So hello, everyone. Now we are looking at Senate Districts. There was an iteration TFCV, which is Turner-Fornaciari Central Valley iteration, and we made some changes here. I don't know if they want to go over it. I can go over some of the changes that we made. And I'm not seeing either of them. So I'll go ahead and start talking about the changes.

First, I'll show you what we began with. We began with a Kings-Kern that carves out Visalia, goes a bit into Fresno, Fowler, Reedley, Parlier are a part of this iteration. And I'm going to switch to the changes. Some changes that they've made were to cut out Shafter. We followed the same assembly lines and congressional lines from groups about where to take in population in Bakersfield. Then moving north, we actually -- following some of Congressional, we took out parts of Tulare, the same parts that we took out for Congressional, and then we also took out a little bit from Visalia as well.

And then going into the former San Benito-Fresno, again, big change that we were working with was that we no longer have San Benito and Salinas Valley included. And so going into what they changed it to, we did bring in Selma and Parlier. And this is following some of our Assembly lines. Going into the City of Fresno, we follow Shaw across and up the 99. And then we move into Madera.
We take in a bit further than previous lines. And we have Chowchilla, Fairmead, almost the entirety of Merced, again, following our Assembly lines where we go up to Livingston and Winton.

And we had the CVAP, the Latino CVAP levels that we were trying to get to fifty-three here because we had looked at MALDEF's lines and Black Redistricting Hub about how they've drawn this. And while they've had similar configurations, MALDEF's area here was around fifty-three, Black Redistricting Hub was around fifty-two. And so we were able to get that to fifty-three percent.

And I see Commissioner Fornaciari's hand is up, so you can take it from here. If that's okay with the Chair, sorry.

CHAIR KENNEDY: That's okay with the Chair.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: You're doing such a wonderful job. I hate to interrupt. You were basically saying what I was going to say. Just the goals here were to keep Kings-Kern at fifty-eight and bring SBENFRESNO up to fifty-three. And as Commissioner Turner described it earlier, it was an awful lot of hunting and pecking to move little bits here and there to get there. But I can't imagine we could do better. But I think we're --
both Commissioner Turner and I felt we had gotten to a really good place.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari. Kennedy, do you have anything further for us?

MS. WILSON: I was just going to mention -- yeah, just the CVAPs, we were able to get that up, and while it's not 58, it is a 57.98. Previously it was 58.06. So it dropped by .06. So it is still at a very high level. And it's just -- it says seven, but it's really close to the eight, so just wanted to note that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And so if we adopt this, we're not done because we still have an under in ECA and an over in MIDCOAST that is then going to impact the rest of the districts, right?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you very much for all the work that's been involved in this. I really appreciate it. I do have a question, though. Because I was looking at, you know, the idea that we're -- where we're getting our population for our San Ben-Fres. I'm kind of surprised we're going up into Stanislaus when, you know, there was a section of Madera that was formerly
in Stanis-Fres, that by -- you know, above -- in Lament, that area. I'm just sort of surprised. Oh, I'm sorry. We are not doing that. Ah, okay. Okay, so I'm just -- all right. Okay. I take that back. Thank you very much, Kennedy.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you all.

So for this area, for the VRA districts in the Central Valley, do we have any objections to these districts? Are we able to support these districts, these VRA districts in the Central Valley?

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I just want to thank the group that's working on this, Commissioner Turner and I believe it's Fornaciari, and the line drawers. These look like very strong VRA districts, and I appreciate that. It certainly will give an opportunity for protected class to elect candidates of their choice. And I see that as much of the protected class was put in as was possible. And it just -- and so I just want to appreciate them for their efforts and will support this iteration. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Same. I -- same as Commissioner Toledo. Well done to Commissioner Turner
and Fornaciari. I really like this iteration and
definitely would be willing to support it. I so
appreciate being able to keep together folks in the
Central Valley, who have asked to be together, who are
all a part of those protected classes and being able to
keep them in a strong district where they can elect
candidates of their choice. So I really appreciate the
work that's been done here. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

I'd like to ask Karin MacDonald -- thank you for
spending a moment with us now. I just wanted to get your
sense of where we could best focus our attention at this
point. Are we free to proceed to Sacramento, or are we
clearer off resuming any outstanding work in the south?

MS. MACDONALD: Hello. Thank you so much for that
question. And this is going to be up to you. I think
either one would work for us.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I did want to just
note, reading through some of the additional COI
testimony that has come in to the Airtable. There -- I
just wanted to know in terms of the Senate Districts,
there's some things that have come up that I wanted to
just raise. Whether or not this is something that the
Commission wants to revisit, I guess, that's a different question, but I wanted to just raise these up.

One, there was some testimony about separating the Conejo Valley that is Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Woodland -- I think it's, like, Malibu, Hidden Hills, I forgot what the -- it's, like, the West Valley. I forgot exactly what -- I wrote a "WV". Anyways, I wanted to just lift that up because they did say that they've been separated, and they are together in, I think, both the Congressional and the Assembly District maps.

So I'm not sure if that's something that is -- there's an appetite to revisit. Also, I know I had said this before. I had also noted that in terms of the Congressional District, the district is very much the same in the San Gabriel Valley and the pairing with the Inland Empire.

I'm a little, I guess, I'm just going to just say it. Both -- I've seen testimony both on the San Gabriel Valley side as well as on the Inland Empire side, a desire not to be put together. I'm not sure what the opinions are on that particular one. And then there's also a concern about -- from the -- from an Armenian community COI, about the separation of Burbank and Sunland in the Senate District from their community in Glendale, La Canada Flintridge, and La Crescenta, which
is part of that San Gabriel Valley district right now.

So those are -- oh, and then last one. And this one, I think, is a fairly significant one because we've been hearing quite a bit from Equality California. But there's pretty serious concern about the separation, three-way split of the LGBTQ community in the Coachella Valley. And in particular, there being vulnerable seniors and other members of the community there, and with that three-way split, it just really disenfranchises them even more so.

I just wanted to lift those particular ones up that I noticed several different testimonies on. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Depending on what we do, obviously, if we go north, we're going to have to take care of that ECA. So I don't know if we want to do that live, or I'm willing to work, you know, with Kennedy offline on that as well, because we -- it's going to affect it. Actually, both MIDCOAST and ECA are going to affect it going up north. So I'm not sure -- it's going to be time consuming if we do live line drawing. So I'm wondering if maybe we can do that offline. And then if you want to go back to southern California or central, wherever the case may be. So just
offering an option. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Ms. MacDonald?

MS. MACDONALD: Yes. Thank you so much. I just wanted to clarify when I said that it was up to you. I meant in northern California. In southern California, I'm assuming that we're going to do that tomorrow. So just didn't want to confuse the populate -- the conversation, not the population. The population of either.

And regarding the ECA district and live mapping versus working offline, we feel that that is a pretty significant potentially shift that needs to be done there. So we would appreciate it if we could at least start with live mapping so that you can make some decisions on that, please. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. Thank you very much for that.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Ms. Mac Donald took all my points.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just going to offer to volunteer to work with the line drawers on some of these questions to see if there is a solution to it. And
if we're going to be covering southern California tomorrow again, then perhaps we could come with some potential solutions if the Commission -- if the Chair and the Commission is amenable to it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I'm eventually amenable, but I do agree with Ms. Mac Donald that this -- we have some major decisions to make even, I think, to get to the point of being able to give direction to a mapper and Commissioners to further refine the conceptual framework.

So I do agree that we need to get started on addressing the -- how we shift the excess population from MIDCOAST up and around to ECA. So I would like to go there at this point. Let me just make one change here.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, I was going to say that -- you kind of said exactly it. I'm concerned about this MIDCOAST area taking that population up and how we get it over to ECA, and, you know, I -- thank you, Ms. Mac Donald for suggesting that we really should do this bit now because there's multiple ways of doing this.

And then I would certainly volunteer to help work out any also -- and, just the whole northern and how it fits through as well. We get a bit of direction. Thank you.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.
Okay. So Kennedy, if you could pull the map back for us, please? Zoom out. Okay, that's enough. So we need it in just a little bit so that we can see the statistics box for the MIDCOAST region. Okay, there we go.
So we've got over thirty percent overpopulation in MIDCOAST, that we need to get most of that around to ECA. So I'm looking for thoughts on how to get that done.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yesterday, you know, we took a quick look, and, you know, if we grab all of Santa Clara County, that's in the MIDCOAST district and move it north, that would solve the MIDCOAST district. Then I think that, you know, there was some suggestion to maybe move some of that population to the west a little bit. But I would suggest we make that move first, fix MIDCOAST, and then decide, you know, where we're going from there. Because we have -- I mean, we have to go north with it. I guess, we could immediately turn east, but we still have to move it north. And that honors the county split. It keeps Santa Cruz, San Benito, Monterey, together, which is what those counties want. So I think that's a good first step.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I would agree, but let's hear from
Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I do agree. But first, I would take the little bit that we can and move it south. The -- you know, what we can add to Ventura and San Luis -- you know, that SCOAST in that area. That little bit there. Because I think it's, you know, it doesn't balance. We've got a negative twenty-three, and we've got positive thirty.

I think we -- if we make it a little bit more equal, it won't be quite as traumatic as we take it all north.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So your suggestion then would be to add approximately one percent --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Exactly.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- so that's --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Exactly. Not a lot. You know, 7,600. A little bit. But I think when it -- you know, get them all under five, I think it might help.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I think I'm leaning towards the suggestion by Commissioner Fornaciari, although I do agree, Commissioner Andersen, that evening out a population would be helpful, but there are some negative districts up north that can help take in that over population between ECA and MIDCOAST.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. The biggest negative that I'm seeing is the south SACSTANIS district. Sacramento is just barely under populated. I don't know that we need to go as far north as the NORCA district. The -- let's see -- SD80 Corridor is -- it looks like next after south SACSTANIS.

I mean, I'm amenable to 10,000 people moving south, but are we doing that for -- is that going to help us address any communities of interest south of Monterey County.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. A couple things. I thought I saw a seven percent district in the Bay Area; is that correct? Or was I --

CHAIR KENNEDY: It doesn't look like it.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. I was hallucinating. Okay. But is the map in the south, the latest version? Because we got -- we have, like, sixteen percent off, or we have two negative eights here also. I thought I saw --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: MCV is negative eight something.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And then what about --

CHAIR KENNEDY: SECA is as well. Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh, and we still got all
this population to worry about in the south. So yeah, okay. I guess, we can probably manage the thirty percent in the north. I just wanted to check what else is happening in the state. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari. Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I'm leaning toward Commissioner Fornaciari's initial thought to shift population up. I mean, it is 300,000 people that would have to be shifted through the state. But I do see that there's an opportunity to shift some of this population, although I think it will -- it's not something that we can do in live line drawing. I think we can give direction and perhaps work with -- have Commissioners work with Kennedy or others, Tamina, on this. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo. Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I see the merit given -- I thought we'd actually done more on the south, and I didn't think that was quite as bad. The one little thing though, as we move this north, we do know, and it's -- it might be important as we shift through the Central Valley. That one area of the Humboldt, if we could fix that area, so that way, we know we're working with correct numbers.
That was -- I was going to leave that completely to the end. But we're going to be dragging population up and around. So I would really like us to do that, you know, ask Tamina to, you know, take care of that if possible. If you go up a little bit further north that corner. No, north. Bringing the map down, please.

Yeah, I think we've all -- the consensus was that now the Humboldt should be whole so that population would go back into the north coast and out of NORCA, which I think as we're moving this population around, we need those numbers to be correct.

It's just as Commissioner Fornaciari said, you know, didn't we have negative eights and stuff we need to be -- these are the real numbers. We can't have, oh, oops. Now we have to do it again. So I would like us to do that, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

I would point out that the numbers involved in that small square in relation to a million person district are quite small.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, except --

CHAIR KENNEDY: I'm willing to do it. So Tamina, please do it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. But it might -- it'll change that NORCA.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen, thank you.

We're doing this.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Tamina, please make that change.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari, did you have anything further?

Thank you, Tamina. Okay. So let's go back down.

And Commissioner Fornaciari's suggestion was that we remove any remaining parts of Santa Clara County from the MIDCOAST district. Is that correct Commissioner Fornaciari?

Okay, so let's proceed with that. Can we get the statistics box? Okay, we've got MIDCOAST to within one percent. So we now have SANJOSE overpopulated by thirty-three, almost thirty-four percent.

Are there suggestions to move any of this to the PENINSULA?

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Gilroy, could we leave Gilroy because that is the triangle. It's Gilroy, Hollister, Watsonville. I know that it's around 60,000.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I would support leaving Gilroy
as part of the -- as part of the San Benito. And we have room, so it does help with population as well. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I would as well. Any objection to leaving Gilroy in the MIDCOAST district? It --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, no, I'm sorry. I was saying that it might take you over the five percent. That's what I meant, in terms of with MIDCOAST.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm just like -- in my head I'm trying to figure out the --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Tamina, could we look at the impact of that?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, Chair. The change is 60,887 people. Resulting deviation to MIDCOAST is 6.77 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So then if we go down to the southern end of MIDCOAST. So are there recommendations based on community of interest input to where we could shrink MIDCOAST slightly on the south? Do we want to put San Louis Obispo in the district with the southern part of the county and Santa Barbara County?

Commissioner Fornaciari and followed by Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Tamina, can you let us know how many people are in the rest of -- in the
northern part of San Luis Obispo County there?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Sure. Just one moment. The population of San Luis Obispo in MIDCOAST is 223,698.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So that's way too many.

So --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, where would we be if we moved it in? What percentage would we be if we moved in? We'd be at --

MS. RAMOS ALON: If you moved this whole area into SCOAST, then SCOAST deviation would be 26.32 percent.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. All right. And I don't really have any suggestions, I guess. If we were going to move, we'd start at the cities in the bottom. But I don't have any specific suggestions.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari. Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Tamina, can you zoom in? Is Arroyo Grande in or not? And if they're in, Pismo Beach is right next to them so that might be a place to -- okay. So what's the population of Arroyo Grande, please, Tamina?

MS. RAMOS ALON: The population of Arroyo Grande is 18,469. Resulting deviation to SCOAST is 5.55 percent.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, so that's too much.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And what is to the south of South
Coast, that's Ventura? None of that goes all the way.
Okay. Well, would we be looking or wanting to put Camarillo in with Thousand Oaks and those other cities in Ventura County?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Chair --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: -- can I ask a clarifying question?
CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Ahmad?
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Are we now moving population down? Or are we still working on --
CHAIR KENNEDY: At this point, we are looking at moving a little bit of population down in order to bring Gilroy into the district.
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Got it. Thank you.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.
Commissioner Fernandez, did you have anything else?
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. Camarillo is 70,000, so I think that's going to take us over. If you can go back up to the San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara border that'd be great. Can you zoom in just one more time?
Sorry about that. Okay, let me -- oh, man. Okay, let me think about that.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. While you're thinking about that, Commissioner Andersen?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Can we go look at the Los Ranchos? Instead of --

MS. RAMOS ALON: Up here?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Tamina, if you could tell us what moving --

MS. RAMOS ALON: Los Ranchos is 1,516 people. And the resulting deviation to SCOAST is 3.84 percent.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Tamina, what is the little area to the west -- east of it? That little other --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Edna.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Edna. Edna, instead.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Selecting Edna as well or Edna instead?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No. Instead.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Oh, instead. Edna is 184 people. Resulting deviation is 3.7 percent.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: 100 people?

MS. RAMOS ALON: 184.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Okay, we need something in between those.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, but if we took both Los Ranchos and Edna --

MS. RAMOS ALON: The population of Los Ranchos and Edna is 1,700. Resulting deviation for SCOAST is 3.85
percent.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. Yeah, I thought you said 100,000. Thank you. Yes, let's -- that would help.

CHAIR KENNEDY: It would help. I'm not sure it resolves our problem, but it would help.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I was just going to make a comment that I've seen -- I'm looking through the COI testimony real quick, and I'm seeing that Los Ranchos is not included. But at least Pismo Beach, Avila Beach, and Arroyo Grande are all part of a, I guess, a five-city, I guess connect -- I don't know. Whatever they call themselves. There is a word for it. I'm not thinking of a cog. Yes, thank you. And they asked not to be separated. So looking for more information.

What about some of those unincorporated areas either to the very north, like, maybe bringing down that northern border of it? And is there enough population there to, you know, kind of chip away at it, hunt and peck, as I think somebody said. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Right. I'm also looking at the possibility of a swap. If we're looking to unite Avila Beach, Pismo Beach, Arroyo Grande, Oceano, and whatever the other one is, we could either look at
bringing the two that are currently in SCOA in into MIDCOAST, or we could look at bringing Avila Beach, Pismo Beach, and Arroyo Grande from MIDCOAST to South Coast and then finding other trades.

Commissioner Akutagawa, did you have anything further?

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. When we were looking at trying to bring population down so that we can bring in --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Gilroy.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- Gilroy. What about Peru and Fillmore that was down towards this -- at the bottom -- at the southernmost portion. I know Fillmore is 16,462. I don't know what Peru is.

CHAIR KENNEDY: But I mean, my understanding is those are in the district that they should be in.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: We received significant COI testimony at -- during public input session that Peru, Fillmore, Santa Paula wanted, you know, all the way down that whole valley to Puerto -- thank you -- Port Hueneme wanted to all stay together. It's an agricultural worker COI.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. And is the unincorporated -- I guess, that's not going to be enough
population there to make a difference.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I liked your -- the idea of -- that Commissioner Akutagawa said. Going up and taking portions of eastern San Luis Obispo. Further north. And going up the -- a little further north. You know, trying to get -- again, further north. Trying to get -- you know, we can't take a nice area. We don't want to take San Luis Obispo itself. And looking something -- yeah -- through -- in that area, something like that. I don't know. Commissioner Fornaciari was more familiar with this area. And I'm just wondering if that -- something like that would make sense in this, you know -- in this part of the San Luis Obispo.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So we would look to move the South Coast district line north towards the San Luis Obispo Monterey line. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct. Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: On the -- to the east.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So yes, roughly that area. Tamina, could you get us a rough estimate of the population in that area?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, Chair. Are folks able --
these might be very small to see the numbers here.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We don't need to see the number. We just need a rough estimate for that area.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay, probably about 300 people in that entire area, but I will get you a number.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. RAMOS ALON: I took the little cities there to give it a little bit more. So we are now at 6,140.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So I'm starting to lose track of the impacts of all of these small changes. If we were to incorporate that into SCOAST, what would the SCOAST deviation be?

MS. RAMOS ALON: The resulting deviation to SCOAST would be 4.3 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And then that's starting to get us close enough in MIDCOAST to bring Gilroy in; is that correct?

MS. RAMOS ALON: It's a start.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And then and then we could just give instructions to balance the population.

Commission Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I'm wondering if we just want to kind of leave Gilroy where it is for the time being and leave an overpopulation in the SANJOSE district and kind of figure out the details of this
later. I kind of feel like we're chopping the -- in San Luis Obispo County were chopping all the wine growing region right down the middle. And so we're going to split that, you know, in a way that might not -- that if we had a little bit more time to think about it, we could make a change that makes more sense, I guess.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Just a thought.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. What -- can you go all the way back up to the northern part of this district, this MIDCOAST district, back up to around where we were looking at Gilroy, and then do you see, you know, where it intersects -- oh, okay. I get it now. I was just thinking we could just try to give up some of that area up at the border of PENINSULA and MIDCOAST, but it defeats the purpose. So sorry. Forget about it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Okay.

Commissioner Fernandez and then Commissioner Sinay, Commissioner Sadhwani. So Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I -- I'm with Commissioner Fornaciari. I actually just drove to San Luis Obispo this past weekend twice. And Shandon and those small communities, I mean, one, they are vineyards.
Two, they're on the, I believe, it's Highway 41 or something. I drove it and probably -- I drive it by memory now. But I don't like splitting off those small communities from the bigger communities in terms of, like, Pao Robles and all of the other cities that are on the 101. So I would -- yeah, I'd prefer to just leave this San Luis Obispo for now, and we can deal with that later. Thank you. And bless you Commissioner Taylor.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We have received COI testimony in the past from this region, from the winegrowers, asking for, you know, to be kept together. So we may want to look at that testimony, which cities they've put together, and that might be a way to take that COI out and -- but -- and keep them together.

Also, Arroyo Grande has written in, way in the beginning, asking to stay with San Luis Obispo, so we don't want to divide them from San Luis Obispo if possible. We are at the -- we are at deadlines.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And what I was saying there was there were two more communities between Arroyo Grande and the coast, basically, that would be part of that five-community grouping that we were talking about earlier, and whether it might make sense to go ahead and
bring them into MIDCOAST with Arroyo Grande, Pismo Beach, Avila Beach and make the necessary compensatory shifts later.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. As we're looking at this, could we actually just turn on the CVAPs particularly for MIDCOAST and San Benito is in there? Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Did you want the statistics or the heatmap?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No, I think the statistics are helpful. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I was just -- you know, I think these CVAPs are helpful. Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani. And just looking at some of the public input that we've been receiving, there is public input from the community that came in earlier today showing maps that are aligned with these CVAPs, but that actually create three VRA districts with CVAPs at this level. And that public testimony is 41010 in our Airtable. It's available for us to look at. The -- I believe the shapefiles were submitted as well, in addition to the JPEG, but just thought that might be
helpful in our thinking as they do have a slightly
different orientation. It's similar but different in the
alignment, but does actually raise the question of
whether we can -- given that San Benito is in a protected
area, whether we can protect all three areas and maintain
those CVAPs, which was what we were looking at yesterday.
So just wanted to raise that.

Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani for -- as I looked
at those CVAPs and compared the public testimony, there
is that. And I just wanted to bring it back to the
Commission to -- so that we're all aware that that
testimony has come in. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

And I would propose that we adapt Commissioner
Fornaciari's proposal slightly by leaving the
overpopulation in MIDCOAST in the form of let's go ahead
and move Gilroy in because it seems that there's good bit
of support for keeping Gilroy with that area.

And then we can keep in mind that we have that
overpopulation, and we'd be looking potentially at
spreading that out towards the south. But we may be able
to give direction to the mappers to be able to work that
out on their own and come back to us with another
iteration. Is that acceptable? We go ahead and move
Gilroy in as an indication of our intent to proceed in
that direction?

Okay. Tamina, if we could just go ahead and move Gilroy into MIDCOAST. We understand that we'll be somewhat overpopulated, but we will provide instructions at a later point on spreading population southward.

Commissioner Akutagawa, Commissioner Toledo, your hands are up. Did you have anything further?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I just would --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa, first.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm sorry. Good.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Just real quick. I just wanted clarification from Commissioner Toledo. He mentioned three VRA districts, and I think there's been so much conversation, I'm getting a little confused as to where we are.

And then separately, I'm looking at, you know, some of those communities that are along that SANJOSE border. Can any of those be brought in, or will it break up COIs or not do any, you know, not bring in enough population to accommodate, you know, bringing in Gilroy? Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I think, I just would want legal to weigh in on the question of the two VRA district versus three, given that we do have public
testimony that three can be created in the CVAP ranges about this -- the level that we have at this point. And I have forwarded on the documents we received from the public to legal for review, but it might be too early, but maybe it's something we can get in the next hour or so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: In terms of opinion from legal.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I would recommend if we're going to bring Gilroy in that we also bring in the unincorporated area to the west.

CHAIR KENNEDY: To the west? Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Is that right? Yeah.

But --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Tamina, could you -- yes. Okay.

MS. RAMOS ALON: This is 120 people.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Resulting deviation to MIDCOAST is 6.73.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Okay, so we currently have 27.8 percent overpopulation in SANJOSE. Again, did we -- was there
any concern about or any interest in moving any of that
to PENINSULA for any reason, or we continue our march
northward?

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: You know, a no of accept
because I'm thinking -- I don't know if Tamina can give
us the population if we actually move the PENINSULA,
MIDCOAST line in San -- yeah, exactly. What's the
population on that? Would that help us at all in this
distance be -- you know, before we hit Boulder Creek?
That sort of unincorporated. You probably already know
if there are any people in that area or not.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Not very many. This is the county
line. I can -- let me see how many people are in here.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And could you also put
Highway 17 on here?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It's not a lot of people. I
don't know how much that would --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. No. I would say that this --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- is something that we could give
the mappers the option of further exploring. But I

think --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.
CHAIR KENNEDY: -- we're at line drawing. We don't need to pursue this --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- right now.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And I don't see a nice easy thing we could do to add to -- up to the PENINSULA. Because again, that's already a two, you know --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- in -- unless someone else sees it. So thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It says 4,200.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, let me rephrase the question. Is it -- is there any reason to move any population between PENINSULA and SANJOSE in either direction before we continue moving north if we want to get PENINSULA closer to zero to give us greater flexibility elsewhere? I just wanted to get a sense of that before we move on.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, Chair. I'm -- I don't have an answer for your question, in large part because, you know, as Commissioner Toledo raised, if there's -- if it's feasible to draw a third VRA district, I think that that would determine our course of action in this area. You know, so I know that he's sending the submission that
we received onto legal for review and for feedback, but
I'm cautious to continue working in this area until we
have a more clear response in terms of the direction to
take.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you Commissioner
Sadhwani.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I was just
going to ask if we can move north a little bit, so we can
see all of PENINSULA and SANJOSE? Thank you.

But I also agree with Commissioner Sadhwani on legal
guidance.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I mean, just, obviously,
if you want to shift some of that population, you can
make the cut in SANJOSE farther to the west.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we would potentially want
to know the population, Tamina, of that area of SANJOSE
including Burbank and Fruitdale.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Moving it into the -- so further
overpopulating the SANJOSE district?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Just looking at keeping SANJOSE more
whole as an option. So if you could just let us know
what the impact of that would be. We don't have to
proceed with it right now. We just need to understand
it.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I'm just -- after we
do this, if we can just zoom out a little bit because
obviously we have various roads we can take. We can just
make a -- you know, go east. Or we can go north and
east, or north-north and east. So I'm just -- there's
various --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- iterations you could
have with this.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Yeah. And that's basically
what we're trying to figure out so that we can get to a
point where we can give the mappers instructions and not
occupy all of this valuable live line drawing time.

MS. RAMOS ALON: The population of this part of
SANJOSE is 141,288 people.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And can you make the typeface
larger and expand the box so that we can see the impact
on deviation and other statistics? Okay. So that would
be -- okay. And based on COI testimony is there any
reason that we would want to trade, for example, that
highlighted segment for Saratoga -- or no, those are both in the same district, so we would -- the trading it for Cupertino, for example. If that came into SANJOSE, and Cupertino moved west.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: To make the -- we can only put like 20,000 people or so in the PENINSULA. Right, to keep it less than 5 percent? So I think we should be kind of thinking of terms of how population -- because Campbell is 44,000 -- you know, kind of looking at -- you know, what we could do.

I can see the idea of trying to switch, but, you know, this -- the Cupertino, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, they really all wanted to stay -- oh, actually they're not with Milpitas or -- okay, I take that back. But I think we should be looking for more like just a small amount, kind of to balance it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, now my idea is just inquiring whether there are any swaps that we want to make in this area that would make better sense than what we currently have.

So Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. There is COI testimony asking for Campbell, Los Gatos, Saratoga, Cupertino, Sunnyvale area to be together. I know all of
that is not possible based off of the numbers, but there
is some flexibility in terms of the different COIs we've
received about this area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you. Okay, we're
fifteen minutes from our meal break. Okay, let's pull
the map back, as Commissioner Fernandez suggested and see
if we can figure out in what direction we would like to
go with this population.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, I was just going to suggest
we make -- not take all of that area but take just part
of it, you know, to get as much of it as would make
PENINSULA have the deviation we wanted, but, you know, we
could take this larger look as well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Following Commissioner
Ahmad's lead, though, that's -- could be kind of close.
I -- I'm just -- I could only have the population --
that's 70,000 that would want to go back in, you know,
with the switch, as you were talking about. I don't have
the actual full population in there.

We might be able to not quite take as much of
SANJOSE and -- actually, to make that switch, to
balance -- put in a little bit in PENINSULA and put the
COI together, but that's something I think -- you know,
we could tell Tamina to do offline too, and then continue on.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, very good.

So Commissioner Fernandez, is the map pulled back far enough?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you. Yeah, I -- I'm just thinking go east, because we've got the negative 4.92 and then it can meet up with ECA, instead of going all the way up and around --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I don't know, that's just my thinking right now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Any thoughts on the most direct route here?

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I was just going to say we would just want to continue to watch the CVAP number, because all of that hunting, unpacking, everything we did impacted -- it changed the number, it lowered it, so that would be the only caution going that direction.

CHAIR KENNEDY: That it lowered it --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, we wouldn't touch that district.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay, I thought she was saying going through that --
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, no, no.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- district.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, not at all.

CHAIR KENNEDY: No, we're looking --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: We're not to touch that one.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- at going through the south SAC-STANIS. So we would be looking at going through South SAC-STANIS.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I would throw it all into South SAC-STANIS and then work with it from there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I think we can take a two-pronged approach to this, with direction to the line drawers about kind of eliminating some -- not eliminating -- adjusting the line between PENINSULA and SANJOSE as well as adjusting the lines between SANJOSE and South SAC-STANIS because we are so heavily overpopulated in this area, and we don't want to have that ripple effect in some of the other districts that are neighboring.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so do you have specific suggestions for -- first of all, adjusting the line
between PENINSULA and Santa Clara?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes, I do. If we could go to that area?

So based off of COI testimony, I'm seeing that communities are asking for Cupertino, Los Gatos, Campbell, Saratoga, Monte Sereno, AKA the West Valley cities in that area to be together.

I see Saratoga is already in PENINSULA, but if we start by adding in population from Los Gatos and Campbell -- I don't know if Cupertino has too many people -- but somewhere around that region, to push population into PENINSULA while it stays under 5 percent and then move in the other direction with the rest of the population. Does that make sense?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, I think the numbers are going to be way out of range.

I mean, Tamina, you can -- you can help us, but I'm -- if the idea is Cupertino, Saratoga, Campbell, Los Gatos, that basically mean -- because Cupertino, Campbell, Monte Sereno, Los Gatos are all currently in SANJOSE. If we're moving all of that to PENINSULA, that's huge.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Are we not going with the change Commissioner Yee recommended with SANJOSE? Burbank, Fruitdale, that blue area?
CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, okay. We can -- we can
explore that. So Tamina, let's explore. Let's move this
to PENINSULA.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And then let's take Burbank,
Fruitdale and that portion of San Jose and put it in
SANJOSE.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Chair, could you start at
the other side, at the east side and -- 'cause we might
end up needing to leave a little bit of the SANJOSE in
there, to have PENINSULA come to -- right just under 5
percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Tamina, could you start --
sorry, could you start over towards Burbank and Fruitdale
in case we need to leave some of SANJOSE in PENINSULA?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: We don't need to take
anymore (indiscernible) 3 percent.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Chair -- Chair, did you want me to
balance PENINSULA, or just get it under an acceptable
number? I can stop here.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Let's go ahead and accept this and
see where we are. We may go further.

Okay, so if we were to continue removing parts of
San Jose, then we would -- I've lost. Okay, there it is,
okay. We would be further reducing PENINSULA, and we
have about 7 percentage points that we could continue to
move portions of San Jose. So my inclination would be to
continue.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah, I was just going to say
that since we have to move population up and around, we
can continue to do that by moving that line that runs
through east foothills, Alum Rock neighborhood down and
around Santa Clara, Cupertino, Sunnyvale to make a
district that encompasses the majority of San Jose in one
district. And then move the rest of the population up
through EDENTECH and out to the east.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, I'm --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Or we can continue to dip into
the rest of the blue area in San Jose.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, I'm --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I'm --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I see testimony speaking both
ways.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I guess I got confused. I
thought the point of this was to get PENINSULA higher to
offset some of the overage in San Jose, and maybe I
misunderstood. So I thought we were trying to get PENINSULA like close to 5 or something like that, but I might have misunderstood.

CHAIR KENNEDY: No, as I look at it, we're looking more at getting it closer to negative 5 so that we could have as much of San Jose as possible in a single district. We've also succeeded in having Saratoga, Campbell, Los Gatos, Monte Sereno together.

The other option would be instead of this portion of San Jose, looking at moving Cupertino -- well, actually that goes in the other direction. So -- okay, so if we continue -- if we take the rest of San Jose that is currently in PENINSULA and we reunite it with the rest of San Jose, then PENINSULA is at a negative 3.69, which is an acceptable population deviation and we have achieved bringing together more of San Jose.

So is that -- is that something we would like to proceed with?

Commissioner Yee says yes.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It's just more that we have to move across now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And that's my frustration, is that we were trying to minimize it, but now we're --
we've actually made it worse than it was when we started.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I'm fine with this change.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I would -- I would ask Tamina to go ahead and make this, and then pull the map back.

Okay, so then we're looking at -- we have negative -- almost negative 5 percent in South SACSTANIS already. We have almost negative 25 percent in ECA, so that's -- we're looking at negative 30 percent, roughly, between those two.

So between these three districts, we should -- as far as numbers, we should easily be able to do this. The question is where the lines get drawn. Where are we going to pull population from, from SANJOSE? So, what is the -- what is -- and we still have open to us, options. Going through COCO, you know, we do have options. So what makes the most sense as far as actually moving the population?

Tamina, if you could -- yeah, thank you. So do we -- do we move it, do we lower than line from EDENTECH farther south, do we -- I don't know. Do we -- do we try to put portions of SANJOSE directly into South SACSTANIS? To me that doesn't seem to be the best option.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just so we have an idea,
could we see what the population is in the unincorporated areas east -- yeah, of Santa Clara County? And also the unincorporated areas -- you know, that one. And then, what's the unincorporated areas of COCO? This -- the unincorporated of this first, and the unincorporated of that one second, 'cause that'll give us an idea of what population centers we would actually have to move so that we could play with that.

And then I think we probably will have to drop a little bit of EDENTECH, which might give more of the Tri-Valley together, but I don't think there's population -- you know, taking Livermore over or something like that.

MS. RAMOS ALON: This whole area is 925 people.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. And what is the same in -- you know, if you take out that central -- I think we sort of tried that before, because that's only like 6,000, if you do that whole central unincorporated area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, while we're waiting.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I just -- Chair, the last change -- I didn't see -- I couldn't tell if we had general consensus on the last change before it was made, and I'm just wondering -- I mean, I just want to make sure that as we move forward we're still operating on
general consensus, given -- you know, I know we have a
lot to do, but I wouldn't want to get to a place where we
couldn't get support for things.

So we'll just -- so just making sure that we're
still operating under general consensus and just as we
move forward, thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, we're exploring right
now. We're not looking at adopting anything, but I do
appreciate that.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. Looking at
the population and where we're trying to move, I don't
know if I see a way to go directly to -- now the box is
covering it -- SACSTANISLAUS?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: SAC --

CHAIR KENNEDY: South SACSTANIS.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: South SACSTANIS directly --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: As Commissioner Andersen says,
I feel like it has to move through EDENTECH, through
COCO, then to South SACSTANIS and then to ECA.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: No direction with that comment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay.
MS. RAMOS ALON: Chair, the highlighted population is 3,532 people.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just exploration, but if we look at Sunnyvale, Santa Clara -- you know, move that -- I mean, I'm just looking at how to move population and also end up in COCO, ending up putting the three -- the Tri-Valley back together, since it is a Senate -- it's Senate, so it's a larger district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I was -- unless I'm wrong -- are they together in that line --

MS. RAMOS ALON: They are currently together.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay, sorry, that county line confused me. All right, so my brilliant idea is dead, so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just -- I did want to bring up Santa Clara and Sunnyvale, 'cause we have heard at different times, different places.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. We are incurring into our meal break. We came back a bit late from our last break, so we can continue for thirteen more minutes, but that would be cutting into our lunch, so let me take
Commissioner Yee's, and then we can determine whether we want to go ahead and break for lunch.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, we have to move a lot of people. I think North San Jose is really the only option, so I would like to see that go north with Fremont -- that part, yes. Not -- yeah, just the northernmost, if that would do it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Yee, could you -- could you guide a selection of population here?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Sure, the part that's directly in under Fremont, adjacent to Milpitas.

CHAIR KENNEDY: No, we're moving it to EDENTECH. Yes. Okay, Tamina, we need the statistics box in the corner to help us. Thank you.

Okay, so that's not actually a very densely populated area.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So we continue to the portion adjacent to Milpitas, to the west.

MS. RAMOS ALON: This area is already in EDENTECH.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Oh, I'm sorry, yeah --

MS. WILSON: (Indiscernible) Berryessa.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. Meanwhile, I would not split up Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Cupertino, that's -- you know, those always get mentioned together.
CHAIR KENNEDY: And what is the population of those three?

MS. RAMOS ALON: One moment, Chair. 344,334 people.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Which is roughly what we're looking to move, right? That seems to be roughly what we want to move into EDENTECH. Do I have any objection to moving that?

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry, my hand is still up. I was excited 'cause that was what I was eyeing.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think I'm just trying to get clarification. I think that would be a good move if it's going to stay because I know that reading through the COI testimony, there's been requests to put Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara with Fremont, but are we -- but I know because we're trying to move population onward -- is that what's going to happen? Is that -- some of that pop -- which -- where's that population moving onward from? The top part?

Okay, thank you. Thanks for the clarification.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Without knowing what is
coming out of the other COI, which fits very well, that's
a great big chunk.

    I was just going to propose a much smaller amount.
You know Castro Valley, I guess -- because, you know,
Dublin is already out. If we put the terrain layer on,
and then you're chalking up parts of Hayward, you know,
this -- that gets -- you know, you could maybe take, you
know, kind of the north -- you know, the mountain, you
know, the hill area.

    300,000 people? That's a great deal. I -- before
I'd say yes on this -- and the idea that Santa Clara and
Cupertino is with Hayward and San Leandro, they are not
going to like whatsoever.

    The parts of Fremont, I can see. The rest of that
area is not high-tech. That's not -- you know -- and to
have them separated from San Jose as well -- I mean, I'd
like to see the exchange before I think that's a good
idea.

    CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

    Commissioner Turner?

    COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I was going to say,
we're just doing the exploration right now. I think we
can do it, and then based on -- I am in agreement with
Commissioner Andersen. Based on what comes out the other
end, I'm just more willing to see it first. So yes,
let's do it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Keeping in mind that this is an exploration, I would propose a potential different area to swap in, would be that area right along the Santa Clara border to -- yes, that -- exactly where your mouse was, that area, to see if there's enough population there, along with North San Jose, that's already highlighted in red. But I'm curious to see what comes out the other end, for both of these.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we would, for the time being, remove Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, and Cupertino and take in the areas that Commissioner Ahmad mentioned in SANJOSE.

MS. RAMOS ALON: I'm just -- this area is 83,976 people.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Ahmad, do you want to --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Is that putting EDENTECH at 7.25?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, EDENTECH will be at 7.25, SANJOSE will be at 25.14.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay, and right now we're
trying to get SANJOSE down to 5?

CHAIR KENNEDY: 5 or less.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay, I will step back for now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Those from the area, I was just thinking -- making up the difference with the rest of San Jose, but I'm not from San Jose, so -- if you don't want to, you know, interrupt this Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, that's kind of your only -- the only option I see right now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: The last part, instead of -- you said Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Cupertino --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, if they're not -- if it's not going to be Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, then it looks like the other area would be San Jose, taking the population --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- from San Jose and taking it up to EDENTECH.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay. So at this point -- Commissioner Akutagawa, did you have something else?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I think I just wanted to perhaps just have us be clear about additional goals. So one goal I'm hearing, and it's the main goal, is to
move that population up.

The question then I have next is -- as we have multiple -- at least two routes that we could go, what would then be a secondary goal? Is it -- you know, at -- when we were considering bringing in Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, and Cupertino, there was some, you know, discomfort with what cities then would go out on the other end if -- and that would be the same question if you bring in San Jose.

And then, you know, are you going to move from the -- I guess, going eastwardly, are you going to go north? I think we better get comfortable with what that's going to be, before we just decide which ones we're going to move because I think that will determine which cities make sense to move as well, too. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

So -- okay, Commissioner Fornaciari, followed by Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes, just looking at it, you know, 300,000 people, it's Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara. Moving up, then Hayward, San Leandro, all the unincorporated parts, maybe Union City too, going east.

Then if you scroll down -- yeah, then it's like the entire Tri-Valley and more going into SACSTAN, and then
it's Stockdon and Manteca, going into ECA or something like that, right? I mean, if we just make big steps like that. I mean, that's the road we're on.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just a reminder, these are million -- almost a million people, and sometimes -- yeah, when we were working in the south, we kept being reminded, you may have to group two or three unlikely partners because it's a million people.

And so, I'm okay with the different steps Commissioner Fornaciari was speaking about, and so I just wanted just to remind us that we do want to move forward, and it's -- and it's a million people.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I think I'm going to follow on what Commissioner Fornaciari was talking about, and I -- let me just, you know, kind of propose this and tell me if -- you know, maybe this doesn't work.

We did a lot of work around -- you know, like around Hercules and Vallejo, you know, Benicia, Martinez. If you move Hayward up into -- with Oakland, you could possible cut somewhere below -- maybe, I don't know --
San Pablo, or somewhere -- maybe just below that, and then you could put those cities with Vallejo, bring it across the Benicia Bridge and into, like, Martinez, Clyde, Pittsburg -- Antioch could possibly be one entire district, which would match a lot of what -- the work was being done around the Assembly district.

Then move those Delta communities into South SACSTANIS and then -- and keep moving the march that way.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you. You know, I wanted to give the mappers some instruction before we went to break, but you know, I can't get a break to give them instruction. You know, Commissioner Andersen, this is going to have to wait.

Tamina, could you please -- after the break we'd like to see an option with Cupertino, Sunnyvale, and Santa Clara; another option with San Jose instead of those, and then the input in the air table that is -- that Commissioner Toledo mentioned, 41010, if you could help us see that and just let us know when all that is ready. I can talk to Ms. MacDonald, and we can figure out where else we can go in the meantime.

Thank you so much. We are on lunch until --

MS. RAMOS ALON: Can I get some direction on where to split San Jose?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Wherever it goes to get to our
population target.

    MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, Chair.

    CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. So lunch until 1:30.

    Thank you.

    UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Chair. Enjoy your lunch, everybody. See you all at 1:30.

    AUTOMATED MESSAGE: Recording stopped.

    CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you everyone for your patience during our meal break. We are back.

    We are working on shifting some population around from the MIDCOAST district eventually over to the ECA district.

    Before we broke for lunch, we asked out mapper to work on three visualizations that we could take a look at when we came back from lunch. She has done miraculous work and finished all of that in time -- in essentially half an hour, so kudos to Tamina, and we are yours to show us what you have been able to come up with.

    Thank you so much.

    MS. RAMOS ALON: Thank you, Chair, gladly. So I'll start with where we left off, with the SANJOSE district being overpopulated by 33.64 percent. I was asked to take a look at two different iterations of moving the population up into EDENTECH, so I will bring those up now.
The first of these iterations looks at bringing more of SANJOSE in. You'll remember that we began looking at north San Jose and parts of mid San Jose to bring into EDENTECH, and I received instruction to just continue down until I met the population requirement.

So this new configuration for SANJOSE, which does not include this green section here of San -- of the San Jose city. It brings the deviation of the district to 3.12 percent. I'll zoom out so you can see what this district looks like.

So the SANJOSE district is here, I'm tracing in black. So that is one option.

And I'll open the second. And apologies for all the little pop-up windows.

The second view moves Sunnyvale, Cupertino, Santa Clara, and the northern part of San Jose into EDENTECH. This creates a population deviation in the SANJOSE district of -1.61 percent. The shape of the resulting SANJOSE district comes along the western part of SANJOSE down here, and then follows the county lines, resulting in a similar overpopulation in EDENTECH.

And Chair, would you like to discuss these two before I move onto the third?

CHAIR KENNEDY: No, go ahead and show us the third as well. Thank you.
MS. RAMOS ALON: The third that I'm about to put up, and I just asked Kennedy to join me, is a submission that we received through public comment, and so it is more than just this particular district, but does give us a kind of unique look to what we're dealing with currently.

So we'll start here in the San Benito area. And what they did is they created a district which includes San Benito and the 1.25 corner of Monterey and then reaches over into Fresno, Madera, Merced, and I'll let Kennedy describe the rest.

MS. WILSON: And it's able to do that because it's taking less from Fresno versus how we had it before, and so it takes very similar portions of Merced and Stanislaus; however, it includes San Benito and Salinas Valley because it doesn't take any of the City of Fresno really, and however, they take none of Tulare, so none -- no cities, no part of Tulare is taken into the VRA consideration for Kings-Kern, and so that's why they're able to do that swap of population.

You also see that Fresno is being paired with Mono and Inyo, which is something that we -- that you've worked hard to prevent during your time here up in the Stanislaus area; however, Modesto is going north and Turlock is going outward, and that's what the public
comment looks like.

We have their Latino CVAP numbers in Kings-Kern without Tulare, they have it at 57.6 percent, and then the San Benito, Fresno with San Benito, Salinas Valley, into Merced area is at 54.49 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Tamina. Thank you, Kennedy. Onto comments from Commissioners.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, there was some thought that this might get us three Senate VRA districts, but I believe Fresno-Kern is going to be thirty -- mid-thirties --

MS. WILSON: 36 point --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- in LCVAP.

MS. WILSON: 36.9 is where It's at.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh, this is the -- oh, these are the CVAP numbers, right, so it doesn't give us a third VRA district. It does keep the counties, the northern counties in the San Joaquin valley together.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Any other comment?

Can I get Commissioner Yee, thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, I mean, it's an interested exploration, but it goes in a direction that discussion this morning -- definitely pulling us away from,
especially, comments about Central Valley and not
reaching over to San Benito despite the CVAP
possibilities there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Of the three that we've seen,
I'd like to continue to see number 2 and see where that
was getting -- where she went from there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, I'm not sure that -- yeah,
the -- but that was -- this was just to take the next
step. So that was the one that focused on Sunnyvale --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- Santa Clara, and Cupertino?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Instead of splitting up San
Jose city as much.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I agree with what
Commissioner Fornaciari was saying. This gives us two
districts, not three, so I don't think that's a viable
option.

So looking back at the previous scenarios, I
appreciate the work that Tamina did, thank you very much.
But that's a huge amount of population, so at this point
what I would really prefer doing is putting as much --
not taking the -- the PENINSULA one, do not lower it to a
the negative.

I would need to come up to 5, which would be grabbing what we were previously doing, taking that section of Cuper -- of San Jose and putting it with the PENINSULA, so we don't have quite as much population to move north. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen. Tamina, could we zoom in a bit then and look at that area? Okay, so let's go back to the working draft before these visualizations, if we could.

MS. WILSON: This is the working draft before the visualization, before we went to lunch.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, but we don't have a way of getting that -- Fruitdale, Burbank, San Jose area back out into PENINSULA, so how did we have that before? We had Campbell, (indiscernible) Park.

MS. WILSON: I can grab the -- so before the draft, excuse these big fuzzy lines -- it looked more like this.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Can we go back to that point?

MS. WILSON: Yes, just one moment please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen? We're not hearing you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry, thank you. I think we were doing this, but now taking a section of the PENINSULA, essentially, from Saratoga going up into San
1 Jose and expanding that out until we reached the positive
2 5. So taking that section of -- oops. Well -- let me
3 get back there -- I think that was -- was that clear?
4 Going up through Saratoga and taking that population from
5 SANJOSE and putting it into the PENINSULA. To keep the
6 tech corridor from Saratoga through Santa Clara, that
7 whole thing -- yeah.
8 
9 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so --
10 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, go -- Saratoga and
11 then taking portions of SANJOSE, correct, that area until
12 we have 5.
13 
14 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, but also theoretically moving
15 Campbell, Cambrian Park, and Los Gatos back into
16 PENINSULA?
17 
18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That too, we could do that
19 again.
20 
21 CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay. So let's look at
22 reversing that change. Let's put Campbell, Cambrian
23 Park, Los Gatos back into PENINSULA.
24 
25 Or Campbell, Monte Sereno, and Los Gatos for now.
26 We don't need to move Cambrian Park, because that would
27 pull part of San Jose with it.
28 
29 MS. WILSON: This would add 83,690 people to the
30 PENINSULA district. Resulting deviation to the PENINSULA
31 district is 10.62 percent.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Andersen, suggestions? Or any other --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, then start at the -- put -- take that -- accept that in, and then start in SANJOSE,, at that -- you know, Burbank, Fruitvale -- Fruitdale and walk that eastern line west until PENINSULA is around 5 -- just a little bit below 5, 499, something like that. Essentially, putting --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead, Tamina.

MS. WILSON: May I do that, is that --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

MS. WILSON: -- follow the direction?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please. Okay, Tamina, we probably need to remove some of the westernmost portion of that and have a more solid north, south line there. But we're at a population that we're happy with.

We can leave this for a cleanup later. Go ahead and accept that.

Okay, so the PENINSULA population is at almost 5 percent. Our excess population is still in MIDCOAST here, so we would need to bring the rest of the Santa Clara County except for the Gilroy area and the area south that would need to connect it to San Benito.

MS. WILSON: Chair, because we did go back, Gilroy is back with Santa Clara. If you'd like, I can move it
back out with this area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, what I was saying was if we can move into SANJOSE, the remainder of Santa Clara, except for Gilroy and the area necessary to connect it to San Benito County.

MS. WILSON: Very good, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Okay, so we know that we have a slight overpopulation in MIDCOAST that we will deal with later, moving some of that population south. So now we have 25 percent over in SANJOSE. We can leave as much as 5 percent deviation there, so essentially we're looking at now 200,000 people plus or minus.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I'm just wondering -- oh, I'm sorry, I -- nothing, nothing.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, do I have a proposal for next step? Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: That would be to redo the North San Jose, Sunnyvale, Cupertino, Santa Clara, move north.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, and if we -- so we had two options looking at that in a slightly different context, but Tamina, can you remind us how many people are in Sunnyvale, Cupertino, and Santa Clara?

MS. WILSON: Yes, Chair. The population of Sunnyvale, Cupertino, and Santa Clara is 344,334 people.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so that's a lot more than we need to move. Okay, so let's leave them where they are for now.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry, could we see how much population is in the Alum Rock portion of San Jose? Essentially, we have to -- essentially, what I would propose is we take -- I think it's 190,000 is what we need to make SANJOSE down to 5 percent, so I would -- I would like the idea of taking a portion of San -- enough San -- isn't that going the other way?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Tamina, could we see the pending changes box, please?

MS. WILSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay, I'm sorry. It -- I know. The area between -- not that area. The area between Santa Clara, is it -- moving that line south. Correct, moving the line going above --

MS. WILSON: North?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, starting -- starting at the north portion of San Jose City there, that crook -- that jagged line, and moving that line south to sort of, matching what's on its east side until we have more of San Jose, about 190,000, and so our San Jose is at 5.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.
Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, you know, that's possible. But I was thinking if we go back to that western portion and expand it, then perhaps that gives us -- let's see, does that work with PENINSULA though?

I was thinking that could offset the over -- the too large population, if we move Sunnyvale, Cupertino, San Jose, but that's -- that's the wrong district, I think. Because that would make more of San Jose whole rather than splitting it further, which is what this change does.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER YEE: And moving to the downtown area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, we also have that northern area above Sunnyvale and Santa Clara, so -- Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER YEE: But that's lightly populated, it was like 6,000 people.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Chair, I like what you were saying because it would -- it would take less of -- not much, but every little less bit of the southern part of San Jose that we're taking would be better.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so we now have SANJOSE at
2.71. We could even retain some of that.

Commissioner Ahmad, would you like to help steer while we're in San Jose?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Well, I'm sure anyone can steer any part of the state, but it would be helpful to see the freeways.

Yeah, I'm just curious to this dip into the heart of San Jose. What is the -- the supporting evidence to make this change?

CHAIR KENNEDY: That doesn't -- yeah.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Is this population-based?

CHAIR KENNEDY: We're just looking at population right now.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: COIs? Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Happy to adjust the contours to take into account the communities of interest.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I would think, rather than doing this dip into the center, I would keep the line as close to -- parallel, like that Alum Rock area, I would move that diagonal line that presently from -- you know, the -- right where it says east foothills and Santa Clara, I would take that section and move in a line, south. I would not just delve into the heart of San Jose.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, you know, I know we're trying -- just trying to balance the population, but I'm feeling uncomfortable about doing this on the fly, 'cause there's a lot of COIs in this area that we need to recheck and -- I know we're trying to get an even march of population around, but I would really rather do this offline and check those COIs, you know, be much more careful around downtown San Jose, look into some possibilities there with Saratoga and West San Jose and swapping around there. You know, just some better options than doing this on the fly, although I know we need to move along here to keep our population going.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Could we just set a target for this area and move on? I'm really -- I would like to do this better than we're doing it right now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And that's what I was going to ask. If we are okay with a 2.71 positive deviation for SANJOSE at this point, we can leave it here and have some additional work done offline to show us, you know, what adjusting the contours to accommodate communities of interest would look like, but keeping in that, you know, range of less than a positive 5 percent and moving on.

Commissioner Andersen?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, but I'd like it to be -- not at 2.7, I'd like to be around, you know, 4 -- 4, 5 at least. But I totally agree that it should be done offline. And then knowing that we have -- if you take 4 -- you know, 4.5 percent out -- or like, it would be, you know, 20.5 percent, to move on.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you. Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah, I agree with this suggestion, Chair. Because eventually the changes would need to be made in this general area, so we can localize those changes and move with the population up in EDENTECH, forward.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect, thank you.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, Commissioner Andersen, can I hear your rationale on the 4.5 target and -- just, you know -- just so we know why that's the number to shoot for?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It's to try to keep as much of the population still within San Jose and minimize the disruption of all the COIs we've worked on throughout the whole East Bay, where we're trying to now move this.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So just that we could reduce the
bubble -- the population that we still have to move?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Over to ECA?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER YEE: And do we know -- is that -- I mean, our target at ECA, is that going to get us there? I don't want to run out of people either, but (indiscernible) ECA.

CHAIR KENNEDY: When we looked at it earlier, it was clear that at least the three counties that we were looking at -- or the three districts we were looking at, we would easily be able to.

We've made some changes since then, so Tamina, could you -- okay, so we're over 25 in SANJOSE, we're under, essentially, 25, in ECA. So if we left 5 percent in SANJOSE, then the best we could do in ECA was 5 percent under.

So yeah, I think we're better having that population left in SANJOSE closer to a zero deviation, which would mean we'd be closer to a zero deviation by the time we got over to ECA.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I agree, even though it's going to be more work, of course, because it's still moving more people through more places.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, but as you say, we don't want
to get over to ECA and find we're short population.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'm noticing that there
are -- there's a positive 5 percent, there's negative --
there are positive sections elsewhere. I don't think it
at all has to come directly from here because -- we
aren't -- we're going to have trouble moving that
through, so -- you know, I'd like us to be able to play a
little bit with that and not -- you know, see what it's
going to do to Eden-Tech, to 80CORRIDOR, to the COCO, to
the entire -- all those four districts, or five districts
that are about to change.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, if we -- if we go ahead and
accept the pending changes, that leaves 2.71 percent in
San Jose. And I would be comfortable with that, so not
necessarily shaving it to zero, but not leaving as close
to 5 percent.

Okay, seeing some agreement there. Can we go ahead
and accept this and move forward?

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. Yes, I
think -- we certainly can accept this and move forward.
Since we're going to continue down this path in the next
couple of hours or so, we may know if we can adjust that
a different way, higher or lower as well.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, I would say let's take a snapshot here and then have this be exploration, so we don't have to try to undo all the steps to make a change if we find out, oh, oops, if it was a different number, then all these other scenarios that we talked about could've worked.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Tamina could you take a snapshot and then go ahead and accept these pending changes?

And again, the intent is to have Tamina and a Commissioner go back and revisit the actual contours of this district in SANJOSE to make sure that we are respecting as many communities of interest as possible.

Okay, we now have 21.12 percent excess population in EDENTECH. Do we want to take it all in one direction or do we want to divide it?

We could put some more population into SD80 Corridor before we head to move population east. Or do we want to go all the way up to the top of Contra Costa County and bring it east?

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, I would recommend taking some of it into the SD80. I think San Leandro
might be a little bit too much, though, for the
population. I forgot to check it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Tamina, could we look at the
line in San Leandro or around San Leandro?

MS. WILSON: Yeah, San Leandro is currently not
split in this district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, and we only have the ability
to bring in about 70,000 into SD80 Corridor before we
would overpopulate it?

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: What is the population of San
Leandro?

CHAIR KENNEDY: 91,103.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: So if we are considering moving
that, we would have to split it, right? Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Either that or if we looked at the
other end of the district, is there a possibility, do we
have any flexibility at the other end of the district?

So we have CONTRACOSTA district is 2.18 over. We
could conceivably -- if we took San Leandro in, then we
would need to push something out at the other end, so
that would put us in Hercules, Rodeo, Pinole; potentially
grouping those with Martinez and others.

Just want to get thoughts on that.

Commissioner Yee?
COMMISSIONER YEE: I was going to say just that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, is that generally a direction that we would like to move? Okay.

Then, Tamina, let's go ahead and move San Leandro into SD80 Corridor.

MS. WILSON: Am I moving the whole city, Chair?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. WILSON: Just a moment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Yee, did you have further comment?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, just to mention we did get testimony of San Leandro wanting to be with Oakland, although a minority of testimony that would like to keep it out of Oakland. So --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Majority included the mayor.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I'm not understanding what's happening. Did that -- did that go into COCO?

MS. WILSON: Sorry, just one moment, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so now we're looking at moving Rodeo, Hercules, and Pinole? Can we look at the population -- pending change? Let's look at moving Rodeo, Hercules and Pinole into COCO?

MS. WILSON: Yes, Chair one moment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so it leaves SD80 Corridor in
good position. We have some slight overpopulation in CONTRACOSTA, but we're going to be dealing with Contra -- with the southern end of Contra Costa County. Is that something -- do we want to go ahead and accept this and take care of that overpopulation on the south?

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I'm not in support of it. I would have rather looked at Alameda, which was a smaller population.

We also have a lot of COI testimony wanting Pinole, Hercules, Rodeo in with Richmond and some of those other areas, so I think we're also breaking the COI in so doing.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, let's hear from others.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I agree with Commissioner Turner. That's that little West Contra Costa school district. And I think part of San Leandro, so just to bring that up to 5. And then we'd have to take, you know, the -- put the terrain layer on and take what was -- what of Hayward or Castro Valley is already in the valley.

I would take that portion, and I think we could make -- get the portion of EDENTECH down to within its range as well.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: San Leandro had a -- we did have it split previously, and its -- we cannot go further north than Davis Street, but I wouldn't -- I wouldn't want to take all of that. I'd only want to take -- you'd have to get that below the five -- you know, below the 5 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Put the corridor in the 5 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. This is one of those areas where I think putting -- we did a lot of work in our Assembly and look -- putting the Assembly districts over this may give us some thoughts.

I mean, my gut is that -- you know, yeah. I think wherever we could put East Bay and North Contra Costa, you know, it just feels -- it feels like there might be another configuration that we're not seeing, and so it might be helpful to put the Assemblies that we created.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I kind of feel like we're leaving too much population behind. Need to get 25
percent, right, out to -- or 20 percent? I don't -- I
don't see 20 percent between here and there. Did -- am I
missing something?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Maybe not.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Chair, we had said that we
wanted to split up EDENTECH into different districts, not
put it all into one.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, but the -- but Commissioner
Fornaciari's point, we now have positive -- let's say 12
percent in EDENTECH. We have a negative deviation in
South SACSTANIS, so we can't pick up any population
there, and we have -- we need 25 percent in ECA. So
Commissioner Fornaciari is right. We've left behind too
much population without a way to get that population over
to ECA.

So thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari for that
reality check.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, that was going to be
my point, too, is that we've tried to max out the other
districts, and maybe we need to bring them down to like 2
percent or something like that in order -- so that it
meets -- or 1 percent. Let me do my calculations. Hold
on.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you, Commissioner
Fernandez.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just don't touch SD Corridor, it's pretty -- that's simple. You want to take from Eden-Tech, you want to take it over to COCO and take it directly in. Don't leave any -- don't make any changes, 'cause we adjusted it to the right number, so then put EDEN -- south, you know, 80 Corridor the way it was. Put the terrain layer on and see how much is already over in the valley, and then take the little bits of the -- to make those cities -- parts of those cities whole as we need it to move the population over.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, very good. Thank you.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah, this is -- you know -- this is the work at hand. So we're having population and COIs, that's what's fighting -- we're fighting against. And we're doing -- trying to do it incrementally.

Is there any thought to just moving the population and then adjusting the COIs? Or -- you know, and I'm just trying to think of our time and what we have left --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right --

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: -- to make a bolder step and then see if we can adjust accordingly.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, well that's what we've done
in SANJOSE. We've gotten the population to a level that
we're more or less happy with and said that we will have
a commissioner work with a mapper to ensure that the
contour of the district respects as many COIs as
possible. So thank you for that.

Commissioner Tuner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: So if we move Alameda into --
I don't know if -- if it can go into -- ultimately, what
I'm trying to do is to see if -- thank you, that's --
when it stops moving. Okay, if we move a portion that --
that number directly, not up into the 80COR, but into the
COCO, we can move Livermore, which is 88,006 into the
S,ACSTANIS and then move perhaps, Manteca, which is also
83, going that direction. So those are -- I'm just
looking for like numbers, Commissioner Taylor, talking
about just the population number and then seeing how we
need to adjust COI, but those are all 80, 80, 78ish or
so, so we may can move in that direction.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, thank you. I was
just -- we have such amazing line drawers. I'm just
wondering if they can just present us some options,
'cause they've rotated the population all over this
region in all of their iterations and perhaps they might
have some suggestions on how to rotate the population and
the various options that they've tried in the past.

Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, we're just trying to get to a
point where we've narrowed down the options enough to
give them direction and let them work offline. Thank you
for that.

Commissioner Fornaciari? We're not hearing you.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Good, 'cause I was
thinking. Yeah, I don't know what to say at this point.

I'll think some more.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you. So Tamina, we need
to not accept moving Rodeo, Hercules, and Pinole. We
need to move San Leandro back into EDENTECH. And is that
back into EDENTECH? I'm seeing that number in COCO, it
makes me think that it's sitting in COCO right now.

There we go, okay. So the -- right now the excess
population in EDENTECH needs to move east.

So, Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I recommend putting on the
terrain layer and seeing what part of Castro Valley,
Hayward is already in the valley. It doesn't appear that
most of it is still in the hills.

So then we need to say, well, Fremont connects
through -- to Sunol, you know, portions of this. We need
to start grabbing, kind of what's on the hill, by the
highways that can get it there and cutting this one up.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: How about we use a
chainsaw, not a scalpel, and we just grab Castro Valley,
San Leandro, San Lorenzo, all of that stuff and parts of
Hayward and move in until we get to the population
numbers. And then we start grabbing Tracy, Mountain
House, Lathrop, and Manteca, who are already -- you know,
we got to move the Tri-Valley that way.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: You know, I mean -- I
think we need to just move major chunks of population and
fiddle with the details later.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Agreed.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: 'Cause if we get to the
end, and we don't like it, you know, we'll have massaged
it all the way through, but we can swap around the edges,
but we still -- you know, we got to move 250,000 people.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, that's what I was
thinking. Fremont does have a connection to Sunol, and
if you're taking that portion of -- essentially, from
that portion of -- like from Newark, not the north point,
but that's -- yeah, come down to the right -- yeah, that point right there. Take that portion of Fremont, put it over, and then take that -- most of Union City, because that's where the Afghan community is as well, go up through that portion of Hayward.

I would not take San Leandro. I would take Castro Valley, that whole, essentially chunk down, direct -- yeah -- well, not -- yeah. Maybe a little bit more than that. Yes, I'd take that chunk first.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, very good.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, I so appreciate this discussion and everyone's care for all of the COIs in this area, and certainly I share those concerns.

I understand, Chair, that you don't want to do this offline despite the fact that there's like massive amounts of population to move, and I understand that.

I'm just wondering if we could just ask Tamina. Tamina, you know this area. You have -- have worked it numerous times over the last several months. I hope I'm not putting you on the spot. But you are an expert mapper and an expert in this area. I'm wondering if you have ideas about how we could move this forward? What -- what is the best way to move this forward in a timely manner?
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, if Tamina has thoughts right now, I'd love to hear them.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Agree, and Fremont is about 230,000, so if you took that, you'd have to take -- pretty much would have to take everything to the north.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, which we can't do for contiguity reasons.

Okay, Tamina?

MS. WILSON: I'm not sure I would have made any of those moves. I think of what's been suggested, I would go with Commissioner Fornaciari's idea.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. WILSON: I would take these northern areas.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good, okay. So can we entrust that to you?

MS. WILSON: Certain -- okay, so I will take these northern areas through Hayward. I will push that into COCO, will take out Livermore -- not more or less, push it here with Mountain House and Tracy, take out Lathrop, take out Manteca, part of Lathrop, depending on what -- I'm not -- I'd have to talk to Kennedy about what those populations are. And those will go into ECA whichever
way she suggests.

Is that what I'm hearing?

CHAIR KENNEDY: That would be the general direction
at this point, and we can see what -- what you come back
with and make further adjustments from there.

MS. WILSON: Yes, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Ms. MacDonald?

MS. MACDONALD: Hello, Chair. Thank you so much.

Before sending this over my way -- so because you're in
the middle of moving a gigantic bubble around Northern
California, we wouldn't really be able to go to Kennedy
because we don't know where this is going to land.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. MACDONALD: So that's the problem we're
having --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. MACDONALD: -- with the situation right now. So
if you want Tamina to work on this offline, then we would
have to figure out what you would like to do and -- yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I'm looking to you for a
recommendation on that.

MS. MACDONALD: Well --

CHAIR KENNEDY: We still have plenty to do down in
the south.

MS. MACDONALD: We do, and that's going to take a
minute because -- since they were not scheduled today, I told the Southern California people that I would let them know if they were needed, so we're going to need a little bit of time to get them to come up and map.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. 2:30?

MS. MACDONALD: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: 2:45?

MS. MACDONALD: Yeah, we can shoot for 2:45, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: 2:45? Okay.

So we have 20 minutes at this point.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm wondering if perhaps Congress -- it might a possibility to go back to the Congress, since we didn't finish the Central Valley earlier today, and just hopefully -- oh, is that Tamina also, and Kennedy?

Okay, so let's just give them time to do what they're doing and then we'll follow. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I was going to say the same.

Commissioner Toledo and I seem to be on the same wavelength today.

We've actually seen those iterations for the Central Valley already. We looked at them this morning, but a decision wasn't made, so I was wondering if perhaps
commissioners were just prepared to have a conversation while the mappers -- while the mappers change over, just so that we can see if there's any consensus around iteration 3 or 4, or the first one.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you for that.

Ms. MacDonald?

MS. MACDONALD: Yes, thank you. So we just had a little mini conference here. And if you wanted to hop over to Congress, that would actually be appreciated.

Kennedy could perhaps start, because there are some areas that you have not yet nailed down. And then Tamina can come back and perhaps taking a little break, since she hasn't had one today and also work with you on Congress, if you wish.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, that's fine. So Tamina -- sorry, Kennedy and Commissioner Sadhwani, if you want to remind us where we are on the Congressional districts in the Central Valley, and I believe we were talking about the -- primarily the VRA district, or Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I was just -- I think we're at a decision point now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: In seeing the three versions -- the three iterations, it's a question of whether we're going
to go with the -- just balancing or the -- or one of
the -- our preferred method, which was the 3 and 4. It's
a little bit -- the nomenclature on our titling was
interesting, but -- so it's either 3 or 4 what we're
recommending and the question becomes does the Commission
have a preference for 3 or 4 in the how we shift the
population throughout the area. And I had heard quite a
bit of support for 4, but I also heard a little bit of
support for 3. So I just wanted to get a consensus on
which of the two really makes the most sense.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Yes, my sense is that there is a good bit of support for
4. For those who are supportive of 3, most seem open to
4 as an alternative; whereas those who are in favor of 4
are less open to 3 as an alternative.

So it seems that if we were looking at a scale that
the balance is probably tipping towards 4. That's my
reading at this point, I'm happy to hear colleagues.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Your read is one hundred
percent accurate for me.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Just this confirmation,
we've already talked about this. But in terms of the
lower seat up in STANISFRESNO, the advice has been that it's at a good number, correct?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: We would have preferred for it to be higher, but given the analysis we've received from legal and from the community that it is the best we can do at this time and also meet all of the criteria. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo and Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes, I'd go with 4 with the caveat that I then would really like to see how much of the Central Valley further up we can get out of VCA. And look further north to put population in because I'm talking the Modesto area, but not in -- I'd go further north in between this Stanislaus and the Sacramento area and taking population, whatever that population is which I do not know. But I'm concerned. If it's 117,000 this portion together is more than or even close to 500,000, then it's a Central Valley area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, thank you very much, Commissioner Anderson.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I support 4.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Numero quatro.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I also support 4, and I was wondering if maybe Kennedy can show us how -- because the population is balanced right now. I believe it's balanced in the San Joaquin County area, but let's take a look at what are the options are under the 4 so that we can address some of Commissioner's Anderson's concerns.

MS. WILSON: So would that be you want to move to live line drawing or?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No, not so much as we currently balance it. So if you can just go through the --

MS. WILSON: So most of these pretty localized changes. Really, the biggest difference here was that the south San Joaquin just had -- and if I can find the old version, hold on.

As you can see it came a little bit more into the south San Joaquin County, and a difference is we had to take out Lathrop. So I had to replace that, and I came out a little bit more to Stanislaus. Otherwise, this is very, at least in the San Joaquin district is very similar to what we had before. And absence of Lathrop, absence of people here in south San Joaquin, I think it was about 30,000 people.
And just how we've had to move things around here was pretty localized. There isn't much change to this district, so going back to adding Modesto back in wouldn't be the exact same but would be very similar to the iteration that Commissioner Turner and Commissioner Fernandez worked on together.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, I just wanted to add for Commissioner Anderson, I'm a big believer in no stone left unturned. We did look at a host of options. We were even looking at what if we put the population down through Ridgecrest into ECA, and how do we pull in more up into Truckee. And we were looking at a whole range of options including even what if we cut Inyo, Mono from ECA and start to rethink the whole map in that regard, which is not what they want, obviously.

I think at this point, my sense is that this is the compromise, right? That it's really tough to reconfigure this. Given the placement of Inyo and Mono in the map, given all of the COI testimony that we've received, given all of VRA obligations and the equal population, particularly here in congress where we are getting down to a deviation of one person, I think that this is the best that we can do. That's not to say we can't explore
more, but I do want to be cautious of our timeline.

Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah. Thank you, very much.

I just want to know what's the population that is in -- is it Stanislaus County? Yes. That portion there that has been put into ECA?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, I can check that really quick. One moment.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Can I say something while we're waiting?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please, Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I did, in thinking about all of these things, we did explore different options as Commissioner Sadhwani said. And we wanted to go with -- we were fortunate because we had Kennedy as a line drawer who had worked with many of our -- and she had all that information about the Sierras and Sacramento.

And so we wanted to create, as Commissioner Sadhwani said, the compromise, so keeping -- and to leverage everything that had been done thus far into something that was palatable. Every time we go further north we end up -- I'm just going to say it, we end up in a
spiral, and then we don't make a decision.

So we thought it would make because the Sierras are such an important area in the State, and we were taking it very seriously. And so we wanted to make sure that we were in alignment with the thinking of the Commission and where we were going prior to this.

So we didn't want to cause additional further problems by taking the issue further north or even further south. Because even in San Bernadino there would have been some additional issues.

So whether we up or down there would have been issues, so we figured this had been the area that the Commission was already exploring to address. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I, like some of my colleagues, are feeling a little nervous about time, and we haven't really moved forward on a lot today.

I absolutely trust each of my colleagues when they work with the line drawer, and the line drawers definitely know this area and having worked with them, they'll tell us when we're off or when we should be looking at another stone unturned.

I think that when we've asked people to do explorations at this point, the assumption should be that
they have turned over every stone. We can ask a few questions, but really trust that that's taken place. And stick to the question on the table, which is which iteration do we feel comfortable moving forward with, so we can move on to the next piece. There's some pieces that just don't seem to get to put into the puzzle, and it's time we put them in.

MS. WILSON: And sorry as I'm clicking all these blocks again, this is a screenshot just because we had so many, so it's not my working layer. I am getting -- clicking into all the cities, there's a little bit of some unincorporated areas, so obviously, it'll be a little bit higher. But this is about 310,000 people.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Four also is.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Kennedy.

Commissioner Anderson, is that the answer you were looking for?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: It is. Just one -- and this should not take much. Could we go up and have a look at the portion of Sacramento County that is not in Sacramento that's been put into another district that you created around Tahoe. Yeah, I guess it's just the full scenario. What is the population in that, right -- that small area there?

MS. WILSON: So there's Folsom and Orangevale.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Okay.

MS. WILSON: And we can see what those cities are
Folsom, Orangevale, and there's actually a tiny bit of
Citrus Heights, which I can also highlight for you, one
moment. This is as I'm still going 170,000. Clearly, I
don't have it all but --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. That's close enough, thank
you.

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you. Yeah, I'm just
looking at that other one that's -- and that portion's
been added to this whole other area which has been
created. I still feel that a Sierra thing (ph.) was
available to put that much area of -- anyway.

Understood.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm going to be a little
repetitive because I'm going to echo Commissioner Sinay's
comments.

You know, I mean, if you look at the job they did in
that north valley, the North Shore Valley with an
(indiscernible), I'm sure they scrub, and scrub, and
scrub you know, to do the best they could.

And I think that I agree that when we send folks off
to do these kinds of explorations that I think we just
have to trust in them that they've turned over the stones. And I appreciate the hard work that they've done.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari. Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. We did turn over a lot of stones, but know I currently do not remember why we did not go with the other iteration that we had. The Fernandez Turner iteration that we looked at before for this area that did not take Modesto all the way out of ECA. And we put both of them up. That was a consideration.

I don't remember us not choosing it, and now we're back to this. And both of them are, I still think, viable options. I just don't remember how we got here and how that got erased.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think I can answer that. I think it was because of the Central Valley. I think we go to this, and then we decided until we settled on the Central Valley that we wouldn't take action on the Fernandez Turner proposal of the north.

And this, actually, well, Central Valley proposal aligns -- is my understanding, aligns with both the proposal that Turner Fernandez provided and also with the original proposal, which was what we have, right, what we
Currently have.

And so we're able to work through both of those, so our goal was to align with what you guys were already proposing, and if that didn't move forward, to default to the previous.

So we were trying to work in an alignment so that we could make the decision for the Central Valley and then also cascade into the Sierras and Northern California.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TURNER:  Thank you, so with that --

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Yes, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER:  Oh, Kennedy, yes.  I'd like to see how that dovetails with that other work.

MS. WILSON:  Okay.  I can pull up your balanced plan as well.  There's going to be a lot of lines, so one difference that I'll just point out before putting the lines on top of each other was the difference was that Mono, Inyo, Alpine were going up into being populated by Roseville going up to Plumas and then Modesto was in with Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne.  And we didn't go with that again because we knew there was going to be excess population within these because they were planning to take out portions of Lamont, Lamont Station, and Visalia.

So there was more going to north that couldn't possibly mix with what you had at the time.  Turning
these off and turning yours on, we have Modesto going in
with parts of San Joaquin and Amador down to Mariposa.

But now since you do like the VRA districts the way
they are that 117,000 is still going to have to come out
of here, which will still be putting it with Mono, Inyo,
and obviously, it's been a while since you've looked at
it and you can look at it again.

There was a lot of still not liking this version as
well and wanting to go back to the draft, but here is the
lines. So again, this had Fresno, Clovis, going
downwards.

Again, big change Modesto was with Amador,
Calaveras, Tuolumne, Mono, Inyo, Alpine, parts of El
Dorado, all of Placer, up to Plumas, which again, wasn't
all that popular with everyone, some people.

And then we had Tracy, Mountain House with Stockton
to Elk Grove, a small split in Vineyard and Excelsior,
keeping Sacramento whole. Parkway up to Fruitridge
Pocket together then, kind of, just the eastern side of
Sacramento County from Arden-Arcade up to Antelope out to
Folsom as well and Rancho Murieta also going east.

So those were some differences. If we were to, kind
of, to model this again, Fresno would still have to be
going north somewhere.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Kennedy.
Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, yeah, thank you, Kennedy. And just based on the changes that were made to the VRA districts we'd have to redo the whole Turner Fernandez because the population is different from what we were working with versus what we would have now. I think we were working with like, 400,000, and I think, now, Kennedy said it's 300,000. So it would have to be redone.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And is that something that you would be willing to redo?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I prefer the draft of what we have now. I prefer that one but if the majority of the -- if there's general consensus, right, is that the word we're using now?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: We could go back, but I will also say if anyone has been reading the -- or if we've had time to read the communities of interest in our database, there's many, many, many people that did not like our proposal, which I'm a little offended by -- just kidding -- but that's okay. I thought it was pretty good.

No, but I do understand because we were having to think out of the box, right. And we were splitting up --
one of the major ones was San Joaquin. San Joaquin was basically whole in the one we have now and probably over 30 different communities of interest, and plus we were also placing Elk Grove with Stockton, which many did not like.

So but I think anytime you make a change, you're going to have people that don't like it. So I didn't answer your question, but I'm willing to work on it if that's what general consensus is.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, so just to add, I think I was eluding to this before, but so one of the things that we kind of just talked through when Commissioner Toledo and I were working with Kennedy is, you know, the 117 people that come out -- right now, we have them coming out through Fresno, and we did look at what are some of the other options for that.

So I did mention, like, Ridgecrest, for example. I think we looked at that, and it was like 27,000 people or something like that. So it wasn't enough to push out that way. So it opens a whole host of questions about then how else would we do this, right?

So as it stands in this map we still have ECA being populated to some extent by the Central Valley with
Fresno. If we wanted to look at an alternative to that (indiscernible) against that, I think that could actually make lots of sense, but it would require redrawing a lot of the map.

And so that would be my only concern, and that's why we didn't pursue it further because for us our task was the VRA districts, and so we really, kind of, kept it at that point.

But certainly just in talking through what might look like, we had talked about, well, Inyo Mono might need to go with San Bernadino, which would set off a whole host of ripple effects down below or a whole redraw of the Northern California area.

So I just wanted to highlight that the key piece here is that because there's this 117 coming out of that area because of the creation of that farm that population has to go somewhere.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah, thank you. I -- Commissioner Turner, thank you for bringing that up. I'd forgotten that we had not actually resolved the issues that were trying to deal with in the Sacramento -- Sacramento in the draft was cut in half -- the city was cut in half, and a lot of people did not like that. We
didn't really like that.

Also, the Tahoe area, even though we said well if you have to cut it putting it in the middle of the lake was okay. And we thought oh, this would be nice to change this. And that was one of the reasons why we said great, let's look at taking that portion of the Central Valley from it was the 417,000, now it would be like 300.

I still think that's worth a go and keeping the Sacramento County and Sacramento County and putting the population Placer population in El Dorado in those counties.

And I think that would actually help us solve this whole issue to everyone's benefit, and I would really hope to have a quick look at this again.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Anderson.

Kennedy?

MS. WILSON: Just one response to that was the draft definitely was cutting through mid-town and the downtown area. However, Commissioner Fornaciari did make adjustments, and it is no longer doing that.

Now, the downtown areas are whole and kept together as this follows the river. So that's just one thing that Commissioner Fornaciari did just for everyone's information about where the line goes now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Kennedy. Commissioner
Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah thank you, and thank you for all of that. I think for me it still feels like we have given up on the Modesto area because including them all the way out to ECA with the Sierra feels like we have not done enough exploration to see if there's a possible way that they can stay in the Central Valley.

We've carved them out of the like communities, and I think along with Modesto and what was, it Lathrop, and put them in with, you know, this Benton and Mammoth Lakes and all these other wonderful areas, it just -- they just don't go together at all in any stretch of the imagination.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So thank you for that, Commissioner Turner. Could I ask you and Commissioner Fernandez to take another look at this and see if you are able to -- based on the VRA districts and the southern part of the Central Valley take another look at this, modify what you previously had based on the earlier version of the VRA districts and bring us back a proposal or options?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I'd certainly would want to look at it again because I would not be interested in touching any of the VRA districts, and there were some things that we really liked about what we were able to do with Placer and some of those other areas.
And so we'll just have to see. And here's where I think the Central Valley because of where it's positioned not because of intent, desire, heart (ph.), but this is where it feels like we are now just very limited in what can happen in this area.

And so yes, let's look it at again and see if we can't pull a miracle out of this.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes, I'm just thinking in terms of decision points, one just one decision point the Central Valley number four right that we have general consensus to lock that in. I like that term so let's -- if we have general consensus let's lock that in.

And then I actually -- we have a balanced map here. The number four is a balanced map if we all can -- it's not ideal, but I would almost want us to move in this direction if we can't find any other stone unturned.

Certainly, there was also iteration 3, but we all moved in this direction, and we have a balanced map, we meet our compliance requirements. It's not ideal, but if we cannot just live with it but support it, then I would say let's move forward with the caveat that of course, if Commissioner Turner and Fernandez are able to -- and I know they are miracle workers because I've seen them
work.

If they are able to address the COIs that we'd like to see united, then we can certainly take that and decide upon that when they bring that back to us. But given the time constraints, I would make this the default if we can all -- well, if we can live with it and support it. I like the addition of the support. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. And yes, the charge would be to not disrupt the VRA districts in any way.

Kennedy?

MS. WILSON: I have a question. So you know, it would be about 100,000 people less, so that is, you know a big difference.

However, I do think some things would kind of stay generally close in structure. I do think that you know, as far as what Mono and Inyo can be paired with, I think that's a big question too.

What do you want it to be paired with because in the Modesto balanced version it was with -- if I can pull that up, it was with up to Roseville, but I think there was some opposition about that.

And some oppositions about Modesto being with them; Amador, Calaveras, Tuolumne, so I guess if there's just specific Modesto has to go into Stockton, Mono and Inyo have to be with Roseville, it would be really helpful to
know, like, what they are okay with being with.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, so Commissioner Turner and Commissioner Fernandez will work with you on that.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Absolutely, and the only correction I wanted to add to my miracle-working comment was that this miracle can't happen without Kennedy.

She --

CHAIR KENNEDY: So.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I just wanted to make sure that goes on record. She is, I think, the brains behind all of this that can make this happen. She knows the areas to carve out that we're not been able to find. And so very confident working with Commissioner Fernandez and myself and we're going --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: (Indiscernible)

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- to do it, but man --

Kennedy's that anchor for us. So thank you, Kennedy. We're going to try it again.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good, thank you, Commissioner Turner. Thank all of you, for taking this on.

Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah, I'd like to say something on that one. Thank you for that question Kennedy, and Commissioner Turner, I agree. Kennedy sort
of knows the ins and outs of this.

What -- because, you know, this was Commissioner Akutagawa and I, this was our area, and so we heard extensively from the people here. What they would like to see is keeping the Mono, Inyo, Alpine with the portion of the Gold Country and a Sierra.

Whatever that is -- it doesn't have to be Roseville. It could be all of El Dorado, and that was enough population, great. It could be Placer, you know, maybe Placer and all that -- that's what they like.

They don't really want the Central Valley, and they don't have to have Roseville in particular. They'd like to have as far north as they can to be in to be a district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Anderson.

MS. WILSON: And if I may, really --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. WILSON: -- just in response to that, what parts of this -- is that it's with Fresno and Madera that was not desirable or what --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: It's that it was the controlling city, the controlling population was something in the Central Valley. It's been Bakersfield for years; it's been Fresno, it's been -- there will be a portion of Fresno if that's the way it's going to be.
But let's not have it, you know, the 170,000 out of
the district that's certainly absolutely tolerable. But
almost half, that isn't.

MS. WILSON: I guess I meant from their previous
iteration has Mono, Inyo -- it goes close to the City of
Madera, but it's still really the foothills, foothills
of -- not Folsom, Fresno. And then it goes up into El
Dorado, takes all of Placer, and goes up to Plumas, and
maybe I don't remember what your commentary was on this
area, but if this area -- I think this is being populated
a lot by Placer. And so I was wondering how do we change
this, or is this okay?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: No. It's that they want to
be -- and the Gold Country does as well --

MS. WILSON: (Indiscernible) Gold Country too.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: -- correct. That area would
like to be a Sierra district. It doesn't have to go just
as far as they could. The Gold Country doesn't really
want to be with the Central Valley either, and they were
saying that back and forth. And a couple of people did,
but that's not where the -- and all the people we were
talking with, that's what they were hoping.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Anderson.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. We are
well aware of what Inyo, Mono, and Alpine want, and we
were working within those limitations. Again, this is
congressional, and we'll get it down to zero. So we do
know what the priorities are, and we'll work with Kennedy
on that. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. And Commissioner
Sadhwani's hand went down. Okay. Thank you.
I think we have this resolved. We have resolved the
VRA districts in the southern portion of the Central
Valley.

We were going to be switching over to Sivan to look
at outstanding issues in Southern California while
Kennedy worked on Senate issues in the Northern Valley
and shifting the population around. So Ms. MacDonald?

MS. MACDONALD: Hello, Chair. Thank you so much. I
think we decided that we wanted to go to Tamina for
Congress after Kennedy?

CHAIR KENNEDY: For Congress?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. That's fine. What does -- I
thought Tamina needed more time to do the work that she
was off doing?

MS. MACDONALD: No. I apologize. It's a little
confusing hopping from map to map. So Tamina will be
working on Senate --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. MACDONALD: -- but that's going to be happening a little later.

And since we hopped over to Congress we talked about perhaps going to Kennedy and then moving over to Tamina, and then if you wish to go to Southern California after that, I can make sure that Sivan is available.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Perfect.

MS. MACDONALD: And I'm sorry if this has been a miscommunication.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. So is Tamina ready to hop back on? Okay, very good.

MS. MACDONALD: Yes, one moment, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We've got five minutes until break.

I was going to offer to go ahead and break early, have a little bit longer break, and come back at 3:15.

Let's go ahead and do that. Let's go ahead and break. It's 2:56. We will be back from break at 3:15.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much, Chair. We are on break, everybody. If everyone could please be back at 3:15, thanks, everybody.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 2:56 p.m. until 3:14 p.m.)

MR. MANOFF: One minute everybody. Checking in with the map team. Hello, Tamina. Thank you, we see your
map. All right, you all, I think we are ready. If the Chair could please, enable video. All right, stand by to go live.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioners?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm here. Tamina's here. We're both here.

MR. MANOFF: Are you ready to go live, Chair, or do you want to give it a couple of minutes?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. MANOFF: Standby. You're live.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Welcome back to today's meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. Again, I am Ray Kennedy, the rotating Chair for today's meeting. We have been moving back and forth as availability of mappers allows between Congressional Districts and Senate Districts.

We apologize for any confusion. We just need to maximize the availability of our mappers in order to reach our targets dates successfully.

So Tamina is back with us, and as I understand it is ready to walk us through some work on the Congressional Districts in her area of responsibility.

So, Tamina, over to you?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Thank you, Chair. We are heading back to San Jose, but this time we are in Congress. We
are not in Senate. And I'd like to review with you what has been posted as Plan YA (ph.).

There are three different iterations in that PDF, which are different options for how to address the issue of San Jose being split four times in the congressional maps.

The map that you are seeing currently with these brown lines is the current map that we are looking at. So this is the one with the four splits. You'll see that Northern San Jose is in GREATERED. We have the western tip of the CUPERTINO district comes into the middle of San Jose the Alum Rock Latino neighborhoods. We have the southwest in with Santa Clara, and we have the south with MIDCOAST.

So we were asked to take a look at some different iterations of what could possibly reduce the split, and that's what I will be presenting to you now.

So this is iteration number 1, and this reduces the splits in San Jose. San Jose is now in GREATERED, that same area in CUPERTINO and Santa Clara. What allows for this change is that the MIDCOAST district has been reworked to take population up the coast, so it now starts in Pacifica, which has been added to Santa Clara area. So I'll zoom out, so you can see that full district. So this'll be a coastal district, which goes
from San Mateo County down through the bottom of MIDCOAST in San Luis Obispo County. That line has not changed.

In Santa Clara, we have a small split in Mountain View, but we've taken Los Altos, La Jolla, and Los Altos Hills over here into Santa Clara. Whereas the GREATERED district remains unchanged.

I'm now going to go to the second snapshot. So this is iteration number 2. And what this iteration does is it takes Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, and Cupertino out of the GREATERED district and puts it with Santa Clara reducing that one split, so now San Jose is in GREATERED and CUPERTINO.

And on this side in MIDCOAST none of these -- so just a note to say that none of these district iterations that we're looking at right now change the CUPERTINO LCAP. I is all the exact same it was. This one has, in order to reduce the neck that was over here, took a little bit more of another Latino COI up in the north from whereas before there was a little hook area that came out over here. But the LCAP has not dropped in any way.

The other two iterations use the same CUPERTINO district that we've been looking at this whole time, and so that obviously, hasn't changed any.

So we have Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Cupertino,
Saratoga, Los Gatos, Monte Sereno, and Lexington Hills in with Santa Clara. And then all of this area of San Jose that is to the mid to the north not including the Cupertino area is with GREATERED. And then MIDCOAST takes the south where it had pretty much before.

And I have one more. Okay. So this is number 3, and number 3 is very similar to number 1 in that we have the architecture of the coastal district. So we have the Pacifica coming down to San Luis Obispo coastal district. The difference is the geography in this area, and so this moved this western area of San Jose in with Santa Clara, where it previously had been up here with the Milpitas area. That does create an additional split in Saratoga, but aside from that, this is the same as iteration number 1 with the Mountain View, small Mountain View split here, and with the Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Cupertino areas still intact with Milpitas, Fremont.

And those are all the iterations I have, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much, Tamina. Excellent work.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, thank you Tamina. I'm going to add a few more comments, and then Commissioner Ahmad will as well, I'm sure. So all of these are motivated by a desire to explore ways to have San Jose in three pieces
rather than in four. Nevertheless, in any of these three
options or the original four-way split option, in all
those options downtown San Jose remains in the CUPERTINO
district.

So the hope was possibly to get at least one San
Jose district with the majority in San Jose population in
it. I believe this third one that you have right now --
Tamina is this the one that has the largest single San
Jose slice of the options in that southern part in terms
of population?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes. The third option has the
largest population of San Jose in a single district, and
that is in Santa Clara.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. So that's the biggest
advantage of this one. We do have that long coastal
district though. For the second one, the question of the
second one, and we saw this the other day as well is that
you have that skinny neck. I think we got a preliminary
read from counsel that the neck was not problematic. I
think we'd want to recheck that today if we're going to
consider that one. That one also kept the whole west
valley together, which was a nice possibility.

Yeah, and then there was the first one that we
looked at. So all of them have trade off's, obviously.
We can also just stay with the four-way split, which we
were told is fine as well. So okay -- so this is the
skinny neck one.

CHAIR KENNEDY: The second one.
COMMISSIONER YEE: And a more even division of the
three parts of San Jose, and then the other one as well.
So Commissioner Ahmad, thoughts?
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Commissioner Yee,
and thank you to Tamina for working with us on this and
bringing forward these different iterations.

As Commissioner Yee mentioned preliminarily we have
the okay on meeting our criteria with all four of these
options, right. And at this point, we're at a decision
point on how we are going to have community of interests,
city boundaries, neighborhoods, shape out -- and county
boundaries -- shape out in this general area. There's
pros and cons to each one, as I'm sure we can find for
every single iteration of every single district within
the whole State across all of the maps.

So at this point, we just need to narrow down which
iteration we are going to move forward with. And as
Commissioner Yee mentioned, we did keep intact Cupertino,
so CUPERTINO district in this view right here has not
been touched for all four of the iterations. Thank you.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.
Commissioner Sadhwani?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, thank you. I wanted to really thank Commissioner Ahmad and Yee for their work on presenting these options, as well as Tamina of course. This is really exciting to see. I know we've been receiving a lot of feedback from the San Jose area.

I just wanted to state my preference on this. Actually, I don't have a strong preference per se. My strong preference would be either iteration 1 or 3. 2 for me I really don't like very much. The skinny neck I find concerning in general, but in addition, it really breaks up a lot of COIs that we have received from very early on from Cupertino, Sunnyvale, many of those Milpitas areas.

So we've also had great feedback on that GREATERED district, so for me I would feel comfortable throwing out iteration 2, thank you for preparing it for our review but I would feel comfortable with either 1 or 3. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I would concur with Commissioner Sadhwani, 1 or 3. 1 or 3. I was leaning more to 3, but I think 1 or 3 would be -- I'd support. And thank you again for the committee, I think it's a difficult job to go through and try to meet all the
compliance requirements. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Tuner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I'm leaning

definitely towards 3 just because as it was expressed

that it has one of the districts that has a majority of

San Jose in it. I think with a city the size of San

Jose, over a million people, they need to have a strong

voice, and at least one district as opposed to being

evenly divided between all. So I like the reduced number

of splits, and I like number 3 for that reason that it

gives them more of a voice in one of the districts.

Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you to my Spanish tutor,

Commissioner Fernandez. I have trouble rolling my r's

still.

So I'd go with option number 3. It preserves the

largest amount of COI and a larger goal at hand. I think

that's what we were trying to accomplish in these

iterations. So number 3, numero tres.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, and I apologize, I
just walked back in. Could I see the closeup of the, like that, Palo Alto, East Palo Alto area as well too? And my apologies if you did cover this. I want to -- I'm just curious if there's any significant differences there because we worked so hard to preserve that COI as well too.

MS. RAMOS ALON: We didn't go into that area, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Then I won't worry about that. So just, generally speaking, it's kind of funny. I was leaning towards number 2 only because it had the least length in terms of the coastal district. But I agree, I think, if the precedence or if the preference is to avoid that kind of skinny neck part, I am comfortable with either one in terms of 1 or 2 -- 1 or 3.

When I was first reviewing all of these maps, I will say that I was leaning more towards number 1. But I could also support number 3. That was probably my least favorite, but I could still support it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good, thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah, thank you. I'm also trying to compare 1 and 3. 2 is out for me because
having San Jose be the largest influence on the entire
MIDCOAST is completely out. And that's what I found
going this. This is 3, I think, which means Stanford,
and Portola Valley and Mountain View, that goes with
Monterey and San Luis Obispo. And that's why I wanted to
have a look -- what does 1 do? Does it do the same
thing? Is anyone having a -- this is -- no -- this is --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead, Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: This is three?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Commissioner Anderson, we
didn't touch that line up there. So that line remains
the same. Where Commissioner Yee and I explored with
Tamina was that southern line of GREATERED and Santa
Clara. So we didn't go up into that area where the mouth
is right now. So that should be the same as previously
that you've seen already.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Commissioner Anderson, if you're
asking which of the --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- ideas has the long coastal
district, 1 and 3, both have long coastal districts.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Correct. And so the only
difference is in terms of what major cities are with 1
and 3? And you're saying -- they're not the same. Which
is the one that -- could I see 1, please? This is three.
Could I see 1?

Oh, I see. I can't see that on the handout. So you're saying it's still the Portola Valley, Stanford, Mountain View, and is that -- what's the other yellow city there? That's Palo Alto?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Both parts of Palo Alto, yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Is that Palo Alto?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, I really appreciate the work that you've been doing on this one. But thank you, I'm going to think.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm just going to support 3.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Remember when we had that really, really long coast and no one liked it and we heard all about it?

Anyway, I think we've done good work, and the real question here -- I support 3. If we don't go with the original, then I would support 3 because the purpose was really to get what we've heard from the communities they wanted a majority district for San Jose. So if we're just cutting it down to three -- if we're changing it to
three, but we still don't have a majority district, then
it doesn't meet with what the request was by the
community.

And so I think the conversation is exactly the way
Commissioner Ahmad said. It's about a majority district
for San Jose or the coastal COI. And it is a tough
decision one way or the other.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.
Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So just to check, two
questions. One, is Newark and Fremont, or is Newark
whole in both iterations? It looks like Fremont is split
in both. And then also could we see the CVAPs for all
the communities?

MS. RAMOS ALON: One moment, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa, for 1, 2, or
3?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'd actually like to see it
for both 1 and 3.

MS. RAMOS ALON: This is map number 1, and Newark is
whole.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, this is 1 you
said? Can we see 3 also?

MS. RAMOS ALON: And this is number 3, and Newark is
also whole.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. And it is 60 for Cupertino, or is it 50? I can't -- it's hard to tell. Sorry for the Latino CVAP.

MS. RAMOS ALON: I'm sorry, what's the question?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No, I was just saying I'm blind. I couldn't tell whether that was a five or a six.

MS. RAMOS ALON: What was a five or a six?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: For the Latino CVAP under CUPERTINO?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Oh, we didn't touch CUPERTINO.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: That's what I was also told, so thank you. Yeah, thank you. I'm actually good with either one. I think both look great. Great work.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, we're going to hear about this, obviously. I don't think this is -- we won't hear quite as much if we would -- San Jose was the -- San Luis Obispo, and Monterey. Stanford, Palo Alto, Mountain View -- it's still the heart of So-Co valley in the PENINSULA.

I really appreciate the work that you're trying to do. This was a very difficult thing to work on. I'm sure you probably thought about this and tried to come up with the numerous ideas of how to keep Pacifica maybe in and take something else out. But that -- this is very
unusual we'll say.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Anderson.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, two things. First just to mention number 2. I realize nobody's preferring that, but just to mention it, that was the one that would put Sunnyvale, Cupertino, and the west valley, which was something a lot of COI, especially, in the summer mentioned wanting.

So we wouldn't be able to honor that unless we went with number 2, and it sounds like we're not moving in that direction.

The other thing just as we phrase this poll (ph.), I'm assuming everyone is stating their preference including staying with the four-way split. So you're saying if you like number 3, you like it better, not only than the three of these options, but including the original four-way split. So if that's not the case, we should hear from you too, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. And to Commissioner's Anderson's comment about Pacifica, we didn't go up that far. We were told to keep the changes localized in this specific area near the VRA area. So we
did not explore up the peninsula or further down beyond the area that we were tasked to explore. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Can you remind me on number 3 of some of the communities of interest that we ended up breaking up? Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Was that directed to Tamina?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, please. Thank you. Or -- yeah, and I'll just continue on that. I think we spent a lot of time trying to respect as many community interests as we could, and then, unfortunately, it lead to four splits, so I'm trying to weigh the two.

So right now I'm kind of, leaning towards keeping what we have, but I'd like to have a little more information on this one. Thank you. Or actually, maybe Commissioners Ahmad or Yee may also know.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Well, the most obvious one is the City of Saratoga being split.

MS. RAMOS ALON: The loss of the City of Saratoga here we do keep -- we were able to keep together two COIs that were previously not kept together. There was one Vietnamese COI that was split into three districts. And now it's actually in one in this map.

And then -- oh, I take it back, there's a tiny bit
of it that's over here that's in the VRA district, but it's in two instead of three. And then the rest of our COIs are -- this map actually does better keeping all of the COIs intact than the four-split did. We were able to reunite at least three that I can think of off the top of my head.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, and this is iteration number 3?

MS. RAMOS ALON: This is iteration number 3.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: And to add to that in terms of other COIs, we did split up the west valley COIs, so we did hear about keeping those west valley cities together, so those are split in this iteration that we see on the screen.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, thank you. No, I do -- 1, 3 -- but I also am okay with what we had as well. So 1, 2, and what we had given the amount of work that went into it as well. And especially the larger cities, the larger cities are going to see more splits, and I understand the argument of four-splits in San Jose, but the neighborhoods in San Jose are so different than in other places and so unique. And so I can see all of the
options and weigh-in. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Tamina, I have a question. So there's -- you're able to salvage or -- salvage may not be the best word. You were able to keep more intact that Vietnamese COI. Would we be able to (indiscernible) that small population that's left and still maintain that VRA district?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Thank you, Commissioner. We actually did explore that, and we were not able to keep this (indiscernible) at that level.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I can support either staying with the draft or going with number 3. Either one. We did split Saratoga, which is a 31,000 population versus San Jose that's over a million. So either one's fine, thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah. You were saying that you were able to in, I guess, this was in version two, to widen that gap. The gap that's right now right next to Santa Clara in the Cupertino area, without changing the
CVAP. Could you do that in the original, and could you do that, and would that possibly do something else, give another option?

MS. RAMOS ALON: I'm sure. So the area in question was really this little hook, right here, and this is the original that we're looking at, it's brown. And so instead of taking this, it went up instead.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah. But could we do that just as a -- regardless of what we do because I think that shows us there's a few more -- I think, there might be another possibility if Commissioner Yee and Commissioner Ahmad could see that, sort of, originally.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Anderson.

COMMISSIONER SADHAWNI: Yeah. Before we make a final decision I just wanted to check in and see was it ever explored -- it seems to me, and I mentioned this yesterday, but this line that's coming through San Jose in the southern portion here, was it explored to just swap that portion of the City of San Jose from there to Campbell and to Los Gatos, this purple area here? Oh, I don't know where the cursor went but that small portion. And then start just building back in parts of Santa Cruz until we populate, just from a compactness standpoint. It would keep some of these communities that
are further north together, and then San Jose, yes, going
down the coastline was that not optimal? So not going
all the way including Campbell. All right, just going up
to Campbell?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yeah. So that wasn't enough
population, which is why we, kind of, had to go over a
little bit more. That's actually the swap that we made
here. So you can take a look at what the original line
was -- was over here.

And so what we did is in order to not leave this
section off and to make it more compact, and actually,
there are three overlapping communities of interest right
here.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right.

MS. RAMOS ALON: And so in order to respect them
all, we moved this line up, and then to also respect the
(indiscernible) COI, which was here but that brought us
all the way over to the line as you see it now.

COMMISSIONER SADHAWNI: Right. But then further
down it stops. Can we just look it one more time,
further down? Right, so I guess my point, is like,
rather than taking in Saratoga and Campbell and those
areas and even potentially Los Gatos, leaving those
further north and then having San Jose take on more of
the coastline. Is that not a possibility?
And then all of these pieces here and I don't know how much you would need to just populate upwards so that you have one district that's further north and then San Jose going further south down into the coast, down into Monterey, having San Jose linked to Monterey?

MS. RAMOS ALON: That is how it is currently.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right. So that's what I'm saying, is like, can we not keep that and just move that line further out so we get more of the City of San Jose encompassed in that district? Yeah, like just that area and bringing the line in MIDCOAST further down to balance into Santa Cruz.

MS. RAMOS ALON: You'd be cutting off -- so Santa Cruz doesn't have a lot of population at all. So it would be kind of taking the entire county of Santa Cruz for a little area of San Jose, which can be done, but you would have to leave a tiny bit to make it continuous.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: To connect, right. Yeah. I think that's what I was originally thinking yesterday, but anyway. To me, it would seem to keep the northern areas more compact, and I think to Commissioner Anderson's point that she raised about places like Atherton and what is it called, Mountain View, these extraordinarily wealthy areas, kind of, being more compact together in that sense as opposed to going all
the way down to San Luis Obispo. Anyway, I'm fine with
these options.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhawni.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: In looking around the room and
just on Zoom, I'm seeing that the general consensus seems
to be either 3 or what we had originally. I think either
3 or what we had seems to be the two. And possible
exploration if we go with 3 or around what Commissioner
Sadhwani said.

But probably committing to one of these in terms of
general consensus and then if there's additional
exploration that can come back maybe and influence us.
But having one of these either what we had or 3 be the
option. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, thank you, Chair. I
appreciate Commissioner Sadhwani's thoughts. Certainly
the long, long coastal district, it's just not ideal.
But the thought was that we do have San Jose with the
lower coast that it would dominate the lower coast, and
there was a lot of discussions about not really wanting
that to happen so even though it would certainly make for
a better shaped district. So it could be explored, but
that would be the hesitation.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

My very strong sense of the consensus is that there was minimal support for 2, there was minimal support for the original. The support between 1 and 3 was a little more balanced, but the preponderance seemed to be on 3. Does that -- Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: You know, I was just thinking what would sort of make sense if you're in Santa Cruz, you've virtually no connection whatsoever to Palo Alto, Atherton.

You go over 17 -- it's not a favorite, but the first cities you come upon in that direction, I'm wondering if we might be able to actually go from -- thinking from the Santa Cruz perspective, going first Lexington, whatever Los Gatos, Campbell, a couple of towns that way just to create enough population because there is a whole lot of population in that San Mateo peninsula up there. But kind of go, a little bit -- not go San Jose, but just enough to keep it so there's San Jose's connected up the peninsula.

But actually come at it from that direction in terms of taking what you need to create the MIDCOAST and leaving the wealthier areas north, is kind of what I'm thinking.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Could you be a little more specific, what are you moving into a district, and what are you moving out of a district? What are you moving into --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I am moving say, I'm trying to move out of a district as much as say Mountain View, Palo Alto, Stanford, you know, those western areas. And move in -- I can't see the cities here, but the first, once you come up 17 and then it's Los Gatos -- yes, Los Gatos, Monte -- Cambrian, I see Saratoga going maybe if we have to, to Cupertino.

But Campbell maybe enough to leave to San Jose with Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, Mountain View, that sort of thing. And not having to take quite as much of -- essentially, I'm trying to put Woodside, Stanford back into the area and taking some of the southern cities, which are closer to the 17 and have more of a connection with Santa Cruz down, than the ones just up mid-peninsula.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Anderson.

Commissioner Yee, can you help us understand if this was something that was explored.

COMMISSIONER YEE: It was not explored. I understand the logic. My guess would be the populations
would not work out because those towns coming down the
mountain off 17 are pretty thinly populated, but we'd
have to take a look. We did not explore that.

By the way, just by my accounts, the tally was 7:3
for option number 3 over option number 1, with no votes
for option number two. 7:3.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, I think that I don't have
any -- I didn't note any preference from you or
Commissioner Ahmad, and I had not expressed any. And
other than that we have, I believe, Commissioner Le Mons
and Commissioner Vazquez who have not been engaged in
this discussion.

But my guess from that is that there's solid support
for 3, there's somewhat less support for 1, and as I say,
much less support for 2 or the original.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I think I am
okay standing behind 3, but I am also okay standing
behind what we originally had.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, thanks for -- thanks
for everyone for the discussion. I have been listening
and watching, both not familiar with this area and also
felt like there were a lot of ideas. I was tracking, I
think most of them.

I do see the wisdom behind option 3. Could be convinced that going back to where we were, the original version, I also see in that as well. So that's where I stand. And thanks for allowing me to check-in.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I'm actually kind of original and maybe try this other idea.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I think I prefer 3, but could live with the original.

CHAIR KENNEDY: That was 3 or the original?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, but preferring 3.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay. And I'm pretty solidly behind 3.

Tamina, could you, for us just get us a population estimate? Don't worry about picking up every little census block, but that area of Mountain View, Stanford, Woodside, Portola Valley, Palo Alto, we just need a population number for that. West Menlo Park, Atherton, that whole area.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Certainly, Chair. You'd like this whole --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.
MS. RAMOS ALON: -- area?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Doesn't have to include La Honda.

Just, as I say a rough population number, yes.

MS. RAMOS ALON: For these guys. Okay, no problem.

One moment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. We don't need areas that are already in GREATERED. Just the areas are currently in MIDCOAST.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: You know, you could almost leave Woodside and Portola Valley.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Woodside and Portola Valley are roughly 10,000 people.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Sorry, Chair, one moment, please. Chair, the highlighted area is 258,733 people.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. 258,733 if we excluded Woodside and Portola Valley, that would be roughly 10,000 less. So we're talking 250,000 in round numbers. And so could we then look at the -- in Santa Clara at Campbell, towards Lexington Hills, and give it a population number for Campbell, Los Gatos, Lexington Hills, Monte Sereno --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: And Saratoga.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- Saratoga.

MS. RAMOS ALON: The highlighted area, Chair, is
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So that's roughly half of the population of the other area.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I was just going to mention the original selection I think accidentally included East Palo Alto and some other part, so it wouldn't be quite that much, but still in that area.


COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Further thoughts, is this something worth exploring? Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Can I ask a clarifying question?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Where would you move Stanford, Woodside, Portola Valley? What is the proposal here?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Those were --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Or the exploration.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, those would have to come into GREATERED, and then the population would have to shift from GREATERED into Santa Clara, and then moving areas in the south out towards the MIDCOAST district.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I see. I see.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. To answer your question, Chair, I like iteration 3, and you asked about to continue to move forward. I don't want 2, no.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Toledo and then Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'm fine with iteration 3 and then moving forward. I'm also fine with what we had.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. As much as I appreciate what Commissioner Anderson is saying because I do agree, I think that's a concern, I don't think the solution is going to really help solve the issue. It's just going to create a different issue of the same kind because we are just swapping, basically, unlike communities with other unlike communities. Unless we were able to move it move north. I think if we're just moving it south, I don't think it's really going to solve the issue.

I'm comfortable with either way, but I mean, I do like and I appreciate the work that Commissioner Yee and Commissioner Ahmad did, so I'm ready to go with just 3.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you very much. So my sense is that we have a solid block that is happy to support iteration 3. So at this point, Tamina we will go with iteration 3.
MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, Chair. I will incorporate that back into our main map.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

MS. RAMOS ALON: And you can move into whatever area you like.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Could you speak up?

MS. RAMOS ALON: I said I will incorporate that into our main map. And then you can move to any other part of the State you like. That concludes the iterations from my area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. Thank you. Do we have other areas that you are responsible for that we need to look at?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Not at this time, Chair.

Okay. Ms. MacDonald, could you chime in and let us know where you think we could best use the mapper's time at this point?

MS. MACDONALD: Thank you for that question, Chair Kennedy. So Sivan is ready to take over, and I think Kennedy and Tamina have plenty of work to do while Sivan is mapping. So if you'd like to move over.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So with Sivan, we are going to mapping Senate?

MS. MACDONALD: If that's what you wish to do, yes that would be Senate in Southern California.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

MS. TRATT: All right. Hello, everyone. Good evening, or good afternoon I should say.

I just wanted to go over the Senate districts in Southern California. I worked on this offline and a little bit in collaboration as well with Commissioner Sinay. But I will just go ahead and walk through those changes. If anyone has questions or if Commissioner Sinay has anything to add, please feel free to jump in and interrupt me.

So just wanted to kind of, big picture, walk through some of the things that we were able to achieve. I'm not sure if Jaime has presented this swap yet. But as a refresher or to kind of present it to you now, this was the swap that was talked about at yesterday's meeting where we would move the northern portion of Upland and Rancho Cucamonga that had a lot of associations with the national forest just to the north into the SD210 district.

I'm not sure what the exact swap she made were here, but I think some population moved through the San Fernando Valley and then up through the Antelope-Victor Valley district. And Apple Valley was moved into the Antelope-Victor Valley.

So that's just some regional context as well because
that move is also what allowed the Coachella Valley to be reunited into the northern part rather than being split into three as it was in yesterday's iteration.

So moving back into the Inland Empire. We have had quite a bit of back and forth about these VRA districts. And yesterday we worked live the SBRC district was a little over 50.

We worked together to try and get it to 51. Offline I was able to try a bunch of different things, and the highest I was able to get it was 52.14, which is where it is currently, which I was quite happy with.

I'm not sure if Mr. Becker had additional comments on this district as it stands. But the Latino CVAP of POF was 54 yesterday. It remains at 54.

The only way that the Latino CVAP for SBRC was able to be strengthened was from splitting a small portion of Southern Fontana. That obviously reduced the Latino CVAP in (indiscernible), so to raise that back up to 54, I had to remove Grand Terrace and a portion of Colton.

So other than those changes the Latino CVAP remains the same, and it's just a slightly more negative deviation. But no extra areas were added.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Sivan.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. Thank you, Sivan.
Great work. I know this is a difficult area. In terms of -- we know about the Latino CVAP, but the African American CVAP the black CVAP, I think, that if memory serves me it either stayed the same or went up for SBRC; is that correct?

MS. TRATT: I believe that is correct. I don't have -- I don't believe I have what it was yesterday, but I do think that it went up at least for SBRC.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Do you have what it was in our draft maps?

MS. TRATT: I do, yeah. So SBRC -- and I would yes -- so the Latino and black CVAP are both slightly less than they were in the Senate drafts.

So they were 55.58 for SBRC and 14.63, currently 52.14 and 10.7. POF (ph.) is currently 54.1 and 12.75 for the black CVAP. And it was 57.1 and 8.25, so the black CVAP and POF has gone up significantly. And I do understand that there's potential crossover voting in this area so.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to add a couple of things. I think Sivan did a great job and in thinking through all the different COIs that we had in this area. As she said Coachella Valley is grouped twice instead of
grouped in three different districts. It's protecting the VRA -- all the different VRA districts and actually increasing the CVAP in some. And also the east Coachella Valley COI is with Imperial, which is part of SECA, but there's a lot of different competing COIs in this area plus the VRA areas, and I think she did a great job.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

MS. TRATT: Thank you so much. So obviously, that's just in an intro. The whole region is looking different, so I just wanted to start where it made most sense and also start in the order that I made these changes so that you can kind of see where some of the other structural changes came into play in other areas of the map.

So yeah. Obviously, first priority of SBRC was strengthening the Latino CVAP there for electing candidates of choice in that district. And then the second priority was looking to see if Coachella Valley and this COI, that is the cities of Palm Springs, Cath City, LGBTQ COIs, as proposed by Equality California, those areas are now intact and with the MCV district. So moving south, we have our SECA district, which goes and captures the Colorado River Basin, as well as, obviously, the Salton Sea. Looking closer at San -- the San Diego County portion of this district, we've
maintained this kind of southern link in the south part of the state that connects this and makes it a contiguous district, but also, I think, better pairs some of these more rural San Diego County cities with other areas of interest.

Additionally, it pairs Borrego Springs with Anza. Initially yesterday, we had looked at pairing Anza in the SECA district and actually for population, it made a lot of other things possible if we moved Borrego Springs up into the district with Anza. So understanding that the goal of having them together was initially to have that environmental COI with the Salton Sea, but still kind of respecting on Anza-Borrego as their own COI kind of together, separate from that.

So in the city of San Diego, the only changes that were made, so we brought in -- let me turn on the highways. So we brought in the rest of Barrio Logan, obviously. And then we moved in as well, some population from the southern portion of the City of San Diego.

Should I pause here? Are there questions so far? I don't want to get too into the explanation if there -- I see a hand, so --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Sivan. Yes?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think what's important here, Sivan, is talking about lowering the CVAP.
MS. TRATT: Yeah. So if you'll notice, a SECA is at fifty-nine percent Latino CVAP. It was over sixty percent yesterday. I know that there were some concerns for packing there, and obviously, noting that these are really large districts and pairing a lot of distinct communities. I think the way that SECA is now pairs several distinct communities together, but keeps those communities together. I don't think I'm explaining that very well, but hopefully you understand what I'm saying.

Moving north to this COR-CAJON district, we have another kind of similar case of kind of separate, distinctive communities of interest that might -- may or may not be communities of interest with each other, but are not split themselves. So, for example, we have Coronado paired with the downtown areas, as well as the coastal area of Point Loma and the LGBTQ COI areas of Kearny Mesa.

And then we also have the City Heights area over here. We have the Convoy Asian business district and the southern portion of the -- that Asian business COI. Those areas are paired with the cities of El Cajon, Granite Hills, Crest, Rancho San Diego, La Mesa, Spring Valley, La Presa, Lemon Grove. And we were able to keep all of these cities whole and keep El Cajon and Santee in separate districts.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: And just to clarify, it wasn't Kearny Mesa, but the LGBT community in Hillcrest.


COMMISSIONER SINAY: That's okay.

And it does have the Convoy district as well as the Linda Vista. So we weren't able to keep the whole -- the -- all the business COIs together because it's a large area. But we were able to kind of split it where it made sense. So Linda Vista and Convoy are together and then Kearny Mesa, Claremont, and some of the UTC is together.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Thank you so much for clarifying. Sorry. So just moving on from there, and I put on -- this is the whole Asian kind of business corridor COI. And we thought that splitting it at the 52 was kind of a natural border, and it was not going to be possible to keep it intact in a single Senate district, although I do believe we keep it intact in the congressional map. But preserving those kind of main areas and into two districts, I think, was better than how it was before.

Additionally, we had the coast of the City of San Diego split into three different districts previously. Now, it's only split into two. And the vast majority or the larger part of the coastal area in the City of San Diego.
Diego is paired with other northern coastal cities, as well as southern coastal cities in Orange County. So that's just kind of looking ahead.

There were no changes to the northern Orange County portion of this border. What did change slightly was this SD-POW-Escondido district. We -- in moving the some of the East County cities out of SECA wanted, I think, to make a more inland district. This previously went all the way from the coastline inland, which I think this iteration makes a lot more sense because it keeps this kind of 15 corridor COI intact, as well as some of the more rural East County cities, and a large portion of the City of San Diego, because we've split San Diego quite a few -- number of times. But I think the way that this is split makes a little bit more sense in terms of COI preservation than the previous iteration.

Are there any questions so far?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commission Akutagawa, did you have further questions?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Actually, I'll just reserve my questions for a little bit later. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: None. My apologies.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. TRATT: So yeah. So those --
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Besides telling Sivan she did a great job again, sorry.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Great.

MS. TRATT: Oh, thank you so much.

So those are the big picture changes in the San Diego County area. Some other changes. Again, we did not change how the districts in Orange County were looking. We did, like I mentioned earlier, bring in Borrego Springs to be with Anza, and that was to rebalance population in the SWRC district after the portion of the Coachella Valley that had previously been in this district was removed and also removed some population when we were working on SBRC.

So those are the main kind of structural changes. We obviously started looking at some of those community partner maps and what we heard from a lot of them was, you know, liking a lot of the pairings that had taken place in the Assembly maps. And so even though these aren't nested exactly from the Assembly maps, they take a lot of the same architecture from there, pairing it together for these Senate districts.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Yes, great job, Sivan. Can you just zoom out just a little bit, please?
MS. TRATT: Yeah. Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Let me turn the highways off.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I guess, the only thing I was noticing -- the numbers person in me, right -- is most of those districts are negative. So it looks like it's a negative -- overall negative ten or eleven percent. So LA must have absorbed the extra 100,000, or someone absorbed them. But I was just trying to see if there was anywhere else that we could possibly move population, but we keep getting negatives up there. That was my only comment. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sivan, I don't know if you wanted to say anything about that. My recollection is that both MCV and SECA were roughly eight percent under when we started. So I'm not surprised with these numbers. I think they are all within the allowable deviations. You know, and we could play around the margins. But I'm generally happy with this and I would be happy to support these districts.

Commissioner Fernandez, did you have anything further?

Okay. Commissioner --

MS. TRATT: The one -- oh, Chair, the one thing I would add, too, is that we -- I think we've been really
successful in keeping cities whole, for the most part, in these maps, aside from some of the splits that we made in these VRA areas in the Inland Empire. But obviously, those were for VRA concerns. But especially in the San Diego area, the way that we've able -- we've been able to keep cities together, if we -- I think it would be definitely possible to get the deviations a little bit closer to zero. But I think it would, again, involve potentially creating some unnecessary city splits.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, right.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thanks for your great work, Sivan.

I do have a question, and this is going to, I guess, kind of lead into a little bit of that LA County area. And I think I -- I'm looking for both clarification and perhaps just to see if something else needs to be done. We're getting a lot of COI testimony now about the combination of the San Gabriel Valley with the Inland Empire and concerns from a number of individuals from the Latino community, as well as the Asian community about feeling that their votes, particularly in that west San Gabriel Valley, that their votes as both the Latino and Asian community could be disenfranchised given the changes to the districts.
I believe it was previously a VRA district. And if possible, I'd just like to be able to see just a comparison, if we could. I don't know if that's possible to see, because I think in the quest to shift the VRA district, we may have also done potentially a disservice to the communities that were encompassed within the previous VRA district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you for that, Commissioner Akutagawa.

So anyone who wants to please take note of any numbers that you want to write down and compare to the November 10th drafts so that when we have the November 10th drafts up with these statistics, you can immediately understand what the differences are. So we'll wait for a minute or two for -- oh, that was handy.

MS. TRATT: Well, I can turn --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sivan, do that again.

MS. TRATT: -- if it's not that artificial. Okay. I can do magic. Let me -- I'm assuming -- Commissioner Akutagawa, I'm assuming you're talking about this SD10 West draft?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And that got combined with the Inland Empire. I think it's Riverside or San Bernardino.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. It was kind of merged, so the --
previously, POF was centered around Pomona, Ontario, Fontana. Now, it looks a little bit different and it's also, like you'd mentioned, combined with the San Gabriel Valley. I would ask Mr. Becker or VRA counsel to respond to the other part of your comment though, because I don't know if I can speak to the voting strength of folks in that area.

MR. BECKER: What's the specific question?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: We're getting COI testimony that the splitting off the west San Gabriel Valley is now doing -- is coming at the cost of both Asian and Latinos in the San Gabriel Valley to combine it -- to combine now a portion of it with the 210, but also the other portion with the Inland Empire.

MR. BECKER: So I'll just look. I'll just talk about the districts that are in front of us. These districts that comprise the VRA areas, including -- I think we're talking predominantly about -- are we talking about SD10WE right now, predominantly?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, I believe so.

MR. BECKER: Yes. That district, by every piece of evidence we've seen, adequately protects Latino voting interests in that area; that is, Latinos are protected by the Voting Rights Act in that area. I would also point out that most of the Voting Rights Act districts in these
areas in this latest iteration are at stronger levels
than the previous iteration. So you know, given the COI
testimony is significantly lower than VRA considerations,
I think the very considerations are nicely handled here
and credit to everyone who's worked on them so far.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: If I can perhaps ask, I
think from -- and I could be wrong. I mean, from my read
on the testimony, it's not so much about COI testimony
per se, but that the previous levels allowed more equal
protection for Latinos in both the SD10W, as well as the
Inland Empire. I think it's the POF areas or throughout
that -- what's currently more of the east San Gabriel
Valley. Yes. The voting strength has definitely
increased. But the way I'm reading the COI testimony is
that now those, particularly Latinos in the west San
Gabriel Valley, are also feeling like they've now been
left behind in that being combined into the 210 draft
disenfranchises them.

MR. BECKER: Yeah. I'm not seeing that at all. I
don't what kind of equal protection violation would be
here. What I'm seeing is the POF has very similar -- it
is lower in L-CVAP, but it also has overall pretty good
demographics for Latino -- to protect Latino voters in
that area. 10West is considerably better than it was
before, and 60 -- I don't know if I can see the previous
percentages on 60X605, but 60X605 adequately protects Latino voting rights in that area as well.

I think these -- I don't -- I -- there might be other considerations you want to take into account, but with regard to the top two criteria, which are equal population and Voting Rights Act compliance, these districts adequately protect those interests, the top two criteria.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Yes. I mean, the two things that I am picking up from the public input is there are San Gabriel Valley communities, particularly west San Gabriel Valley communities that feel that they are being left at the mercy of foothill communities, much more affluent foothill communities. Secondly, that communities in the Inland Empire don't care to be linked with Los Angeles County and vice versa. So those, to me, seem to be the two main strains of public input that we're getting on this district.

MR. BECKER: Chair, may I make just make a brief comment on that?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

MR. BECKER: I just want to stress again, these, I think, are the largest legislative districts anywhere in the country. They are nearly a million people. They're going to be a lot of areas linked with other areas that
don't look like those areas. And there's really no way to avoid that in Senate districts, particularly where you have large concentrations of population, as you do in LA, you know, going into San Bernardino -- the western parts of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, and then, of course, North Orange County as well.

So I definitely -- I'm not surprised you're getting that testimony. I think that's very likely to be a sincere feeling on the part of a lot of residents. But there's really no way to draw Senate districts in this area where there aren't going to be some areas that look a little different than other areas elsewhere in the district just because they're so large. There are nearly a million people.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Right. No. And I think that's a helpful reminder for us and for the public.

Commissioner Akutagawa, I'm sorry. Did you have anything further?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I mean -- Mr. Becker, so I just want to ask I'm looking at the SD60X60 -- 605, the SD10West. The one place where I guess we saw the greatest increase and it was at the cost of the 60X605, and I guess to a degree the 210 district. I guess, this is just what I was saying.

I think just instead of being able to ensure that
multiple communities could be better protected, where we're -- I guess we're seeing quite a -- in looking at the draft versus the actual numbers. Sivan, just for clarity, is the draft the old numbers? Maybe before I say what I'm going to say, maybe that -- if it -- if the draft is the old numbers, then I will stand down. Because then it's actually okay.

MS. TRATT: I'm sorry. What do you mean by the old numbers?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So you're seeing -- you're showing these drafts --

MS. TRATT: These in gray -- yeah. In gray --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Is that --

MS. TRATT: -- the gray labels with the gray lines are the November 10th Senate draft that the --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Got it. Okay.

MS. TRATT: -- Commission voted on.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

MS. TRATT: The darker labels are what is posted on the website as the current iteration for Senate, not official.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you. I stand down, then.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: We actually saw
improvements then. Sorry.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was looking at it the other way around.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I, again, share the concern. I've been really trying to ensure equity for everyone in the San Gabriel Valley. And I think that being said, as Commissioner Akutagawa noted, I think this current iteration strengthens the VRA district, particularly, you know, SD10West, as it relates to Latinos in this area. And so I just -- I'm not sure there was another way to do this. And by do this, I mean, I have a strong VRA district for Latinos who live in protected areas. And this was the map, I feel like, that kept the most communities together while also meeting our VRA obligations.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Thank you. I wanted to weigh in on this, because I know a lot of the testimony has been coming in with some very targeted attacks on the place where I live, actually, which is La Canada. So I just wanted to note that. You know, I
don't have a strong preference for where my city goes.
It could go anywhere, actually. It's not a strong
concern for me, and I certainly don't want my personal
preferences to weigh in here.

I wanted to note a couple of things, however.
Notably, we are hearing all of this testimony in what is
now this Senate map that pairs the Asian American
community of east San Gabriel Valley with a place like La
Canada Flintridge. We have the same exact pairing in our
congressional maps, but we never heard this concern. And
so I'm just kind of curious, if we're talking about
making a significant change to our Senate maps, does the
community have the same concern for our congressional
maps too? And should we blow that up as well?

I'll also just point out that La Canada, yes,
definitely is a more a higher-income area. It also
happens to have -- about thirty percent of the population
is Asian American. So I don't necessarily find it to be
a terribly strange pairing necessarily. But again, I
live there. And actually, if others want to change it,
I'm fine with that. If we want to keep it there, I'm
fine with that, too. I actually don't have a strong
preference there. But I just wanted to point out some of
the inconsistencies in the testimony that we're
receiving.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I guess I'll just address that, because I said the same thing yesterday. And so we did get responses in response to my comment. So what I was -- what I received or what I saw in the COI testimonies that I read was that on the federal level, the stewardship of the national forest is important and hence the advocacy for the communities.

I will say that one -- just doing a quick glance at the numbers and comparing them, the numbers for both Asian and Latino communities actually did go up. So that's why I feel pretty comfortable still continuing to support what we have. We also saw a strengthening in the VRA district. And then also I will say that the core cities that we received a lot of advocacy and community input on are kept together along with -- yes, there are other cities. But as we've been reminded, this is a very, very large district. So I think I will probably get a lot of, you know, unhappy people. But I think this is -- this, for right now, I think we're in the best interest of all right now. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you. Yeah. I
actually -- no. I'll keep my comments to myself. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you all.

So are we -- we're looking at this essentially as Los Angeles and all of southern California. So we're looking at this as Los Angeles, Orange County, San Diego County, Imperial County, Riverside County, San Bernardino County. Are we at a point where this is a map of the six counties of southern California that we are able to support?

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And I think I missed it, whenever we talked about it for congressional. But again, in this one, Upland and --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Rancho Cucamonga.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- Rancho Cucamonga are split. So I was wondering if we could maybe unsplit one of them so that they're at least both whole, if possible. Because the -- let's see -- the POF is a negative 4.52 and then the SD210 is a positive 4.7. So I was just wondering if the numbers would allow it? And I apologize, I don't have the numbers. So if you wouldn't mind -- if Sivan could maybe highlight it really quick?

That'd be great.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. And --
CHAIR KENNEDY: The numbers -- sorry, Sivan. The population of the cities is right below the city name.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. But I don't know --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- like, how much is above or below, if that makes sense.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Yeah, Chair -- and if I could also just respond to that, Commissioner Fernandez? So I believe the reason that the Upland and Rancho Cucamonga cities are split, I believe they're split like this in multiple other districts as well. The reason being that the folks who lived in the northern parts of these cities did have a lot of testimony talking about the forest and that was also the reason for Jaime working yesterday to move those areas into this SD210 district with the rest of the forest. So that was the thinking there.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

MS. TRATT: I'm happy to --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, you know what, Sivan?

MS. TRATT: -- take a look.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. I mean, that's fine. That was -- I don't remember that piece of it. And if that's the reason, that does make sense to me. So I'm
fine. I mean, I haven't gone back to see the communities of interest for Upland, other than they don't want to be next to -- or they want to be with Santa Clarita. That's all I had. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Sivan, could you zoom in a bit more on Upland and Rancho Cucamonga and put the highways on for us?

MS. TRATT: Yeah, absolutely. I was also just going to highlight it quickly. I just -- I haven't tried adding the rest in, so I would just want to watch the Latino and black CVAP numbers for this POF district to make sure that those weren't negatively impacted. But let me turn on the streets.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. While you're doing that, Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I did remember something. We did receive calls, that's right. I was reading the -- in our database, and I do remember that we did get calls from Rancho Cucamonga complaining that they were -- or stating that they were split in the Senate and Assembly twice and then congressional three times.

So it sounded like they preferred not to be split, but maybe they didn't want to be split, but included with the forest. I'm not sure. Thanks.
MS. TRATT: So I'll look at Rancho Cucamonga next.
If we added this northern portion of Upland that's split from POF, that would be moving almost 9,000 people. Both districts would stay within legal deviation. But it looks like the Latino CVAP for POF would drop from 54 to 53.71, and the black CVAP would drop slightly as well.

And let me just look at Rancho Cucamonga quickly.
So again, would lower the Latino CVAP even further to 52.65, and additionally lower the black CVAP to 12.43.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Great. No, thank you.
Thanks, Sivan. I appreciate it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.
Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Before we move on, I just wanted to bring back up the question.
Sivan, just since you're on the -- in the Inland Empire right now, I believe I heard you say that you were able to reunite or reduce the split for the LGBTQ community in the Coachella Valley?

MS. TRATT: Yes. So we have received a lot of testimony and some emails from Equality California specifically asking for the areas that would not be under VRA protection and consideration in this eastern southern portion of the Coachella Valley, but basically everything from La Quinta north to be together in a single district.
My understanding is that there’s a lot of, especially, elderly LGBTQ folks who are particularly vulnerable and living in homes in this area. And so it’d be largely to protect their voting interests.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: All right.

MS. TRATT: And previously, again, it was split three times. So the fact that we were able to make this split, obviously, to protect VRA concerns and then keep the rest intact as a single COI.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Wonderful. Thank you. The other -- one other question that I wanted to ask about since we’ve received even more testimony now is -- well, one is around the Glendale, Burbank, Montrose, La Canada Flintridge, La Crescenta area. And I just wanted to see -- there was concerns from the Armenian community. And it looks like everything except for Burbank is included. But Burbank is a lot of people, so that may not be possible to fix.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. I would have to defer to Jaime for the specifics in this region, but I do think that moving Burbank into this SD210 district would cause quite a big ripple in this area, as that is over 100,000 people.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Okay. That’s it, Chair. The only other one was around the Calabasas area,
but I'll wait for Jaime then since --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- yeah. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Thank you. Sivan, Encanto and Paradise Hills split between COR-CAJON and SECA. Can I see the area and the populations there?

There was -- there is COI testimony desiring to keep Paradise Hills and Encanto together. I don't think -- I want to see if either of them are really large places and see what happens if we move them both into COR-CAJON.

MS. TRATT: So I believe that Paradise Hills is right here. Encanto is right here. I would definitely be able to look at -- I had a different iteration where I just grabbed more population north of Imperial Ave., rather than just north of Bonita. So I can definitely look at making that swamp, if you would like to explore that now.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. And not so much a swamp. I'm looking to see if we can bring Paradise Hills in with COR-CAJON.

MS. TRATT: Right. Right.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Okay.

MS. TRATT: So that would be just --
COMMISSIONER TURNER: I see.

MS. TRATT: -- moving this population in Paradise Hills back into COR-CAJON --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Um-hum.

MS. TRATT: -- and then instead grabbing more population kind of north of where this line moves.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Let me start exploring that change. I'm just going to move this population out first to see how many folks we'll need from this area. One moment, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Sivan.

Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

We are three minutes from break, so this is -- we can see how this plays out before we go to break. If Sivan needs additional time, we would be back at 5 o'clock.

Yes, Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sivan, I'm not sure if -- if we do that swap, I think it's better just to see if we can move the -- move in Paradise Hill, because I think that area, unless I'm mistaken, that's also part of this COI, the southeastern San Diego COI. And the reason we had agreed -- you know, we had looked at a lot of this to try to figure out, is that we had received requests in the
past from National City to be with Paradise Hill, because there's a lot of crossover relationships with those two communities. But we had split them in every single map but this.

So I do think it's worth exploring to see if it fits into to the El Cajon -- Coronado, El Cajon. But just I don't think the swap is -- might be the best decision. We'll have to see, because I think we continue to split the community.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay, so let's go ahead and get the population in Paradise Hills and South Bay Terraces and see what it is.

MS. TRATT: Well, so I could leave South Bay Terraces in and just take Paradise Hills, if you think that that South Bay Terraces is more closely associated with Bonita. I guess the other thing we could look at would be removing this area and trying to bring Encanto down into SECA, although it sounds like they would rather be in the COR-CAJON district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. First step, we need to know the population in Paradise Hills.

MS. TRATT: Yes. Yeah. One moment, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And we need the pending changes box.

MS. TRATT: Yes. Let me bring that back right here. And I will just -- okay. So it looks like that would be
moving -- and let me just make sure that I exclude any
portions of National City that I might have grabbed by
accident and Bonita.

Okay. So just grabbing this San Diego city
population in these two neighborhoods would be about
35,000 people. So why don't I go ahead and move this
out?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Hold on. Hold on. Let me navigate
this for a second.

So Commissioner Sinay, does it make sense to move
both of these in or does it make sense to move only the
Paradise Hills portion in?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, here's the challenge,
look at the -- the Latino CVAP is high again. It's up to
sixty --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- sixty percent. I mean, I
think my gut has always said that moving this in along
with the Lincoln Park area is, you know, keeping that
whole southeast San Diego COI together. But we were
instructed to try to bring in parts of San Diego that
would balance the population and balance the COI -- I
mean, the CVAP.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So then, Sivan, can you
remove the Bay Terraces portion from the selection?
MS. TRATT: Yeah. So I don't have official
neighborhood boundaries --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Let me just do it.

MS. TRATT: -- but just looking --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: -- Whitman Street --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: -- maybe all -- that's -- Okay. Great.

Just wanted to double check and one moment while I
remove --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So that now has us within
deviation in both districts. SECA, L-CVAP is below sixty
percent. Does the --

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, they've been asking for
Paradise Hills to be moved in with Encanto, not Bay
Terrace.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And so that's what is currently
selected.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Thank you. Sorry.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. And this would, as Chair Kennedy
just mentioned, this would not require an equal
population swap, so we could move this population in and
then -- and leave it if Commissioners felt happy with
that change.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. So that's now my question.
Commissioner Akutagawa?

Well, we're over time for break, so let's break and
I'll take questions when we get back from break at 5
o'clock, or 5:02 now. So we are on break until 5:02.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 4:48 p.m.
until 5:01 p.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your
patience during our mandatory break. We are back. We
are currently discussing Senate districts in Southern
California. We left off with a pending change along the
southeastern edge of the COR-CAJON district in San Diego.
We have a selection highlighted in red here that would
take our population in COR-CAJON from 1.83 percent over
the target population to 4.28 percent over the target
population. This is still within acceptable deviation
ranges.

The SECA population would go from negative 0.11
percent to negative 2.56 percent. Again, still within
acceptable deviations. The Hispanic CVAP in SECA would
go from 59.11 to 59.55. The Hispanic CVAP in COR-CAJON
would go from 22.53 to 22.95.
Just wanted to get the reaction from Commissioners on this pending change. Commissioner Turner is not in the room.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No. My comment was related to a different issue.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Do we have any objection to making this change in southeastern San Diego? Okay.

Sivan, can we go ahead and commit this, please?

Thank you.

MS. TRATT: All right. That change is committed.

Let me zoom out. One moment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And Commissioner Turner has returned.

Commissioner Turner, I don't know whether you wrote down your question before break.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I think --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Your hand wasn't up, Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- what we were looking at was the switch by adding Encanto and Paradise into COR-CAJON, and I think that matched or balanced or something when I left. But we were going to still talk about it, I think.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. The switch of Paradise Hills, we have moved that from SECA into COR-CAJON. Our
population deviations are still within acceptable ranges.
So are there any further questions on this at this point?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: No. That's beautiful. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent. Thank you.
Commissioner Taylor, your question?
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Nothing earth shattering. I just wanted to provide a little bit of context as we were talking about that Upland-Rancho dividing line.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I believe that when we created that, it was to increase both the Latino CVAP and African American CVAP in those communities of interest. Hence, any movement lowers them both. And I think that's what it proved out. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.
Any further questions on -- well, we'll exclude LA for now -- on the other counties in southern California, Orange County, San Diego County, Imperial County, Riverside County, San Bernardino County.

Sivan, if you would be so kind, just walk us around those five counties one more time so that we can marvel at your handiwork?

MS. TRATT: Absolutely, Chair. Here's Orange County, and then moving south into San Diego County, and
then into Imperial County, Riverside, and San Bernardino.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, thanks. Can we just zoom back real quick to Orange County? I know we'd -- you know, yesterday when we were working, we were predominantly focused on VRA districts, so we looked at and improved on the SAA district. I'm actually interested in the Costa Mesa COI with Irvine.

Was there ever an attempt to try and get Costa Mesa in Irvine back together? It wasn't something -- I don't believe we had a chance to discuss that area yesterday. So I just wanted to raise that and see if there are options to bring that in?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So just from localizing sort of ripple effects, as we love to call it, standpoint, moving Costa Mesa in which is a little over 100,000 people in with this IOC district, I think it would make most sense to swap out population from the Lake Forest, Mission Viejo, Laguna Hills area to kind of limit that to a two-district swap. Did you have another idea of how to accomplish that or did that sound like something you wanted to explore?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That sounds reasonable to me, depending on how the rest of the Commission feels on
it. Yeah. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: That strikes me as reasonable.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Actually, I would then advocate more for a three-district swap and then bringing in Dana Point and/or San Clemente if the numbers bear, and then move -- then that way then you shift over, like, maybe either Trabuco Canyon or Mission Viejo. And yeah. Maybe Mission Viejo and into the SOC-NSD, so that you're keeping at least those inland counties in there. And then the connection to Camp Pendleton will be through Rancho Mission Viejo.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Got it. Got it. So I think we can spend a few minutes exploring this. And so I think my thinking on this would be -- and Sivan, tell me if this is not the right way to go about it -- if we moved Costa Mesa into IOC, move Mission Viejo into SOC-NSD and then look at moving Dana Point, San Juan Capistrano, and San Clemente into N-OC-COAST.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. I think that would --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Or at least two of those.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. I think that makes a lot of sense. And, obviously, I think, if I'm understanding the larger goal being to create a coastal district --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct.
MS. TRATT: -- probably Dana Point and San Clemente, trying those two first --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

MS. TRATT: -- before going north into San Juan Capistrano.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yep.

MS. TRATT: There may be some city splits with this just -- but I had not tried this. So if you'll go on this journey with me now, I'm happy to play that out.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. I think we might be able to fit it within allowable deviations. So let's go ahead and try this.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Perfect. I will start that now. And Commissioners can keep an eye on the pending changes as well as I do that.

Commissioner Akutagawa, do you have a preference of where we bring additional population in from?

I think Laguna Hills has a bit of a weird shape in this kind of noncontiguous area. So I think it might make sense to split this kind of separate area of the city if we -- because otherwise, it would make more sense to add in Laguna Woods as well, and that would be a --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: -- probably too much population.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I think it'd be --
MS. TRATT: Otherwise, we could look at Trabuco Canyon would be another option. But I know that Trabuco Canyon, Modjeska, Silverado, that would be kind of separating.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: So we --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I think try -- let's try the Laguna Hills split for right now and see how that works.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Sounds good.

(Pause)

MS. TRATT: Perfect. So it looks like this swap was successful. If I add Dana Point and San Clemente, just these coastal cities, the deviation of SOC-NSD would be negative 1.83, N-OC-COAST would be at a negative 0.6 percent deviation, and IOC is at a 1.78 percent deviation. So really great deviations for that three-district swap.

Again, keeping together Costa Mesa and Irvine and then bringing in Dana Point and San Clemente for an all-OC Coastal district and tying Rancho Mission Viejo in with Camp Pendleton for the north Orange -- excuse me, north San Diego County District.

So I'm --

CHAIR KENNEDY: I am -- I'm happy with this.
Commissioner Taylor, did you have comment?
Any further comment from Commissioners?
Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I like this. I just have one little question. What is the blue city that is between, like, Laguna Hills and Laguna Niguel -- it's that little one to the west? Yes. What is that?

MS. TRATT: Aliso Viejo.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I mean, does that make more sense going to does that make sense going -- well, it's fifty-two.

MS. TRATT: So that would --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Does that make more sense going with the Inland and start at the San Juan Capistrano, going with San Clemente and Dana Point?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Thank you so much for that question. I can definitely explore that. I think in the first round of making these swaps, it was kind of going in a clockwise motion between these three districts. And we already moved to Costa Mesa out from this coastal district, which is why we pulled Laguna Hills in --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Um-hum.

MS. TRATT: -- rather than Aliso Viejo. But if you would like me to explore making the swap for Aliso Viejo and San Juan Capistrano, I would be happy to visualize
that for Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I don't know. I
was -- I've always thought they were a little more
closely related, but Commissioner Akutagawa is more
familiar with that area or someone else. I mean, does
that make sense?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Yeah. It -- I think
it -- yeah, it could work. I mean, Aliso and Laguna
Woods and Laguna Hills have a close relationship and San
Juan Capistrano also has a close relationship with, like,
Mission Viejo and Ladera Ranch. But I think it also has
close relationships with San Clemente, too. So I
think -- let's see what that looks like.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yep. Let's see what it looks like,
Sivan. Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Yeah, absolutely. One moment while I
complete this population trade.

CHAIR KENNEDY: No. San Juan Capistrano was in the
Inland -- yeah.

MS. TRATT: Yes. So now San Juan Capistrano is with
San Clemente, Dana Point, Laguna Niguel, and Laguna Beach
in this N-OC-COAST district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I just was trying to be clear,
Aliso Viejo, did we move it out of the coastal?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Because, you know, we do have COI testimony requesting that it's in the coastal district. So I'm wondering if that was response to coastal or just something we thought we were cleaning up. Looking at -- what's the number on this little thing here?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. You know, now that I'm looking at this, I'm just kind of thinking just from a compactness, I guess, maybe it's not super compact. But I think leaving San Juan Capistrano in would be better because of its closer proximity, because it is part of the San Diego district. And I think leaving Aliso back in the North OC District --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- would make more sense.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Yep.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, Aliso would go into the Coastal District --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Um-hum.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- and San Juan --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- goes back to the --

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- would go back into the SOC-NSD.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So --

MS. TRATT: Right. Both coastal districts, one would be an OC-based coastal district and one would be a largely San Diego-based coastal district. But both are mostly coastal COIs that are kept intact.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. TRATT: Just to clarify.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. And Aliso Viejo has more closer connections to would be -- to -- closer to OC. San Juan -- they would -- I know that they would say the same thing too, but they're just from a proximity -- they're just a little bit closer down to San Diego.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. TRATT: Chair, should I go ahead and swap those back?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, hold on just a second.

Commissioner Turner, did you have anything else?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Nope, just reading the COIs.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Akutagawa, you're finished? Okay.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can we scan out a little bit and see the San Diego side of this? Thanks. That's
exactly what I thought. I would actually rather keep San Juan Capistrano because that actually equalizes the two sides more in that — on the San Diego side, it's not — you know, you've got Carlsbad and — I mean, you have Oceanside and Vista and San Juan Capistrano has some in common with them.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So you'd like to go back to what we — to the previous iteration? Okay. And Commissioner Akutagawa, your thought on that?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I would agree. I think putting -- reversing it --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- going back to what we had. San Juan Capistrano would be in the SOC-NSD and then Aliso Viejo would be in the North OC-COAST district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Any objection to reversing that change? Okay.

Sivan, yeah, please proceed.

MS. TRATT: All right. That change is complete, Chair. Thank you so much.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So again, SOC-NSD deviation negative 1.83 percent, North OC-COAST deviation negative 0.6 percent, Inland Orange County deviation 1.78 percent. All of those deviations are within acceptable ranges.

Any further comments, questions, requests on the
five southern California counties other than Los Angeles? Okay. Seeing none, I am going to mark this one as completed and able to be passed on to Commissioner Fernandez to lead the discussion over the weekend on any final refinements.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. Seeing what we've done in Orange County, what seems -- I'm tempted once again to revisit the -- bringing in the 78 corridor, because I think it would have more in common. But I'm just saying it out loud for you all to say to me, no, we're fine. It's --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sivan, if you -- yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- Oceanside, Carlsbad, Vista, San Marcos, and Escondido versus -- Yeah. Because we have a coastal city and very wealthy communities connected to Oceanside and Vista. It's kind of a mix right now. And it would go with the COI that we've been hearing a lot about. And that's the only reason I'm bringing this up, is just that we created an inland district. I mean, San Clemente is important to the base because that's where the military families live and go to school, but most of them, I think, are in Oceanside.

So anyway, I'm okay either way. I'm just bringing
it up because I don't want to just leave any stone not
turned -- whatever the right word is.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And if we had a population
overage in SD-POW-ESC, you know, that might be more
easily done. We are getting close to maximum negative
deviation already. So moving San Marcos out, we'd then
set off a ripple and have to figure out where to get that
population from.
Commissioner Fernandez?
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I was trying to
figure out how to make it work. But yeah, you're right,
because that's negative. And then we've got that
population in the Orange County. So I'm just talking out
loud right now. So I'm done. Thanks.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.
Commissioner Sadhwani?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Before we move on, I
just wanted to go back and double check our VRA districts
in the area. We had received -- we've received testimony
today, and I recall a caller last night also specifically
suggesting that the SAA district, we had raised it -- we
were under fifty percent before, and I know that we had
worked to increase that. But community testimony is
suggesting it needs to be even higher and the request is
to raise it a full percentage point. So I just want to
raise that.

There was some concern also raised about the SD60X605 just north of there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- about raising that one percentage point as well, so I just want to raise that and see what we're thinking.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I don't know if counsel wants to weigh in on it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Great. Thank you for that, Commissioner Sadhwani.

After we finish with Sivan, I'm going to ask Jaime to join us. But right now, we're focusing on Sivan's area, which is the five other counties of southern California. The discussion here of SAA is timely.

Sivan, could you please put on the heat map? And then I'll ask Commissioner Akutagawa for her question or comment?

MS. TRATT: Chair, can I comment just really quickly? I turned on --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. TRATT: -- the Senate labels. I just wanted to point out that SAA in the Senate draft was 45 percent Latino CVAP is now 50.56, which was, I believe, the same
as some of the community-submitted maps were able to achieve in this area.

Additionally, this 60X605 was at 51.09 and it's currently at 55.31. So I just wanted to point that out quickly and let me turn on the heat map. Sorry for interrupting.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. No, I appreciate that. And in fact, actually, last night when the caller had called in, I did go back and look at the maps that have been submitted by the People's Redistricting Alliance and had seen the same. So I don't know if there's little areas that we can pick up still or not. I see that SAA is underpopulated, so I figured I would at least raise it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. No, it's an excellent point. And I'm looking there in the southwestern corner of Orange, and I know that we were we were very proud of having kept Orange whole. But maybe we need to look at moving that. It almost looks like a dog head or a kangaroo head from the southwestern corner of Orange into SAA, and see what that does for us.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I think there may be some hunting and pecking to be done in Orange, but -- and
also I would also suggest that little corner of Anaheim. I also want to point out that Stanton is also a possible area. You don't see the red on there, but it would also unite, I believe, a Arab American COI or a Middle East Muslim South Asian COI as well, too. If we don't take the whole thing, at least a portion of it could be another option that I just want to suggest.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we see that taking that area of Orange would actually decrease the Latino CVAP. So that was not a successful exploration.

Let's try that area of Anaheim. Well, I don't know whether it's technically west Anaheim, but let's give it a try.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Could you also zoom in so that we could see the streets in the area, too?

MS. TRATT: Sorry. I was on mute. But yes, let me turn on the Google map. It's a little obscured with the heat map. Can I turn the heat map off momentarily?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Momentarily, yes.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Just so you all can orient yourselves.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we see --

MS. TRATT: So we were looking at adding more of Anaheim in this kind of --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct.
MS. TRATT: -- skinny portion right here? Okay.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct.
MS. TRATT: Let me turn the heat map back on, and I'll turn the base map off. So moving more population in from the City of Anaheim would have a slightly negative effect on SAA's Latino CVAP. It would become 50.53, currently at 50.56.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we will abandon this one and we will next look at Commissioner Akutagawa's suggestion to explore moving Stanton from SAA into -- where'd it go? Sorry. From N-OC-COAST into SAA.
MS. TRATT: So it looks like that is also driving our Latino CVAP in the wrong direction.
Chair, if I may, what was really successful in raising the Latino CVAP in some of the other VRA areas was actually removing population. And I was looking at this corner of Placentia that's split. Perhaps we could look and see what it would look like if we place this corner of Placentia back with the IOC?
CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. Yes. Let's explore that.
MS. TRATT: So not quite. It looks like that still lowered it to 50.43, and also would leave us needing to add additional population, so --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we will --
MS. TRATT: -- (indiscernible). I retract my
suggestion.

Is there any other exploration in this district that Commissioners would like to see live?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I mean, I can certainly just mention the -- what has been submitted to us, but I think a lot of this would be challenging given that we just built out that whole coastal district. But some of it is moving Cerritos and Artesia into the OC-COAST district, moving Buena Park south of the 5 freeway from SAA into the North OC-COAST. So you know, to your point, Sivan, perhaps portions of Buena Park could be lowering that CVAP.

Another suggestion, which I think we've already done, because I don't think we have much of any of Orange in there, but you can correct me if I'm wrong. Moving orange west of North Glassell Street from SAA into IOC. I think we've done that already, haven't we?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So there's no portion of Orange.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right.

MS. TRATT: Another thought that we could explore would be moving -- and again, this is in two different districts, so I'm not sure that it would work out with the deviations --
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Um-hum.

MS. TRATT: -- but we could look at removing more of Garden Grove and adding more of this portion of Orange, which I think would potentially help.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

MS. TRATT: Is that something --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm definitely open to anything with that goal of increasing. My understanding, actually, when we had worked on this and other maps, was that actually that portion of Garden Grove did have a high proportion of Latinos in it, but I am happy to explore.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And we had heard from folks in Little Saigon that they were interested in moving Garden Grove east of Euclid out of the district with Little Saigon. So that would seem to be the line or a line to explore.

Commissioner Sadhwani, did you have anything further?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: The last one was move Brea and the surrounding unincorporated areas from IOC into the SD60X605. That's to --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- increase that one, so sorry.
CHAIR KENNEDY: I think we might, once we look at eastern Garden Grove, we might go to your suggestion of exploring moving far southern portions of Buena park and seeing if that makes a difference.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I think would.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So -- but let's explore the far eastern portion of Garden Grove first, followed by the far southern portion of Buena Park.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I was just going to suggest Brea, but that's just another piece of it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I was going to suggest grabbing some of Whittier. It's very -- seems to be very densely populated. But that's jumping into LA.

MS. TRATT: Chair, should I start with the Garden Grove Orange?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. If you can zoom into that area of eastern Garden Grove. We had already tried that that kind of dog's head corner of Orange, and that was depressing the number. So I'm wondering, are we -- is either of those lines -- the north-south lines in Garden Grove at Euclid already?

MS. TRATT: All right. Let me --
CHAIR KENNEDY: You can turn off the heat map for now.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Thank you. Let me turn off the field for the cities as well, just so we can see that a little bit better.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Euclid is to the west.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Yes. This does not appear to be split on Euclid.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. So Euclid is right there. Yeah. So let's check and see if we move that -- the rest of that segment from North OC-COAST into SAA, that is east of Euclid.

MS. TRATT: Oh, so you -- oh, my suggestion had been to move the line further in this direction, but you're saying move it back to Euclid?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Okay. Yes. Let me try that now. One moment, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: The Little Saigon community has been suggesting that Euclid is a better dividing line. So I wanted to explore that.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And my understanding is that that portion of Garden Grove is, you know, disproportionately Latino, not necessarily as Vietnamese.

CHAIR KENNEDY: It didn't help our numbers at all.
Oh, okay. So we abandon this one and I think SAA, you know, we've gone around, and -- oh, we -- the next is to look at the very southern portion of Buena Park.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No. I was just going to suggest the southern portion of Buena Park. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Yeah. Thank you.

And Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I noticed that there's a corner in Fullerton up near La Habra, too, that had, like, a lot of red. So that may be also a small portion to try to look at.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Let's do southern Buena Park first, and then we'll do that piece of -- we'll look at that piece of Fullerton next.

MS. TRATT: So Chair, just to clarify, it was moving a small section of southern Buena park out from SAA into N-OC-COAST; is that --

CHAIR KENNEDY: That's --

MS. TRATT: -- what the directions were?

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- that's the idea, yes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. South of the 5 freeway.

MS. TRATT: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: South of --
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- of the 5.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- of the 5. So let's start with trying south of the 91.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. And even much that might be a little bit too much, but let me --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: -- let me see how much we can add. One moment, please.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm noticing that a lot of the entertainment areas are actually there. That's what we would be taking out. Can we just look at this area a little bit more broadly? Is the Latino CVAP on?

CHAIR KENNEDY: It's going up.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So Commissioners can watch. This is the Latino CVAP for SAA.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Got it. I'm just thinking about our conversation earlier about resources being inside of communities. And I recall, in particular, a lot of the testimony from this area was that these are workers in the -- these -- this entertainment zone. So then taking them out, you can taking out the driving factors. But that's okay. Let's explore it, because our VRA considerations are the first priority.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We've got it over fifty-one.
MS. TRATT: Just trying to remove population north of the 91. How -- so if we added this population in from Buena park, it would raise the Latino CVAP to fifty-one percent, and we would still be within our deviation of plus or minus negative -- or plus or minus five percent. Excuse me.

I could probably add a little bit more -- or add in -- being removing a little bit more population and keep it under five. But I would ask to see how folks are feeling about moving in this direction before I do that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I think in general we're feeling good, Sivan. Could you grab that one little block at the far southeastern corner of the highlighted area? That little -- yeah. Right there. Okay.

So Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Can we see just the whole area, just for context? Okay. So a couple of things that I just want to mention, I think to build a little bit upon what Commissioner Sadhwani was saying. It's looking like we're -- it's not really a one percent change. It's a tenths of percentages change. And the reason why I'm going to say this is that, to her point, that entertainment area, that's Knott's Berry Farm, that's Medieval Times, that's what used to be the wax museum. I don't think it's that anymore. But there's
also another one of those dinner theater -- pirate's

dinner theater kind of places alongside there.

Within the remainder of Anaheim, it also includes
Disneyland. And I'm just thinking that from a -- you
know, from a representation perspective, whether or not
it just makes sense for all of that to be in together.
Since the Disneyland area is also included in the same
district. And also where a lot of the individuals who
would work in those areas as hourly workers and others
live in and around that area, whether it would be better
for them to all be combined in one area so that they can
also hopefully help create, you know, different kinds of
policy changes that will help the people who live in that
area. So just a thought.

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Right. Thank you for that,
Commissioner Akutagawa.

My understanding is that that would be a community
of interest consideration where we're considering a VRA
consideration.

Mr. Becker, do you have anything to say on this?

MR. BECKER: Yeah, I just say I think all -- COI
testimony, obviously is relevant, but VRA considerations
are more relevant, and this is an area where the
percentage of Latino CVAP is on the lower end and it is a
VRA -- it is a district that comprises some significant
VRA areas with regard to the Latino community.

  So look, this is this is nearly a half of a percentage point boosted, which is significant. I mean, anything boosting it up is significant at this point and should take -- given the constitutional criteria, priority level should take precedence over communities of interest.

  CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much for that.

  Commissioner Akutagawa?

  COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Just a question.

  Can we look up at that La Mirada, East Whittier area? And I'm wondering, would we be better off -- or would it make sense -- I know it would take away a little bit from the 60X605, but would it be better to take a little bit from there and then also widen that neck a little bit at the same time?

  CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Then let's all remember where we are on this one. We don't need to commit it quite yet. Let's go ahead and explore up in La Mirada, East Whittier, La Habra, and the other one was in southwest Fullerton -- or where in Fullerton, was the --

  COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yep.

  CHAIR KENNEDY: -- area that you wanted to explore?

  COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It's that upper northeast
corner, La -- yeah. Right there. Do you see that little red dot, or the square? Yeah. Right there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So if you can have the -- keep the pending changes box up for us to see, and let's hunt and peck a little bit and see what we can do in this area.

MS. TRATT: That's a really good way of putting it? It's hunting and pecking; isn't it?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. TRATT: Yes. One moment while I explore those changes, Chair. Looks like it brought it down to 50.55 from 50.56.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. TRATT: This is the only area that you were interested in, correct, Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. That's correct. And it didn't make a difference.

MS. TRATT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

MS. TRATT: And then next, would you like me to look at La Mirada?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Do you see that little -- I don't know. It looks like a hat or a ship or something. Yeah. Right there.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So unfortunately, it looks like
that is lowering the Latino CVAP as well.

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Okay. Does it make any sense to
explore that area to the north of south and East Whittier
between the city boundaries and Highway 72?

MS. TRATT: Absolutely. I can look at that right
now.

So it looks like that actually would raise the
Latino CVAP slightly in SAA to 50.7. Looking at the
Latino CVAP in 60X605, it would lower from 55.31 to
55.26, as this is also a VRA district that we would be --

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Right.

MS. TRATT: -- pulling population from.

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Okay. And how are we -- okay. So
on deviations, we're still doing well. Can you extend
that out to the western end of the South Whittier city
boundary?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Where my --

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Yes.

MS. TRATT: -- cursor is?

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Correct. Correct.

MS. TRATT:  Yes, absolutely.

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Okay. So Mr. Becker, we have
explored in this area, and this gets us to virtually the
same place on the CVAP in SAA. That has brought down the
CVAP in SD60X605, but it's still over fifty-five. So we
have SD60X605 at over fifty-five percent. We have SAA at over fifty-one percent, and we are within permissible deviations. And we will --

MR. BECKER: So I'd just say briefly --
CHAIR KENNEDY: -- and we've widened that neck.
MR. BECKER: Yeah. So I don't think the neck is really a concern there. That is --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.
MR. BECKER: -- I mean, you've grabbed populations that are in proximity to each other. You haven't bypassed other populations. I don't think that's a significant legal compactness concern.

I'm just not sure why you would why you would reduce Latino CVAP in a VRA area to boost it to a level that is slightly lower than you could gain by not touching the VRA area for --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.
MR. BECKER: -- for COI reasons, which again, I can't stress this enough, because it comes up a lot and we're in the home stretch. COI is significantly lower than VRA and equal population considerations.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay. So the bottom line is we achieved virtually the same thing in two different ways, one of which did not materially impact the Latino CVAP in the other district, whereas this one did. Am I
understanding that correctly?

MR. BECKER: Yeah. I think that's right. And if I'm recalling correctly, I don't remember the exact percentage, but I think this is actually lower in SAA by -- I mean, not by a lot, by hundredths or maybe a tenth of percentage --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Two hundredths.

MR. BECKER: Yeah. But again, given that at best it's equal, and you've touched a VRA district and reduced it slightly, whereas the other alternative doesn't do so at all. And it was only -- it was being done for a much lower priority criteria. I mean, I would advise whenever possible don't reduce the VRA area where -- when you don't have to. And you've now demonstrated you don't have to do that.


Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. You know, earlier, Chair, I was trying to give you the testimony that also was about both SAA and this district, 60X605. The testimony was to increase both of them. So I certainly would not support this change.

I would prefer to do the Buena Park change in order to boost that CVAP in SAA. Because as Mr. Becker just
laid out, right? We're taking from one VRA district, which we've had testimony to improve and just adding it to another. So my preference would be the Buena Park swap.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I'm almost thinking, at this point, maybe taking out more of Buena Park, actually, and swapping for other portions of lesser L-CVAP areas. And I believe we looked at Orange and a couple of other places.

It does seem like there's a lower Latino CVAP in Buena Park, and that might actually help us to raise the L-CVAP even more than fifty-one percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Just an idea. And I'm just throwing it out there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So you would underpopulate SAA and then go elsewhere to find population to replace it?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: That's correct.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I would be looking for a swap.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So Sivan, can we go back to that area in Buena Park and take that initially?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Chair, I was also going to ask, there is this southern, kind of tail portion of the City of Buena Park.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. TRATT: Can -- should I first explore maybe moving from more of the southern part that wouldn't be in these entertainment areas to see what effect that would have?

CHAIR KENNEDY: You know, there's that north-south street, I can't quite make it out. Just below where it says Berry.

MS. TRATT: Right here?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: This is Knott Avenue.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So I'm thinking we explore using that as the boundary, the 91 as the northern boundary, and going all the way down to the southern boundary of Buena Park and seeing what that gives us.

MS. TRATT: Just --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Chair?

MS. TRATT: -- one moment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I was just going to suggest -- I think when we looked at this previously, it wasn't a huge area that gets us to underpopulation pretty quickly.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: It seems like perhaps, I don't know Cypress College very well, but it looks like we're right there on the border. And certainly, as we've looked at other places, we've tried to keep colleges together. I'm wondering if we use the street just above it as a starting point. Yeah, Crescent Avenue. And then come downward to that corner. Yeah. And at least start there and then work for further north.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, my sense is and this is building on what Commissioner Toledo said, his suggestion was that we could afford to underpopulate SAA, and then look to bring in population from perhaps Orange or somewhere else. So I'm not concerned right now about keeping the deviation within the five percent.

And so if we if we took Knott Avenue up to the 91, all the way to the southern boundary, let's see what the population of that is. Let's see how far underpopulated we'd be at that point, and look at where we might make that up.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Let's try it.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I almost did a Toledo there. I was going to just say a couple of things. One, I don't know if Orange is going to make that much of a difference. We already saw that it wasn't.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And I'm a little hesitant to take it. I mean, it's -- I mean, to be honest, I mean, this is already going to be a huge district and we know it is. I'm wondering if, from a compactness point of view, since we know that the tradeoffs are going to be probably minimal to zero, if we're better off just leaving it as it is.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Leaving Orange as it is?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. And just taking away the portion of Buena Park that gets us up to the fifty-one percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. TRATT: Chair, I have highlighted in red this selection that was requested.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, actually, the idea was to bring Knott Avenue all the way down to the south.

MS. TRATT: So that would be cutting into the City of Orange. I'm happy to --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Oh, okay.

MS. TRATT: -- (indiscernible) as well. But it does -- the border is at Knott Avenue within the City of Buena Park.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And I actually saw that at one point we had it at 51.8. So I don't know exactly where we were when it got to 51.8. But perhaps it's worth -- I don't know if you recall which order you did things in, but I'm backing up a couple of steps and seeing if we get it back up to the 51.8.

MS. TRATT: Yeah, I think I had more things selected in Orange up to Knott Ave, so let me add that selection back in quickly. That's not 51.8, but it's 51.62.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. TRATT: Then it would be underpopulated by 6.59.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. So then do we want to look at bringing the northern boundary down from the 91 slightly?

MS. TRATT: So more in line with what Commissioner Sadhwani had wanted to explore at Crescent Ave.?

CHAIR KENNEDY: No, something Park, just below where it says -- in between where it says Knott's Berry Farm and Medieval Times -- or maybe try La Palma.

MS. TRATT: Okay, La Palma? That's right, yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so then let's try Crescent.
That dropped the LCVAP by almost a quarter of a percentage point, I think. Okay. Does anyone have thoughts on where we might look to rebalance the population if we left it at this point? Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I don't. I think that this could probably be something that we could work on offline and see if we can get it up any higher?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Jaime is going to be available to us in about half an hour. So I was trying to vamp.

MS. CLARK: I'm actually here. I chatted you, Chair Kennedy. I'm sorry if you missed that. Hello, I'm here.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. So then let's go ahead and try to finish this off then. Or no. Let's allow Sivan to just do a little bit further exploration around this corner of Buena Park and Orange and see where we maximize our Latino CVAP and then bring that back to us, if that's okay with colleagues.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

Thank you.

Okay, Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, just real quick, I'm wondering, you know, just maybe like just along the border of Westminster and Santa Ana, maybe, you know, I wonder if that might also make a difference.
MS. TRATT: In terms of adding population from Westminster, or --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, because if you want to take that Buena Park part out, you've got to add some back in, right? Otherwise you're going to be over five percent deviation?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. TRATT: That would be if we added all of the selection that's currently highlighted in red. Previously we had highlighted just a more northern portion of Buena Park that would raise SAA's Latino CVAP above fifty-one percent and would keep it within deviation. So that was less of a swap between districts.

I think the second part of removing this would be adding in population, potentially revisiting this corner of Orange in from IOC.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, that's what I was just suggesting. Instead of looking at Orange, because we already looked at it didn't really make -- in fact, it brought the CVAP down. We didn't explore that that kind of border with Westminster. And maybe just looking to see is that even -- would that even at this point, you know, would that even make a difference. And if it does, then take from there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. My recollection is we, as
Sivan was clicking, was that we were able to get the Hispanic CVAP up to perhaps as much as 51.45 without exceeding the maximum five percent deviation. So what I would like to do is instruct Sivan to continue exploring, to see where she is able to maximize the LCVAP without exceeding the five percent maximum deviation.

MS. TRATT: Thank you for that direction, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Leave her to explore that. Is that acceptable? Okay.

So Sivan, we are asking you to continue exploring in this area. We believe that we can do slightly better on the Hispanic CVAP without exceeding maximum deviations, and just do your best and get back to us when you're ready.

MS. TRATT: Okay, absolutely, Chair. I will continue exploring that offline. Am I okay to stop sharing my screen --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. TRATT: -- so Jaime can take over? All right.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. Thank you so much.

MS. TRATT: Kristian, I am going to stop sharing my screen just to give you a heads up.

MR. MANOFF: Thanks, Sivan.

MS. CLARK: Hello.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Hi, Jaime.
MS. CLARK: Hi, I hope you are all well. What is on the screen now is the current iteration for the Senate maps in Los Angeles County, and if you'd prefer to look at a different map, let me know and I can change.

CHAIR KENNEDY: No. This is what we need to look at at this point.

Does anyone need a tour around or are colleagues ready with questions and comments at this point? Okay, I'm not seeing reaction either way. Okay, now, thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And we might have already done this, Jaime, so just please stop me. The Glendale-Burbank combo -- did we already try that? I know that you --

MS. CLARK: Can you elaborate please on what you mean by the --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: In terms of that's a frequent flier communities of interest of Glendale with Burbank. That's what I was asking. Sorry about that. Because I, you know, I don't want to decrease any of the numbers per se with my CVAP number, so I just didn't know what that could potentially look like. Thanks. And either way is fine with me right now.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, thank you for that question. So
just in terms of the current configuration of the map, moving either wholly into a district with the other would cause pretty big ripple effects. Burbank itself is 100,000 people -- I think 107,000 people, so about ten percent of a Senate district. Moving into SD210 would make the percent deviation of SD210 about fifty percent. Definitely then, yeah, there would need to be big reconfigurations, whether that's, you know, moving these cities on the eastern end of the district in the 110 out, which were moved in yesterday, which -- and including other cities because these two areas where they're split it's 58,000 people, or so, I believe. So yeah, there would be big reconfigurations in the works.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you Jaime. I'm not interested in lots of ripples right now. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, and I mean, if both SD10 -- 210 and POF were underpopulated to the same extent, there might be possibility of Burbank shifting east, but then we would have the problem that SCSCV (sic) is already well underpopulated and it would be difficult to do a rotation to get population back in there.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, that's right. So SCSCV (sic) would become negative fifteen percent, and then -- I mean, minimizing what the ripple would be would be including these areas of Rancho Cucamonga, Claremont,
potentially parts of Glendora and with the Antelope Valley/Victor Valley-based district, and then combining -- you know, splitting Santa Clarita Valley and combining that with SCSFV I think would be the smallest number of districts that could be impacted, although not necessarily the most elegant of trades that would be possible, but that would be the way to, like, minimize the change and -- yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Jaime, one other option that I can see is that we would not be able to move all of Glendale into SCSCV (sic), but we could potentially move 75 to 80,000 from SD210 into SCSFV and essentially, we'd be switching the deviations. So SCSFV would go from a negative 4-something to a positive 4-something, and SD210 would go from the positive 4.7 to a negative 4-point-something. I mean, do colleagues want to explore dividing Glendale?

MS. CLARK: Just a quick, like, note on that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. CLARK: I'm so sorry to interrupt. Adding any substantial population from Glendale would change the Latino CVAP in SCSFV to below fifty percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so that's why we don't want to do that. Yeah, that's already -- okay. So thank you for that.
Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I was going to ask about something similar, but for the Armenian community, there's been -- I brought this up already a couple of times. We've done so much for other communities. And it seems like they're very -- they're the largest community, you know, in terms of one of the largest Armenian communities, I think, in the U.S. is here in that Glendale/Burbank area. They've asked to be kept together. They also asked to include La Crescenta and La Canada Flintridge. But it seems like reading one of the COI testimonies that Glendale and Burbank has the densest population of Armenians in the U.S.

And so just a question; if we were to try to move more of Burbank, I know that SD210 is overpopulated. There was also requests by both the -- I'll say the LA County side and the San Bernardino side to keep their respective county lines, you know, separate. If Burbank or parts of Burbank were to be moved in, you know, could we move -- I think, what is it, is it Claremont that's -- or I don't think it, well. I don't know. Actually, it wouldn't really matter. It'd be the other way around.

It's -- anyways, I was just trying to see if there was some way to make it -- try to see if we could try to make it work because I know that SCSFV is underpopulated,
but I'm wondering if Burbank, how much of a difference it
makes to the Latino CVAP and if there's another
configuration that could help raise that but also achieve
this other goal. But I guess the question I would just
like to ask is, is this an exploration that the
Commission, the other Commissioners would want to give a
try just for the sake of at least trying, or is this
something that the preference is just to move on? I'd
like to at least try to see if we could do something, but
I also will defer to the rest of the Commissioners
because I know where we are, too.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Jaime, do you do you see any
way of combining any parts of Burbank and Glendale in
either district without decreasing the Latino CVAP in the
surrounding districts?

MS. CLARK: Creative thinking might mean that
Glendale and Burbank could be in the East Ventura-based
district together. I think the SCSFV could still be
fifty percent Latino CVAP. Again, this would be a big
exploration with a lot of creative thinking. And then
what would happen with the rest of SD210, I couldn't say
off the bat in terms of how to balance it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Let me let me go to the other
hand.

MS. CLARK: I --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead, Jaime.

MS. CLARK: -- and just to add to that really quickly is I do think that it would definitely require putting part of the San Fernando Valley with Santa Clarita and Antelope Valleys.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you. Let's go first to the other hands.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I know we've got a lot of recent response to that, so I'd be interested in seeing if it makes sense and not if the testimony makes sense, but where we are currently, if there is something that could be done but I raised my hand. When we're ready to move from this area when I go SBRC Moreno Valley, I guess our latest iteration in SBRC split Hemet, East Hemet and San Jacinto. Is it [Huss-into] or [Juss-into]?

CHAIR KENNEDY: San [Ya-cinto].

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Jacinto. Anyway, they want to be with Moreno Valley. I know a lot of those are under there. There's a couple of spaces. I just wanted to look at it, Jaime, and see what it is that we've done.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Turner, I appreciate that that. That is in Sivan's area which we just, I thought, closed down. So (indiscernible) --
COMMISSIONER TURNER: I waited. I thought it was in this area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Jaime, can you help us?

MS. CLARK: I will absolutely try to help. So the question is whether Hemet can be included in SBRC. Is that the --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Moreno --

MS. CLARK: -- request or question?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- Valley. Yes. East Hemet, San Jacinto with Moreno Valley.

MS. TRATT: I'm still here. I'm still listening from the background. So Jaime, you can phone a friend if you'd like.

MS. CLARK: I'd like to phone a friend, Sivan.

MS. TRATT: Thank you so much for bringing that up, Commissioner Turner. I did definitely explore trying to keep -- because I know we've definitely heard a lot of testimony about Hemet, East Hemet, San Jacinto with Moreno Valley. I really, really worked this, like, for a long time, trying a lot of different ways.

I was -- just again, keeping in mind that VRA is the number one consideration, I was not able to find an iteration, like, in this area that would keep all of the areas of interest, Hemet, East Hemet, I was -- tried to bring a portion of Hemet in, was unsuccessful. It
lowered it below fifty. Remember, we started at fifty yesterday.

So I think potentially it would be a question of maybe moving out San Jacinto and moving in Hemet. But I think that that would be far more disruptive to communities of interest and potentially lower that Latino CVAP that's already at fifty-two percent. And I can explore that offline with you if you would like. But I definitely had it in mind when I was looking at this area and definitely tried my best.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No, no, I wanted to hear that, that is what you did. And I apologize. I missed that option. I thought that you were in -- this area was in Los Angeles, I guess. But and I'm so glad you were still there, friend. Thank you for responding.

MS. TRATT: I'm just (indiscernible) here in the background, just, yeah, bringing you up to date, so.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Great, thank you.

MS. TRATT: Were there any other questions I can answer about this area?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No. I just knew that it had been together, and I'm glad you tried it, and we'll move from here.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Can I have a brief question on this as well -- same issue, same question. Just in terms
of -- certainly the Latino CVAP, but also, we know there's a lot of cohesion with African American CVAP. Was there effort to try to raise the African American CVAP? I know we've done everything we can to raise the Latino CVAP in this area.

MS. TRATT: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm just curious if that was also --

MS. TRATT: From where it was before I started working on it, it has been raised. It is lower, I believe, than it was in -- Jaime, do you have the draft labels, or I can look on my side as well.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And I think that's okay. I think I remember it was around fourteen percent, but I know you've raised it from where we have it. So that's what I was looking to hear. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I'm noticing that we do have a very minimal underpopulation in MCV. Okay.

Commissioner Vazquez has to hop in the car soon. Let's hear from her first.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry, jumping around, but I wanted to make my comment before I got in the car, so thank you. I am interested in exploring, you know, trying to keep Burbank and Glendale together in any iteration. My contingency, or at least my energy would
be to see if we can get some of the, I would say, more working-class areas of the West San Gabriel Valley into the SD10 West district.

And again, I know we've got conflicting testimony about keeping that Asian COI together versus, like, keeping working-class communities of the San Gabriel Valley together. If we can do something with Glendale that helps us to add some population from Monterey Park, Rosemead, Alhambra, and San Gabriel, that would seem to me, like, maybe a compromise. Not necessary, and I can support this map as is. But that would be where I -- I would try to add population if we took out Glendale.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez. Be safe on the roads. The issue that we deal with, of course, if we if we try moving population east, as it were, so if we if we moved Burbank in moving population down, moving Alhambra, Monterey Park, Rosemead, San Gabriel east is then what do we do at the other end? And I'm not sure we have a good answer for that question.

Okay, we've got thirteen minutes.

MS. CLARK: Chair Kennedy, could I just respond briefly --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Um-hum.

MS. CLARK: -- which is that if that is something the Commission is interested in exploring, I think that
looking at, you know, this is similar, although not exactly what we had in the draft, the lines on the map or the draft right now, it includes those with San Gabriel Valley cities that were just noted in with some of the East San Gabriel cities that are sort of like the core of the current iteration, which I'll turn back on. And then also just to note is that Glendale hasn't moved districts between the different iterations. So moving these areas into 210, or out of 210, I think Glendale would stay put. And definitely, absolutely the question then of what to do with Ontario, Chino, Montclair, Pomona areas on the eastern side of this district certainly arise.

And just a note also that I think that including these -- or moving these cities out, we would then need to pull more population from SD210 whether -- yeah. And at this point, if that is talking about such a big rotation that I can't really speak to exactly what that would do, aside from essentially going back to something really similar to the draft, specifically in the west San Bernardino and west Riverside County areas.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you so much for that, Jaime.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I'm back at the Glendale-Burbank. I was wondering if we take Glendale
add it to the Burbank and then took, you know, the areas that are right at the 210, right at the forest, like Sunland-Tujunga, Coyote, Trails (ph.) -- that area and move that into the 210, would that be a, you know, one for the other, and I do -- I do not know whatsoever if that would affect the Latino CVAP or (indiscernible) that.

MS. CLARK: I -- so I'm just going to, because I don't remember off the top of my head, but I can tell you that Glendale is almost 200,000 people, so twenty percent-ish of a Senate district. Sunland-Tujunga and Foothill Trails were not 200,000 people. I can find out exactly how much they are right now quickly. But I think it wouldn't be an equal population swap.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And it was just a -- it was a thought to (indiscernible).

MS. CLARK: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. And Jaime, just as part of this, so that we're all clear on what we're dealing with, if when you finish this, if you could just highlight Glendale and let us know what the LCVAP is in Glendale.

MS. CLARK: Absolutely. So this highlighted area is sixty -- oh, here, I'll move it so everyone can see. It's 66,000 people -- 66,800. And if I pretend like I'm
going to make it a new district, we can see just the
Latino CVAP in this area alone is 23.58 percent. And for
just the city of Glendale, it's 196,000 and the Latino
CVAP is 15.79 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. So this is our conundrum.
Moving Glendale in is going to crater that LCVAP in SCSFV
and not sure we have a reasonable path to building it
back up. Okay.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I thought we were closer
to consensus yesterday, that we were, you know, that we
were all -- although these aren't perfect maps, but they
were maps that we could all support. Certainly, I'm open
to exploration in the area as long as it is able to
maintain all of our -- all of the criteria we discussed
yesterday. But I thought we were -- and maybe we are.
Maybe I'm just -- I just want to make sure that we all
continue to be able to support these maps that we have.
Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, right when we had to
switch to -- or when we wanted to switch to Commissioner
Vazquez, you were still saying something about MCV and I
was trying to see where you're going. And if not, I just
wanted to be clear as we move from this area that what we
answered in response to that particular COI is trying to
put San Jacinto, Hemet, East Hemet in with the Moreno
Valley, lowered the Latino CVAP and it could -- ought to
be done, is what we said.

CHAIR KENNEDY: That that is my understanding. I
was I was going to say that if we wanted to -- and I
believe we tried this exploration looking at, you know,
the top portion of Hemet, you know, trying to make this
sort of move and without negatively affecting the LCVAP
in SBRC, you know, we've got five minutes or so before we
are going to be headed to break, we can have the heat map
up, we can have the Latino heat map, we can have the
black heat map up to see if there are any marginal
changes that we want to make. But you know, I think we
have tried to explore this, and we haven't been
successful before.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Andrew, I see you nodding,
yes, Andrew.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Andrew?

MR. DRESCHLER: Yes, if I may, Chair, yeah. I was
working with Sivan a little bit last night after we went
off camera just to explore this option a little bit more.
And you know, we started the day with Latino CVAP at just
over fifty percent, and you know, when we worked --
remember working in the meeting, playing around moving in population from Hemet and just -- we struggled to get to fifty-one percent Latino CVAP. And then, you know, offline, she did continue to explore a couple of different options with the Hemet, and we were unable to get it, you know -- get the Latino CVAP to fifty-two -- over fifty-two percent with Hemet. And so yes, we did explore this quite a bit, Commissioner Turner.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Andrew.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. At this point I'm fine with the maps and I just -- I feel that the moves of Glendale and Burbank would cause all this ripple effects and then to get them together, then it's going to cause some other issues somewhere else with other communities of interest. So I would suggest we just move on. So thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: You. Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I would recommend we move forward. I mean, what's really difficult is kind of buyer's remorse to a certain extent, or remorse, you know, could I -- could we -- could I and you know, we're
all doing it in different parts of the maps. And you
know, I keep wanting to say let's do something that makes
us a little scared every day, and I think we're doing a
lot that makes us scared. And I'm, you know, it's a
journey we're doing together. And I just keep asking us
to please trust each other and no, I can tell you right
now, I'm feeling -- I'm trying to think, okay, San Diego
and Imperial Valley, we did it so quickly -- what did I
miss. What did -- and you know, we can do that on any
part and every part of this map. And I'm sure, you know,
people can tell me everything I missed. But
collectively, I think we've caught each other. And let's
just keep moving forward and then sleep on it and see
what we feel in the morning.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.
Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I have a question for
Jaime. And again, I'm trying to -- without going into
line drawing, I'm just trying to make sure that we
explore everything. The -- besides the Glendale/Burbank,
the other COI testimony that I read was the cities of
Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Westlake Village -- I guess
they, along with Hidden Hills and Malibu, we had read in
other testimony that they form a COG and they noted that
in the Senate map they are separated or they were, I
guess, Hidden Hills is separated. It looks like they're
together with Malibu now.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not Hidden Hill.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Not Hidden Hills, okay. I
think that was the only other thing. So I thought Malibu
was separated. So I was thinking, I was like, would that
make a difference if we were to move Glendale in and all
that stuff? But okay, it's a much smaller problem than I
thought we had, so okay. I am hearing what the
Commission's saying. Just a question. Do we want to try
to move Hidden Hills in, is it worth it, is it worth it,
is it possible -- since they do have that COG together?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. And we have done that in at
least one of the other maps.

So Jaime, just if you could let us know if it's
possible to move Hidden Hills over without pushing
SHORELINE over the five percent. It is possible.

MS. CLARK: It is possible; would you like me to
make this change?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Any objection?

Okay, please proceed. Thank you.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you, Chair. So I look
at some of some of what we're asking for right now as
just trying to refine what we're doing and not
necessarily trying to reshape the map, so I think we're trying to be responsive to some of the feedback we're getting. I think it helps to put out into the public sphere some of the whys (sic) things work and why things don't and adds more context into the entirety of this matter. So I think some of these questions are helpful. -- this Burbank/Glendale was helpful. And I think it's appropriate in this -- they need to ask and if -- and we can see why we can and can't do it. So I don't see it as trying to reshape or think of anything differently, we're merely trying to do those last little final steps and explain to our public why -- and explained to our community partners why it is we can and can't do something.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. No, that's excellent. Thank you for making that point.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. Thank you, Commissioner Taylor for providing that insight. I think that's right. And I think I'm fully supportive of these maps as are, and I am fine with looking at additional refinements as long as we have -- are able to do so. But time is running out.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Time is running out. Thank you so much.
I understand from Andrew that Sivan does have some options for SAA. Unfortunately, it is time for a break. We also need the instructions for call-in to be read. Public comment will begin at 6:45 immediately upon our return from the break. In accordance with our newly adopted policy, the lines will not close. We will instead respect a total limit of three hours of public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much, Chair. In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone.

To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed. It is 85932989398 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 nine. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it is your turn to speak, you'll hear a message that says, the host would like you to talk and to press star six to speak. If you would like to give your name, please state and spell it for the record. You are not required to provide your name to give public comment.
Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream audio to prevent any 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.

And Chair, I will pass it back to you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. As mentioned, it is now time for our fifteen-minute break. So we will be back at 6:45 to begin taking public comment. Thank you, everyone.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 6:30 p.m. until 6:45 p.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your patience during our fifteen-minute break. We have concluded our mapping for the day. We made some good progress on both congressional districts as well as Senate districts. And we are now ready to hear from the public. Our public comment period is open. Katy, could you please take it away?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Absolutely. Thank you, Chair.

Public comment periods will be a minute and thirty seconds this evening; you will receive a verbal warning at thirty seconds and fifteen seconds remaining. We will be taking public comment for three hours, up until 9:45.
I will be identifying you by the last four digits of your telephone number. If you will please remain alert for when I call those numbers out. And if you will please speak at a steady pace with all county names, numbers, cities, and your comment in general so that the Commissioners and translators can understand.

Right now we have caller 0013, and up next after that will be caller 0396.

Caller 0013, please follow the prompts. And one more time, caller with the last four digits 0013, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. 0013, I do apologize for some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I will come back around to you momentarily.

Right now, we have caller with the last four digits 0396. Up next after that will be caller 0805.

Caller 0396, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I'd like to share my strong opposition to the iteration STCV-2 (ph.), 3, and 4 of the KINGSTULAKERN congressional district (indiscernible). The Commission should honor the draft maps that they put out. The district need to be compact and reflect the community. Maps that connect random areas from around the Central Valley are not
honoring the community of interest. Some of these maps can only be justified as -- justified by race as primary criteria and CVAP score. The Commission cannot allow any organization to dictate the entire Central Valley. The Commission shouldn't cave to every wish, want, and desire of a hyperpolarized political group such as Dolores Huerta Foundation, because all she is doing is putting communities of interests in jeopardy. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 0805, and up next after that will be caller 1043.

Caller 0805, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. STERLING: Hi there, this is Claire Sterling (ph.) from the San Fernando Valley. Thank you to the Commissioners again for doing such a great job. I really just wanted to call in one more time. I know that you guys are doing such a great job, but unfortunately, the San Fernando Valley and the Assembly maps have not been finished completely.

So I really just want to say if we could go back, I've been looking, and I support the LA firefighter map. It does a really great job of creating a Latino opportunity (indiscernible) including some really incredible communities like Van Nuys, North Hills, Valley
Glen, making sure the Filipino community stays whole, the Jewish community stays whole, the LGBTQIA community stays whole. And that's really what we're looking for here in the San Fernando Valley. So if you guys can think about that when you go back to it, that's really what we're looking for. Thank you so much. Have a good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 1043. And up next, after that would be caller 2714.

Caller 1043, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioner. We, the Little Saigon community, we're continuing to calling in every day to make sure our voice heard.

Commissioner Andersen, thank you for listening to us for months. We have been calling in, sending email (indiscernible) to make our voice is heard. All we ask for is to keep the inland part of Huntington Beach with Little Saigon in congressional, Senate, and Assembly. I am asking you to please go back to the GGW and add in Huntington Beach. Every time I call in, I only hear overwhelming support for Huntington Beach and Little Saigon and very few not. So I don't understand why Commissioner Akutagawa hesitate and always make up excuses not to add Huntington Beach in. I'm asking you
to make sure leaders of Saigon community --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- have one voice to protect our community of interests. Thank you for listening and good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 2714, and up next after that will be caller 3640.

Caller 2714, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. I have made comments and also call in the last couple of months regarding Little Saigon district. I have spent at least a couple hour on the phone waiting to be called on to make public comment almost every day, and I will continue to do so because this is very important to me and our Little Saigon community. This will affect us for the next ten years.

Thank you, Commissioner Andersen, for wanting to revisit the Little Saigon congressional map. Your comments give us hope. You talk about adding Huntington Beach to Senate and congressional map, and we can't thank you enough for it. When you are finished with the congressional map, please go back and relook at the GGW Assembly map again. Please consider Inland Park or
Huntington Beach to Assembly map by adding all of North Garfield Street and --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- (indiscernible) Street in Huntington Beach. You can remove Stanton and east Garden Grove, since they have no common interest with us. By doing this, the Commission will give the Vietnamese American community a vote in the Senate, Assembly to ensure that we have a true representation for the next ten years. Please respect our community, family, and children. Have a good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 3640, and up next after that will be caller 4434.

Caller 3640, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I would like to share my strong opposition to iterations STCV-2, 3, and 4 of KINGTULAKERN congressional visualization. The Commission should honor the draft maps that you put out. These districts need to be compact and reflect the community. Maps that connect random areas from all over the Central Valley are not honoring the community. Some of these maps can only be justified by race as the primary criteria. The
Commission should not allow one organization to dictate the entire Central Valley. The Commission should not cave to every wish, want, and desire of a hyperpolarized political group such as Dolores Huerta Foundation, because those doing so will put communities of interests in jeopardy. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we will have 4434, and up next after that is caller 4607.
Caller 4434, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, my name is Sue (ph.), and I'd like to comment on the map for this eastern central California district, and I'm asking that you not combine Clovis and North Fresno with the Sierra Mountain area. Our issues are really different from each other. Rural California's pressing issues include wildfires and forest management and difficulty getting homeowner insurance, and logging and recreation. We're a tourism area. There's just a lot of different issues. And we are -- we're a more rural area and the Fresno and Clovis area are much more compact, much more metropolitan than us. And so I'm just asking that you would consider that and not throw us into an area that doesn't really reflect the same needs.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 4607, and up next after that is caller 5038.

Caller 4607, please saw the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioner. I just wanted to express my appreciation to Commissioner Kennedy for your comments the other day for wanting to go back to Little Saigon district map. Please protect Little Saigon and stand by our side. Adding North Garfield Avenue in Huntington Beach to give us the final presentation for Assembly we need for the next decade. Just adding North Garfield Avenue but stopping at Beach Boulevard doesn't make any sense because by stopping there, it would not include Huntington Harbor, where over forty percent of residents are Vietnamese Americans and still doesn't make our education or school district cross over complete. I had a lot of comments this week surrounding Little Saigon, but I am disappointed that while our community has advocated for months to act to include Inland Park portion of Huntington Beach with Little Saigon, it was only suggested to have a few (indiscernible) added to our community. Thank you for listening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 5038, and up next
after that will be caller 5179.

Caller 5038, please follow the prompts. Caller with the last four digits -- oh, there you are. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi there, Commissioners. Thank you so much for agreeing to make the swap with Sylmar and connecting it with the eastern San Fernando Valley for the congressional map; it's super important for the eastern San Fernando Valley to be together in this congressional map. Additionally, too, I'd like to thank you all for listening to the community and creating the supermajority Latino Senate district in the San Fernando Valley.

The last thing that you guys need to do is please focus on the Assembly maps. Specifically, you should listen to the community and please create the supermajority Latino Assembly districts in the San Fernando Valley, keeping the San Fernando Valley together. That remains the last thing that you guys need to do to do.

Additionally to that is create Santa Clarita Valley and connect it with the northwestern part of Los Angeles. You guys can probably reference the Senate map that you all drafted, which is perfect. It's exactly what everyone needs. So it correctly solves the issue with
the San Fernando Valley and Santa Clarita Valley and
creates equitable representation for everyone in the
community. So thank you all for listening. And I know
I'm not alone on this, so thank you all for the hard work
you do. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now is caller 5179, and up next after that
is caller 5777.

Caller 5179, please follow the prompts. The floor
is yours.

MS. WONG: Hi, good evening, Commissioners. This is
Amy Wong (ph.), and I'd like to comment on the San
Gabriel Valley. You all did a great job at the
congressional level, but I'm calling in with concerns
about our San Gabriel Valley Senate districts. The
cities in the West San Gabriel Valley, which include
Alhambra, Monterey Park, San Gabriel, and Rosemead,
deserve to maintain their political power by remaining in
a Latino majority AAPI-influenced Senate district that
adequately represents the diversity of our region.

But while we support shared federal stewardship of
the San Gabriel Mountains and communities in Alhambra and
Monterey Park who use it, we don't think the Senate seats
should follow the congressional seat logic. In regards
to state and local policies, affluent white communities
in the foothills hold an enormous amount of political
power over smaller working-class cities in the west San
Gabriel Valley. This is especially shown in the 710 and
10 freeway debate.

A secondary effect is that the eastern San Gabriel
Valley is pushed into the Inland Empire, which stretches
El Monte all the way to Pomona, Chino, and Ontario.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. WONG: Grouping these separate communities of
interest does not make any sense. Regarding Assembly
districts, I do want to thank you for including El Monte
in Assembly District 49. However, I urge you to use
Garvey Avenue or Rush Street instead of the 10 freeway as
the border. That way, more API communities -- community
members can be included in the API-majority district.

Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 5777, and up next after
that is caller 6311.

Caller 5777, please follow the prompts. The floor
is yours.

MS. MUN: Hello, Commissioners and first of all,
thank you for all your hard work. My name is Tina Mun
(ph.). I have been a resident in Huntington Beach for
over ten years. Keeping Huntington Beach with Fountain
Valley, Westminster, and Seal Beach makes a lot of sense for our many shared community of interests. All of these cities currently together in our Assembly, Senate and Congress districts.

Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy, for exploring the GGW map to remove East Garden Grove starting Euclid for the Assembly district for the Little Saigon. You are going onto the right direction that we have asked for. Please do all of north of Huntington Beach, all Garfield and Huntington Beach. It would be a good idea to remove Stanton as well, since they don't have any community of interest with Little Saigon. I actually haven't been to Stanton. I don't even know if they have any --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. MUN: -- Vietnamese business there. Thank you again, Commissioner Kennedy.

And I'm asking if all of other Commissioners would please do consider our comments as well. Thank you for all your hard work and have a good evening.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. MUN: Good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 6311, and up next after that will be caller 6855.

Caller 6311, please follow the prompts. The floor
is yours.

MS. COLE: Hi, thank you. My name is Robyn Cole (ph.) from San Joaquin County. I've been in San Joaquin County for forty years, and I'm asking you to keep us whole as -- as whole as possible. Please do not put us with Sacramento and Elk Grove. Our needs -- our infrastructure is completely different. By putting us with Sacramento in Elk Grove, anyone in San Joaquin, all of our voices will be silenced because we're just not big enough to compete with the Sacramento area. We are our own community, and we don't have anything in common with Sacramento and Elk Grove other than we're in the central part of California. But our needs are different. Please take those into account, make San Joaquin County as whole as possible. Do not include us with Sacramento and Elk Grove. We really need to have our own independent voice in Congress to support our needs. Thank you very much for taking the time. Thank you for all your hard work. We do appreciate it.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 6855, and up next after will be caller 7682.

Caller 6855, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. SUKATAN: Commissioners, good evening, Samuel
Sukatan (ph.) from Navarro (ph.) Voters Education Fund here. It's been a couple of days since I've spoken to you. Seems like you're having a bear of a time, and I know that the deadline is bearing down upon us. So I appreciate your good humor and your consistent attempts to draw and redraw. Commissioner Sadhwani made some comments earlier about the 210 -- an SD210, excuse me, district and the questions of federal stewardship, and I figured I'd kind of return to that on a principal question. You see, I feel in SD210, you've done the same thing that you're doing in eastern California with the kind of Modesto water user versus water loser question, and doing the same thing again in the north coast, the north San Diego congressional district, in that there was a very specific kind of environmental question that people have opposite sides of and the opposite sides of that community bound by that environmental question should be able to elect somebody who will fight the corner on the question.

So in the case of the Sierra --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. SUKATAN: -- water, somebody who was keeping water rather than somebody and versus somebody mixing with Modesto, right? Same thing with the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station. And in the case of the
Senate seat (indiscernible), dealing with the 710 and 10 freeways.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. SUKATAN: We did support the federal change. While we don't support it in the Senate, you'll hear more about that as the night goes on. But definitely appreciate your consideration, and please keep talking.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 7682, and up next after that will be caller 7726.

Caller 7682, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, Commissioners. My name is Rami, and I've been a lifetime resident of San Diego. I'm calling in concern of Encanto and Paradise Hills in southeastern San Diego, specifically in the Senate district maps. I'm really concerned that Encanto and Paradise Hills are split between COR-CAJON and SECA. Paradise Hills is on the southern boundary of the COR-CAJON map. They're super important areas in the southeastern SD area that should remain whole in this COR-CAJON district. Encanto and Paradise Hills are historical black communities in southeast San Diego that will face the backlash if they're split. I please urge you to keep all of southeast San Diego in COR-CAJON...
district. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 7726, and up after that will be caller 8037.

Caller 7726, please follow the prompts.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Matt and I'm a resident of Alhambra. I'm calling to express my opposition to the state Commission splitting the West SGV from the East SGV. West SGV cities along the 10 freeway, such Alhambra, Monterey Park, San Gabriel, and Rosemead are currently being connected to white, affluent foothill cities such as Pasadena, La Canada, and Bradbury.

The SGV has its unique issues and challenges and deserves its own representative in the Senate. Small SGV cities are constantly fighting for resources. We have been working in a coalition together to improve our neighborhood and secure regional dollars. In policy decision, preference is often given to affluent communities such as in the 710 and 10 debate while low-income residents in the SGV continue to carry the burden of poor air quality and traffic congestion. We deserve proper representation. Please respect working class communities of color in the SGV. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now we have caller 8037, and up next after that will be caller 9938.

Caller 8037, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. First of all, I want to say thank you to all the Commissioners for your work. When you revisit the congressional districts one last time, I hope you don't plan on making too many major changes in Orange County. Our community has engaged a lot in this process, and I certainly think the current maps are close to reasonable compromise. Any changes should be contained swaps within our Orange County districts because we are happy to have four strong congressional districts mostly contained within our district -- mostly contained within our county. Thanks for all your work and for listening to the callers from our community.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9938, and then up next after that we will retry that caller 0013.

Caller 9938, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star -- there you are. The floor is yours. Caller 9938, will you please double check your phone, make sure you are not on mute. You are unmuted in the meeting.
MR. MANOFF: Caller 9938, if you could please call back from a different phone.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

Right now, we have caller 03 -- I'm sorry, wait, no, we were retrying caller 0013, and then up next after that will be caller 0317.

Caller 00 -- caller 0013, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. Caller with the last four digits, 0013, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Commissioners, for preserving the voice of San Jose. We agree with the decision to implement Map 3 as discussed today. Thank you so much for listening to our community and not splitting us up into four districts. We appreciate all your hard work on this matter and agree that Map 3 allows the tenth largest city in America to keep a representative that speaks for us. Happy holidays.

Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we will have caller 0317, and up next after that will be caller 0983.

Caller 0317, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, good evening,
Commissioners. I have spoken before the Commission many, many times and have participated today listening in to your comments since about 3 o'clock this afternoon. I would like to begin my comments by saying the following.

And thank you so much.

Thank you, Commissioner Yee and Commissioner Ahmad for developing a plan YA, San Jose congressional district iteration 3. And thank you for so many of the Commissioners supporting the map iteration 3. Thank you to Commissioner Sadhwani and Commissioner Toledo fully supportive of this idea. Thank you, Chair Kennedy, for asking for this exploration.

I support Plan YA, Senate and congressional district iteration 3 which is September 15th, 2021. It is very similar to CD_GREATERED which has been roughly the same for several weeks due to many COI's testimony that support it. Iteration 3 is similar to current CD_GREATERED, which is ascribed to many ways COI's testimony from now to back in the summer. The COI (indiscernible) included many letters --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- unanimous votes by (indiscernible) City Council, Santa Clarita Council, majority of Freemont, (indiscernible) and the MALDEF maps submitted led by the Asian Law Alliance Organization and
hundreds of individuals for GREATERED submitted during
the summer.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you again for this
(indiscernible) process, (indiscernible) to consensus,
collaboration, cooperation. This Commission has been a
on a model of hard work, effectiveness, and dedication,
and I thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

Right now, we have caller 0983, and up next after
that will be caller 2567.

Caller 0983, please follow the prompts. The floor
is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. I have
been living in Huntington Beach for five years, and more
and more Vietnamese Americans have moved here because of
better school districts. I am asking you to listen to
the hundreds of calls, emails and (indiscernible) that
have been submitted for months from the one Little Saigon
community has been very involved and watching the meeting
very closely. We are asking (indiscernible) Garfield
Street on the way to (indiscernible) in the Huntington
Beach (indiscernible) and East Garden Grove at Euclid
street. Keep Little Saigon together and allow the growth
for the next decade. Thank you and have a good night.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 2567, and up next after that will be caller 2911.

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

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Commissioners, I would like to share my strong opposition to Iteration STCV-2, 3, and 4 of Kings-Tulare-Kern congressional visualization. The Commission should honor the draft maps that they put out. These districts need to be compact and reflect the community. Maps that connect random areas from all around the Central Valley are not honoring a community. Some of these maps can only be justified by race of the primary criteria.

The Commission should not allow one organization to dictate the entire Central Valley. The Commission shouldn't cave to every wish, want, and desire of a hyperpolarized political group such as the Dolores Huerta Foundation, because doing so will put communities of interests in jeopardy. We strongly urge the Commission to keep Kings County as a whole, as they have no interest in being separated into two congressional districts. It is a disservice to its people and will harm their ability to be represented in an equitable way. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we'll have 2911, and up next after that we'll have caller 2931.

Right now we have caller 2911. Please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. ARICA: Good evening, Commissioners and staff. My name is Janine Arica (ph.), speaking on the Senate maps in San Diego County. I've been calling for the past month and our community members have been calling in since January 2020, and time and time again have continued to express their communities of interest, which is why I'm alarmed that Encanto and Paradise Hills are split between COR-CAJON and southeast CA. Important areas in southeast San Diego should remain whole in COR-CAJON district, as months and hundreds of communities of interest testimony and commenters told you.

There are historical black communities in southeast San Diego. And we know that across the nation, across the state, our black communities continue to be the most marginalized and will be the ones who face repercussions if they continue to be split. I urge you to please, please honor the diversity of our state and continue to keep southeast San Diego whole. So please keep all of San Diego in COR-CAJON --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. ARICA: -- district and set a precedent that
will dramatically change the next ten years. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

Right now we have caller 2931, and up next after that will be caller 4201.

Caller 2931, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioner, I have calling in every day and willing to wait in the queue for hours because of Assembly map of GGW is not done for Little Saigon. Please complete by adding on the North Garfield Street south at Seapoint Street in Huntington Beach to Little Saigon map. This area has been nearly 50,000 Asian Americans, ninety percent of which are Vietnamese Americans.

Thank you, Commissioner Andersen, for paying closing attention to Little Saigon. Please protect us and make sure Little Saigon have a true presentation.

Commissioner Akutagawa, if you already consider adding the Island Park of Huntington Beach in congressional and Senate district, why didn't you go back to change Assembly district as well? I don't understand your thought process. Do you have a different agenda that you can please share with us? Please, please listen to the voice of Little Saigon. Please keep us together.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. Have a good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Now, right now, we have caller 4201, and up next after that will be caller 5181.

Caller 4201, please follow the prompts. Caller with the last four digits 4201, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. Caller 4201, you appear to have some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I will come back around.

Right now, we have caller 5181, and up next after that is caller 6070.

Caller 5181, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm pleased to see that you have all changed the Senate map, the San Fernando Valley, to properly represent everyone. I'm also pleased to see that you are also honoring the Latino communities' request for Sylmar to join the eastern San Fernando Valley. This is absolutely necessary for proper representation.

The last thing you need to do is please change the Assembly map for Santa Clarita, so it looks like the Senate one and extends all the way to northwest Los Angeles. Please remember that Acton and Agua Dulce are
part of the Santa Clarita Valley. So they have to be
together when moving the map north. Thank you for your
time, Commissioners.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And thank you so much.
And right now we have caller 6070, and then up next
after that will be caller 6957.

Caller 6070, please follow the prompts. The floor
is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. Thank
you for all your hard work and for listening to the San
Fernando Valley community. My name is David. We are
pleased to see that you have changed the Senate map
(audio interference) involve specifically the Latino
community. Also, thank you for agreeing to keep Sylmar
with the eastern San Fernando Valley in the congressional
map. This is really important.

You all need to focus on creating an Assembly
district for the Santa Clarita Valley that has Acton and
Agua Dulce in it. They're a hundred percent part of the
Santa Clarita Valley. So please keep the Santa Clarita
Valley intact in making the maps and make the Assembly
district push northwest into the rest of Los Angeles like
(indiscernible) Park. The Senate map is a good blueprint
as to how the Santa Clarita Valley Assembly map should
look. So please these changes so our community can be --
MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- properly represented for the next decade. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 6957, and up next after that is caller 7592.

Caller 6957, please follow the prompts. Caller with the last four digits 6957, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. CASTILLO: Hi. My name is Felicia Castillo (ph.), and I'm the Vice President of External Affairs of the (indiscernible) Associated Student Government of UCR. I'm here to urge you all to adjust the California State Assembly district boundaries that encompass UCR. UCR is located at 900 University Avenue, and it's a community of interest. Students like myself have a greater connection to the communities in the proposed AD 58 district that is included in the December 8th iteration. I'd like to draw your attention to the alternative maps that were submitted by campus architect Jacqueline Norman. And Norman's comment ID number 40611 for the actual map and shapefile. We very much appreciate your attention to this matter. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

Right now, we have caller 7592, and up next after
that will be caller 8224.

Caller 7592, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you and good evening.

In regards to congressional redistricting in Santa Clara County, I ask that the Commission to reconsider its adoption of Plan YA iteration number 3, which you approved today. With the adoption of this plan versus the current Congressional District 17 for CD_GREATERED, Asian majority areas from Fremont in West San Jose would be removed, while nonAsian majority areas of San Jose would be added, as well as the white majority Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, and Loyola. I would guess that CD_GREATERED's Asian CVAP is lower than the current CD 17 Asian CVAP. Plan YA iteration number 3 splits the 2020 census Asian majority Saratoga, a city with fewer than 35,000 residents between two congressional districts. By comparison, San Jose is more than one million residents -- more than one million residents. I ask that the Commission reconsider Plan YA iteration --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- number 1, which, as with iteration number 3 divides San Jose among three congressional districts. You can also see my public inputs 4536 and 4585. And please ask Tamina to explore
301
1 if an Asian CVAP majority CD_GREATERED could be created.
2 Thank you so much.
3 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And right now we have  
caller 8224, and up next after that will be caller 6789.
4 Caller 8224, please follow the prompts. The floor
5 is yours.
6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening -- good evening,
7 Commissioners. Our Little Saigon community has grown in
8 the last forty years from the (indiscernible) of
9 Westminster to Garden Grove, Fountain Valley, and now
10 into -- in Huntington Beach, Seal Beach, Rossmoor, and
11 Los Alamitos. It's important to the elders in our
12 community to have access to health care system like
13 hospital and doctor who speak Vietnamese or has immediate
14 access to translate. This a very important with Garden
15 Grove, Westminster, Fountain Valley, and Huntington
16 Beach. We need your help to make sure our community is
17 well-represented by an Assembly member who truly
18 understands the culture and unique tradition of our
19 community. The inland part of Huntington Beach belong to
20 Little Saigon, though the Vietnamese American community
21 has grown beyond Westminster and Garden Grove. While I
22 appreciate Commissioner Andersen consider -- sorry --
23 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.
24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- consider add Huntington
Beach to Little Saigon for our congressional and Senate. Please don't forget to go back and Assembly -- and complete the Assembly district. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 6789, and then up next after that will be caller 9799.

Caller 6789, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. TRAN: Hey, Commissioners. My name's Vincent Tran (ph.). I'm a Fountain Valley resident. Firstly, I want to thank the Commission for keeping Little Saigon full and keeping Huntington Beach out of Little Saigon. A number of the callers have called Huntington Beach a vibrant Vietnamese community of over 25,000 people. If anyone simply goes on data.census.gov and type in Vietnamese Huntington Beach, the only available data clearly states that there are only 8,000 Vietnamese people -- less than five percent of the total population. When you search Asian Huntington Beach, you will see that the Asian population is 25,000. It's clear that these callers are trying to provide false facts and are politically motivated and organized by interest in Huntington Beach.

Second, I heard the Commission was attempting to increase the Latino CVAP for the state Senate district
SAA. I want to suggest to add portions of west Santa Ana into North OC-COAST district. And I think that would increase the Latino CVAP for SAA and also bring together the Vietnamese COI in N-OC-COAST.

As I mentioned before, there are over 24,000 Vietnamese in Santa Ana all concentrated in west Santa Ana. And in 2018, when the city was sued by the Asian Americans Advancing Justice because there --

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

MR. TRAN: -- at large election was disenfranchising Asian American voters, the city created a board for Asian voters, and eventually elected their first --

MR. MANOFF: Ten.

MR. TRAN: -- Asian American council member. Now, west Santa Ana west of Harbor Boulevard contains a large portion of Vietnamese voters --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 9779, and up next after that we have caller 5719.

Caller 9779, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. TAYLOR: Good evening. My name is Courtney Taylor (ph.), and I'm calling from the City of Los Angeles to thank you all Commissioners and Commission staff for your tireless efforts on behalf of the
residents of the State of California. You took on the
Herculean task of drawing these lines in consideration of
the legal and regulatory framework while also trying to
be responsive to the enormous amount of public input and
many competing interests. I mean, there's no possible
way for you to satisfy everyone. But I am confident,
having watched this process from the beginning, from the
lottery selection of the first part of the staff and then
watching them take in public comment to choose what
became the final fourteen Commissioners -- and community
outreach and billboards popping up and all the social
media. You really want to engage with the community and
hear what they have to say.

It's just been amazing to watch. I appreciate it.
I have such a great appreciation for what you're doing,
and I'm confident that you're going to do your best in
the spirit of compromise to put forth the best maps on
behalf of all Californians. So again, thank you for your
effort.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. TAYLOR: Keep up the hard work, keep up the good
work. You're nearly done. You're almost there. And
happy holidays.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

We have caller 5719, and up next after that, we'll
have caller 9605.

   Caller 5719, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours. Caller with the last four digits 5719, please check your phone to make sure you are not on mute. You are unmuted in the meeting. Caller 5719, please double check your phone, make sure you are not on mute on your telephone.

   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you hear me now?

   PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we can.

   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right. Thank you so much. Thank you so much for the opportunity to address the Commission and for all of your hard work throughout this process. I really appreciate seeing some of the changes that have happened most recently, especially with the congressional districts, the Senate district -- primarily the Antelope Valley area and also the Santa Clarita Valley area. The congressional district map really seems to embrace the communities of interest as a good sense of the geography of the region. Same thing with the updates that have made to the Senate map.

   It's the Assembly district map that continues to be troubling, especially for the Antelope Valley, especially the way that they completely divide our community, and the fact that if those maps could be reworked, for instance, you know, in Santa Clarita or bring them over
into the Antelope Valley. But right now, the way that Senate maps have been drawn are doing a tremendous disservice to the entire northeastern Los Angeles County area. Like I say, this particular area is often overlooked in the way of resources --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- and we really need to have representation that can reflect our needs, and that comes by not dividing our communities of interest. Thank you very much for your time, and thank you again for all your work, and a very happy holiday season to you all.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9605, and up next after that is caller 2966.

Caller 9605, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. RUMETTO: Yes, good evening, my name's Elizabeth Rumetto (ph.). First, I would like to thank you for the time you've invested in this process. Yesterday I was pleased to hear the attention of several Commissioners were paying to the requested edits by the greater UC Riverside community. Thank you for your comments and to ensure that UC Riverside as a community of interest, is kept fully into Assembly District 58 within a Senate district.
UCR, located at 900 University Avenue, extends beyond the university boundaries, including research, district land preservations, art, and much more that contribute to a larger university and college town. Currently, UCR campus is being split in the December 8th iteration that can be altered to better acknowledge the UCR community of interest.

Currently, the community is split in the December 8th versions of the Assembly Districts 58 and 63. The UCR community of interest can be defined as our main campus, as well as surrounding infrastructure, landmarks, and communities that surround UCR.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. RUMETTO: When you review the Assembly district maps, I encourage you to consider the maps that were submitted by campus architect Jacqueline Norman under comment 40611 -- again, comment 40611. Yesterday, as part of the official record that include a shape file map for your reference. Thank you very much for your time and attention to this matter.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 2966, and up next after that will be caller 1619. Caller 2966, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. I am a
member -- or I am a resident of the Central Valley wanting to express my views on the current ECA Congressional District. As a resident of Clovis, I believe we should remain with the mountains and ECA District. Clovis has a strong connection to the foothills and rural communities. Many Clovis residents own property in Shaver Lake and the mountains and regularly travel between the two communities. During wildfire season, Clovis often acts as a place of shelter for many mountain residents escaping the fires and many whom are displaced.

We're also both concerned with forest management. Many residents, also of Clovis and the mountain communities, regularly commute to work through the city and foothills and large events in Clovis like the Clovis Rodeo, our annual antique fairs, and BIG Hat Days draw large crowds from the mountain and foothills. As the two communities are so similar, please consider keeping Clovis and Northwest Fresno with the ECA.

MR. MANOFF: Twenty.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you for your time and all your hard work on the committee. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 1619, and up next after that will be caller 2108. Caller 1619, please
follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. If you go through with this STCV-2, 3 and 4 of Kings, Tulare, Kern Congressional Visual -- Visualization as it is being presented, you should no longer even call yourself an independent commission at this point. I know my neighbors and community leaders have called numerous times and asked you to repeatedly not to split up Kings County, yet you are bowing down to a leftist organization which doesn't even live in our district. Things need to be balanced.

The Voting Rights Act is very important, but not to such a degree that communities that are not shared are joined together. It is clear that you are not being independent. This district is so gerrymandered to a degree that it's setting a dangerous precedent.

Please, me and my community are imploring you not to split us up. Please don't bow down to outside politics. If you still want to be considered independent, do not split us up. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 2108, and up next after that is caller 7312. Caller 2108, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. MATHIAS: Hi. My name is Metaborach Mathias
(ph.) and I'm calling from the western part of San Bernardino County, and I was calling regarding two -- two different maps that impact lines that -- of San Bernardino County. The first one being the SD10WE draft from 12/14, which drew South El Monte to Ontario. But as a West San Bernardino County resident, I could say that this map didn't -- doesn't really quite make sense in tying communities together where the west -- or those parts of San Gabriel Valley don't really connect to the Western San Bernardino County region; whereas, I think, Pomona is really considered -- the Pomona Valley -- the cutoff of the connection -- the connection of the western part of San Bernardino County going into LA County.

And the other map that I wanted to make a comment on was also --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. MATHIAS: -- the ADJRC iteration. And while I want to thank the Commission for keeping Corona, Hoopa Valley and Riverside together, it included Grande Terrace in this map. Which, Grande Terrace is in San Bernardino County and it's also part of a completely different school district --

MR. MANOFF: Ten.

MR. MATHIS: -- it's actually part of the Colton Joint Unified School District, and so it splits up that
community from San Bernardino County. But it might make
more sense to include --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 7312, and up next
after that will be caller 9424. Caller 7312, please
follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, my name is Vince Sanchez. I'm a
constituent of North Hollywood, and I'm very concerned
not only about the State Assembly, but the State Senate
maps. What you have done is put white, wealthy
communities in the State Senate San Fernando Valley
areas.

Commissioner Toledo, I'm calling on you as a
champion for the Latino community to move these
communities out of our district. These are predominantly
communities that have been racist to our communities in
North Hollywood and Sun Valley. Burbank and Sunland-
Tujunga do not share our concerns. Move them into the
South San Fernando Valley and unify us with North
Hollywood, Valley Glen, and the communities that are
Latino and immigrant heavy. This, let alone, will
increase the Latino CVAP by one-and-a-half percent. You
need to do this to protect our communities.

In addition, on the State Assembly maps, please,
please try to create two districts that get to fifty
percent, at least.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. SANCHEZ: I really support the Firefighter map, which seems to be the best strategy to combine the East San Fernando communities, Latinos, Filipinos, Armenians all in solidarity in one community. And it's most important (In Spanish, not transcribed) that these --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

MR. SANCHEZ: -- maps get instituted. Please, please look at my suggestions. I've emailed the entire Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9424, and up next after that, will be caller 0688. Caller 9424, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. ECKOV: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Trevor Eckov (ph.). I called earlier this week about San Jose being split into four districts, and I am absolutely ecstatic to see that you, in your third map, have decided to reunite San Jose into a majority Congressional district. And I -- I just cannot thank you enough for listening to the hundreds of voices that have written on your public input page and have called in this week and last week. Your consideration for keeping San Jose intact really shows to me the faith the State of
California has put into you for our democracy is very much intact. And I greatly appreciate how much you are listening to the voices that have been calling in day by day. Again, it -- it really reaffirms the oath that you have all taken to serve this state's democracy.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. ECKOV: And I just want to thank you again for keeping San Jose intact. And have a great holiday.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 0688, and up next after that, will be caller 4560. Caller 0688, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, this is Vivian, and I'm a lifelong resident of the San Gabriel Valley. I'm calling because San Gabriel Valley needs to remain whole. The State Commission's new districting maps will split the San Gabriel Valley and does not reflect the majority of working class Asian American, Pacific Islander, and Latino American voters in the cities of Alhambra, San Gabriel, Rosemead, and Monterey Park. Social media outreach is not enough data because the residents here are busy and tired from working and fighting for resources to improve our neighborhoods.

Just take a walk or visit a restaurant here, and you will see that the redistricting does not reflect the
demographics of my community. I have never heard of La Canada or Bradbury until the redistricting map, because they are majority white households of incomes around $150,000. My mom just retired from USPS and her annual salary is around $60,000, like the majority of my neighbors and residents in the community. Preference is given to these affluent neighborhoods in the foothills when it comes to issues like the 710 or 10 Freeway while my family, friends, and neighbors bear the burden of poor air quality and traffic.

The cities of San Gabriel Valley deserve to maintain --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- a majority Latina and of Asian American Pacific Island a majority senate district because that would adequately represent the diversity of our community and accurately reflect the demographic makeup of the region. Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 4560, and up next after that will be caller 4644. Caller 4560, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. Good evening, Commissioners, and thank you for taking my call and for all the work you are doing. This is Nancy from Elk
Grove. I'd like to say that it has been frustrating at times watching these meetings and the lack of attention to Sacramento County. You had promised to make more time on Old Fig Garden and the entire County of Sacramento. I'm kidding just a little, and if you recall, you did wait until the eleventh hour to fix our Assembly maps.

Now, when it comes to Congressional maps, there is no justification whatsoever for Elk Grove to be connected to Stockton, just like the earlier caller said. We tried this with the first visualizations only to be met with lots of testimony from Elk Grove and Stockton residents indicating our opposition. Please, please discard the Plan FT Iteration entirely. If this is in Sacramento County, how does the population need for only two major Congressional districts; not three? Instead, please use the draft maps --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- as your foundation. And if you want to improve on this plan, all you have to do is take the City of Sacramento splits and move it south similar to the Assembly maps. You can even move Rancho Cordova in with Elk Grove and add other communities for population, such as Fair Oaks --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- Old River, Folsom or
others. Bottom line, Elk Grove does not belong with Stockton in Congressional district.

Thanks a lot for all your time and have a good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 4644, and up next after that will be caller 9230. Caller 4644, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. My name is Haleigh (ph.). I'm a second generation Mariposa resident. As the Commission continues to look at my region, I think it's important to know that communities like mine up here in the mountains do not belong with city areas like Clovis or of Fresno. Thank you for your time. Have a great evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9230, and up next after that will be caller 6089. Caller 9230, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. Thank you so much for finally creating that super majority Latino District within the San Fernando Valley. I also want to thank you for agreeing to swap Sylmar out of Santa Clarita and into the eastern San Fernando Valley where it belongs.
The main focus for you all now is to create two super majority Latino Assembly districts within the San Fernando Valley. And please create an Assembly map that San -- that has Santa Clarita within the northwest Los Angeles County similar to the newly proposed senate districts here. This will make everyone happy and ensure equitable representation for the Latino community and all Angelinos.

Thank you, Commissioners. We look forward to these positive changes.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 6089, and up next after that will be caller 8108. Caller 6089, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Problem. By not referencing it carefully, the Commission has drawn an assembly line. And by drawing the assembly line as a guide, the floor seat unintentionally split the Latino community with Victor Valley by particularly exploiting Northern Hesperia.

Solution. An easy two district swap between ANTVICVAL and MCV, all the portions of Hesperia and AV 39 Antelope plus all portions north of Main Street to ANTVICVAL. Number two, add Apple Hill, Spring Valley Lake, Phelan, Pinon Hills, Wrightwood, and Lytle Creek to
MCV.

Stats. Victor Valley's area kept in ANTVICVAL area are forty-nine percent Latino; areas added at fifty-three percent Latino; areas removed are twenty-seven Latino.

Result. ANTVICVAL would have Adelanto, Victorville, and Northern Hesperia. MCV would have Apple Valley to Southern Hesperia, Oak Hills, Phelan, Pinon Hills, Wrightwood and Lytle Creek. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 8108, and up next after that is caller 3952. Caller 8108, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. MANORE: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Ben Manore (ph.). I'm long-time resident of Santa Clarita Valley. I want to thank you very much and endorse your adoption of CV Greater Iteration Number 3. I believe that that action will keep the district whole in its diversity and its continued value of community within its own community of religion, education, social and economic standards.

I also want to congratulate the effort of keeping San Jose more whole and only having two districts, rather than four. I would like to see a larger number of maybe two districts in the future, but this is -- this is a good start.
Anyway, thank you for your service. Happy holidays. And again, very good work to all of you. Good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 3952, and up next after that will be caller 3588. Caller 3952, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MAYOR LICCARDO: Thank you to the commissioners for your incredible, tireless work on behalf of all of California. My name is Sam Liccardo; I'm again, the Mayor of the City of San Jose. And I just wanted to say thank you for hearing our voices from the City of San Jose and to enabling San Jose to have a clear voice in Washington in the Congressional map that was revised to enable San Jose to have at least one district that would have a majority of San Joseans. It is a wonderful Christmas gift to us. We appreciate it very much, and I just wanted to say thank you for hearing us. Happy Holidays.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 3588, and up next after that is caller 9002. Caller 3588, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. First, Happy Holidays. And after watching the video this afternoon of how painstaking this process is, you guys
totally deserve a joyful and restful holiday season. So thank you for all of your work.

I wanted to thank you, also, for making the -- the -- what I think are the right changes to the San Fernando Valley Senate and Congressional maps. I'm really happy that you were able to honor the communities' input in creating a senate Latino VRA district and agreeing to fix the Congressional map by keeping Sylmar with the Eastern San Fernando Valley.

I would only ask now that -- that you consider focusing on fixing the Assembly map and making Santa Clarita Valley District mirror the Senate map and push towards Northeast Los Angeles to keep it to -- to make sure -- so that in the event -- so that the Assembly map also just makes sense and is consistent. Acton and Agua Dulce really are a -- a -- an extension of that Santa Clarita Valley --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- and they're all part of the same community. Thank you, again, Commissioners, for your hard work. Happy holidays and you're almost there.

You're almost there. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9002, and up next after that will be caller 2395. Caller 9002, please
follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. LIMA: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Joseph Lima (ph.) from Modesto. Thank you very much for taking my call. There's no question that the solution proposed by the Commissioners Sadhwani and Toledo, which I believe you have been referring to in a collation, is the best choice for Central Valley. I believe this proposed district will effectively represent our communities. You have done the right thing by this -- by not rushing through this process. Thank you very much for taking my call.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 2395, and then up next after that will be caller 4920. Caller 2395, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I live in Victorville, and I'm calling to generally support the State Senate map titled SDM6L Iteration. The new Senate iterations in Los Angeles County are far better when it comes to representation, especially for the Latino and Black communities. My only request is that the east side of the district follow the same dividing line as Victor Valley as the Assembly map titled AV39 Antelope. The Assembly map keeps part of Hesperia with Victorville and Adelanto and cuts out Apple Valley.
By doing that, the Assembly map protects the Latino community at interest in the Victor Valley. The Senate map should do the same.

The way that the AD39 Antelope cuts through the Victor Valley keeps the Latino community together. I only ask that SCS6L Iteration make this minor adjustment by including part of Hesperia, which is mostly Latino, and removing Apple Valley, a predominantly white, non-Latino community --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- from the district. Thank you for your time and for your consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 4920, and up next after that will be caller 9006. Caller 4920, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. This is Tanai (ph.) in Eastern California and asking to not combine our area with Clovis and North Fresno with the Sierras and the mountain communities. Our issues are extremely different and unique. We have different pressing needs of wildfires, forest management, difficulty getting homeowners' insurance, catastrophic wildfires, water issues, logging, recreation, and health care. We are a gateway to -- for tourism to Yosemite National Park, and
just very, very different from North Fresno/Clovis area. Our trash issues are quite different, and we are just a rural -- very rural and not city at all.

So we want to stay connected to Mariposa, Yosemite, Oakhurst. The mountain communities, and Course Grove (ph.), and Yosemite Lakes, and the whole mountain area is very unique. So thank you for taking that into consideration. And God bless you and merry Christmas.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9006, and up next after that will be caller 3647. Caller 9006, please follow the prompts. And one more time, caller with the last four digits 9006, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm calling from Modesto. I just want to let you know I've been really glad to see the updated VRA maps for Congress. I'm really happy to see three effective Latino seats in the Central Valley. I know the Central Valley often gets passed over in these processes, but it's clear to me that the commissioners' commitment to taking public input seriously has helped very much. We thank you for that.

Please stick with the iteration on the table right now. I think it's number 4. It's what's best for our
local communities. Thank you so much for your time and
for being committed to fair representation for California
citizens. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 3647, and then up next
after that will be caller 1123. Caller 3647, please
follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners,
and thank you all for your commitment to this process.
I -- I want to commend you on the new State Senate maps
in LA County. These iterations are a big improvement.
And in particular, SDAMP6L (ph.) Iteration Northern LA
County. It's fantastic; far better when it comes to
representation for Latino and Black communities, and the
Latinos see that.

The only request I have -- and I heard Commissioners
earlier say that, you know, minor adjustments they're
interested in seeing. One that I'd love to see the line
drawers just try is on the east side of the district,
following the same dividing line in the Victor Valley as
the Assembly Map AD39 Antelope. It divides -- it keeps
Victorville, Adelanto, and part of Hesperia together and
it preserves the Latino community of interest as one unit
in the Victor Valley. And so --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- rather than having Apple Valley in this District, Victorville, Adelanto, and Hesperia -- parts of Hesperia -- would be much better for the Latino community of interest in the Victor Valley. Otherwise, SDAMP6L Iteration --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- looks great. And I just want to commend you all. Thank you for going through this process. And as another caller said, you're almost there. Thanks so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9471, and then up next after that will be caller 2297. Caller 97 -- 9471, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. Very nice to meet you. I'm calling about the San Fernando Valley Congressional District. I represent the (indiscernible) and I'm concerned that on the last day of line drawing, you removed Porter Ranch and Granda from the San Fernando Valley and placed these communities with (indiscernible). One of the largest and strongest in community in this part of the San Fernando Valley and this move cuts it off from the rest of the Valley. I think this has something to do with how you want to handle (indiscernible). It doesn't have to be this way.
Porter Ranch and Granada can remain with the San Fernando Valley and you can stay connect for lands if you want to leave that District with the North, which has a similar character. This will then undo what you achieved (indiscernible).

Please don't tear up the Valley at the last minute. Please keep all our communities together by connecting Porter Ranch and Granada with other Valley neighborhoods like Northridge, (indiscernible), and (indiscernible), which are all in the same (indiscernible) district by the way. I would appreciate it if you can take a minute to examining -- examine that area one last time. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, I have caller 2297, and up next after that will be caller 1002. Caller 2297, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. I'm calling to support the State Senate map entitled SDANTDICVAL Iteration. I agree with several earlier callers that we should follow the same lines of the Assembly maps for that same area -- AD39 Antelope and swap in Hesperia and remove Apple Valley. The district should follow the same dividing line in the Victor Valley as that Assembly map I just mentioned because it keeps Hesperia with Victorville and Adelanto and cuts out Apple Valley. And by doing
that, the Assembly map protects the Latino community of
interest in Victor Valley. So this makes sense that the
Senate ap should do that same thing.

So what I'm asking is that we make a minor
adjustment, as I mentioned, by including Hesperia. And
that's because it's mostly Latino and removing Apple
Valley, which is predominantly white, non-Latino
community. And in order to add population, if that is
needed, I would suggest and hope that you would consider
adding some of the northernmost sections of the San
Fernando Valley to the map if needed.

And I want to join the chorus of applause for all of
your hard work and your constant efforts. Happy Holidays
to each of you.

MR. MANOFF: Ten.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You certainly earned some
rest.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 1002, and then up next
after that will be caller 9205. Caller 1002, please
follow the prompts. All right. One more time. Caller
with the last four digits 1002, please follow the prompts
to unmute by pressing star six.

I do apologize. Caller 1002, we do appear to have
some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I have
you down for a retry and I will be coming back around.

Right now, we have caller 9205, and up next after that will be caller 4263. Caller 9205, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

Caller 9205, if you could please doublecheck your phone and make sure you are not on mute. You are unmuted in the meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. I've been watching this process play out and I'm disappointed by the recent maps. When it comes to the San Joaquin Valley, foothills and the mountains, the Congressional districts should pair likeminded communities. For example, many residents of Oakhurst commute to Madera City and Madera Ranchos daily for work and errands; not to North Fresno or Clovis. This is why these two communities do not belong in the same district. So please, do not put Clovis and North Fresno with the ECA district. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 4263, and then up next after that will be caller 7483. Caller 4263, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. DONALDSON: Hi, this is David Donaldson (ph.) and I live in Santa Clara, Santa Clara County. In support of your decision that you made earlier tonight
regarding the Iteration number 3 for San Jose
Congressional District map and I had been calling in to
support either one or three. And I have to congratulate
the entire commissioner team. They did outstanding and
brilliant. And the idea -- the ideas -- I -- I would
also like to thank Yee and Ahmad and Sadhwani for their
excellent leadership.

As far as what you're doing, I considerate it a
public service that hopefully other states will follow
because of this excellent leadership. That's basically
it. I had other things to say if there was a question
about one or three.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 7483, and up next
after that is caller 2019. Caller 7483, please follow
the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, all. I'm
calling about Stanislaus County. We are a county of
(indiscernible), and Quinceaneras, and American Graffiti
nights, and apricot fiestas, and (indiscernible), and
yes, agriculture. I've been looking and pondering the
maps, especially Iteration 4 for the Central Valley, and
I would especially like to thank Commissioners Anderson
and Turner for their thoughts and consideration of trying
to move Modesto and Turlock back into the Central
We are a relatively small population area compared to a lot of those around California, and for many years we have felt that we were never heard. I understand the need to maximize the VRAs and would suggest moving Turlock and Modesto into our Central Valley District to possibly attain your goals for this area. We absolutely belong with agricultural --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- areas of the Valley and I hope you will continue to make that happen. We are a Central Valley District now, so I know it's possible. One representative cannot possibly perform meaningful work while dealing with --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- forest land, desert, and ag. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 2019, and then up next after that will be caller 6556. Caller 2019, please follow the prompts. Caller with the last four digits 2019, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Good evening, Commissioners. Can you hear me?
MR. HOLLOWAY: Hello? Okay. Great. First, my name is Brian Holloway (ph.). Thank you very much for your service. I'm a lifelong resident of Sacramento and am speaking in opposition to the map for the Sacramento Congressional District. Sacramento is at the confluence of two major rivers, and we are the most at risk of devastating floods in the entire nation. There are over 600,000 residents at risk of flooding, and it could be said that this is the largest community of interest in the region. Under the proposed map, most of the flood plain of both rivers are no longer in one Congressional district and this will harm our ability to protect Sacramento.

To help visualize, the flood plain of Sacramento is basically the same as the City of Sacramento boundaries. And we need both to be kept together in the same Congressional district. Please keep the flood plain in one Congressional district, as it has been --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. HOLLOWAY: -- for decades. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 6556, and up next after that will be caller 1220. Caller 6556, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, my name is Paul (ph.), and I'm calling from Fresno. I just want to say I think that the maps that you guys have drawn today is really great. I think drawing the arm through Visalia was a really good idea. And I think that at this point you guys did a lot of good work, especially making sure that the VRA Districts have good -- good representation. So I hope -- just want to say that you've done a great job with the current map, and I hope that going forward, you can approve this map without going back to the drawing board again.

So again, thank you for all your hard work in making sure that the VRA Districts have good representation. And that -- that I think that the current map (indiscernible) Valley with the arm going through Visalia was a good move. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 1220. Please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

MS. ROWE: Hello, my name is Kris Rowe (ph.). I'm calling from West Hills in the San Fernando Valley. I'm looking at your Assembly District AD40SCV, and you have -- I have very strong environmental concerns. I -- I look at -- the East San Fernando Valley is fine for a VRA area, but what you've done is divided West San
Fernando Valley in particular. And I've sent my comments on ID40297. You have divided the San Fernando Valley and put parts of the Santa Susana Field Lab, a toxic site that qualifies as a federal Superfund site, with West Hills and it's in Ventura County and west its nearby. But then, you take us all the way out to the Santa Clarita Valley. And because of issues like -- of environmental justice, I support -- there was a gentleman that was an Asian member from Granada Hills that said, yes, we are all in Council District 3. We should be -- San Fernando Valley should be whole.

And if you could divide the districts differently on the Assembly district and the Congressional district --

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

MS. ROWE: -- you -- you would -- you would achieve greater Hispanic population, but you would keep the communities whole. You've divided West Hills from its adjacent Canoga Park and Woodland Hills, and I really would appreciate it if you look at my comments, as I said, 40297 in Malibu -- she did Malibu S --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: At this time, Chair, we are up against a break.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Katy. It is 8:14. My alarm is going off to remind me that it's break time.
We are on break until 8:30. For those of you in the cue, please remain in the cue. We will be back in fifteen minutes to continue taking your calls. Thank you so much everyone.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you so much, Chair. We are on break until 8:30. Nice to see you up late on the CRC nightshift.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 8:15 p.m. until 8:30 p.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your patience during our break. We are back with you. It is 8:30 p.m., and we are looking forward to continuing to hear from the public after -- or at the end of today's meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission.

Katy, please take it away.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Absolutely, Joe. And thank you those that have called in. If you have not done so already, please press star nine. This will raise your hand indicating you've called in to give comment. We do have some hands raised here. Right now, we'll be going to caller 4458, and up next after that will be caller 5115.

And a brief announcement for those that have recently called in. Please speak at a steady pace,
our meeting is being translated. Please take your time
with county names, cities, numbers, and your public
comment in general.

Right now, we have caller 4458, and up next after
that will be caller 5115. Caller 4458, please follow the
prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, can you hear me?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. Thank you so much. My
name is John (ph.), and I live in the mountain area
community of Ahwahnee. And what I would like to do is
to -- I'm going to talk about ECA -- eastern county --
Eastern California. And I would like to recommend that
you do not, and I repeat, do not combine Clovis and North
Fresno with the Sierra Mountain communities of interest.

Our interests are extremely different and very
unique. For example, in rural California, we have
pressing issues of wildfires, waste management, a lot of
the people up here can't get fire insurance because of
the catastrophic wild -- wildfires. We have water
issues, we have logging, recreation. Health care is a
whole different animal up here.

We are also a gateway tourist community that thrives
off tourism, and North Fresno and Clovis is not that way.
And even the trash issues are extremely different as we
have rural areas that have seventy-five households per
square mile or less, so we have different issues on that.
We have many backgrounds, walks of life from Oakhurst to
Madera, Mariposa and Merced. And the mountain
communities that share a special interest --

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- need to be in the same
district that does not include highly populated cities
like Clovis and North -- and North Fresno. So keep the
mountain communities unique regarding the seats.

MR. MANOFF: Ten.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, and God bless you,
and Merry Christmas.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 5115, and then up next
after that will be caller 6883. Caller 5115, please
follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. My
name is Cassandra (ph.), and as a lifelong San Jose
resident, I just wanted to extend my gratitude for your
work on our Congressional maps today. Especially,
Tamina, for all your hard work drawing these maps, and to
the entire Commission for choosing Iteration 3 that
preserves a majority San Jose voice in Congress. Thank
you so much for listening to our community and for not
splitting us into four Congressional districts. We really appreciate it and agree that map Iteration number 3 allows our tenth largest city in America to keep a representative that speaks for us. So thank you, again, and I wish you a happy holiday. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 6883, and up next after that will be caller 6743. Caller 6883, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. ROTH: All right. Thank you. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. ROTH: Great. Good -- good evening, Commissioners. It was afternoon when I started, so I -- my name is Joseph Roth and I'm on the boards of the Westside Neighborhood Council and the Westwood South Homeowners' Association. I appreciate your service and your continued consideration throughout these deliberations.

I'm calling tonight about an LA County SD West of 110. Please revisit the composition of this SD West of 110 Iteration as it separates the west side from longstanding communities of interest to the north, as in Westwood, and to the west like Santa Monica and West LA and Brentwood, where we share some common arterials, business districts, and issues.
Additionally, I also want to point out -- and I'm familiar with VRA -- VRA -- and I know this doesn't count -- but lots of other ethnicities are being taken into account, and the Jewish community on this side of the hill is being disbursed into three different districts. So if you could give more consideration to that, as well, that'd be great. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 6743, and then up next after that will be caller 3899. Caller 6743, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. SOULE: Hi. Thank you, Commissioners. My name is Karen Soule (ph.), and I'm a resident of the Yorba Linda in Orange County. And on the December 8th version of the Congressional maps, you guys really got it right and it seemed that you listened and honored the input of North Orange County residents by keeping the close-knit communities of Brea, Fullerton, Yorba Linda, and Placentia together. However, after the 8th, something strange happened and when you redid the maps, you split up North Orange County.

It just doesn't make any sense that Yorba Linda isn't with Fullerton, Brea and especially Placentia because we have common interests with shopping, dining, and education in these communities. Especially Yorba
Linda and Placentia share a school district and Yorba Belinda Boulevard runs through Yorba Belinda, Placentia, and Fullerton. We had fair and balanced districts, but you destroyed our district, and I can't fathom why. And please, please, just take another look at it -- how you had it on the 8th. And I hope you can change it back and keep our neighbors together. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 3899, and then up next after that will be caller 5352. Caller 3899, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. I want to thank the Commission for all the time they spent in Long Beach and just to say that we're generally happy. I know there's been a lot of testimony, some of it even conflicting, but we saw many of our top priorities were heard. We definitely don't want the Commission to go in the wrong direction at this point and divide our city even more. So we certainly can live with our current map and we hope we see minimal changes in the future. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 5352, and up next after that will be caller 6483. Caller 5352, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, can you guys hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, so my name is James (ph.). I am a lifelong resident of Rancho Cucamonga, and I was just wanting to comment that while you guys have been doing a good job with the districts so far, I would just like to point out that Rancho Cucamonga and Upland really don't have any -- any ties to Los Angeles County. We want to be grouped into San Bernardino County districts, not with Los Angeles County districts. It's just a different culture, different -- different -- different economics; things like that. We just would really like to be -- over here in Rancho Cucamonga and Upland, really like to be placed with San Bernardino districts, especially the State Senate District. Thank you and have a good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 6483, and up next after that will be caller 7268. Caller 6483, please follow the prompts. Caller 6483, have you intentionally lowered your hand? I don't believe you did so. All right. There you are. Caller 6483, if you will please follow the prompts by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. I'm calling
about the Assembly, Senate and Congressional districts
and the very large district VCA. I'm concerned about
adding the cities of North Fresno and Clovis to the
Sierra National Forest and mountain communities of
Verona, Oakhurst, Mariposa, Bass Lake, Madera and others.
If this happens, the mountain communities will be
disenfranchised. The important issues are water and
trash, transportation, employment, and economic issues,
and the Valley cities do not share these same concerns.
Please consider keeping the cities out of the ECA
district and allow the mountain areas to be joined with
their truly communities of interest like Bass Lake,
Verona, Sierra National, Mariposa, Madera and others.
Thank you so much for your time. Greatly appreciate it.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 7268, and up next
after that is caller 1535. I'd like to invite those that
have just called in to please press star nine. If you
haven't done so already, please press star nine
indicating you wish to give comment. This will raise
your hand. Makes my job a little bit easier. Right now,
we have caller 7268, and up next after that will be
caller 1535. Caller 7268, please follow the prompts.
The floor is yours.

MR. RUIZ: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is
Angel Ruiz. I am a member of the Central Valley Equitable Coalition Map. I live in the City of Tulare. It's a beautiful city, by the way; I encourage people to move here. We recommend you to adopt -- I mean to prioritize the creation of three effective VRA Congressional Districts: CVAP level -- CVAP level and VRA are appropriately reflective of what we have done in the county where they adopted our guidelines for what we were doing. And I am proud to say that I didn't miss one meeting for redistricting in the County of Tulare. That was a lot of fun. Also, as a CSU Bakersfield student GIS program, I'm wondering how many layers Jaime has on her map because I am fascinated by everything that you guys are doing.

Thank you so much for serving. Thank you for being the voice of the state of California. Thank you for helping everybody. And please, one last thing --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. RUIZ: -- I urge you to help Little Saigon. I have heard so many comments from there. I have heard people from all parts of -- of -- of California, but please, I urge you to help the people of Little Saigon. Thank you again so much for doing what you are doing. It means a lot.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 1535, and up next after that is caller 2641. Caller 1535, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. MALDONADO: Hi, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. MALDONADO: Commissioners, it's Tony Maldonado (ph.) again from Santa Clarita. Thank you and the mappers for your hard work on our Congressional, Senate maps, but please, no more drastic changes. You've done the right thing pairing us with (indiscernible) Valley and moving so much to the San Fernando Valley East. So thank you. However, we suffer from wildfires and it's a serious concern. So if you remove Porter Ranch and Grenada Hills, which are part of the City of Los Angeles, and then go further into the rural parts of Sunland-Tujunga and the foothill trails by moving the eastern side boundaries of Santa Clarita further into the Angeles National Forest, you will help us to strengthen our wildfire risk management, which is quite a serious concern. Currently, the boundary sits off the 14 Freeway, this is area to Placerita Canyon State Park and Magic Mountain Wilderness, but are entirely within the Santa Clarita Valley and experience wildfires often. I've sent you some shape file so you can actually look at this.

On another note, please revisit Santa Clarita's
Assemblies Map -- Assembly map, which should match our Congressional --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. MALDONADO: -- Senate maps. Currently, you have us connected to the San Fernando Valley, which makes no sense at all and should be removed. And it should be replaced as Agua Dulce, Acton, Lake Elizabeth and the unincorporated areas of Northwest LA County. Then we're cooking with gas.

Before I go, a big shout out to Katy, the call moderators, and ASL interpreters. Thank you for doing a great job. Everyone, have a good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 2648, and up next after that will be caller 8563. Caller 2648, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. MENENDEZ: Hello, my name is Magda Menendez. I've been a resident of Bakersfield my entire life, and I'm asking that you allow for better representation of the Latino community in the Central Valley. The draft maps dilute -- diluted the voice of our community by including too many areas and have always voted against us in the past. But it looks like there's a fix. Map STCV4 was posted on your website today and it's effective. STCV4 includes two very strong Latino voting rights acts
seats instead of three weak seats. It keeps far more of the communities together.

The District of Bakersfield is fifty-nine percent Latino CREP. The District with the City of Fresno is fifty-three percent Latino CREP. These are both effective seats according to the Dolores Huerta Foundation. Dolores Huerta Foundation knows the Central Valley and knows our community. Please support STCV4 and the map for Congress. Thank you. Good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 8563, and up next after that will be caller 1623. Caller 8563, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours. Caller 8563, if you would please double check your phone, make sure you are not on mute. You are unmuted in the meeting.

MS. KADIR: Hi. My -- sorry about that. My name is Karima Abdul Kadir (ph.). I'm calling from the high desert region of Victorville. I'm calling regarding our State Senate District. I'm calling because we want to keep Hesperia in our State Senate District. It's a high Latino population and we need to protect our communities. So that map I am looking to protect in SDANTVICVAL Iteration.

So just a minor change of removing the Apple Valley if possible if needed and including Hesperia. That would
make it a stronger force for the voting rights of the Latino
community. So I hope the Commission keeps these
communities together. Thank you for your time and
consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 1623, and up next
after that will be caller 0566. Caller 1623, please
follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. Hi. Thank you
all for your hard work. I'm just calling to say if you
could please keep Rancho Cucamonga and Upland in the San
Bernardino County District. We do not have a lot in
common as far as interests go with Los Angeles County.
We also have different taxes in both of those counties
and Upland and San -- excuse me -- Upland and Rancho
Cucamonga are in San Bernardino County and I feel like
the district should stay that way, too, and not put us in
with LA County. Thank you so much. Have a happy holiday
season.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 0566, and up next
after that we will retry caller 1002. Caller 0566,
please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, this is Barbara (ph.),
and I live in Madera, but I do business up in the
mountain areas -- Oakhurst, Coarsegold, and also in the
Clovis/Fresno area. And those are two completely
different communities. Clovis has -- especially has high
density neighborhoods. I know because I'm looking for a
house there. And the needs of both those communities are
so diverse that they should not be put together. So I'm
asking that you consider leaving the mountain area the
mountain area. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we will retry caller 1002, and then
up next after that will be caller 4993. And for those
that have not done so already, please press star nine to
raise your hand. Caller 1002 -- caller 1002, if you will
please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.
The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, hello.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. Hello the
Commissioners. This is upsetting to hear one voice
tonight from the political group (indiscernible) which is
start calling last week and call (indiscernible). You
know, it is for sure, it has not been to our local
schools or even (indiscernible). There are so many
Vietnamese American students and customers in this area, that (indiscernible) population of Vietnamese American in Huntington Beach.

Please, listen to our collective voices. This is one. Put north of (indiscernible) Street in Huntington Beach to Little Saigon, which will include Huntington Harbor where the majority of the residents are Vietnamese American. If adding Huntington Beach with Little Saigon on in the Congressional and Senate, why wouldn't it make sense to also --

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- do so with the Assembly?

Leave our community the collective voices we need to protect our school districts between Westminster, Huntington Beach, and Sun Valley. Please, put Huntington Beach with Little Saigon for our three maps --

MR. MANOFF: Ten.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- including the State Assembly maps. Thank you so much for your hard work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we'll go to caller 4993, and up next after that will be caller 2313. Caller 4993, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I just wanted to thank the Commission for the incredible work that they've done
through all these many months, but most of all just what
they did to protect the City of San Jose and to listen to
the concerns of over 600 San Jose residents who have
weighed in following the lead of Mayor Liccardo saying
you can have a heavily Asian district from the north part
of our city; you can have a heavily Latino district that
includes the east side; and you can still also have a
district that is the majority of the city of San Jose.
So we know that we've always got one person who will be
fighting for us.

And we're fortunate that we're a large city - the
tenth largest city in the country. And not every
district -- not every jurisdiction has the ability to
count on one person who will be fighting for them. But
we are the largest city in Northern California, and
knowing that we're going to have that voice fighting for
us was just enormously important --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- is enormously important to
our community. And the fact that you all listened,
you -- you saw that we could do what we -- it was
possible to do what the Mayor and others have said could
be done. And you tried and you gave us that voice was
just, like, enormously appreciated. So we're very, very
grateful for what you've done and hope you all have a
wonderful holiday season.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 2313, and up next after that will be caller 1536. Caller 2313, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. Good evening. My name is Pedro (ph.), and I'm calling from Fresno. Thank you all, first off, for your hard work and really just -- it's very impressive the way you're hearing out the -- the most-populated state in the entire country. And as somebody that experienced redistricting heavily in the local level, the way you're conducting things really has me desiring more at the local level.

But I do want to express my support for the (indiscernible) Congressional Plan. I'm here to support the changes made to the Central Valley Congressional map as shown in the fourth visualization. Then you can -- I also wanted to just add that even though the Merced/Fresno District is -- is great as it is currently drawn, even though the Latinos see that it's slightly slower at 50.24 percent, we believe it will perform for our families and it creates most opportunities for fair representation throughout the Central Valley. That's all I wanted to share. Thank you, all, and great job.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 3516, and up next after that will be caller 1597. And for those that have just called in, please press star nine to raise your hand indicating you wish to give comment. Caller 1536, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, this is (indiscernible). I just want to take this opportunity to thank the commissioners for listening to the community and I -- I want to comment regarding the San Jose Congressional District Iteration 3 map from December 15th. Looks like you guys finally heard us. Asian community, we feel like we need other voices (indiscernible).

And we really appreciate the brilliant work of Commissioner Sadhwani, Commissioner Yee, Commissioner Ahmad, and the entire commission. It is not easy the task that you guys were given. You guys were to -- able to listen to different groups and you still heard us and gave us a voice and we really are grateful for it. Thank you so much for your hard work and dedication and you have a happy holidays.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9517, and up next after that is caller 7452. Caller 9517, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commission. My name
is Vanessa, a resident of Fountain Valley. Please keep Huntington Beach with the Fountain Valley, Westminster, and (indiscernible) make a lot of sense for our many (indiscernible) communities of interest of those cities and communities together in the Assembly, Senate, and Congressional District.

Commissioner (indiscernible), thank you for wait -- thank you for wanting to visit Little Saigon District map.

Please make sure you include (indiscernible) of Huntington Beach with -- of all the north (indiscernible) Street to the Little Saigon Assemblies to allow the communities to be represent by the same Assembly member who understand the great Little Saigon community. Thank you very much. We say goodnight.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 7452, and up next after that is caller 4521. 7452, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. SOTO: Thank you. Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you for your hard work and diligence. My name is Michael Soto. I'm an Alhambra homeowner and Advisory Housing Commissioner. I'm calling today regarding the latest San Gabriel Valley State Senate maps. Alhambra, San Gabriel, Rosemead, and Monterey Park are Latino API
minority majority cities along the 10 Freeway and should be included with the rest of the San Gabriel Valley, rather than Pasadena and other predominantly white portal communities north along the 210 and 134 Freeways. These west San Gabriel cities do not share concerns around fire danger with the (indiscernible) communities and have a high -- and are working class communities as opposed to more affluent communities to the north.

Also, just another further distinction, is that these communities to the north have major higher education institutions, such as Caltech and The Claremont Colleges. I urge the committees who are working the San Gabriel Valley back to the November maps where the San Gabriel was united in one district and represents a more accurate community.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. SOTO: Please do not dilute Latino or API voices in the San Gabriel Valley. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 4521, and up next after that will be caller 1587. Caller 4521, if you'll please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, this is Deborah with the City of Rancho Cucamonga, and I'm calling to request to please keep the City of Rancho Cucamonga whole. We
are a community of 177,000 people and are currently split into two Assembly districts, two Senate districts, and three Congressional districts. We respectfully request that you keep us into one district, as we have a sense of identity and historically been in all one district. And we thank you to keep our neighborhoods together so that we do not have diminishing community power and have the opportunity for strong representation. Thank you so much and have a nice evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 1587, and up next after that will be caller 2737. Caller 1587, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. RAMOS ANDERSON: Hello. Thank you, Congress -- Commission. My name is Patricia Ramos Anderson, and I'm from Santa Nella, which is a gateway to Silicon Valley to Central Valley in Merced County. For generations, Merced and the Salinas Valley have been -- have much similarities in Central Valley far, far from any kind of central cove. I have a family of three generations. I was raised here and actually retired and came back.

What's important about our area is the demographics are very similar to those in Merced County, Central Valley, and its agricultural-based economy. And also, we have great fishing, by the way, at the San Luis
Reservoir. Our communities and (indiscernible) many unincorporated rural communities such as ours need a strong voice who will represent us in Sacramento and advocate who understand our issues that impact us here in Central Valley. We must keep Salinas, Merced, and Central Valley together.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. RAMOS ANDERSON: Support the communities of interest instead of the status quo. That's been a challenge because we've not had enough representation that brings back infrastructure especially to many of our rural communities. And my little town --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

MS. RAMOS ANDERSON: -- might be small, but it brings in like 4 million dollars of revenue yearly for the past fifty years with the same supervisor -- now, he retired and left in the district election, but never had a park built in three --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 2737, and up next after that will be caller 2450. Caller 2737, please follow the prompts. Caller with the last four digits 2737, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MS. RAMOS: Yes. Senora Ramos. (In Spanish, not
MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (In Spanish, not transcribed).

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (In Spanish, not transcribed).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 2450, and up next after that is caller 7100. And these are the last two hands I have in the cue. So if you have not spoke this evening, please press star nine to raise your hand indicating you wish to give comment. Makes my job a little easier. And if you have not spoke this evening, please press star nine.

Right now, we have caller 2450, and up next after that will be caller 7900. Caller 2450, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. NAIL: Hello. My name is Mike Nail (ph.). I live in Hesperia and work in Victorville. I am calling to generally support the State Senate map titled SD_ANTDICAL_Iteration. The new Senate iterations in Los Angeles County are far better when it comes to representation, especially for the Latino and Black communities. My only request is that the east side of
the district follow the same dividing line in the Victor Valley as the Assembly Map 8039 Antelope. The Assembly map keeps part of Hesperia with Victorville and Adelanto and cuts out Apple Valley. By doing that, the Assembly map protects the Latino community of interest in the Victor Valley.

The Senate map should be the same. The way that the AV39 Antelope seat cuts through the Victor Valley, keeps the Latino communities together. I only ask that SDANTVICAL Iteration makes this minor adjustment by including part of Hesperia, which is mostly Latino, and removing Apple Valley, a predominantly white, non-Latino community from the District.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. MAYO: Thank you for your time and consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 7100, and up next after that we have caller 5178. Caller 7100, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. PORTALA: Thank you. I've been waiting for a long time. My name is Majesh Portala (ph.), a thirty-year resident of Freemont, California, and I work in Cupertino. And I basically am representing the San Jose (indiscernible) District. I'm calling for the third
time, actually, over the last few months. And two days prior to this meeting, I was pretty educated. The community was calling me to make a presentation, but as before, the commissioners were not listening. But I was very presently surprised and very happy that you all chose the Iteration number 3.

As you may have guessed, I represent the South Asian community, which has created many jobs and supported the community (indiscernible) created prosperity and realized the human potential here in the Valley. Keeping Freemont and Cupertino together will not only strengthen our democracy, but stop this (indiscernible) my south Asian community as thriving today as we were feeling disenchised (sic) by what we were noticing -- what was happening. Especially the Iteration number 2 was a clear insult as it was (indiscernible) --

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

MR. PORTALA: -- and difficult to (indiscernible) to my community by targeting (indiscernible).

Thank you so much for listening and (indiscernible).

Finally, I'd like to thank (indiscernible) Commissioner Sara Sadhwani for really listening to the community, and we are pleased to listen to her. And I'd also like to thank the Commissioner Yee. Have a --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 5178, and up next after that is caller 0413. Caller 5178, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. LONG: Hi, my name is John Wong. I was born and raised in the community of Rancho Penasquitos. First of all, I want to thank Commissioner Sinay and Sivan on their work in the Southern California area of East (indiscernible) District. Overall, I am mostly pleased with what you all have done so far (indiscernible) today.

I understand tomorrow you may adjust a few things in the North County San Diego District, but if you keep the Coast/Inland two district format, I just want to do a little bit of cleanup. This will be really good news for you, Commissioner Sinay, since I know you want to keep the (indiscernible) High School District together. If you could just move the SSD and SD Coast District in Carmel Valley east of the 5 down to Penasquitos Creek to keep Carmel Valley whole, that would be really great. And then, we can keep (indiscernible) Unified whole by making sure that --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. LONG: -- (indiscernible) Highland and Rancho Penasquitos are -- are back in the SD (indiscernible) Escondido District. You can kind of follow the Fairbanks Ranch, City of San Diego boundary and kind of just
like -- just --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. LONG: -- continue that south to Penasquitos Creek, and there you have it, keeping both of our school districts whole.

I'm putting it out there. If you can do that, Commissioner Sinay, that would be really good. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

All right. Now, we have caller 0413, and up next after that will be caller 8116. Caller 0413, please follow the prompts. Caller with the last four digits 0413, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. Caller 0413, you appear to have some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I do have you down as a retry. I will come back around.

Caller 8116, you'll be right now, and up next after that will be caller 7215. Caller 8116, please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. Can you all hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, awesome. Hi, everyone. My name is Cassandra and I'm a resident from Merced County, and thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. I want to first state that I support the
(indiscernible) redistricting plan overall, and I especially really like the three Central Valley Districts from the fourth visualization.

I think the Merced Congressional District is great as it clearly is drawn. And even though the Latino CVEC is slightly lower than 50.24 percent, I think it will benefit my district and I believe it will perform for our families. I really think it creates the most opportunities for fair representation throughout the entire Central Valley. And I especially really like how it keeps the Central Valley whole, because that way we have the chance to elect a senator that lives there and is there 100 percent of the time. And I think that's really important.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So I think that's -- that's it for my comments. And thank you for your time and for all your hard work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 7215, and up next after that is caller 2078. Caller 7215, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, my name is Samantha, and I am calling in just to show my support for the map of congressional plan. I am here to support the changes
that have been made into the Central Valley congressional
map as shown in the 4th visualization. And these
districts draw the current district stronger than before
with an overall fifty-nine percent LCVAP. And I
particularly think this is necessary because I believe
that it will greatly perform for families over the next
decade. That's ten years, so it's a long time. And in
this historically underrepresented region, it is going to
be really important for all of our communities for our
day-to-day life. So thank you so much for this
opportunity. That will be it. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 2078, and up next
after that will be caller 1123.

Caller 2078, please follow the prompts. One more
time. Caller with the last four digits 2078, please
follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The
floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. My name is Vanesh
(ph.). I'm calling about the San Fernando Valley
congressional district. I represent the (indiscernible)
Association of Los Angeles. And I'm concerned that on
the last day of line drawing, you removed Porter Ranch
and Granada Hills from the San Fernando Valley and placed
these communities with Palmdale and Lancaster. There is
a large South Asian community in this part of San
Fernando Valley. And this move cuts it off from the rest
of the Valley. I think this had something to do with how
you wanted to handle Sylmar. It does not help in the
district.

Porter Ranch and Granada Hills can remain in the San
Fernando Valley and you can instead connect Sundland-
Tujunga with the district to the north because they're
similar character. This would not undo what you achieved
with Sylmar. Please do not tear up --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- the Valley at the last
minute. Please keep all of our communities together by
connecting Porter Ranch and Granada Hills with these
other wealthy neighborhoods like Northridge, South
(Indiscernible), and North Hills. We share all in the
same LA City --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- Council district, by the
way. I appreciate if you can take a minute to examine
that area one last time. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 1123, and then up next
after that will be caller 5319.

And for those that have just called in, please press
star nine indicating you wish to give comment. This will raise your hand. It will help me sort through the queue. Please press star nine.

Caller 1123, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. VALADEZ: Hello, Commissioners. My name is Samantha Valadez (ph.). Thank you all for allowing me the time to speak tonight. I seek to support the MALDEF congressional maps and want to state my support for the changes made to the Central Valley congressional map as shown in the 4th visualization. As a resident in Kern, these new districts draw the current district stronger at over fifty-nine percent Latino CVAP. This is a necessary change and will greatly perform for our families for the next ten years in this historically underrepresented region. The Kings-Tulare-Kern district of MALDEF's CD 21 needs to be as strong as possible in Latino CVAP to perform for our community. I urge you to please support the MALDEF congressional map with the changes made to the Central Valley as shown in the 4th visualization. Thank you all.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have color 5319, and then up next after that, we will retry caller 0413.

Caller 5319, please follow the prompts. The floor
is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners, I'm calling from Napa County. I just wanted to thank the Commission for all your hard work and for keeping Napa County whole as an agricultural district. I also wanted to thank you all for changing the public comment process and not closing the line. Many vulnerable populations live in areas with limited or unpredictable service, and dropped calls happen often. Keeping the three-hour window open addresses this issue. Finally, I want to thank everyone behind the scenes. The Commission is great, but the staff behind the scenes is what makes it all possible. Thank you all again. Have a good night and happy holidays.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will retry caller 0413, and up next after that will be caller 2956.

Caller 0413, please follow the prompts.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, good evening. Hi, Commissioners. my name is Ginger (ph.), and I live in the Madera Ranchos. I've been watching the Commission process very closely for the last several months, especially the recent map ideas. I think it's important
to know that areas like the Ranchos should be paired with communities like Madera, Chowchilla, especially the mountain counterparts like Mariposa, Oakhurst and Coarsegold. Clovis and Fresno should not be with countryside and mountain communities. Will you please keep that in mind? Thank you so much. Have a good evening and have a Merry Christmas. Thank you. Bye-bye.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we will have color 2956, and up next after that will be caller 1808.

Caller 2956, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, all. I first want to start off by just thanking the Commissioners for all the work that they've done. I know that this has been an extremely intense process and I completely understand this is a ton of public comment to listen in to. I want to go ahead and share in with -- many other commenters have shared already in regards to the San Gabriel Valley. The west San Gabriel Valley and the east San Gabriel Valley cannot be split up. They need to be made whole. This is diminishing the power of our communities. And so much of the coalition work that we've been doing around homelessness, around transportation issues, we just got put in place with San Gabriel Valley Regional Housing
Trust that it's going to be serving our communities.

What is going to happen to that trust should this happen?

I also want to underscore that I've been listening to the meeting, and I've been very concerned that it seems like Commissioners aren't willing to make any changes at this point. And if that's the case, then what is the point of public input? I understand the VRA districts are incredibly important, but we are trying to offer public feedback --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- to this process because we know our communities and we love our communities. And we would just appreciate if you took into account some of our feedback that we are providing here. Thank you so much and have a very good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we will have caller 1808, and up next after that will be caller 3331.

Caller 1808, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. And one more time. Caller 1808, if you wish to give comment this evening, please press star six to unmute. Thank you, caller 1808. Please contact the Commission in other ways if you still have comments.

Right now we have caller 3331, and up next after that will be caller 3656.
Caller 3331, please follow the prompts to unmute.

Caller with the last four digits 3331, if you wish to give comment this evening, please press star six. The floor is yours.

MS. PEREZ: Good evening, Commissioners. First of all, I'd like to thank you for listening to our comments and concerns. My name is Dora Perez (ph.) and I'm living in Alhambra in the San Gabriel Valley. And I'm calling to speak in opposition of redistricting of the west San Gabriel Valley. This map dilutes the AAPI and the Latino votes, reversing decades of policies that were meant to ensure equitable representation.

I'm calling to share my concern that the State Commission is reducing the political power of Latino and AAPI voters in the west San Gabriel Valley. The west San Gabriel Valley cities that encompass Alhambra, Monterey Park, San Gabriel, and Rosemead are currently being connected with white, affluent foothill cities such as Pasadena, La Canada, and Bradbury. Bradbury is one of the wealthiest zip codes in California, with an average household income of 150,000 dollars; La Canada with an annual household income of 175,000 dollars. These cities are predominantly white. However, in Alhambra and Monterey Park, our annual household income is 61,000 dollars. And these cities whites make up less than ten
percent of the residents. The affluent white communities in the foothills --

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

MS. PEREZ: -- hold a tremendous amount of political power over the small -- smaller working-class cities in west San Gabriel. Our communities in west San Gabriel are constantly fighting for resources to improve our neighborhoods.

MR. MANOFF: Five seconds.

MR. PEREZ: And policy decisions -- thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 3656, and then up next after will be caller 7726.

Caller 3656, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. Caller with the last four digits 3656, if you wish to give comment this evening, please press star six. Thank you so much for calling in this evening, caller 3656.

At this time, we will be going to caller 7726. If you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. And one last time. Caller with the last four digits 7726, if you wish to give comment, please press star six.

At this time, Chair, everyone in the queue has had an opportunity to speak.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much, Katy, and thank you to all of our callers this evening. In accordance with our new public comment policy, I wanted to take a moment to invite anyone who might be out there listening or watching the live feed who might wish to give public comment to go ahead and call in. Katy, could you please read the instructions again?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Absolutely, Chair. One moment.

In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commission will be taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247 and enter the meeting ID number 85932989398 for this meeting. Once you have dialed in, please press star nine to enter the comment queue.

The full call-in instructions were read at the beginning of this public comment and input session, and they're provided in full on the livestream landing page.

At this time, Chair, we do not have any new callers, but we will give it a few minutes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yep. We will stand by for a couple of minutes to see if anyone else calls in.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, I just wanted to remind
all our viewers that we'll be on the same channel
tomorrow at 9:30 as well as on --

CHAIR KENNEDY: (Indiscernible).

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It's tomorrow. Is
tomorrow --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Friday.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Friday.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: These days are just
meshing. And then Saturday is also 9:30. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And we do have a caller
that appears to be joining us.

Caller with the last four digits 9938, can you see
that yet? Give one moment. Caller 9938, if you will
please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.
The floor is yours.

MS. SAL: Hi, my name is Linda Sal (ph.) and I
wanted to thank Commissioner Yee and Commissioner Ahmad
for developing the Plan YA, San Jose Congressional
District iteration 3. Thank you also to Commissioner
Sadhwani for proposing this direction as an alternate to
the NEC (ph.) map, and Commissioner Toledo for being an
early supporter of this idea and Chair Kennedy for asking
Commissioner Ahmad and Commissioner Yee to try out this
map iteration 3 -- that direction.
And I also think that the end result is brilliant, creating a long coastal district, which is a tradition in California of protecting the coast. The district has a lot in common. A lot of people drive down the coast, have activities and events, and we cherish our coast. This plan meets all of San Jose Mayor Liccardo's request --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. SAL: -- and I support the plan because it's very similar to Greater CD -- GREATERED, which has been roughly the same for several weeks because it's had so many COIs in support of it since the summer. So thank you again for all your dedication. You are a model of effectiveness, collaboration, and great decision making. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And at this time, we have caller with the last four digits 7840, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. One moment. Caller 7840 appears to have had a dropped call. One moment, please. At this time, we have caller 1915. If you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours. Caller --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, thank you so much for preserving the voice of San Jose. We agree with this
decision to implement Map 3 as discussed today. Thank you so much for listening to our community and for not splitting up us into four districts. We really appreciate all your hard work on this matter and agree that Map 3 allows the tenth largest city in America to keep a representative that speaks for us all. Thank you. Happy Holidays.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And caller 7840 is back and please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, hello. My name is Arman (ph.), and I am calling from the San Fernando Valley, specifically Valley Glen. I first of all want to thank you all, Commissioners, for the incredible work you've done at building these maps. From there, I do want to let you all know that I am a long-time resident of the San Fernando Valley and that I am calling on you and asking you to adopt the San Fernando Valley firefighters' Assembly map. So I'm specifically talking about the Assembly map right now.

The LA firefighter map is supported by neighborhood leaders and community members such as myself. And the reason why I support this map is that it incorporates all of North Hollywood and Toluca Lake into a single Assembly
district and unites the Filipino community -- my brothers and sisters -- in Van Nuys, North Hills East, Panorama City, and North Hollywood into one district instead of the current map outlining which divides this growing population into three districts.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Finally, I support this because the map aligns traditionally Jewish neighborhoods and keeps our LGBTQ populations in the Valley unified. Once again, thank you for your work. I urge you to change the maps and to support the LA firefighters' map or the San Fernando Valley firefighters' map for the Assembly district. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 2672, and right up next after that will be caller 9379.

Caller 2672, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, I'm calling from Arcata. I wanted to call in response to the -- I noticed that you have that really long coastal district, which I appreciate, but I noticed you do a little cut in Humboldt. I'm referring back to the -- I know that was done because the Native Vote Project asked for that. And I note that there's some letters from the tribes the
Karuk and the Yurok that wanted Siskiyou County to be drawn into the west.

With that in mind, I would just appreciate -- I know you're looking at southern California and that's kind of the big thing on your minds right now. But I think it's a pretty easy fix. The population isn't that big and there's no VRA question. So like, just drawing the western half of Siskiyou County into the NORTHCOAS district and then taking that out on the Sonoma side, further down the coast. I know that the Environmental Protection Information Center up here has been really supportive of that as some of our environmental friends up and down the state, and then the Karuk and Yurok tribes. So I'm just asking for Point Reyes to Castle Rock in one district with the Karuk and Yurok in their traditional lands. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And at this time, I'd like to give caller 9379 an opportunity. Please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours, hello.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello -- oh, I'm sorry. Hello, my name's Manson and I'm calling again from Orange County. I've been a lifelong resident for almost two decades. I'd just like to recommend a small fix to the SANTAANA and SAVANAANA districts between Garden Grove and
Santa Ana in order to maximize the representation of the Latino community and the Asian American community in those areas. I recommend you split Santa Ana along Harbor Boulevard and Garden Grove along Harbor Boulevard and West Street.

That way, by splitting these two cities, you can increase the Latino voting age population in SANTAANA by 0.5 percent and the Asian American voting age population in SAVANAANA by 0.7 percent. Another suggestion I'd like to make is that in the Assembly -- in the Assembly drafts, you have a district going on the Orange County coast. But I feel like Costa Mesa would be a better fit in that district than Lake Forest and Laguna Woods.

Those areas are across a ridge, and I think a district --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- that would represent the coastal economy would be one that includes Costa Mesa and that district. That is all, and have a great night, and thank you for your work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

One moment. And right now, we have caller 5038, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you for taking these calls in so late at night. I
just want to emphasize again one more time that you all keep the San Fernando Valley together, no matter what, for all the congressional and Senate and Assembly maps like you did for the Senate maps, specifically, which is great.

Just remember also to please keep the Santa Clarita Valley together. That includes Acton and Agua Dulce as well. And remember to push the Assembly map specifically northwest. And if you know what -- I'm sure you all know what that means, because that's kind of what the Senate district maps specifically -- that you all made is a good template for it. So just keep doing that, push up north; Frazier Park, that's a good area. So just keep doing that and create the supermajority Latino districts, too, in the San Fernando Valley for Assembly. I think that'll make everyone happy. So just keep pushing forward to that. And yeah. Well, we appreciate all your hard work, especially late in the night. So thank you so much for your hard work. Thank you. Bye.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller -- wait; right now we have caller 6349. Caller 6349, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, thank you. I'm
calling from the city of San Juan Capistrano. I want to actually draw some attention to the SOCNSD district. I noticed that it kind of incorporates most of our coastal neighbors, but just, like, jacks to the east and picks up San Marcos, which was a bit of a surprise to me. I know that the 78 corridor is a thing there, but -- and I know that there's been a lot of conversation about that. But I recognize personally that somebody who really believes in rail and kind of -- there's kind of a federal rail corridor there, and I know that some of that have tied up with Pendleton and tied up with the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station.

So I'm calling to request that there's a kind of a coastal question there. Like, so there's, like, there's bluff erosion. There's people dealing with climate change, people dealing with oil spills. And so like, people closest to that question, like, all the coastal cities. So your San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano, Dana Point, Oceanside, Vista, Carlsbad, Encinitas, and then reach down for some of the folks that are working on climate change, like in Solano Beach, Del Mar, and then all the way to La Jolla and UCSD; the Scripps Institute works really closely with a lot of the communities that are dealing with the sea rise and its consequences. And a really truly coastal district. And then having San
Marcos, Escondido, Fallbrook, and Rainbow, because all of those east county and northeast county communities kind of line up together.

It also separates the educational institutions. So you've got Cal State San Marcos in one and UCSD in the other. Again, I would really appreciate that. And I know that you say that you're close to done, but I would appreciate you taking a look at this. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 4059. Please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners -- long-time listener, first time caller. I'm a resident of Dublin, and first of all, I just wanted to say that you guys have done a very, very phenomenal job. You listened to a lot of testimony, including people like the previous caller who called in multiple times tonight already and other callers who keep repeating themselves night after night.

I just wanted to say that as a resident of Dublin, I don't like that the COCO Senate seat is the only one that respects the community of interest of the Tri-Valley. As you look at the Senate districts tomorrow, please don't nest districts with Assembly -- two Assembly seats. As you know, nesting is not required. Please keep the COCO
Senate seat district as is. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And at this time, Chair, everybody in our queue has had an opportunity to speak.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Katy. Everyone in the queue has had an opportunity to speak and I have invited further comment as required by our new policy. So thank you very much to our listeners, to our callers, to our staff, to our ASL interpreters, our captioners, and everyone. We will close the lines and conclude this part.

We have a few minutes. We will just quickly recap the day and preview tomorrow. And as Commissioner Fernandez mentioned earlier, we look forward to seeing everybody at 9:30 tomorrow morning. So audio staff, thank you very much. We can close the lines.

No, we're not adjourned. As I said, we have a few moments to continue with our recap of the day and our preview of tomorrow. So we -- today was a little less organized than I had hoped, but this is due largely to what mappers are available to us when. I do believe that we still accomplished a good bit today; we certainly need to keep our noses to the grindstone tomorrow. As today, we will start with a -- going back to any congressional iterations that are outstanding -- would appreciate it if
you all would let me know what, from your perspective, 
what iterations are outstanding.

And then after our 11 o'clock break, we would shift 
back to Senate. My highest priority tomorrow for Senate 
is to take a look at the work that's been done by Tamina 
and Kennedy to continue shifting that excess population 
that came up from San Benito over to ECA. I anticipate 
that we might have a good bit of discussion on that, 
depending on how they've handled that. And then we all 
have a variety of ideas on how to handle that. So that 
is probably going to be an important conversation that we 
have tomorrow.

Ideally, under the original time line, we should 
also finalize all of the Senate work tomorrow, as well as 
the Board of Equalization Districts. I don't anticipate 
the Board of Equalization Districts to take up a huge 
amount of time, but we do need to discuss them, take them 
seriously and do what we need to do to ensure that they 
are the best Board of Equalization Districts that we can 
come up with. Of course, those are approximately ten 
million people each. We'll be approaching this primarily 
by way of nesting Senate districts or possibly 
congressional districts to make sure that we get our 
Board of Equalization Districts completed by the end of 
the day.
I hope to turn over a clean plate to Commissioner Fernandez on Saturday, who will be leading us through a full review of all of our districts in hopes of landing on Monday with agreement to adopt these maps as final, after which they would go out for further public review before we certify and deliver them to the Secretary of State.

So Commissioner Turner, your hand was up.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I thought you were asking a question about what to expect for tomorrow. Commissioner Fernandez and I -- we do have iterations tomorrow --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- for the northern Central Valley area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, for something. For Senate? No?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: For congressional.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Congressional, okay, perfect. So that --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, I just want to warn you it may be slightly less than the miracle we hoped for, but yes, we have something.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, but this is what we're here to do. We're here to explore these things. And sometimes,
as colleagues have said, the wisdom of the of the crowd
might be able to come up with a solution where, you know,
one of us or another of us haven't been able to. So I
look forward to that discussion tomorrow morning. Thank
you for the work that you've been doing on that.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, likewise, Commissioner Ahmad
and I have not only the homework we were assigned, which
was to work out the splits for the Senate in San Jose and
we've worked those out in a way that we're pretty happy
with, so we'll show you those.

But we also worked out the whole ECA situation
picking up from Kennedy and Tamina's work and continuing
it up and around the north part of the state. We're
happy with a lot of the things that we were able to do.
There are some unfinished bits, including leftover
population in SACSTANIS. And some -- the worst part is
the Alameda/Contra Costa Counties. There's just some
things that we're just really not happy with. We ask
Commissioners to be open minded tomorrow about
possibilities. Assuming there'll need to be compromises,
but we think you'll be interested in what we've been able
to accomplish.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent. Thank you so much. We
look forward to that. And thank you to both of you for
your work.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah, I just wanted to add to that. Let's come in with an open mind and an open heart. This was for Senate. We are excited to have conversation with everyone on what works and what doesn't work. There's a lot of pros and cons here, a lot of population that needed to be moved because of the big deconstruction that we did in the San Benito area. So that population has to be moved somewhere. So these are just ideas. And Tamina is amazing. I just want to make sure everyone agrees with that one. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: That's for State Senate, yes. Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I want to -- I know I keep coming back to the San Gabriel Valley and hearing some of the comments tonight, especially from the person who just felt that we're not listening or we're not willing to listen. I think that Commissioner Vazquez, she's not on, but she had also talked about particularly focusing on some of the more working-class cities within San Gabriel Valley. We have Assembly districts that do include them at the higher Latino CVAP. I would like to try to see if there's a way to, I think, address some of
the concerns. I did look up the household incomes for Monterey Park, Rosemead, San Gabriel, Alhambra, and also including Temple City. I compared them to the two cities that were named -- Bradbury and La Canada Flintridge. I also looked up Arcadia and San Marino because those are wealthier areas. And all four of those cities, Bradbury, La Canada Flintridge, Arcadia, and also San Marino have average household incomes that exceed well over 100,000 dollars, in the range of about 150,000 dollars.

In comparison, the highest for Monterey Park and Alhambra are around 80,000 dollars for San Gabriel -- yeah, for San Gabriel and Rosemead they're in the 50-to-60,000-dollar range. So we're talking about very different communities. And since we're hearing from both members of the Latino and Asian American communities in these cities, I think, you know, we've spent a lot of time taking on some of the other more knotty, you know, kind of challenges in these cities. I'm well aware of the VRA obligations, but I want to see if there's a way to just combine both.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

I would suggest that we also need to be looking at another metric. So anyone who wants to do some research tonight could tackle this one. If we if we looked at the proportion of that district that falls -- or let's say...
the distribution of average incomes associated with population. So if, you know, I guess in my mind, if seventy percent of the population has lower incomes and thirty percent of the population has higher incomes, you know, it doesn't necessarily mean that the communities with lower median incomes are always going to lose out. I understand the power of money in politics. I like to fight against the power of money in politics a lot of times. But I believe very much in the power of people. And people who understand how to organize themselves can quite often beat people who just have money. So let's not lose track of the power of the masses, the power of the people, and think that we're -- just because we're comparing and seeing that there are income disparities, we don't need to despair because there are income disparities.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Well, I will say, though, if I can, we're not just talking about income disparities. We're talking about predominantly immigrant and also nonnative English speakers versus those who live along the foothills that are much more -- they tend to be more American born. They're also more proficient in English and navigating the systems. And I mean, I see -- I think -- I see what is being said. I -- you know, I'm also being -- I'm trying to be responsive, and I think
I'd like to. And coming from those communities, I understand what they're saying.

And so but I'm also very mindful of the kind of constraints that we have. But I would not feel right if I didn't at least give it a try. So I could do the research in terms of household income. But you know, across all of the percentages of the cities that are included there. But you know, the majority are foothill cities and they're definitely economically a little bit more better off than the cities that have been cited numerous times by callers. And you know, it does hurt to hear someone say that they don't feel like we care and that we're not listening when I feel like we've tried our best. But if that's what they're feeling, and we've done so much for the other cities.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, yeah. I fully agree with you. You know, I fully endorse us looking at this. I mean, we still have to be mindful of our calendar, but I don't want the -- I don't want that eliminate the possibility of doing some further thinking, some further exploring. We just -- as long as we're conscious of the calendar full speed ahead, you know, let's take a look at this and see.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. It is 9:54. We've been here
for almost twelve and a half hours. I appreciate your patience. I appreciate your support during the day today, and look forward to spending tomorrow with you, so thank you all. Have a good evening.

Meeting adjourned, 9:54 p.m.

(Whereupon, the State of California, CRC Live Line Drawing Meeting adjourned at 9:54 p.m.)
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