STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION (CRC)

In the matter of:

CRC PUBLIC MEETING - LIVE LINE DRAWING

Southern California

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2021

11:00 a.m.

Reported by:

Jacqueline Denlinger
APPEARANCES

COMMISSIONERS
Isra Ahmad, Commissioner
Linda Akutagawa, Commissioner
Jane Andersen, Vice Chair
Alicia Fernández, Commissioner
Neal Fornaciari, Commissioner
J. Ray Kennedy, Chair
Antonio Le Mons, Commissioner
Sara Sadhwani, Commissioner
Patricia Sinay, Commissioner
Derric Taylor, Commissioner
Pedro Toledo, Commissioner
Trena Turner, Commissioner
Angela Vázquez, Commissioner
Russell Yee, Commissioner

STAFF
Alvaro Hernandez, Executive Director
Ravindar Singh, Administrative Assistant
Anthony Pane, Chief Counsel
Fredy Ceja, Communications Director
Marcy Kaplan, Outreach Manager
Toni Antonova, Data Manager

Technical Contractors
Kristian Manoff, A/V Technical Director/Comment Moderator

Line Drawing Team
Karin MacDonald, Statewide Database
Jaime Clark
Kennedy Wilson, Q2 Data & Research
Sivan Tratt, HaystaqDNA

VRA Counsel Strumwasser & Woocher
David Becker

Also Present
Public Comment
Deborah
Floyd Bryan, ILWU
Charlotte McKenzie, Citizens University Committee, UC Riverside
Betty Wilson
Tina Huang
Karina
Aaron
Sylvester Rojo
PUBLIC COMMENT (Continued)
Alexandra Mendoza
Alfred Lomas
Craig
Jesse
Lula Davis-Holmes, City of Carson
Sandra Tomayo
Mary Fujii
Jeremy Payne, Equality California
Paola Avendano
Fabian Viennese
Theresa Abraham
Shauntay Thomas
Sofia Villalobos
Gina Roberts, Valley Center Fire Protection District
Michelle Smith-McDonald
Fernando
Lauren Babb
Virginia Juralopa
Stuart Waldman, VICA
Jessica Zepeda
Ricardo Lara, City of Maywood
Pam Freccous
Teresa Grisnabor
Sandra Rodriguez, CHIRLA
Jessica Torres, City of Maywood
Claudia Sanchez
Diana
Patty Yu
Kate Laddish
Tom Meyers
Verges Seymour
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call to Order and Roll Call</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Maps Line Drawing Discussion</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Session</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Maps Line Drawing Discussion</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAIR KENNEDY: Good morning, California. I'm Ray Kennedy. I am Chair this week of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are going to be beginning our work on the Senate maps today. We have this first half hour or so for roll call, reviewing the run of show, any announcements, reviewing outstanding iterations from yesterday, and I do believe that we have an iteration that we need to finish up, but my intent is to get us to the start of the Senate districts at approximately 11:30.

First up there, we will review the November 10 drafts in conjunction with, i.e., overlaying our current Assembly districts. And today we are hoping to start with Los Angeles area Senate districts, beginning with VR8 areas, and hoping to finish at least a first run through the remainder of Southern California. So that is the run of show.

My apologies to Ravi for keeping you waiting. Ravi, could you please call roll?

MR. SINGH: Thank you, Chair.

Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sadhwani.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Present.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER Turner: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Present.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MR. SINGH: And Commissioner Kennedy.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Here.

MR. SINGH: Roll call is complete, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Ravi.

So are there any announcements from Commissioners or
staff?

Seeing no announcements, okay.

So Jaime, good morning.

MS. CLARK: Good morning.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I believe we were in the midst of an iteration with you when we went on break yesterday and started public comment. So we need to get back to you and finish what we were working on with you. So could you bring us up to date on where we are with that?

MS. CLARK: Absolutely. Thank you so much. So where we left off yesterday was in discussion of this district boundary between the Shoreline District and 10CORR. The iteration moved Century City and this country club and neighborhood just south of Hillcrest Country Club into 10CORR.

This boundary also splits Palms neighborhood council, and this was the area and the iteration under discussion when we left off yesterday.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Was there a compensating change on the other end of that district?

MS. CLARK: There was a three-district change. One of the swaps was to move population -- or excuse me, to move the district boundary between 10CORR and STHLA, north to Manchester in the area that the hand is waiving over.
Additionally, involved in that three-district population swap was making the Westchester neighborhood whole in the Shoreline district. And then additionally, some of these changes. However, depending on what the Commission is looking at, or is -- wishes to enact, I think it would be possible, if so desired, to weave this 10 Corridor boundary and the Westchester Playa boundary, and then look at trading population just along these boarders, potentially, but it depends on what the Commission would like to see.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I just wanted to -- oh, first of all, obviously, thank you. Maybe not obviously. Jaime, you deserve all of the -- all of the praise and the thanks.

Then secondly, I did just want to reiterate my concern about splitting Palms. Not at all opposed and think it's great if we can get Century City into the 10 Corridor District. I'm absolutely in support of that. Just not thrilled at the idea of breaking up the small community of Palms.

If the Commission is interested, I would -- I maybe might suggest splitting Culver City to the west, using the 405 as a boundary. And there are several places
where Culver City jumps the 405. And so again, just -- I used -- I lived in this area for about a decade when I first moved to Los Angeles. And so I do feel like the 405 is a very strong community divider, especially on the west side. So for me, my proposal would be to keep Palms whole and then exchange that for population in Culver City west of the 405.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

Jaime, could we just have a quick look at the population figures on both sides of that, so how much difference it would make if we kept Palms whole and how much population we'd be looking at if we -- if we did use the 405 in Culver City.

MS. CLARK: So this highlighted area is the western part of Palms that is not included in 10CORR, and that's 20,766 people. And I will look at the number of people west of the 405 in Culver City right now. So one moment, please.

So this, of course, crosses the 405 here, and I can look at, you know, how much the population would be reducing that, but this highlighted area is 6,877 people.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And that small area further along the 405 is going to be pretty minimal population.

MS. CLARK: Oh, didn't even see that. One second. But I -- yes, I think that it's very low population; no
1. population.

2. CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Other Commissioner's thoughts on this, we would -- we would -- if we were to keep Palms whole, we would need to find additional population to make that possible.

3. Or Commissioner Vazquez, do you have further comments on this in light of those numbers?

4. COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Not -- not especially. I mean, you'll sort of note that it's -- you'll note that just given that there is 20,000 people in what's probably, you know, like a half mile -- half mile square -- square miles, it's very, very densely populated, like I said, pretty working class, very densely populated.

5. So I don't have other options. I mean, I'm also -- my -- I would also be willing to keep Palms whole in the Shoreline District. I'm not sure if that is going to be even more of a challenge. Again, I don't know that this is something that's especially concerning, but if we're in -- if we're moving lines for population, I would just like to see if we could keep Palms whole.

6. MS. CLARK: So this highlighted area is 6,489.

7. CHAIR KENNEDY: So that's much closer to the area west of the 405.

8. COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: That is the wrong direction,
right?

    MS. CLARK: For -- yeah, so for that Culver City split, that would be -- yeah. So the Shore --

    CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So they're both current in --

    MS. CLARK: Well, actually, the Shoreline then would be over populated -- oh, yeah. Yeah. Yeah, wrong direction.

    COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I -- I can get -- I can get comfortable with this. I just thought I would -- I would flag it. Not my preference, but I'm okay with this.

    CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Could I ask you, because we heard a -- if I recall correctly -- or let me do it this way.

    Commissioner Akutagawa, could you remind us of your comments yesterday regarding Century City?

    COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It was -- it was mostly that it is a different kind of area. It's shopping area, the theater, a lot of high-priced financial services firms in the area. You know, I think about Century City and its, you know, Avenue of the Stars.

    To me, I mean, I stated it last night, I think it's just a question of does it make sense? But if -- if -- I -- let's just say I'm not going to stop this. I just wanted to just make that comment. But I hear what
Commissioner Vazquez is saying, and I think now it, you know -- I think we just have to make a decision. You know, we're going to have to center one COI over another, and I think we just need to make a decision about which way we want to go on this, and you know, what fits within the, kind of, principles and values that we said we wanted to follow, so --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Yeah, I mean, I -- I've been by Century City numerous times. I guess, my -- my impression of it is -- is very similar to Commissioner Akutagawa's, so I'm -- I'm somewhat uncomfortable with -- with the change of -- of putting Century City into 10 Corridor.

You know, and particularly if it involves breaking up Palms. I -- I would tend to support Commissioner Vazquez's desire to keep Palms whole. One way or another, it -- it seems to me that it sounds more like a more natural fit in 10 Corridor, but as Commissioner Vazquez, I could go either way on that.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was basically going to say what the two of you said. You know, for me, when there's a -- when we need to make a choice of where to divide, I
will -- you know, I tend to side keeping whole, those communities who have been divided in the past, be it, literally or figuratively. And so I would tend to say Palms should -- should stay whole. It is very dense working class community, and it's -- I think there's ways -- Century City has -- is a big -- you know, has -- looks to be diverse. The parts I know are also the office buildings, they -- the -- the Mormon Temple, those type of things.

And so there might be ways, if we need to, I'd rather split Culver City and find where the right residential area's to be in the 10 Corridor then put all of Culver City and not have Palms in there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good.

Commissioner Turner, was your hand up?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: It was, and then I just put it down. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez, and then Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Jaime, is -- is Culver City already split, or is it whole? What's the status of Culver City?

MS. CLARK: Yeah, Culver City is whole in 10 Corridor right now, or 10CORR.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Chair, remind me again why
we were doing all of these changes?

CHAIR KENNEDY: It was a proposal brought forward by Commissioner Turner. Anything further, Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm kind of with Commissioner Vazquez on this. I do tend to lean to keep those communities together that normally don't have time to have a voice, so I don't want to split up Palms. But then on the flip side of it, I don't want to split something that's already whole either. So I'm kind of -- I'm not helping right now with this conversation. I'm just stating what my -- I'm trying to be consistent with how I've commented in the past, so I've got to think about it. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Jaime, could you remind us of the population of that Century City block?

MS. CLARK: This is 3,296 people. And additionally, just a reminder that this area was also included in 10 Corridor as part of this change, so there might be a way to address Palms in either direction, and then, you know, either remove or add from this area as well. This previously was in the Shoreline District.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Le Mons, your hand was up and then went down. I want to give you an
opportunity here.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I wanted to support keeping Palms together as well. I -- I just want to comment on the Century City thing, and I think I want -- yesterday, I had my hand up after Commissioner Taylor because I thought he really said it best.

So it's just some of the dialog around some of the thinking that makes me a little uncomfortable in this idea that, oh, well, that's a wealthy community, or that's a country club. And I'm just not getting where -- where that's coming from. And you know, at the end of the day, the representatives have the responsibility for the entire district, period. And so that's what the districts and the communities in those districts should have expectations of their representatives to do that.

And I don't think we should hold the mindset that a representative does not have that ability, but they can only be myopic and singular in their focus, or make assumptions that because a particular group is there or not there, that that particular group is somehow -- because to me, it comes from the -- some negative kind of thinking that only a certain group of the group is going to get taken care of. And I know how much history we have on all of that.

But I just want us to be a little bit careful. I'd
like us to be a little bit more thoughtful and not be
presumptuous that it's a negative to have a community
like Century City in this particular district that's been
drawn.

I don't think I said it as quite as eloquently as
Commissioner Taylor did yesterday, but I did want to lift
that up. But I do support at the same time, keeping
Palms together for the reasons that Commissioner Vazquez
has so eloquently laid out. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And if it -- if it is a
trade-off between those two, I just wanted to get a sense
of your thinking on that.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well, I think that Jaime just
said that there's a possibility, based on this other area
that was also added, that the trade-off might happen
along this Roxbury -- and I'm not sure what -- you know,
what populations did, but the -- the split might happen
there, right, in that little area, and put down in the --
the Shoreline, and then that way, whatever the number
was, like 3,000 -- I'm sorry, I wasn't tracking very
carefully, the population numbers in Palms that need to
be offset.

So I'd say look there. And again, if Century City
ends up being the one taken out, that's -- that's fine as
well. I'm not opposed to that. I just wanted to make
that point, that has more to do with a theme that I feel
like I keep hearing.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. No, that -- that's very
helpful to get that broad picture of your thinking on
this. Thank you so much.

Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. And I thank you for
your comments, Commissioner Le Mons.

I would like to keep Palms whole. Again, I like
my -- my line of thinking is to keep as many communities
whole as possible. And yeah, I think we should lean
towards the -- excuse me for not being quite up to speed.
Do we have any COI testimony about keeping Palms whole,
or split? Are they willing to be split? Can we refer to
our -- to our support?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I don't believe there's any
COI testimony, unless it has come in. That being said,
data is -- data is data. Data is our community input.
Data is also what is publicly available. And so some of
my analysis is both lived experience, but also data that
I have been looking up around Palms in terms of, you
know, the income composition. Mostly single working-
class people, et cetera. So for me, I don't know that
it's a huge issue that we don't have specific COI
testimony supporting keeping them whole, when we have
access to data that indicates we may consider keeping them whole.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

Jaime, you had, I believe, flashed up a community of interest.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. Yeah. So it was just a COI that was submitted through the COI tool, and it includes, you know, Palms with Culver City, and also some of the westside neighborhoods, so that's just one. I don't have anything here that's more like specifically the shape just of Palms that has any testimony included with it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: But that was the one that was called Palms, that I would show it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. Perfect.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I guess what I'd want to say is that I feel a little disadvantaged in that I'm not in the area, so I can only rely on the testimony that's been received. And so the testimony that I lifted up from the black census and redistricting hub basically spoke of the particular Century City area having always been associated and counted on, then therefore in the Southern California, Southern LA area as opposed to being moved out.
And so with that, I think the tradeoff then ended up negatively impacting Palms, and it is not what I would want to have Palms split, but if there is another opportunity, I was still in favor of having Century City be in on the -- toward -- not in the Shoreline.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just -- quickly looking for -- since the question was asked, I saw one piece of testimony that spoke to Palms being -- I think that's the area that Jaime was showing earlier being affiliated with -- sorry, it said -- I think it said Temple Akiba. Hold on, I'm going to pull up the -- the COI testimony again.

Temple Akiba of Culver City is the home of reformed Jews from Culver City, Westchester, Marina Del Rey, Del Rey, Playa Vista, Palms, and Mar Vista.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And that is located?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: That is located -- well, that's the area that I think --

CHAIR KENNEDY: In Palms?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Or it's -- it doesn't say that it's in Palms. I guess is this particular COI testimony is speaking to that grouping of communities, I
guess related to being in that sphere of influence of the
temple.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And I'm looking for me.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: To see if there's anything
else that says anything else.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Good.

Circling back, Commissioner Vazquez, did you have
anything else?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Just one more thing. Just
wanted to note that I do agree with Commissioner Le Mons
and Commissioner Taylor, and it seems like Commissioner
Turner. I think -- I think it's important to think
about, sort of, community assets, and I do think Century
City is absolutely a community asset. And if it has been
historically, sort of associated with the self-LA
composition of communities, it makes sense for me -- to
me, for us to keep trying.

And maybe if, Jaime, you could quickly, sort of
visualize what you had suggested about taking portions of
this Beverly Glen area. So you'll also note Palms is
basically a donut hole of apartments and working-class
people surrounded by single family homes in Culver City
to the south, and South Robertson and Beverly Glen to the
north.

So if that's what it's looking like we're protecting, yes. Like, I'm trying -- we're trying to protect this donut hole that's surrounded by otherwise pretty high-income, single-family homes on the westside.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. I mean, my inclination would be to try to respect the community of interest, which linked all of Palms to all of Culver City. So I mean, that's where my thinking is on this.

Commissioner Fernandez, I apologize if I skipped you. I thought your hand was still up from previously.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. I -- well, I was going to say something, then I wasn't going to say something, and now I guess I'll say something. Culver City is about 40,000, so if you were going to do a split, you'd cut it -- I believe, Culver City in half. So I definitely don't want to see that. I do like the link with Palms with Culver City, and hopefully we can just find a way to -- to work around that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Taylor. Commissioner Taylor, we're not hearing you.

Okay. Hand went down. Okay. So Jaime, would you be able to walk us through what it might look like to include all of Palms in the 10CORR District and where we
might find population to make that possible, whether it's
that area north of Palms or --

MS. CLARK:  Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Or some other --

MS. CLARK:  Yeah.  Thank you.  I was just kind of
zooming out the map and thinking about this also.  So we
highlighted this entire area that was about 20,000
people.  I do not believe that there's 20,000 people
right here to do an equal swap, but maybe if the
Commission doesn't mind, I can just highlight that area
to understand exactly how many people are there.

I'm just going to do that as quickly as possible.

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Yes, please.

MS. CLARK:  So that -- this is about 3,300 people.
So definitely not 20,000.  It was kind of -- yeah, so I
guess this is -- this is what was involved in the 3 way
swap, for how we got here was including adjusting the
boundary of STHLA, and then also making Westchester
neighborhoods whole completely in Shoreline.

So potentially, you know, there would be some
adjusting that could be done there.  Or if Palms was
going to be included in 10 Corridor, and then Shoreline
would be underpopulated by 20,000 people, so it could be,
you know, picking up West Hollywood or Mid City areas,
and then doing a swap here between Glen2BA and 10CORR.
Another question that I have is whether going all
the way to the 405 here for Palms is the goal, or if it
would be okay to use Overland, for example, as a
boundary, just to try and get more of Palms in with
Culver City and the 10CORR District.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. I -- I mean, my -- my
inclination here would be to go ahead and switch Beverly
Glen out and then see how far out we can push Palms
towards the 405, understanding that we might not make it
all the way.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I just -- I think
that's a great compromise. I think Overland is a very
large street, so again, I'm thinking about streets and
freeways being good guide posts for communities of
interest. I think going at least west to Overland would
be a good compromise.

I also just want to reflect on -- I still think
splitting Culver City for me is very much on the table.
The communities of -- within Culver City, again,
especially west of the 405, again, looking at public
data, looking at real estate listings in that area of
Culver City west of the 405, these are multimillion
dollar single family homes. Apartments for sale, condos
for sale are north of a million dollars in this area.
And so in terms of splitting a vulnerable community, if the tradeoff is splitting Palms, or splitting pieces of Culver City, for me, I would like to keep splitting Culver City on the table.

I just don't think it's as vulnerable as Palms.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And I believe I would support you in that using the 405 as a -- as a boundary, could I get some thoughts from other Commissioners on that? If we -- if we moved both Beverly Glen and Culver City west of the 405 out of 10CORR and used that to bring in as much as possible of Palms, is that something that we could support?

Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I support that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

I'm seeing head nods. Any objection?

Okay. Jaime, could you go ahead and do that then, please, and show us how far Palms could be united?

Okay. Commissioner Vazquez or others, are there -- are there specific streets or landmarks in Palms that we might want to look at as far as bringing this overpopulation down?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Overland was a good one, so bummer that that doesn't work.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, I mean, we --
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Well, was -- yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I was thinking, actually maybe stay closer to the -- keep the portions that you just removed closer to the freeway. Or sorry, to Venice Boulevard. I would -- they -- there's definitely even tiers in Palms --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Closer to Venice, I would say is probably lower income, cheaper apartments. So maybe remove stuff closer to the 10.

MS. CLARK: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So if we -- if -- yeah, if we took Palms Boulevard over to Overland.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Uh-huh.

MS. CLARK: So this is not quite to Overland. It's around Keystone. And this highlighted area would make it so that 10CORR was 637 people underpopulated, so I'm going to turn on the census blocks, and they do -- oh, great. So we might be able to get --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, if we can -- if we can get those -- yep. That one more census block and then find another place to -- or if you could show us other places where we might balance that -- that deviation of 121, I think we're -- we're in good shape.
MS. CLARK: Maybe in this area, which is around --
it looks like Burgen -- or Burgen and Beverly areas and
South Robertson could be a place to balance between
10CORR and Shoreline.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. CLARK: Would you like me --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Just -- yes, please. And then there
just above the 10, right -- yeah, just a little bit just
above where your hand was, there's a block that's 114, I
believe; is that that block right there?

MS. CLARK: Yeah. I can definitely look at that.

Sometimes, in my --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. CLARK: -- experience, it's easier to try and --
you have, like, more wiggle room if you try and grab
smaller --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.

MS. CLARK: I don't know.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: And I would recommend that as
well. There's a line of apartments, really that line the
10. I used to live -- that was where my apartment was,
where the Buffer Apartments between the freeway and the
multimillion-dollar homes to the north, so I would
recommend, in the spirit of keeping working-class people
in apartments together, Jaime is doing -- what Jaime is doing is right.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Perfect. Then let's give Jaime two or three more minutes, we can wrap this up, and then we can move onto our Senate work. We will continue to come back to any small outstanding congressional iterations first thing in the morning, try to dispose of those before 11:00 tomorrow. On Thursday and Friday, we start at 9:30, and I know that we have some larger outstanding iterations for congress, and so my intent is to address those during that first block on Thursday and the first block on Friday.

(Pause)

MS. CLARK: So I found a way to balance to zero population. It was a swap in between both District Shoreline and 10CORR. This boundary is around Castle Heights Avenue, and this is McConnell Drive areas. I'm going to zoom out so everyone can see the larger implication.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you, Mr. Kennedy. Just wanted to -- I was just going to speak to your comment about tomorrow and Thursday about the schedule. Just in particular, I just wanted to let you know that
Commissioners Akutagawa and I, and legal have reviewed our Central Valley maps, and we'll be ready to present whenever you need us to.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Whether it's any time in the schedule in the next couple of days. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much.

Okay. Is this -- are we happy with these changes, and can we shift our attention to Senate? No objection. Okay.

Jaime, thank you so much for helping us through this. That is now -- that can now be finalized for sharing with the public, and we will turn our attention to our Senate work.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So just for clarity, so is Palms split?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Palms is split, but it is much more whole than it started out.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So here's a question, I notice that as Jaime was showing where she balanced population in that South Robertson neighborhood council area, I guess I'm wondering if we would be better served by taking even a little bit more from that particular area that she took from because that -- those are single-
family homes also, and it's a pretty -- again, if you
want to keep Palms whole, I'm just wondering if that
would make for, you know, a more equitable split, if you
want to try to keep Palms whole at this point, if that's
where she took from.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I agree with you in concept,
Commissioner Akutagawa. That being said, I think there's
just so many -- there's so much population, even in this
little triangle north of that -- that split in Palms now.
There's so -- there's so many people in apartments there,
that I -- I don't know, even if we took all of, like, the
rest of South Robertson, I'm not sure that we could
balance population and still keep something resembling a
compact district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And if we took the rest of
South Robertson, that would leave Century City
noncontiguous. So I don't see that we have room to
really maneuver too much here.

MS. CLARK: And just a quick note -- I'm so sorry to
interject. And actually, South Robertson is one of the
more densely populated areas in the City of Los Angeles
as well, so just a note.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Becker, do you have any concerns to raise at this point?

MR. BECKER: I do not, not about this area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.

Okay. So moving onto Senate. I just wanted to point out that we have, essentially as it's laid out, we have 16, 90-minute blocks, four per day, to work on the Senate and the Board of Equalization. As I mentioned, the extra 90-minute blocks, one on Thursday morning, one on Friday morning will need to be dedicated to finishing up those outstanding iterations on congress.

So I think we have a full plate ahead of us. As I mentioned, the plan for today is to begin in Los Angeles with VRA areas. After -- well, we'll start first with the review of the November 10th drafts in conjunction with the overlay of the current Assembly districts. It is quarter of 12:00. We have until 12:30 in this session. That could take us to the end of this first 90-minute block, and then we would have three more today, starting with the VRA areas in Los Angeles County, continuing with Los Angeles County after the lunchbreak, and hopefully being able to get into Southern California VRA districts and the rest of Southern California before 6:15.

So Commissioner Akutagawa.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I saw that one of our notetakers has asked for a recap of what the Shoreline and the 10 Corridor districts will look like now for the purposes of the notes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Jaime, could you just review that very quickly for us?

MS. CLARK: Yes. Without switching back for the sake of time, so the changes in 10 Corridor were in the Palms area and we're moving Cheviot Hills from the 10 Corridor District. The southern boundary to the east of Westmont is at Manchester now. And in Shoreline, Westchester neighborhoods are now included in that district, and we move the split in Palms to Palms and Overland, and everything sort of east -- or excuse me, west of that in Palms. And additionally, Century City is not included with Shoreline, but the Cheviot Hills area is.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Jaime, and thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Mr. Becker.

MR. BECKER: If it's appropriate, Chair, I'd just like to make a couple of quick reminders as we're entering into the Senate districts again.

First, these are huge districts. These might be the largest districts in the country that I know of. They
are larger than a congressional district. So they are
going to cover large areas of land, particularly in the
less populated areas of California, including the
northern and eastern part of the state.

Second, just as you've been working on congressional
districts and had very little flexibility with regard to
deviations, you're back to a point where you have an
ability to deviate by population of plus and minus five
percent.

And then lastly, I'd just like to point out, while
nesting is the least important of all the criteria
listed, it is -- it is not something you need to have or
pay much -- there's going to be a lot of other
considerations well above it that should take precedent.
So as you're considering this, nesting is going to lose
out to every other consideration on the list of
congressional criteria. Or I'm sorry, constitutional
criteria. So keep that in mind as you're proceeding down
this -- down the homestretch here.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.
Okay. So Jaime, are you going to take us on this
tour?

MS. CLARK: I will. I'll take you on a tour.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

MS. CLARK: So on the map right now, the Senate
draft is in black lines with black labels. And just for
the sake of space on the map, right now, it just has the
name of the draft district and the percent deviation of
the draft district.

The blue lines represent the Assembly iteration from
12/08, so your most recent Assembly iteration, and those
also are in blue with blue percent deviation associated.
As you can see, we did a first -- a first pass at
numbering these districts based on the 08 iteration, a
12/08 iteration, and so that's what the name is. It's
AD02-NCOAST, so this would be District 2 and it's called
NCOAST. We did that so that everyone could understand
the number, plus what we've been calling it and the
Assembly iterations.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. CLARK: So --

CHAIR KENNEDY: If I can stop you there. I just
want to confirm that what we have up on the map viewer is
consistent with what we are showing here live.

MS. CLARK: Yes. We have the Senate draft up on the
map viewer, as is the Assembly district iteration from
12/08, which is your most recent iteration.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. Thank you.


MR. BECKER: Sorry, my bad.
VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. I -- thank you for that, Jaime, but I'm looking at the Tahoe area, and I know that the latest one that we're all working off of is not actually that one, it's the one that has -- I guess it's with Mr. Fornaciari's balance frozen, and I think that's what we're calling it in that area, where the county line splits Tahoe.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen, I believe that was for the congressional maps, wasn't it?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh --

MS. CLARK: So right now we're looking at the Senate and the Assembly.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: And the Assembly, okay.

MS. CLARK: Yes. We're not looking

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: All right. Thank you very much. No, thank you. Thank you. Yes, you're absolutely right.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

So just an overview of the Senate districts. Right now, for the north coast, you have a district that goes all the way from Marin County up to Del Norte County, including Trinity.

Some differences here, just -- and this is going to be a very, very broad overview. All mappers will also have the Assembly 12/08 iteration up, which is your
working draft at this point, so that everybody could go
over this again as needed.

But, you know, some differences here would be that
you have Lake County end with more inland counties and
Assembly. So if you wish to maintain this north to south
based district, it would be, you know, their -- that's a
difference in terms of if you're thinking about nesting
at all.

Similarly, the same district, the Lake County, Napa
County district, again, just with the north coastal
district would be unable to be nested.

And looking in Sacramento -- I'm not even going to
get into it too much here, but there is some significant
differences as you can see. This Tahoe area would be
able to remain whole, should you choose to look into
nesting.

Moving just a little further south through the Bay
Area, I think that there is options, should you choose to
look into nesting in this area, just based on what you
have for your Assembly districts right now.

Yeah, so -- and then again, in Senate, you don't
really have any east to west crossing of the bridges with
the Bay, in the Bay, and additionally, you don't cross
the Golden Gate Bridge here. So right now, the Bay Area
is sort of like East Bay, and then there's South Bay
where there's some, you know, wiggle room, and then also Peninsula and San Francisco areas you don't have any crossover.

Looking at the Central Valley, generally, using sort of the mountain ranges as a general boundary, however, in -- for San Bernardino County, do have that currently going with areas of West Fresno County.

And moving further south, here on the eastern edge of Fresno County and Tulare County, using the -- using the Sierras or the ridge of the Sierras as a natural boundary there, this boundary is shared, at least in Tulare County with Assembly districts.

Similarly, moving further south down the Central Coast, no east to west crossover in either version of districts between Fresno or Kings County when we're looking here at San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura Counties, there's a line there.

Going to move into Los Angeles County. There are significant differences here, right? So in your current Senate draft, Antelope Valley and Victor Valley are together in sort of a High Desert based district. Not crossing over a ton, past Camarillo here in Ventura County, and definitely, you know, all of Camarillo is with Ventura County based districts in Senate.

Just for population purposes and also, you know,
based on your wishes, were not crossing Mulholland here for Senate.

And additionally, some other just general architecture kind of stuff -- and actually, for LA, I'm going to remove the Assembly lines because the map is so busy. So right now, just looking at the Senate lines, we have the ports separate, and the Long Beach area going north on -- around 710, to include some of these gateway cities with Long Beach, keeping sort of this, like, South and Central LA areas together in one district.

In the NELA based district, keeping East Los Angeles and Boyle Heights together. This does include Eagle Rock and other areas, you know, in -- in the City of LA and South of Glendale that the Commission's been wanting to keep together in District. Just kind of zooming out at the 210 District, this has San Dimas, Claremont, Glendora in with Burbank and Glendale whole.

And then moving towards San Gabriel Valley, having San Marino, Monterey Park, Alhambra areas with cities such as Pico Rivera and out to West Covina. And then just out of south of that, the Walnut, Diamond Bar, Hacienda Heights areas with Whittier, Downey, Bellflower, Norwalk, and Artesia.

So then I'm going to put the Assembly districts back on and look at Orange County for the Santa Ana based
district. Sort of a similar shape here, as with the other versions, or the other levels of districts, generally maintaining the line here between Orange County and Riverside County, and continuing to zoom out, just going to continue down the coast here through very Southern Orange County and San Diego County. Again, just kind of going to zoom in.

And this one difference is it's including this Chula Vista based district with SECA to make one large geographically large district, sort of combining East County areas with Imperial and parts of the Coachella Valley.

And then in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, sort of the rest of the Coachella Valley here in with some of these other areas, just north of San Bernardino, so this is like Yucaipa and Calimesa together.

Some areas with VRA considerations here, further west in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, and then kind of zooming back out again, this takes us to this geographically large Antelope Valley and Victor Valley based district, so general overview of sort of the architecture of the Senate draft with your Assembly lines.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Jaime. We've got some work to do. So I -- we are -- I wanted to take enough
time to make sure that we had a good understanding of
where we stand, and I think at this point, it would be
good to have a brief discussion about priorities that
colleagues see in the -- in the Senate plan as it
currently stand. And if we can identify any priorities
that we have moving forward between now and 12:30 so that
when we come back at 12:45, we can start off with the VRA
areas in Los Angeles County.

So Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, I
believe our priorities on this one should be pinning down
the VRA Districts, and that's not just -- it was in Los
Angeles, it's in San Diego, in Orange County, San Diego.
It's also the Central Valley, and if it does go over and
include the San Benito and lot. Because if we know that
area, there's a great possibility of making some
iterations of the entire north and having it be willing
to be brought back to the -- to the group as a -- to
quickly go over and spend more time where we know we'll
have to do it live through the Los Angeles area because
there's some VRA districts down there. So I -- that's
why I would prioritize, so the VRA districts, the opinion
goes down. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Commissioner
Andersen.
Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I -- my priorities are the VRA districts in the Inland Empire, and particularly the Rialto, San Bernardino, Fontana Region.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: This is not so much -- well, I guess it will be part of my priority, but could we have what current -- in our current draft, what no -- the -- how many VRA districts were we able -- you know, did we keep in our current -- in our current draft, because I think sometimes we forget -- I'd like us to start from there. And then the number of minority and majority districts that we have in the current draft.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Jaime, is that something that you can speak to at this point?

MS. CLARK: I don't have that number easily accessible.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. We'll come back to you on that.

MS. CLARK: There's eight districts that have a Latino CVAP at 50 percent plus.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I would like to start with the VRA areas across the whole state.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I will join the chorus to say, yes, VRA Districts. And to Commissioner Sinay's point, yes, currently we have eight districts that are at a range of above 50 percent Latino CVAP. That being said, we have a number that we identified in the Assembly as having VRA considerations that were not necessarily -- that -- well, in any case, that I think we should take a closer look at, so I'll highlight a few of them.

One of them includes an Antelope Valley. Certainly, Santa Ana in Orange County, which we know. That always requires a lot of reconfiguration in Orange County. Several in Los Angeles, including the gateway cities down to the San Pedro Port is one of those. Inland Empire, yes, and I think there's probably COI testimony that we're going to want to play around with in those areas.

And then of course we've heard some testimony also about the SECA district that we have in the San Diego areas, which is spanning from San Diego all the way out through Riverside and up to Needles, and what kind of cleanup that we would probably need to, or want to do in that area as well. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I definitely agree
on let's -- let's really get comfortable with where we are on the VRA district statewide. I think Commissioner Sadhwani uplifted some of the VRA districts in Southern California. I would agree with Commissioner Vazquez as well, too.

One other thing that I know hasn't been brought up, but we've had a number of conversations about trying to keep Irvine whole, so I noticed that it is split, so I just wanted to throw that in there as well, too. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FRENANDEZ: Yes, definitely VRAs are always a priority. I guess I -- this has nothing to do with the priorities, but Jaime, having the overlay, that versus the Senate, I guess I'm having a difficult time figuring out how we're going to do the nesting, depending on which map we're using.

So I think that's -- are we just -- are we using our draft Senate maps? Or are we using our Assembly? That's -- that's what I'm getting confused at right now, because that -- in the last prior -- the last criteria is nesting, so I can see us using our draft Senate, but then how are we going to know if we're ever going -- if we're going to be able to nest? It's just it's -- it -- that
whole overlay thing was the blues and the blacks were
confusing.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. You know, we spent the time
to come up with the Senate draft, so I think we need to
move forward with the Senate drafts. Nesting -- and I'll
ask Karin to step in and supplement what I'm going to
say, but you know, the Senate draft plan, we could -- we
could already take that and say we've been able to nest
to X percentage. So it's not just a question of these
two, these two, these two, but a Senate -- a Senate
district that contains, you know, most of one Assembly
district, and most of another is nested to a certain
percentage extent.

So Karin, would you like to explain that further?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes. Thank you. Thank you so much
for that question, and also, I know that Mr. Becker is
here, so -- so he could weigh in on this.

Essentially, I think -- and I'm sorry that it was
confusing with the lines on there. We wanted to provide
you with a visual so you could see what the lay of the
land is right now, because it is one of your criteria.
And while we have talked about a lot of communities of
interest, of course, and you've seen the geographies for
communities of interest, and we've talked about the VRA,
and we've talked about all of the other criteria. This
is pretty much the CORRS 10 that you've seen this other
criteria on that you -- that is at the bottom of the
list, of course, as Mr. Becker explained in relation to
the Senate maps that you have created and that you will
be working off of.

What we have available to you is the ability to turn
these on and off. And as Mr. Becker said previously,
these really have to stand on their own. So you have to
go through all of the different criteria to construct
them, and then, you know, you get to -- you get to
nesting at the end, but if you want to use the Assembly
districts as a reference, you can do that.

And again, we -- you know, we can -- we can take a
look throughout the process, as you see fit, and just see
if there is potentially a line, and in particular, if --
you know, perhaps they're close and it doesn't really
matter to you whether you go over to the right or a
little bit to the left. There may be some natural
opportunities there in other scenarios, in other parts of
the state, perhaps, it's probably just not going to work.
So that's why we showed it, and I hope that answers the
question.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I'll elaborate a little bit further
on the question and then ask Commissioner Fernandez if
she wants to follow up.
I had -- I had described a situation where we would have, say 80 percent of one Assembly district, and 70 percent of another Assembly district, or you know, some combination of -- well, plus a piece of a third. Okay. So we have -- we have that kind of configuration that we're looking at in a Senate district. That could be described as some percentage nested, correct?

MS. MAC DONALD: Chair Kennedy, I'm sorry, was that a question for me? Or was --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. MAC DONALD: -- that a question for Mr. Becker?

CHAIR KENNEDY: For you. If a Senate district consists of 80 percent of one Assembly district, 80 percent of another, and 40 percent of a third, so that would give you all the population that you need, that -- that some percentage nested, if I understand it correctly?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes. I would like to hand this over to Mr. Becker because my understanding, and again, I'm not an attorney, is that either you're nested or you're not. So basically, nesting refers to, you know, for example, taking two Assembly districts and then, you know, nesting them together in one Senate district.

So of course, if you're almost able to do that, then you could say that in your report. We tried to nest it
and it's almost there. Let's say it's to 90 percent
there, so -- but generally speaking, it refers to two
Assembly districts in one Senate district and then ten
Senate districts in one Board of Equalization District.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

MS. MAC DONALD: But please -- if Mr. Becker is
here, perhaps he could weigh in on this also. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: He's back with us.

MR. BECKER: Yes, I'm here.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So Mr. Becker.

MR. BECKER: Hopefully you can all hear me. So
that's exactly right, what Karin just said. Nesting
is -- you either nest or you don't. There is -- there is
no almost nested. The nesting means literally that two
Assembly districts in their entirety comprise a Senate
district.

I'll also just state again, nesting is the very last
requirement. And I think one of the reasons that it
might be the last requirement is because if you decide to
nest, and likely that was a decision that probably would
have been -- had to be prioritized earlier, given the
timing right now, if you decide to nest, any change to
any nested district is going to affect two maps and
ripple through two maps, and that could be really
difficult, particularly under time constraints.
I'm not suggesting not paying attention to the nesting criteria. I'm not suggesting that that criteria doesn't exist. It does. It is just very intentionally, I believe, placed at the very bottom of the other criteria's that you're all considering. It loses out when balanced against any other criteria, whether it be compactness, COIs, political boundaries, VRA concerns, equal population, et cetera. So just remember that as you're considering how you're going to procedure.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Mr. Becker.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just going back to the priorities, so there -- you know, I want us to look at the baseline for when it comes to, you know, a minority, majority, and VRA districts, you know, what we can do. The baseline is our draft. So if we can -- if we go up, that's great. Not that we can go up on VRA, because we know the VRA information.

The other -- the other piece is I would like to explore further the VRA district that encompasses, you know, the SECA and really look to see if we can create a San Diego -- all San Diego VRA district because there are communities, as we know. There's a significant Latino community throughout the county, and I think that we might be able to do that.
And that would allow Riverside and Imperial Valley to have one that reflects more their population. So that's one of my -- one of my priorities for exploration.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. For me, section 2, Voting Rights Act, would be the top priority where we should start with. I would also encourage the -- us to have a goal for the state on the number of VRA district, as well as by region, so that certainly, of course, the draft maps that baseline, but it's a baseline that's -- and in my opinion, it's probably on the lower end, but -- so I would encourage us to really think through all of the -- all of the goals and what we actually want to achieve in terms of Voting Rights Act compliance. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo. Did you have numbers in mind per region?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Well, I mean, I think what -- what we've heard from the community is the baseline to really compare our numbers to what the community maps are suggesting, the baselines that we have there are eleven. That may be too difficult to do because we have so many COIs in some of these areas.

But taking a look at where we are; we're at about
eight at this point, if I remember correctly. So eight, the highest number we probably can achieve is probably that eleven, and figuring out by region what that might look like if we were to get closer to the eleven.

But -- and I'm not saying hit the eleven, I'm saying if we got closer to it, because I -- we do have community of interest testimony that we have to work through, especially in non-VRA areas, and so that would be my suggestion. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: All right. Well, and it would be in the non-VRA areas because we know that in the VRA areas, the VRA is the higher priority than the communities of interest.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Absolutely. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, so VRA, and I don't think it was noted, so also, particularly I think we have VRA in the Central Valley area. And then, I guess, so my other priority would be for us from a process commission standpoint in this area is as we're discussing changes, if there is a known sticking point, we can perhaps name it and note it so that once we settle, we won't have so many surprises towards the end and have to continue to draw and redraw.
So it's fine to have different perspectives. But if we know where the sticking points are going in, and maybe we can get through this a little bit more expeditiously than we have in the past.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you for that.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Actually, Commissioner Turner just lifted it up. I think there's a lot of VRA districts in the Central Valley, and I'd like to suggest that we perhaps start there. I know that the Inland Empire also has VRA districts, but I think it's the Central Valley that has been the most vexing for us, I guess I'll say. And I think if we could try to get to a place that we feel comfortable. And to Commissioner Turner's point, you know, we know some of the sticking points because we've been grappling with it with the congressional maps as well as with the Assembly maps.

I think if we could get that in place then it would hopefully make a lot of the other, you know, non-VRA districts both to the north and to the south a little bit easier, so I'd like to just suggest that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Ms. Mac Donald, could I consult with you on that? The original idea was that we would start in Los Angeles County with the VRA areas in Los Angeles County, and
perhaps move to non-VRA areas there, and then take up the VRA areas elsewhere in Southern California.

Commissioners are suggesting that, A, we just run all of the VRA districts before doing anything else, and Commissioner Akutagawa has just suggested that we start with the VRA areas in the Central Valley. So I wanted to get your thinking on that.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes, thank you so much for that. I suppose our recommendation would still be to start with Los Angeles and then work our way around, but if you would like to just start with the VRA areas everywhere, that's fine. That would work, we think, so we do still think that LA is probably a good starting point. It just generally lends itself for mapping a little bit better, and I think we've seen, with our experience, that when we start in LA, the rest of the state just flows a little bit better, irrespective of the fact that we do spend a lot of time in the Central Valley these days.

CHAIR KENNEDY: All right.

MS. MAC DONALD: In the beautiful Central Valley.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So could you -- could you describe for us what we might encounter if we -- if we did start in the Central Valley, what problems we might encounter as far as making the map whole?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. So I haven't, honestly,
really thought this through perfectly because we have --
we have been planning on starting in Los Angeles, but one
thing is generally population bubbles because if you're
starting in the Central Valley, you are kind of -- you
know, you are again in that area where things are pushing
up from the south and from -- and from the north also, so
kind of working in the circle has been working pretty
well because you don't want to start in the Central
Valley and then you land in Los Angeles, where obviously
you have a lot of voting rights concerns, and maybe not a
lot of wiggle room in some of these areas, and also, you
know, going into the Imperial Valley and so forth.

And so I think generally, the way that the
population flows, it is -- it is a little -- practically
speaking, it's a little bit better to start, either from
LA and just kind of work our way around in a circle.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And if we started in LA with
the VRA districts and then went to Orange County, San
Diego, Imperial, Riverside, San Bernadino, also VRA
districts, then Central Valley, VRA districts, then
potentially Central Coast, and then went north from
there, would that be a workable way forward?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. We think that that will
work, we just really need to stick with the circle to
actually really circle our way around so that we can keep
track of the way that the populations have flown.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.

Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. Yes, I certainly see the idea of starting with VRA in LA because I -- as I see it, there's so many VRA districts, that that will -- essentially will be -- it's a redraw in terms of can you nest? I don't think you can at all, because you can't next VRA districts, they just don't work that well, and then that destroys the areas around them.

So in terms of nesting, I think kind of getting all of that arranged, that entire area will give us a framework.

Additionally, then I think, once we have -- okay, it looks like right -- we have -- we can have some little borders, as we did before, you know, like we know where -- there's a line at -- in Ventura, here's kind of a line in maybe Kern or Inyo, around that area, then I'd say we jump to the Central Valley, do those very districts because you can't do anything up north until you really figure out is San Benito in the -- crossing the Central Valley or not?

And then you can actually, the north, you can do a fair amount of nesting. I would say clean up the
Assembly districts, the -- because we made a lot of advances there. Quickly -- quickly do that right, and then go nest, nest, nest around the Central VRA district. I think that will all come together in that direction. I think that's essentially what Ms. Mac Donald was saying. Work out the Southern California, because that gives us our lines, and then the Central Valley, where we can actually kind of work around the north.

So I -- because I'm thinking we can actually -- that's what I believe Commissioner Fernandez brought up the nesting, because the north area has a lot of non-VRA areas, and it lends itself to nesting. The south does not. It's that simple.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Thanks. Just to weigh in on this, to this conversation, agreed. When Commissioner Fornaciari, and in particular the plan of starting in Los Angeles and working south where there was a method to our madness, so when -- I recall a few moments ago, Commissioner Toledo had mentioned increasing the number of districts and ensuring that we are meeting our VRA requirements.

In Los Angeles alone, there are three districts that are above 45 percent Latino CVAP. Those might be really
areas that we would want to look at.

In addition, there's a fourth in the -- in Orange County. So you know, that alone, cleaning that up alone could go a very long way to ensuring our -- that we are meeting our obligations, which was really kind of the thought behind starting in Los Angeles and working that way.

Certainly, we're going to have our work to do in the Central Valley. I'm not suggesting that we don't, but from that regard, I think it's clean up as opposed to -- well, who knows, right? Who knows where we'll end up, but I'm hoping that it's clean up as opposed to large structural changes. We have fairly strong looking districts already there. As you recall, we had built four Assembly VRA districts in the Central Valley, and I believe those were not entirely nested, but really built out of the logic of those Assembly districts there.

Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I would agree with Commissioner Sadhwani and certainly starting with the VRA and starting in Los Angeles, I would also -- I mean, if there's a way to ensure that our lines are -- because ultimately it's the bottleneck, right? The -- we have
each line drawer, or those lines are in region, and so
making sure that we're able to distribute the work in a
way that allows us to get through the whole map in a --
in efficient manner, and sometimes that means going --
seeing a different part of the map to be able to get the
work to the appropriate line drawers and be able to
maximize our staff capacity because that is a -- that is
a limitation. It's a restriction on us.

And I mean, we have great line drawers, but there's
only so many of them and there's only so many hours of
the day. So just making sure that we are able to
maximize our ability to use our staff resource. Thank
you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. You know, a
lot -- I think Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner
Sadhwani met with the line drawers and did a lot of
thinking about our plans. We didn't quite necessarily
follow their suggestions. The last two plans, and
some -- and it didn't quite go the way we wanted it to,
so maybe we should listen to their original plan and try
it because we tend to go around and around and around and
end up usually -- you know, I just -- I'd like to see us
move, and I think whichever way we go is going to work
well, but I do want to respect the thought and planning that went on behind the scenes before we started.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much for that.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to respond to my initial question regarding which maps. And I am glad that we're using the Senate, because we did have -- we did spend a lot of time, and I -- and then I guess response to Commissioner Andersen is even in the north, I don't necessarily think, or believe that that's for a nesting as well because when we did the Assembly, we knew that there were certain areas we may be cutting off and we thought, okay, maybe when we get to the Senate, we could accommodate some of these bigger communities of interest. So I am grateful that we're using the Senate maps and that's what I was hoping and I want to make sure that the public knew which maps we're looking at right now, or using. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. Thank you so much.

Commissioner Fornaciari, and/or Commissioner Sadhwani, do you want to just take a moment and remind us of your initial planning for this?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I think Commissioner Sadhwani kind of summed it up. We had planned on starting in LA, starting with the VRA districts. Well,
starting in Southeast LA, I guess, but probably that was more focused on the Assembly. And -- but in general, just start in LA, move down through Orange County into San Diego and then around and finish up the Inland Empire, was the direction we were -- we had thought we'd head. Is that -- did I capture that right, Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I think that's right, and you know, but I mean, when we started that in the Assembly, it became clear that, you know, originally, the intent was to work in one area for a day, send the line -- the mapper off with very specific guidance. And they could have a day to work on that and then come back. And I think we quickly devolved to, you know, send the member off for an hour and hope that they come back an hour later and go work in another area of the state.

And I think that it's become very difficult to post those iterations as well, which makes it complicated for the public to follow along. So I think the, you know, last week we had attempted to provide a plan. We -- yeah, we didn't present it, in which we would take two days in each area for the Los Angeles and Southern California, for example. So because it was very clear that one day wasn't sufficient for the Commission in any one area.
And so, but again, we I think we, you know, I think we turn and move as is needed. And I think a part of this is, you know, best laid plans. We have to be nimble. We have to be able to move as is necessary. So yeah, that was the initial thought process was sticking to one area, trying to make as many changes as possible. And what we've seen, right, especially, you know, working with Jaime in Los Angeles and particularly the interconnection between various counties, the small little changes that folks want to see in one area then leads to larger changes elsewhere. So it does become complicated. I don't I don't know if there's another way around that, but, you know, if -- yeah. However, however, the chair would like to proceed. Thank you.


Commissioner Andersen, and then Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, I really like that plan. One addition that we learned from last week is when we're not getting a direction in an area, move to the next area and let Commissioners really contemplate what they'd like to do. And that's why I like starting in Los Angeles. We sort of thought through scenarios. We'll see a lot.
I think we can give some direction and then we can possibly move to the -- to the Inland Empire, you know, essentially Sivan's area, which Commissioner Toledo said to be able to spread some of the work around. And our emphasis -- we really need to make sure we're getting direction, you know, we have a lot of thoughts. And yes, we want to know why. But remember, lead with that goal and how you think you get there and then why. Don't just lead with why it never gets the goal of the direction. So I just want to emphasize that and move through this rather quickly, I think.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, thank you for that explanation, Commissioner Sadhwani. And I see the logic in starting in LA now, so I think I was just kind of pulling from our experience last night looking at the Central Valley VRA districts and thinking, oh, my gosh, you know. But I see the logic and I appreciate and agree with it.

I've been thinking about -- I guess one thought that it's been kind of percolating for me and now I think, given what you said, I'd like to make a suggestion for process, perhaps. And I'm very guilty of this, as I'm going to just say, perhaps all of us to some degree. You
know, we're trying to be responsive to public input, especially as it's coming in. I'm wondering if that has derailed us a little bit and that perhaps we just need to allow our process to finish and not try to insert the public inputs that we're getting real time as it's being posted and as it's coming in.

And perhaps we just need to take a pause and look through the entirety of all the public inputs that we give so that then we do give -- we do allow the plan as it's been laid out by Commissioner Sadhwani and Commissioner Fornaciari to come out. And then that way, then, the inputs will then be based on the collective set of all the changes that we're making.

We allow the entire body of the public to make inputs on the same set of maps instead of continuously making these little changes. And then it might also make the time a little bit more efficient. So that's just the thought that we just, you know, look at everything all at once together once we're done.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you for that. Commissioner Sinay. And then we are up against our break.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I definitely appreciate what Commissioner Akutagawa just said. And at the very beginning, we set up a process to be equal to all. And
we created a process of how people could access us. And that was through our forms, our COI tools, and such. And some people have our emails. Some people don't. Some people have our Twitter handles. Some people don't.

I would like us really to use the database, our Airtable. And so that way everybody has equal access at the equal time to all the Commissioners. And that we read -- we read comments from there along with the public -- the public call-ins. I just -- the going to our emails or going to Twitter, or going to tweets, or whatever it might be -- I said that twice, sorry -- is just not fair for the greater public.

And so I just want -- it's late in the process. I know. So we may not be able to make that change, but that's something I believe in.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much, Commissioner Sinay. Thank you, all of you, for those thoughtful comments. We will take a fifteen-minute break. And when we come back, we will start working through VRA districts in Los Angeles County with Jaime. Thank you all.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 12:30 a.m. until 12:46 a.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your patience during our break, we are back and we are ready
to begin our review of VRA districts in Los Angeles. We
will be stepping out for a few moments for a very quick
closed session. I estimate that that's going to be on
the order of five to ten minutes.

But before we get that, and then while we're waiting
for everyone to get back into place, Jaime, could you
just go into a little more detail than the first time
around and show us what we're looking at in LA, focusing
primarily on the on the VRA areas?

MS. CLARK: I'm sorry, there's a little bit of
background noise, so for the -- specifically looking at
the VRA areas in this, or the overview of the total?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, overview of Los Angeles
County, but with most of the focus on the VRA areas.

MS. CLARK: Sure. Thank you for clarifying. So I'm
going to start here in Antelope Valley and just kind of
zoom out. Antelope Valley is with Victor Valley and
areas in San Bernardino County. And the very northern
part of Upland and Rancho Cucamonga, as well as the San
Antonio Heights along the 210 corridor.

And then a bigger zoom out sort of with northern,
very rural San Bernardino County High Desert areas.
Santa Clarita Valley is intact and is with areas in San
Fernando Valley in the City of San Fernando, Sylmar,
Pacoima, Mission Hills areas out to Reseda. And then
here, the boundary in Van Nuys is at Oxnard.

In the rest of -- much of the rest of San Fernando Valley is including sort of Granada Hills down to Woodland Hills and out to Studio City areas, is included with some communities in eastern Ventura County, including Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks. The shoreline district for your Senate maps includes Malibu, Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Topanga. Palisades with Bel Air, Beverly Hills, Westwood, Santa Monica, Venice, Marina del Rey, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, all of Torrance, southern areas in Gardena, Palos Verdes.

Just going to head back north west of 110. This includes Westlake, Pico-Union, South Central, Central, Alameda. And heading west and south a little bit includes Palms, Mar Vista, Del Rey, Westchester, LAX and Inglewood. SPCC includes San Pedro, Carson in West Carson, Compton, Lennox, Hawthorne, Lawndale, northern parts of Gardena, Watts, and Westmont in some areas north of 105 along the 110.

The district called 710TOWATER, this includes Long Beach, Lakewood, following up the 710 to include some of the Gateway cities, including Huntington Park, Walnut Park, most of Florence-Graham and then Southgate and Linwood are whole.
Looking at the SC60X605, this includes Walnut, Diamond Bar, Rowland Heights, Hacienda Heights, Whittier, La Morada, Artesia and Cerritos with Norwalk, Bellflower and Downey. SD10WE includes Azusa, Covina, West Covina, Baldwin Park, El Monte whole, southern parts of Arcadia split along 210 and includes San Marino, San Gabriel, Alhambra, Monterey Park, Montebello and Pico Rivera.

The SDNELA district includes Bell, Maywood, Vernon and Commerce with East Los Angeles, Boyle Heights, downtown LA, El Sereno, up to Highland Park, including Glassell Park out to Hollywood, West Hollywood, and East Hollywood, and includes Greater Wilshire and Koreatown.

And finally, zooming out the map, the SD210 includes much of this Angeles National Forest area, the boundary on the eastern side is at the county line. It includes Claremont, out to San Dimas and Glendora, Duarte, Monrovia, Pasadena, and South Pasadena, Altadena, out to Glendale and Burbank. And this district includes Sunland-Tujunga area, Hollywood Hills areas as well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much, Jaime. We are going into a brief closed session under the litigation exception. We anticipate being back at 1:00. Commissioners, we will see you in the closed session. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a closed session was held from
12:53 a.m. until 1:03 p.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your patience. We're back from a very brief closed session, and we are ready to start with Jaime on our VRA districts in Los Angeles County.

MS. CLARK: Thank you. So the districts identified by your counsel as VRA districts are the ST10WE and SD60X605. I will read off the percent deviation and percent CVAP for all groups, for both of these districts.

For SD10WE, the percent deviation is 1.96 percent. Latino CVAP, 50.29 percent; black CVAP, 2.16 percent; Asian CVAP, 33.05 percent; and white CVAP, 13.3 percent.

For SD60X605, percent deviation for this district is negative 4.12 percent. Latino CVAP, 51.09 percent; black CVAP, 4.34 percent; Asian CVAP, 22.93 percent; and white CVAP, 20.45 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Do we have any requests for explorations in relation to either of these two districts? Are these districts that we are happy to support? Any questions? Shall we move on to the next districts? Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Maybe we can look at all of them and then come back to think through what we learned in this process and see if there's different groupings we want to see or whatnot.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. We will -- for now we will consider these as final. Jaime, are there other areas that we need to look at specifically or shall we just start going clockwise or counterclockwise from here?

MS. CLARK: Thank you. So the last information that I have from your counsel is that these are the only two areas in which there are specifically areas that would require your attention in terms of the Voting Rights Act, and otherwise, we could go anywhere that you wish.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Then I would -- I would say let's go counterclockwise, because then we would end up at the Orange County Line at the end of this tour. And then we can consider where we are.

MS. CLARK: The other counterclockwise.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

MS. CLARK: Got it. So here we are at SD210. The eastern boundary of this is between Los Angeles and San Bernardino counties on the county line. And then this district includes much of Angeles National Forest and spans across the 210 to Sunland-Tujunga and includes Burbank, Hollywood Hills areas.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can we just zoom in a little so we can see the details of who's in and who's -- who's been grouped with who? Thanks.
MS. CLARK: I hope this is sufficient, Commissioner Sinay. If not, please let me know. So again, out from the eastern boundary of -- or rather the boundary between Los Angeles County and San Bernardino County. This includes Claremont, La Verne, San Demas, Monrovia, Pasadena, and South Pasadena, Hollywood Hills, North Hollywood, Neighborhood Council, Burbank, Sunland-Tujunga, and Foothill Trails areas.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. I mean, are we giving interest in changes at this point or we are just --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- taking a tour?

CHAIR KENNEDY: No. We've taken a tour. This is --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. All right. Sounds good. Yeah. I mean, in general, I'd be curious to hear from other Commissioners. Definitely, we've heard a little from the -- from communities in the Alhambra, Monterey Park area wanting to be coupled with within that 210 corridor potentially.

So I'd be curious -- and you know, which would have implications, of course, for how we approach our VRA districts. So I just want to raise that and see where other Commissioners are landing on those kinds of issues.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Any thoughts on that? Commissioner
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I was kind of in that same area. I was -- is it -- my thought was if we could put the Assembly iteration map over this one, since we had so many conversations in this area, that might help us or it might confuse us. I know that two lines are tough, but I just -- I wanted to -- because I agree that I think there's things we can do differently in the VRA district and still keep that community of interest together.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Do you have suggestions?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm still studying the map, sorry.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Any other colleagues?

MS. CLARK: So in blue, again, this is your Assembly iteration, basically your working draft. Right? Your most current Assembly lines, so the northern boundary of that, the areas here in sort of -- in your Assembly draft, the West San Gabriel Valley areas are included in this district as it's drawn right now. Main differences are that Glendora is not included, El Monte is whole. And then Pico Rivera and Montebello are with this district whereas in Assembly they are not.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Vazquez, followed by Commissioner Fornaciari.
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: So sorry, I'm wondering if Commissioner Sadhwani could repeat what she's looking for here.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, you know, in most of our other maps, and that's not to say we necessarily have to do it here, but you know, it -- especially in our Assembly map, we actually have an Asian American VRA district. In our Congressional map, that same region is actually coupled with the 210 kind of corridor.

Here, we have it as a part of -- as a part of a VRA district for, you know, in which the protected community is Latinos. So I'm trying to gauge the interest to take that portion out, put it into 210, and reshape and reconfigure our obligations for the VRA district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And just if you can specify which areas you're referring to as --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, sure. Monterey Park, Alhambra, East San Gabriel -- East San Gabriel, Temple City, El Monte potentially -- or El Monte might be able to be in there, too, in the VRA district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, and if you pull those out, what would your thinking be as far as what population to pull in?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, I mean, potentially I
think there's a couple of different ways to look at it, right? I mean, so we have on the other side the POF district. So it could be going further east out to Pomona that direction. It could be, you know, connecting throughout El Monte down to Montebello and Pico Rivera. It would be a fairly sizable architectural shift there. But I think that there's options in which way we want to go.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Jaime, do you have any sense of whether we would be able to maintain the CVAP figures if we moved, if we shifted that district to the east?

MS. CLARK: So as it is configured right now, it's 50.29 percent Latino CVAP. Shifting this to the east, I think it depends on how far east we're talking. And also, this would be getting into areas where there are VRA considerations in western San Bernardino County. And it's sort of coming up on, like, a cluster of areas -- an area where there's sort of a cluster of VRA consideration areas.

So it is difficult to say the overall impact not only to this district specifically, but also like the total VRA area -- or the total number of districts, I guess, in which there are VRA considerations.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Fornaciari, and then Commissioner Turner, Commissioner
Vazquez, Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I was -- I was just kind of thinking of exploring the same thing that Commissioner Sadhwani brought up. So can you do me a favor, Jaime, please, and just turn off the Senate districts and turn on the Assembly districts so we can see where our VRA districts are?

So EASTSGV is -- the West San Gabriel Valley was the Asian VRA district. Right? And then, going down the 85 corridor was a VRA district. And that was another VRA district? Okay. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. Okay. So the question I have with how we're going already in wanting to just kind of switch, move areas -- and I understand the why, I'm not against any of that. I'm just wondering, with the Assembly work that we did, we worked also in Senate for drafts. With the Assembly work we did, it was grueling, trying really hard to respect COIs, and honor public comment, et cetera.

We landed in like areas that we believe would have best representation. So the question is, is do we actually -- is it going to work out at some point for the Senate maps that we're actually going to choose something
different than we chose? I mean, in Assembly, it feels like we're taking what we have and going to start trying to force fit in or at least -- not force it, maneuver it to make it look like Assembly -- our current Assembly instead of starting with Assembly.

I don't know how different to say it, Chair. I don't know how you can answer that. For me, it just feels like we're going to go through a process to try to get it -- that we -- to a process, to get to the point where we like it as well as we did with our last iteration of the Assembly maps based on all of the conversation and testimony we had. And it seems like it's going to be a longer way to go around it. I don't know.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, I mean, my sense of what the Commissioner Sadhwani is raising is the possibility of conceptually shifting the Senate district so that instead of the West San Gabriel Valley Assembly district being combined with major parts of the East San Gabriel Valley --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- Assembly districts, that it would kind of shift over east by one Assembly district. I mean, obviously not -- or not obviously, but at this point, not necessarily being perfectly nested. But at
least conceptually, moving the center of population of
that Senate district one Assembly district to the east.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, and so -- and that makes
sense. And I agree with that. And it's because looking
at it now, based on what we did before in the Senate,
after all of the conversation, it looks like it should go
this way instead of the other way. And I'm just
wondering if that's -- if we have a sense of if that's
going to be repeated, where we continue to move to look
like the old which then would -- might suggest we start a
different direction instead of reshifting all of them.
Let's -- yeah, I'll stop there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, I mean, I think that
Commissioner Turner is right in that the Senate maps
represent a lot of work, a lot of effort, a lot of
thought that went into them. And you know, I'm certainly
happy to entertain suggestions for shifting things. But
we should keep in mind how much thought went into
creating these in the first place.

And if there's good reason to change them, then we
can -- we can look at changing them. But let's make sure
that we have a fairly well-developed sense of where we
want to go with any changes so that we can use the time
as efficiently as possible. Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I am -- I think
I'm in support of Commissioner -- what Commissioner Turner was saying. I mean, I look at these -- at this particular district and its -- there's a lot of time and energy that went into developing this district and keeping some of the COIs here together.

And so I mean, I think -- I'm not opposed to exploring, but I think this is also a very -- as we've seen through all our maps, this is a very complex -- as is all parts of California. A complex area with many, many overlapping COIs and -- I mean, this district doesn't look, I mean, I think it does a good job of balancing the interests at this point. But of course, I'm not opposed to exploring if there's a way to maintain the balance that we have here. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. I tend to be in -- agree with Commissioner Turner. And I -- and part of it is we put a lot of work into the Senate map. But I feel like we've gone through master classes since December 10th when we approved the Senate maps. And we've gotten so much more information that if we -- maybe there's a way to look -- start at the Assembly map and think through. Okay, what have -- what do we want to see in the Senate? And then, go to the Senate and know where
to change it.

But I'd rather be more concrete and say, you know, what we did right -- what we liked here and what we'd like to see in the Senate is these parts of these two districts together because we've done so much thinking. Especially when it comes to all of it -- I mean, VRA and others. I feel like going back to the Senate maps is reminding me, you know, you can write a book report on Lion, Witch, and the Wardrobe in sixth grade. And that's going to be very different than a book report that you write in college, you know.

You get different understandings. And we really have gotten a lot of input, a lot of thinking, and a lot of analysis on all of our parts. And I would like to start from the Assembly and build the Senate. And I don't think we're going to be throwing out what we learned because all the way through we keep going back to what we've learned and what we've seen.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I agree with what has been said lately. And just as an exercise, I propose that we look at the Assembly maps. And we just -- just as an exercise, combine them. Like, quote-quote, do a little, like, oh, I'm going to put those two together,
and those together, those together. And then take a picture of that and compare that to the Senate map.

I think it might show us areas that we might want to add here, delete there, and maybe not. But it might give us the area -- it might really show us -- because if we look at the Assembly right now, there's so many lines, we're getting a little confused. So I'd propose that. Or as we're looking at one district, turn the Assembly lines on and if -- to the best of our ability, only look at those lines, which I think that might be a little harder.

But -- yeah, as we did -- we did a lot of rethinking as -- you know, in the Assembly from what matched this, you know, from the November 10. Just an idea.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: You know, I'm kind of going along those lines, too. You know, yeah, we put a lot of work into the Senate map. But we've also spent a lot of time on those Assembly maps and learned a lot. And thought about how we could group them, and that's why I wanted to, you know, turn the Assembly maps on.

And I guess, I'm going to throw something out there because it makes sense to think about loosely nesting, you know, the West Covina, Baldwin Park, Irwindale
district with the district below it. And then the kind of Norwalk, La Mirada, Le Habra district with the district to the west of it, in the Senate -- in the Senate and get potentially stronger districts that way.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And I'm not being too much attitude, but I do want to respectfully disagree that we did not spend a lot of time on the Senate maps. On the visualizations, so every week we had a -- or every two weeks, I can't remember now, we had different visualizations. They were always different.

And then the last week before we approved our drafts, that was the first week of live line drawing. And like we normally do, we ran out of time. However, we have spent a lot of time on the Assembly. So it would make sense to look at the Assembly, as my fellow Commissioners have said. But I just want to say out loud that we did not spend a lot of time on the Senate maps. And we intentionally said we'll go back to it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, and as Jaime has demonstrated, she's able to turn lines on, lines off, as we wish. So let's be -- let's be ready to tell her to switch back and forth or overlay, whatever is going to work best for you.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. And so Chair, in
thinking it through a little bit more, what I think I'm at least want to do -- at the very least, is for us to see if we cannot come to some agreement of our approach that we're trying to take, because it will make a difference and will seem like we're pulling together in the same direction instead of conflict.

So are we trying to utilize the Assembly maps whether -- regardless if we've named it or not as individuals, you know. Is that what we're trying to do, or are we trying to stick with the work that was done in the Senate? And I think if we start from a kind of consensus there, an agreed upon place. At least we'll know what we're working towards instead of looking at the map saying, oh, yes, I remember we did this area in the Senate and felt good about the -- you know, whether it was long time -- term or short term, felt good about it. And then someone else is but let's change this, let's change.

It's like, what are you trying to get at? Well, what I really want to get at is getting a different shape based on the last Assembly maps that we've done. And so let's just know what we're trying to do and then we can do it together.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that.

Commissioner Sadhwani?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. So I agree with everything everyone said. Right? Like, we have Senate districts. We also put all this work into the Assembly map already. We've been thinking about the COIs.

I agree with you, Commissioner Fernandez. I actually don't think that we've put in tons and tons of work on the Senate map. I think that there's definitely work to be done here.

So just in terms of process. Right? Initially, the thought was we can -- we can do a little live line drawing, but if there's big architectural things, then we need to name it. Hopefully write it down ourselves. Agree to it, have some general consensus that everyone likes that direction. And then we can ask, you know, Jaime or the other mappers, can you go back and work on this?

When I'm seeing this map, I'm thinking, oh, there's a lot of things I would like to change that are kind of big. But I -- before I say them, I kind of want to talk about it with everyone because we haven't really had that chance yet. So I'm wondering if Jaime, maybe, would be able or willing to weigh in here as well, or Karin.

I mean, does that sound like any kind of reasonable in which we can toggle back and forth between these districts as well as our Assembly districts? Be --
hopefully be very specific, and that requires all of us being very specific and clear about what that direction is, what we want to see.

So for example, here, perhaps it's nesting what was that Assembly district with -- more so with the 210 district as opposed to the -- sorry, the West San Gabriel Valley cluster with the 210 district as opposed to the East San Gabriel Valley. That in and of itself is a massive change. Right? Probably not something we're going to do here live right now.

So instead, that's something if everyone is in agreement, we can kind of bullet point and could come back to us in a day with -- or so with changes. And so I'd love to just hear Jaime and Karin weigh in on that and see if that's a reasonable way to proceed so that we can toggle back and forth between what we have and those Assembly districts that we've spent a lot of time working on.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Jaime, Karin?

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you so much for that question, Commissioner Sadhwani. I think considering that it is 12/14 and I think you are planning on being done with these maps in, I believe, three days. Big architectural changes and things that can be done offline
and then be evaluated, would most certainly have to
really be agreed upon, I would say, by the Commission.

Because while Jaime is working on those or while
somebody else is working on them, they are not live
mapping with you. So you know, I think we have to be
very careful in looking at the time line and the fact
that you presumably want to be done sometime in the next
couple of days with this. So that would be my input on it.

Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Karin. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, so generally agreeing with
everyone, especially the observation of how much we've
changed, and learned, and grown since putting together
this draft Senate map. You know, the big variable is the
VRA districts. If carrying Assembly VRA districts yield
VRA Senate districts we're happy with. And so we go down
that route -- and I think it is worth trying -- I think
we could really focus on the resulting VRA districts and
really decide, you know, pretty quickly and pretty
certainly how happy we are with them.

And if we are, if that's looking promising, go
forward from there. But if not, to then, you know, to
abandon pretty quickly and go back to plan -- what was
plan A.

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

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I agree with what Commissioner Yee just said. I guess for me, I thought we were just going to start on the VRA districts and try to get those in a good place that we want, because obviously it impacts everything else around it. Just on the larger process question, I guess I'm still trying to understand what the goal is that we're trying to achieve by making these changes. And I think that would be helpful.

And we've said that multiple times before and then we kind of forget and we just go to the changes. So I think it would just be helpful, I think, to Commissioner Turner's point about being able to pull in the same direction.

If we all understand what the goal is and we're in agreement with it, then I think it makes all of our comments a little bit more additive than perhaps -- not conflicting, but perhaps we might think this is the direction which we're trying to go. But it may not actually be that and therefore it may end up being more confusing and conflicting in terms of the direction that we give to the line drawers.

And I think as we get closer, I'm also becoming much more conscious of our shortening time frame. And so I think we just don't have as much time as we did with both
the Assembly and the -- and the congressional. And not
that we want to shortchange the Senate, but I think we
just need to be much more focused now. And especially
given our experience that we've had, we can hopefully
bring that to this process so that we can be more
focused. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. So we are looking at a
VRA district or a cluster of VRA districts or districts
that we might somehow improve or we're trying not to lose
where we've -- where we've achieved that. And
Commissioner Sadhwani has proposed a general direction
for this particular district that we might look at
combining the West San Gabriel Valley district with the
210 district, and the East San Gabriel Valley area with
an area to the east.

Again, that that sets off a whole series of changes
that we need to think through and determine whether it is
something to be pursued, because it is going to take a
good bit of time. And even if it's done offline, it's
going to take a good bit of time. I think we're at a
point where we need to be very specific about changes and
reasons for changes.

A general sense of what we've learned from the
Assembly districts, you know, the only -- the only option
that I see there is just almost ignoring the Senate maps
and saying we start with the Assembly maps. We go these two, these two, these two, and make modifications from there. But is that is that our best way forward?

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I mean, I think we have a draft. We have strong draft maps, I think, in this area at least. But what I was going to say was that if we're going to make changes, we should align them with our goal. So you know, what our goals in this area? And making sure that we're that we're not inadvertently having, you know, not reaching our goal by making changes.

And so I mean, we just need clarification on our -- on our goals for this area in terms of districts you want to unify, or communities of interest we may to unify, majority/minority seats, whatever the goals are. Right?

And then -- and then -- and work with that in mind, because otherwise we may be disrupting our COIs, which we put together very carefully and it did take us quite a bit of time to get here. So that -- those are just my thoughts.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Thank you.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I would love to pick these two, these two, these two as far as Assembly. But in
addition to some of the areas -- some of the COI testimonies that we tried to accomplish in Assembly and just didn't work out there. And so where we come across those areas, perhaps making some changes, you know, if we can, for the Senate that we couldn't for Assembly.

So I don't know, I think -- and then once we do that, that seems to be a quicker process. Not that that's the way to go, but it'll let us know where all of the problem areas are and where that -- maybe there's some natural fits. And we can then count that area accomplished and then move to areas that, you know, we're having a little bit more difficulty in.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Let me -- let me offer a suggestion, that we do a pilot. That we take Los Angeles County, that we start from the Assembly districts. That we look at which Assembly districts to pair. We see, you know, this is -- this is a relatively finite number of districts.

We see how that goes for us. And we determine whether that's an approach that we want to continue with through the rest of the state.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And my major concern is -- with that is around the VRA districts. Right? The VRA
districts, you can't put two VRA districts together and -- I mean, they'll all have to be crafted to ensure their effectiveness. And that may mean that they may have to look -- so just -- that's just my concern. I mean, I'm not opposed to moving in that direction or doing that. I just think with the VRA districts, we just have to think differently than maybe other nonVRA areas. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Right. And nothing is saying that, you know, this is -- that the goal here is one hundred percent nesting. The goal is to build areas that we are comfortable with and then massage them to where they work, including making sure that we are meeting our VRA obligations to the best of our ability.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Other comments?

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, because that's exactly what I had proposed. But what -- I did want to make sure that I was indeed talking about looking at the Assembly map, Looking at any -- any of the districts that are -- we consider already VRA or are close to our VRA districts, you know, that are, like, close to the VRA area. Look at those.

Don't worry about all the rest of it out and around.
But look at those, and go, okay, I kind of like that because they're not together. Create a, quote, Senate map and compare it. And see, do we like that? Because I don't -- I think we're going to -- even if we do that, like Commissioner Sadhwani said, well, I kind of want this one going up. And then modify those, fix those.

And then, we'll actually have VRA for the Senate. And we can adjust -- and this is something that Jaime could certainly do. Then, make suggestions to create the, you know, kind of draw from here and put around here to fill out LA County.

And I think that is a very doable thing. And I think that's going to be -- it might actually be the fastest thing we could possibly do. But I would like to hear Jaime's comments on these couple of suggestions.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Okay. Jaime or Karin, either one?

MS. CLARK: Hello, hello. So the proposal is to just start nesting?

CHAIR KENNEDY: The proposal is to -- is to start nesting within Los Angeles County. We're going to do Los Angeles County as a -- as a pilot and see how this goes for us. See if we like the results when we compare it to the existing Senate draft. And then we make a determination at that point if that is a course we want
to follow for the rest of the state.

MS. CLARK: Thank you. Before we begin, I will save a snapshot of where we're at now. So just one moment, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. That -- I'm not saying nest everything. I'm actually saying, because we need to do a very first and I think we should concentrate on see if we, quote, nest those -- any of the -- any of the, you know, like, I'm looking at this one, you know. SD -- well, the Assembly. Anything within Assembly districts, within the areas that would be VRA consideration.

Look at those. So here we go, the SGV or WESTSGV, those areas, and includes ones not just VRA districts. And then and look at -- and see (audio interference). We like those; nest that area. That's what I'm proposing, because then, that's the area that we have to work out. And then we could see now what other Jaime could -- who's look at this all the time, she could say now, you're going to run into trouble here or there on the outer edge of that. Not just start, like, in the corner and work in.

CHAIR KENNEDY: No, no, no. We're going to -- we're going to start with VRA areas. Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I think -- I think I'm in agreement with Commissioner Andersen here. When I look at the map, when we pull out, it's not just about Los Angeles County. Right? Like, the VRA areas are very much connected from the eastern portions of Los Angeles County into Imperial -- excuse me, into San Bernardino and Riverside counties.

No, we cannot completely nest. But can some of the logic of our Assembly districts be used to help us build? So for example, if we were to decouple what is in our Assembly district, the western San Gabriel Valley from the eastern San Gabriel Valley, more so with AD53PCO -- is that what that is? Yes. Right.

Clearly, you're going to have to take more than steps in doing this. Isn't that a complete nest? Right? There's going to be -- need to be some changes there. But perhaps, like, that would be a general direction that I would be really curious to see. And then I know that a lot of those Assembly districts in Riverside and San Bernardino are also -- are also VRA districts. I'd like to see some combination of them.

I don't even know to what extent that even aligns with what we have in our current Senate draft for the Inland Empire. But we know that we did a lot of work on the COIs throughout there. And so I'd like to see where
that puts us. That's not to say that that's going to be our final, final district because we'll have to make sure we're hitting the CVAPs that it would be able to perform That the protected community -- the communities we're trying to protect can actually elect candidates of their choice.

But to me, that would be kind of the general direction. I'd like to see our Senate map move in and then kind of come back and clean up. I think we can clean up a lot within the Los Angeles area once we have those VRA areas locked in.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I would -- I would want legal to weigh in on this approach, just to apprise us of any potential risks that we might encounter along the way. I mean, I'm also thinking, right, because VRA really is about people, not geographical locations. And as we start moving the lines, we potentially could be shifting the VRA districts and putting in -- just like we did in the Assembly, putting in nonVRA areas with VRA areas makes a brand new VRA district. And so potentially does -- and it could be -- I would just want some advice on that and some clarifications. Thank you.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Mr. Becker, you're back with us, I believe?

MR. BECKER: Yeah. And I'm going to need -- I literally came back on as Mr. Toledo was just speaking. So someone's going to need to summarize the process that is at issue, because I had to hop off for about fifteen minutes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So the idea is that we take our Assembly districts, which represent a lot that we learned in the process of developing those Assembly districts, and we look at combining Assembly districts to give us a general concept of what a potential Senate district might be. That we look at that potential Senate district and make whatever modifications to it we believe are important to make. And we can compare that to what we have in the current Senate plan.

But the idea is that if we -- if we do this -- if we go through this process focusing on Los Angeles County, and that doesn't -- that doesn't mean that we can't cross county lines at all. I think that we would want to limit crossing county lines to districts that have a presence in Los Angeles County just so this doesn't get out of hand as far as the scope of it. But if we -- if we see that that approach works for us in Los Angeles County, that we could then generalize it to the rest of the
MR. BECKER: So my thoughts are primarily process oriented and not necessarily legal. There's no legal reason you couldn't do that. But I will say, and I defer to the line drawn on this as well, I heard Karin Mac Donald make this point. You are thirteen days away from the deadline, the legal deadline, and less than that with regard to the target deadline.

If you're to do that, it's likely that it could have a rippling effect with regard to populations and already considered inclusion of communities of interest and other aspects that came into the drawing of both these lines and the Senate lines. I'd also say that, you know, generally when nesting is a higher criteria, there are states like that.

Alaska, for instance, where nesting is a higher criteria and they nest by definition the Assembly -- their House districts within their Senate districts. They start drawing the House districts with the idea that they are going to nest. That has not been done here, I don't believe. And so you could end up with a -- with a very significant domino effect that would cause the reconsideration of a variety of lines that you've already drawn.

So that's my that's my advice. Again, it's process
oriented. There's no legal reason you can't do that. But I think it might -- it might create significant problems and considerations with regard to why the Senate draft -- maps were drafted the way they were in the first place.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Could you elaborate on that last point?

MR. BECKER: Well, you can -- you -- you've authored you put out some draft Senate maps for public comment. You gave two weeks for public comment. This is a major change from that. Those Senate maps did reflect considerable consideration of criteria that are above the nesting criteria, communities of interest, political geography, equal population, VRA, et cetera. It is -- you know, I think there is some -- there's some pros and cons of nesting.

Again, this is a process type of point I want to make. There are pros and cons of nesting. It is in there is the least important criteria in California. But generally, if you're going to nest, it's something you need to consider very early on so that you can draw the lines knowing that you intend to nest rather than put out draft maps that are not nested for public comment. And then go back to it to a very, very low rated criteria later on. That's basically what I mean by that.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Turner, did you have a further point?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. I did. Two things.

Number one, I wanted to be clear that from my perspective, nesting is not the point. From my perspective, it -- we worked hard on various communities of interest and we made adjustments as we went along in the Assembly to ensure we were incorporating all of the public comment that we're getting. No, move further to the east, west, south, and north, et cetera.

And so I think they reflect what we intended to be kept together. And so not just for the sake of nesting because of the work that was already done, that was very different than some of the work that we did in Senate.

Number one.

The other piece is -- as I wanted to understand, I think Commissioner Toledo said -- you'd mentioned something about it being a problem for putting two VRA districts together. And I totally don't understand what that problem would be. For sure, if that's the direction we went in, we would, if it was in a VRA area, be looking at the CVAP numbers, and you know, and adding and taking away population so that we can keep it, you know, high or whatever. But it seemed like you were indicating that there was a problem just in combining the two. And if
that's the case, I want to understand that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Toledo, would you like to respond?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I mean, when it comes to VRA, it's not necessarily geographical standpoint. People, and people are maybe in, like, three districts rather than two districts that -- because the -- in order to maximize their -- the opportunity for -- maybe maximize is the wrong word. In order to ensure that the -- that the protected class has the opportunity to elect candidates of their choice. So you're really looking at it -- I mean, it -- just nest -- and maybe it's because we're using the word nesting. And maybe that's the issue.

But by combining to two VRA districts don't necessarily create -- two Assembly VRA districts don't necessarily create, in my opinion, a Senate district that may -- that it may be adequate to meet the needs of -- just because every area is so different, so you have to look at them individually as opposed to. So that was my take, but I appreciate legal to weigh in on this as well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: So it's just unclear, I mean. Just because you have two Assembly VRA districts doesn't mean you haven't created -- you've created a proper Senate VRA
district by combining the two of them. The electoral
dynamics might be different. There might be packing in
districts or not.

Which is not to say it can't be okay. It can be
okay. It's just it's not automatically okay. That's
basically what I'm saying. So we'd need to be -- I mean,
it's not that combining the two of them automatically
raises VRA concerns. It also isn't that combining the
two of them automatically satisfies the VRA. We have to
consider them all fresh and new.

And then you have the other variable of what if you
can combine the VRA district of nonVRA district, which
could be done. And there are areas where there are
significant minority populations, and whether that
comprises a VRA, a compliant area. These are all -- we
can't answer these questions in hypotheticals. They have
to be done. But on the other hand, it would also be
starting, basically, an entirely new plan from -- for
consideration.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Becker.

Anything further, Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No, thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, thanks. And sorry, my
Wi-Fi has been a little unstable today, which is why I
keep my I'm keeping my camera off a little bit more here. You know, I appreciate all of this conversational process. And I agree with Commissioner -- the first point Commissioner Turner made was we're not talking about necessarily nesting in the traditional sense. But how do we build on the work that we've done? So you know, yes, the process piece, I'll just go back to the first thing that raised. In our current Senate map, we have roughly what we've developed in our Assembly map as the West San Gabriel Valley with the East San Gabriel Valley. My general direction then would be to remove that portion of -- that is the West Gabriel Valley in that district, which we've identified has a VRA application or only at 50 precent Latino CVAP.

So by removing it and rethinking our approach in that area, which, yes, would go eastward and would set off some additional changes in our Senate map, would improve the CVAP. So that's, for me, the goal. We don't need to necessarily do -- actually the rest of the LA map to me -- for me personally, and we haven't really talked about it, it's about some minor tweaks around the edges, actually.

So I don't necessarily need to start with the full Assembly review, necessarily, but that one change alone -- if we wanted to do it, and we haven't arrived at
whether or not that is something that the full Commission
wants to do or not, would set off additional changes to
the rest of our VRA districts. And that's why I raised
it. Right?

I think we could take any number of approaches to
get there. But that's my concern, is that we have a VRA
district that actually, when you look at it, it's two
different VRA districts that we've created in the
Assembly for two different communities. Is there a
better approach to doing that? That's ultimately what my
concern was.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I guess my question at this
point would be, you know, didn't we try to create a
better one when we were developing the Senate map?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think we only spent a day
on the Senate map, so I'm not so sure.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. I'm -- Commissioner
Turner said exactly the right thing. This was not to
nest. This was to look at a comparison and realize that
it was to -- it was to give everyone a framework to try
to move forward. If this is -- it's just too -- no, that
doesn't work, drop that idea. Look at our Senate map and
bounce back to these and go, yeah, yeah.

And move one out, put the other one over because we
need to move along now. And I think we all have the good idea of we really want to make tweaks to the Senate map. We want to absorb what we learned from the Assembly map, because we did. We actually made a lot of changes. But we've also done a few other things now because we worked on the congressional map.

So I don't believe that if we just went to tried to put these Assembly maps together into Senate maps, we want to tweak that as well. So let's not do the step of -- let's just do the comparison. Have Jaime bring up the lines. I think that's going to be probably the easiest way for us to move forward.

Because if -- and talk and say, yes, I'm thinking about removing, you know, Alhambra, putting it up here, and grabbing Moda, such, and such, and such. Let's verbalize what we actually are thinking so we can say, yep, don't like that idea. I like adding Pico Rivera to Whittier, something like that, so we can get some direction and move forward.

Okay? So I think I would -- I would say look at our Senate maps, pull the Assembly maps underneath them, and say, this is what I'm thinking. And people say, yes, I like that. Say yes, I don't, or -- and suggest the next thing.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.
Ms. Clark.

MS. CLARK: Thank you so much. If this is a direction of the Commission overall would like to go in, this is just a suggestion on how to do this as quickly as possible. And it would potentially be, you know, some online work and then some offline work.

So I can't -- right now, what's on the map is the Assembly districts. And I could -- the Commission could discuss which districts they would generally like to pair. I could fill those in with -- you know, so say that you wanted to put the eastern Gabriel Valley district with PCO. I could fill both of those in red, for example, and then move on.

And the Commission could sort of look at what the pairings could be, assuming or maybe knowing that there would definitely be adjustments just based on, you know, moving half of a district out of one of the districts, or roughly the population of half the district out of any of the districts will definitely cause big changes throughout this area.

So then the Commission could kind of look at what pairings could occur. And then also give direction on what, you know, A, see if that's even something that they're interested -- that you are interested in doing after, you know, looking like really in terms of pairing
districts. And then also if that's something that you
even like, then giving direction on what to remove or
what not to remove.

Knowing, for example, I'm just going to use El Monte
as an example. In your Assembly draft, it is split.
Whereas in the Senate map it's not split. And you know,
looking at pairing -- the pairings that have been
discussed so far, it's replicating that split potentially
unnecessarily or in a way that the Commission isn't --
doesn't want to replicate. And that would be true across
the map across the state.

So that's just a suggestion for moving forward and
thinking -- just thinking about your deadline, thinking
about time right now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I was thinking about -- so I'm
trying to understand the conversation a little bit,
because I'm hearing two different things. One is, I
believe what my understanding --and Commissioner
Andersen, correct me if I'm wrong and -- or others can,
is -- is that we would be nesting so that we can evaluate
the maps that we have. So it's more evaluation, trying
to compare our maps -- the draft maps that we have now to
to the -- to nest, for lack of a better word, the
grouping of the -- of two Assembly seats and trying to find opportunities for improving our draft maps. And so it's more of an evaluation tool rather than a reworking of the districts. And I don't know if that's what I'm understanding or if I got it all wrong. But I'm just trying to understand at this point.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And Commissioner, can I answer that one? Yes. That's exactly what I was saying, put them together and then, put them up underneath it. I think that that's going to be more complicated than -- I don't really recommend doing that. I kind of -- I like kind of the idea of putting it up underneath it.

I think that might help move forward faster. I think if we do this step. It might get confusing. And it'd be like a whole another step involved. And so I'm trying to get the group to move forward and I believe Commissioner Sadhwani had an idea of let's look at what we have. And you know, like, she's saying, let's take all Alhambra out. We're actually going to start to shift this over a little bit. And I think going back and forth between our Assembly districts with our Senate map might move us along the fastest.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can we pull up the Senate map?
This is just for an example. Sorry, the Senate draft.

So if we look at the -- at the Senate district that has Long Beach in it. You know, right away, I'm sure all of us were like ooh, because we did so much talking about it in the Assembly district. And so what we could -- you know, for me, I just kind of looked at that one and said, okay.

I know we wanted to, you know, if we can Long Beach, you know, shouldn't be in this one and we can move it, you know. We learned from just a day or two ago what might work in this area. I've got two screens up and I've got the Assembly and the Senate map. And I think as much as we can have two screens or 2 tabs, you know, a tab open to look at them.

But I think we're ready. We've had enough conversations and I think we've landed on we need to -- we need to start with the Senate -- the Senate drafts as the base. But looking at our Assembly and saying what we liked about the Assembly maps that we would like to see in the Senate maps.

And how we do that, having both sets of lines gets confusing. But if that's how people want to go, we can go that way. But I think -- I think we're all agreeing at this point.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So let us -- Jaime, if you
can back out just a little bit. Okay. So Commissioner Sadhwani, you would like to remove Alhambra and I forgot the other one -- Monterey Park from --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I would actually say Arcadia, Temple City, East San Gabriel, Rosemead, South San Gabriel, San Marino, Alhambra, Monterey Park.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. To --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Keeping El Monte, South El Monte.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- to the -- to the SD210?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I recognize that's going to throw off our deviations just a little bit.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: We're going to need a plan. But I think shifting -- you know, this is a VRA district -- it is meant to be a VRA district and we're currently at fifty percent Latino CVAP. So finding ways to boost it by going further eastward, to me, seems like a pretty good idea. That could long term mean that Montebello, Pico Rivera go elsewhere. We can figure that out as we go.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay. But we're -- going we're going to include Montebello and Pico Rivera in what
we're moving out right now.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I would actually keep it in for now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Keep it in for now? Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So this --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: This could be the case that maybe, you know, from a compactness standpoint, maybe it goes better with, you know, either to the east or to the west or something as we continue to rearrange.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So the area in red is the area that you're proposing to shift to the SD210?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Jaime, let's go ahead and do that.

Okay, so now we need population. Commissioner Sadhwani, go ahead and talk us through where you'd like to see the population coming from.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Minimally, you are going to need San Demas to connect us to Pomona. And then I, you know, here again, and I -- this is a -- this is a question for mappers. What is the best way to proceed here? And I think pulling out and including Ontario and Chino. Certainly those are areas that we have covered in other VRA districts. I mean, Montclair would have to be
in there to.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And this is being moved into SD10WEST, correct?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Correct.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So that's --

MS. CLARK: And just a note is that this -- the pop -- the deviation of SD10WE would be fifteen percent overpopulated. So not all of this area could be included.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Understood.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Understood.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, that's right. You know, to me, starting in El Monte going east, this becomes more of a, you know, semi-suburban sort of area, which is where I -- I'm kind of left wondering if Montebello and Pico Rivera end up going elsewhere. But a part of a part of answering that question -- I mean, we can again question for mappers. How do you want to proceed?

We could take them out and leave them hanging. We could keep them in and cut back Ontario. You know, certainly SD210 is way overpopulated. So we're going to need to have shifts in this population moving through the map. In which Montebello, Pico Rivera might come back
into play.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Well, this might help minimally, but I noticed that North El Monte was also taken -- or I think taken out or left in, I don't know. I think taken out of this current district. So you might want to put it in just so that all the El Montes will stay together, so that might be small. Yeah.

Also, I would agree Montebello and Pico Rivera may be better going -- if we're going to do this, I think they'd be better going with some of the gateway cities. I think, or at least with Whittier and, you know, Downey and all those cities. So that may also be a way to ensure that some of the, I guess in this case, either Chino or Ontario can possibly stay a little bit more whole.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Do we -- Commissioner Sadhwani, do you want to propose removing something from the selected area before we -- before we make this change to get the deviation down from where it is?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, what I -- not from the selected area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I agree with Commissioner
Akutagawa. And I think by taking Montebello, Pico Rivera out, there were districts not far from there that, you know, while they may not have been VRA districts necessarily. For example, I'm looking at NELA. Right? What happens to that NELA district if we start putting in Montebello, Pico Rivera, and potentially -- do we have West Hollywood in there?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right? I mean, I think that there are some -- these are some of the kinds of shifts that I'm talking about within the LA map that could lead to some, you know, more natural pairings of communities. And however the line drawers want to work through this. If we want to do it live, if we want to give general direction, I'm fine either way.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I would say commit this and the, you know, I know we'll be overpopulated and our Latino CVAP is now quite high. Right? But I think that's going to change once we take out Montebello and Pico Rivera.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So let's go ahead and -- Jaime?

MS. CLARK: Thanks. Yeah, I was just going to say that I think that these are going to result in such big
changes to the map overall that I think it is something that probably is in the Commission's best interest to make these changes live. So then the -- what, you know, so then you understand the -- understand, I guess, the trade-offs in these locations of making these changes. And I'm going to commit this change right now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please. And then, as Commissioner Sadhwani had suggested, let's move Montebello and Pico Rivera to the NELA district for now. They may go elsewhere eventually, but let's look at what that does for us. Okay. Thank you. So if we -- if we pull out, and let's look at where we are on deviations right now.

MS. CLARK: So the deviation of the SD210 district that would become 3 percent and the Latino CVAP would be 58.84 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. CLARK: And of course, the NELA district will be overpopulated. That would be seventeen percent deviation.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And where do we need the population right now? Do we need that in 210 or where do we need it?

MS. CLARK: So yeah, eventually -- well, 210 is also overpopulated. So we need population for the rest of
this -- for the rest of this district. It's called POF, this is with a Jurupa Valley, Fontana, parts of Rancho Cucamonga, that's negative forty-seven percent deviation right now and -- yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So it would -- it would involve or could involve shifting population through SD210 to that? Can we --

MS. CLARK: This is also an area where -- I believe, where there are VRA considerations. So I don't know that it would be possible to maintain or to meet your VRA obligations through moving population, either through 210 or through what now is Antelope Valley and Victor Valley together. I think you would maybe have to go through --

I'm just kind of going to zoom out a little bit. I think you would have to go through parts of San Bernardino County, Riverside County, and then through Orange County, and then this more central part of LA. And essentially, it's moving about half of an Assembly -- or excuse me, half of a Senate district at a time. So about 500,000 people shifting throughout.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Let me pause a minute and call on Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you very much, Jaime, for that description. And Commissioner Sadhwani, I really like where you're headed here and how you're
headed. I see a couple of things that would help us here
is maybe if we put that the Gingles, the three condition
map that shows the entire area that we're looking at,
just reflect quickly over that to say what areas we --
essentially, what's our -- what areas are we looking at
that we need to cover which might give us a limit in
terms of how far we can push to one area without losing
it.

But I also like the idea is, when you're grabbing an
area you'd like to switch -- move that just to have kind
of consensus over. Is that -- does anyone else have --
oh, no, I really want that area in, because then we won't
have to revisit.

We can sort of do this as we go. And do it all
together as a group. I think that might, you know, we
don't want to get into the just one person doing
things -- which I don't think was going on. But just a
little bit of -- a little bit of facilitation there, I
think, might really create this a little more quickly,
because I did see other Commissioners have their hands.

And this is an area where a lot of people have
worked on this quite a bit. So it just might help a
little bit if we did those two things, kind of did the
overlays. We know how far out we don't want to get -- go
beyond, and what areas we have to make sure we include.
So if we could maybe pull that map up. But that's -- I don't know if other people think that's a good idea, but I think I'd certainly help me to know what areas we're, you know, we don't want to leave out.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Jaime, do you have that as a layer? No? Okay.

MS. CLARK: No, I do not.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: There we go. So we -- so that I've got the map, but I -- and I can show it, it's not very granular. I don't think it's going to be necessarily -- it's not zoomed in and it's not going to necessarily help that much. What I can do is, whether it's appropriate to do an open session or closed session, I can advise you on areas where VRA concerns are relevant.

I think we've had a lot of discussions along those lines already. So that should be fresh in your mind. And we can certainly, if you draw certain lines and there are legal concerns, we can discuss them in either open or closed session, whichever is appropriate at the time, given kind of a nonhypothetical boundary, but an actual boundary.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you. Commissioner Sadhwani. And then it will be time for our lunch break.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I think just going
back to the wisdom that Commissioner Turner lifted
earlier, especially in this area. And I know that
Commissioner Vazquez had to step away. We spent actually
a lot of time redoing this area in the Assembly maps.
Again, not a straight nest, of course, but it might be
helpful just to remind ourselves what we did.

We had a long conversation about Rancho Cucamonga,
about Fontana being paired with Rialto, about the value
of keeping Redlands or not keeping Redlands, or portions
of Redlands, of Grand Terrace and some of the portions
that are currently underneath the data view box that I
can't exactly see. But I'm pretty sure if we started
pulling in some of those areas -- again, not a complete
nest, but we could build off of that to build out this
VRA district that clearly needs to be built in this area.

And then beginning to equalize the population here.
Right, I mean, we have a clear sense of where the VRA
obligations are going to be. There's going to be one in
the San Bernardino area, one in the Riverside area. And
we have those as at least a guidepost to start building
them off of and readjusting some of these. Right?

And I think that the positive of this is now we do
have this VRA district in the eastern San Gabriel Valley
spanning out into San Bernardino that is at a higher
CVAP.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So please be thinking of how
to build out and balance these districts during lunch.
And we will be back at 3:00 p.m.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 2:16 p.m.
until 3:00 p.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your
patience during our meal break; we are back with you. We
are currently exploring ways that we might strengthen our
Senate plan, beginning in Los Angeles County.

Commissioner Sadhwani had initiated an exploration
of doing some recombining of elements from our latest
Assembly districts, and so we are currently looking at
what our next step is.

So Commissioner Sadhwani, do you have a suggestion
of where you would like to go next with this exploration?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, I guess that question
that I have is one: are we all in agreement in making
these change, right? I mean, I think the real focus here
that we said going into this is strengthening our VRA
districts. And at minimum, taking out this region in a
VRA district and extending it eastward, has done that.

Certainly, I see a path forward to continuing that
work in the Inland Empire. That being said -- and right
now, the changes that we've made are leaving a lot of
population hanging around, right? Like we're over in the
210, we're under in the POF, et cetera.

So my question to, maybe to Jaime, is do -- I mean Jaime is focused in the Los Angeles area. Do we leave what we have done here and start looking at the other VRA districts in LA, so that we can rework the Inland Empire with Sivan; or do we continue on?

So that's a question for Jaime, and for the full Commission. I mean, I'm not hearing anyone's response on these changes. So I think I just need some confirmation if this is definitely the direction folks want to go.

And I think the focus for me is how do we improve and strengthen our VRA districts. I see this, you know, the removal of this Asian American COI that we've heard a lot about, that makes up or comprises an Asian VRA district in our Assembly maps. I see that reflected in almost all of the public testimony that we've received, but I'm not hearing a lot from other Commissioners. So if this isn't the full direction that the Commission wants to go in, then we should probably pull back, right, because no point in continuing to explore if this isn't what everybody else is actually wanting to do. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Vazquez and Commissioner Toledo, and Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Huge apologies, because I had
to step away for the entire process of getting from there
to here. So acknowledging that on its face, I am not
terribly thrilled with the district as visualized right
now, particularly the huge portions of the Inland Empire
that are now paired with the west -- sorry, the East San
Gabriel Valley. I can envision me getting comfortable
with that; again, I wasn't part of the conversations, so
if someone could walk me through sort of that, I can see
me getting there. I do think Pomona is probably, like,
that transition point between the two areas, where Pomona
definitely has, I think, shared interests with both the
East San Gabriel Valley and the Inland Empire. So again,
I can see a world where this makes sense, but just sort
of on its face, not super thrilled by this.

I am in agreement, for sure, to keep sort of the
west San Gabriel Valley sort of whole and together; and
strengthening the west -- strengthening the East San
Gabriel Valley's VRA commitments. I just don't know that
I am sold that this is the way to do this.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

I'm in support of strengthening the VRA districts up
in Los Angeles, and one way to do that, and I think if
probably given when I zoom out and look at where the
population is that we can draw in, while maintaining the
VRA districts, it's really from the Inland Empire,
because that's where much of the population growth has
occurred. And then rotating it through over the northern
part of Los Angeles and then to more of the rest of Los
Angeles to populate our VRA districts that are on the
lower end of the CVAPs.

So there's -- I think we tried this also in the
Assembly and it was just difficult to do, because it is a
complex rotation of appellation through these districts.
However, so VRA comes first, and I think we have to
solidify these districts before we start shifting the
other districts. And I think that's the concern I have,
is, you know, how much time will this take. I mean, of
course, we want to get our VRA right and we have to
solidify that and so I'm trying to process how to do this
in the most efficient manner possible.

Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. I mean the time question has
to be paramount because, you know, from my perspective,
above the VRA, above the equal population, is finishing
these maps on time. You know, everything will have been
for naught if we are not able to complete this task in a
timely manner. So my question is, to Commissioners, is
do we believe that we can make changes this extensive,
potentially throughout Southern California and the
Central Valley, recognizing that there aren't VRA
concerns in large portions of the state but there
certainly are in this portion of the state? Or are we
better off trying to make the best changes that we can,
but more of a marginal nature without major architectural
changes? So I just wanted to put that question out.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, and you know, I hear you
and I think that that's something that goes in our heads
and every time we say, okay, let's just move forward,
then something nudges us because we didn't do -- we
didn't make what was good, better, or what was better,
best. So when it comes to VRA districts I just think
that they do need to be the best. It's for ten years,
and they're really critical for those communities.

I also believe that things take a while. You know,
the taking things apart and putting things -- take a
while, but all of a sudden, in five minutes we may have
four districts.

You know, I'm a firm believer, because I'm a
facilitator and all that, that you have to trust the
process and just rush us, but trust the process -- not
rush us, but nudge us, but we will get there and we will
get to best.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, sure. You know, I mean I know in the congressional maps we took some time to review some of the testimony that we had received. We had specifically looked at, like, maps from the Black Hub, from MALDEF, from Advancing Justice, Equality California, et cetera, many of these groups that have submitted full map plans.

I'm just wondering, Chair, if it might make sense to just take a look at how some of these other groups might be visualizing some of these areas. You know, I think many of them were certainly cognizant for VRA obligations and perhaps advocating for the strongest possible, you know, VRA districts; and perhaps that could help as a guide.

Not to say that we would adopt any one version of those, but perhaps just taking a moment to reflect on what we have seen, and certainly coupling that with all of the community testimony that we have received.

I don't know if Jaime has any of that loaded, but if it's reasonable to you, Chair, it might make sense; and maybe can help us answer just how doable this work is and if we actually want to go down such a path.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good, thank you.
Jaime, do you have any of those available to us?

MS. CLARK: I have Senate submissions loaded in for Advancing Justice and MALDEF, and I just received shapefiles from Black Census and Redistricting Hub. They're not loaded into my map yet, but it would take just a few moments to load them.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Would you like to load them while we discuss a little bit further?

MS. CLARK: Certainly.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.

Yes, definitely our VRAs need to be strong. And I guess, I just caution; we have VRA districts and then we keep trying to get them stronger, and stronger, and stronger. So I think we need to get to a point where we just have to cut if off because then we're just spinning our wheels. And at the point where our VRA attorney is comfortable with it, and then maybe at that point we need to move on. Just because we do seem to be going back to the VRA districts and changing them. And as we've seen, then they have the ripple effects to other districts that we've already somewhat finalized but no longer are finalized because of the ripple effect.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. My sense -- and I've lost
track of whether Mr. Becker is with us right now or
not -- is there --

MR. BECKER: I am.

CHAIR KENNEDY: You are? Okay. Do you have a
general sense of being okay with where the Senate maps
are before any changes, or --

We're getting background from someone. Commissioner
Yee, is that your mic, or I don't know whose --

Thank you.

MR. BECKER: So I think we've already been over my
judgment on some of these districts in the LA area, so
I'm not going to rehash that. I don't know if you're
asking for what my view of SD10WE is under the adjusted
configuration. I don't think --

CHAIR KENNEDY: No, no, not yet.

MR. BECKER: -- there are any VRA concerns about
that, okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, no. Okay.

Someone's hand had gone up. Can we scroll back to
the top of the -- thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I just have a question. I
guess since we're starting now from -- in a sense, I
don't want to say from scratch, but if we're going to be,
you know, readjusting these VRA districts. I know that
there's been an effort to try to keep the changes
localized, but I think my concern with this kind of large
change is that we have to -- if we're going to do this,
we just have to be open to all of it; because I think
there's going to be ripple effects to the Inland Empire,
which then ripples to San Diego. And you know, I
guess -- or if we're going to go up towards Central
Valley. I'm not sure which way, once we get into the
Inland Empire, if we're going to go left or we're going
to go right, I guess, in a way.

So I think if we do this, I just want to say I
think, you know, we just got to not try to keep it
localized. I think we just got to let the ripples kind
of work itself out and see what happens. I know it's
going to -- there are probably people that are probably
just thinking, oh, my gosh, what are we going to do? But
I think if the goal is to create, you know, stronger VRA
districts. If we're, you know, through this exercise,
clearly you know there's some dissatisfaction, you know,
or perhaps more of a desire to do better, not
dissatisfaction.

But it's a desire to do better, then if that's the
case then, you know, I think we just need to try to see
what that's going to mean for the other districts and not
try to constrain ourselves to just like, let's just keep
it to LA County, because that may not be workable. So I
mean if we're going to do it, let's do it right, at this point.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. So Jaime?

MS. CLARK: Hello. CHAIR KENNEDY: Hi.

MS. CLARK: I was able to load some. I was able to load the Black Hub's proposal into the map. I am happy to just kind of look at all of these together. I have not had a chance to assess or evaluate any of these, really.

So one moment; I'm going to turn off the Commission's districts and turn on -- who would you like to see first? I have MALDEF, Advancing Justice, and Black Census and Redistricting Hub.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I think, given what we're working on, let's look at MALDEF first.

MS. CLARK: I'm sorry; could you please repeat that?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Let's look at MALDEF first.

MS. CLARK: Okay. So their lines are here in purple. I'm just going to zoom out. So I think essentially what it would do is redraw a lot of your -- you know, redraw a lot of the area. So I think that would just have to -- would be something that the Commission would have to be comfortable with, if
you're going to move in a path forward. So they do include some of these areas in the Inland Empire with the East San Gabriel Valley areas.

And see, I'm just looking around everything. It looks like they have Long Beach in three districts and they also have Long Beach with some of the gateway cities. And then in -- I'll turn on the Commission's lines again, just to see some of these differences here. It looks like some significant, maybe, differences, in sort of Riverside and San Bernadino Counties. And they have the Victor Valley and Antelope Valley separate from each other.

Would you like me to move onto a different plan?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, if you could go to the Black Hub's maps?

MS. CLARK: Okay. So here their lines are in red. It looks like in more like the city of Los Angeles and, you know, southern and central Los Angeles is pretty similar to the Commission's current maps.

Here they have Long Beach in one district but gateway cities and have the ports separate; and including, excuse me, some of these cities like Hawthorne or Bernadino, Compton, et cetera, with San Pedro. It looks like they have some differences here in the Santa Ana area.
They include La Habra, and it looks like at least part of La Mirada, with Santa Ana, and this western portion of Anaheim. They also include Pomona, Ontario, Chino, with some of these Eastern San Gabriel Valley cities.

They have part of Victor Valley with Antelope Valley; and additionally, it looks like there's a split here in Santa Clarita.

And then in Riverside and San Bernadino, I'll turn on the Commission's maps. So also sort of -- yeah, there's differences here too.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I'll just observe that I like -- I mean I see that they have gone over into San Bernadino County as we are looking at doing. They then are able to have a San Bernadino-based district and a Riverside-based district, without combining those two. And I certainly see a lot of positive in that.

The district wrapping around from Cabazon, Banning, Beaumont, around to Norco. I, you know, I can see that making a fair amount of sense. I can see, I mean, the SECA district looks very similar to what we currently have. The configuration of the -- we'll say the Central Desert District, including Coachella Valley, Joshua Tree National Park, Twentynine Palms Marine Base, et cetera. You know, I can see some sense in that.
One of my concerns in this would be trying to better balance population between Victor Valley and the Antelope Valley; if we are going to cross that line. I've consistently said I would like to see population as balanced as possible between the two elements of a district that crosses that line in that area. Just some of my thoughts.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, thank you. This was helpful. Still not super thrilled. I don't think this composition makes as much sense in terms of putting like communities together, as what we have drawn. That being said, if the rest of the Commission is interested in pursuing this, I think that I am happy to go that way.

For me, a priority, then, if we're going to make major changes, is in the Senate map. I would very much like to see us keep the Antelope Valley and the Victor Valleys whole and separate, since we had to combine them in the Assembly. I would prioritize keeping those separate, more like, I think, the MALDEF plan that we just saw.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

And so Jaime, can we see that third plan that you have available?

MS. CLARK: This is the Advancing Justice plan. So
just a quick overview is, again, sort of in like southern LA County and eastern LA County, pretty similar to Commission's Senate plan. And then moving here towards San Gabriel Valley. Yeah, some of the differences the Commission is discussing right now as well.

Moving into Pomona, Ontario, Chino here in this district with East San Gabriel Valley, this looks similar to Black Hub's, and it looks like an identical, potentially, sort of split with Black Hub, which is having Victor Valley split with Antelope Valley; Santa Clarita split, and then having some of the San Fernando Valley areas and areas along 210, included with this Antelope Valley District.

I'm going to turn on Black Hub's as well. Yeah, it looks like it's the same submission in terms of shape.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I just want to say thank you Jaime for showing s that. I really appreciate it. And I hope folks see where I was coming from in trying to remove the Asian American COI that we've heard a whole lot from. It is reflected in all three of these maps as not being a part of a VRA district, a strong VRA district that can perform for the Latino community, who is the protected community in this district.
And I definitely understand the concern of putting together communities that aren't similar, and we've talked about this before in the Senate map. We're putting together a million people. So it's going to happen that there's going to be pairings that are people that are different, right? I mean that's the nature of a humongous map, humongous districts that are like this. And you know, we can debate whether or not there should be such large districts, but nevertheless that's the job that's in front of us.

So you know, again, I'll just pose the question, is this the direction that the Commission wants to move in? And if not, we can revert and just accept what we've got.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. My sense is that for improving representation in this VRA area, specifically, I am happy to continue along this line. I would think that we would generally try to limit the ripples to a reasonable extent. I mean, if we completely obliterate the map we're starting over, and I really don't think that's the best way to go on this.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: If I may?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I agree with you completely. To me, you know, from the get-go I've kind of said, to me a lot of the stuff happening in LA is generally good, and
it's like moving around this one district does set off a lot of ripples that we'll then have to work out. It will allow us to make some of the changes in LA to meet some of our other goals, right, we talked about earlier.

Commissioner Toledo had mentioned, you know, the number of districts that, you know, center around working-class Latino communities. I know that that was an interest for some. I think some of these changes can allow us to get to that place. But yes, it will have ripples, and I think a lot of those ripples are going to be, you know, in the Inland Empire and further down the map. But as we see from a lot of these other maps from community groups, are LA maps are fairly similar actually to what other folks are drawing. I think the key piece for me was that we continue; we have that Asian American COI that we've heard a whole lot of testimony from, paired within one of these VRA districts. And so pulling that out was a priority that I wanted to raise.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay. I thought there was another hand, but maybe that was your hand earlier.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think it was Commissioner Turner.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Oh, it was Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. So we saw
the three maps; thank you, Jaime, just now. I think there are other maps that's coming in as well. That I just don't know if we are resistant to starting there and lining up, or taking hours and lining -- I'm looking for shortcuts that still accomplishes everything. And so I'm not supportive of starting from scratch. I'm not locked into our map versus their map. We know a lot more today than we did a couple of weeks back.

I really do want to say if there is any iteration that we've seen, and I really don't care who sent it. If there's any iteration that we've seen that gets closest to what we're trying to accomplish, I would love for us to start there and then make our adjustment based on what we've heard.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner. Jaime, do you recall having seen anything that goes in this general direction? Do we have any previous iterations for Senate maps, for example, that do what we're trying to do?

MS. CLARK: The Commission had never requested seeing these areas paired together. Like having Pomona and Ontario, for example, paired with East San Gabriel Valley, so that is sort of the basis or, I guess, like a pivot point for the Commission, then no, we don't. We haven't -- none of the Commission's iterations have
grouped these cities together in a Senate plan?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Excuse me.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I guess the question would be also, like, what are we trying to do? I mean, yes, we're specifically trying to raise this elapse in the Los Angeles region, but these -- and solidify our VRA maps. Right? To really solidify our VRA maps and increase the CVAPs; potentially increase the number of Latino majority seats. The only population that can rise to that level of a million people or more. And so those would be the, I think, the three criteria that we're looking to while trying to solidify the VRA maps. And so as we look at the community maps, you know, I don't know if Jaime has an assessment of which ones go in that direction, right? Or actually meeting all three or most of the three requirements.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner, and then Jaime.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: So we have on the screen now this proposed shift that we seem to like, but the concern is this may take a long time and shake a lot up. What I'm asking is, Jaime, of all the maps that we've seen and ones that's coming in right now, do we have any that has this direction that we can now say and this is what else they have that we can move in? So it does not line up
with -- because we had a different direction. We had
something; the map kind of going in a different way
earlier. But based on what we want to do now, what can
give us, you know, a good start?

MS. CLARK: Yeah, thank you. So I'll just kind of
show the three maps again. And actually I'll put these
on top of each other. So there are some differences
between what MALDEF has submitted and what Advancing
Justice and Black Hub have submitted. These, I think,
would be more minor changes overall than compared to the
Commission's map, right? So these are more similar to
each other than either of them are to the Commission's
map.

And back to Commissioner Toledo's questions, if I
have an assessment of accomplishing these in the VRA
areas; I have spent about as much time with them as the
Commission has at this point. So I don't have -- and I
think that would also maybe be a question for legal.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Jaime.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you for all
this; it's very helpful. Would it be helpful to say,
like, to proceed as -- here Commissioner Sadhwani said,
okay, like, I want these, these, these together. I'm
thinking, well, why don't we go this direction. Then
say, and someone could take notes on this, say I'd like
to see, you know, Chino Hills with the La Brea, such --
you know, I'd like to see duh, duh, duh, duh, duh, dah.

You know and then say, well, you know, I want Vernon
and Commerce and, you know, whatever they are, say some
combinations like that. So we can kind of have a grasp
of, oh okay. You know, if it takes us a while to move
things and we stop and we talk about it, why don't we
kind of spin a few scenarios? Someone write then down
and then go, oh, I like that scenario, and then go with
it.

Commissioner Sadhwani was doing a great job here;
and we're okay, here and here, realizing that okay, what
about these other areas? And then if someone else could
say, well, you know, I don't want to take all that out,
I'd like to see -- we keep this area, keep whatever's
northwest of the red drawing we have right now. I want
to see that still in there, but I'd like to see, you
know, the areas down in Downey, Norwalk, et cetera, et
cetera. So I want to see all of those together. And
then maybe we can spin a couple of scenarios. So we
have, you know, we know how many. Are we doing three,
are we doing four in this area? And then create them and
then draw them.

Would that help, because people. You know, I think
Commissioner Sadhwani clearly has an idea and now she wants someone else to kind of pick up the ball and run with it a little bit more, I'm feeling.

You know, and someone else says, well, you know, I really want to see this, this, and this. And if we just write that down, we can try it. Because I think we saw a bunch of different ideas here. Now, let's spin some scenarios and go.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, so one more. So a new comment that come in, and I want to say this particular one, they're again maps of, you know, the area's potential nesting Southern California, et cetera. But the point I want to get to in this public comment, it says: "This proposal was created in three steps. It used our initial nesting of 128CRC Assembly iteration. There was an adjustment for contiguity, and then adjustment for Voting Rights Act." And it talks about the resulting plan that creates twenty-three center districts, of which ten are one hundred percent nested, so forth and so on, et cetera.

It talks about it increases the Latino majority Senate districts, et cetera. This is a fourth kind of way to think about it and if it's utilizing our
iterations that we started with, and then just being able
to make some suggestions. Again, for me, looking to see
what can we do, instead of recreating or starting over,
it seemed like it would be, to me, a good place to start.

CHAIR KENNEDY: It does seem to be a good place to
start. It is starting with the Assembly map, not our
Senate map, just so we're all clear on that. But yes,
that does sound like a useful starting point.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I'm at a loss here.
Honestly, I think -- I mean, do we want to do this or
not? I think I'm still waiting; I think I'm hearing
people say yes. And then if yes, then how, right? So we
can work on it now; we can give some general direction.
And as we've done in other maps, we could work offline.
I'm happy to volunteer to help with that if it's helpful;
happy to let someone else do it. It doesn't really
matter. But I think it doesn't sound like we're landing
anywhere as a Commission in terms of do we want to move
in this direction and if so, how?

I think, Commissioner Kennedy, when you were looking
at one of the maps it was really helpful because you
identified -- there is a VRA district that spans from
Eastern Los Angeles into San Bernadino. There's one San
Bernardino-based one, there's one Riverside-based one. I
mean, maybe some general guidance like that if we all can
agree upon it, could then be (audio interference).

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay. Commissioner Sinay, while we're waiting for Commissioner Sadhwani's internet to catch up.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Answering Commissioner Sadhwani's is, yes, I would like to move forward with this in LA. I thought we were piloting LA, seeing if it worked, and then we might look into other ways of doing it. But like everyone else, I'm nervous about wasting valuable time, and I thought we had already landed on let's pilot this here in LA and as we learn, we may bring in other things.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Other methods.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think I'm hearing that there's willingness to explore, but to do it -- but it's the process that I think we're needing to figure out. How to do it in a constrained manner so that we are able to finish our job in a timely manner. So I think it's more of a process and time management, and how we go about doing it, and do we do it in live session, during our public meeting, do we work on some of this offline? I mean, at the end of the day we have to solidify our VRA
map. So I'm in agreement with Commissioner Fernandez.

Once we got them into -- once we start our goals, based on VRA counsel advice, and we're able to get them to that amount, then we finalize those and then we work around them.

But that will take a little bit of time to get them -- to be able to get them to that amount, potentially, unless they already are there. And I'm not a hundred percent sure they are. So it's the process I think that we need to just clarify a little bit more and think about a little more.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, I had taken my hand down, but I'll go ahead and give my comment. I'm willing to go forward with it, but I think we need to agree upon what the basis, like, what the first district's going to look like, right, because that's going to impact everything else. So I think once we have that -- I also think that this is going to take a few hours to do, because it's going to impact so many other districts; and then it's going to impact other VRA districts too. So we might be able to start the line drawing here and then at some point may need to cut it off and provide direction.

But I think it's good to start with a base and maybe have
a district that everyone kind of agrees with and then go from there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent. Thank you so much.

So then along those lines and thinking about what Commissioner Sadhwani had mentioned earlier as far as my response to one of the maps from stakeholder groups, could we then try to solidify this one district, the SD10WE? So we have approximately sixteen percent overpopulated at this point. If we can go ahead and finish this and then talk through general direction for the rest of this area. Then we could allow Jaime to take off and work on something to come back to us with and we could start working with Sivan on Orange County and San Diego.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So let's see. It looks like based on what we're looking at here, we need Montebello and Pico Rivera -- just sort of generic saying what I think needs to happen here. Montebello, Pico Rivera goes south. Jaime, if you could zoom out a little bit?

Then SD -- whatever. SD60 is going to be overpopulated, so we're going to need -- but it should be a strong VRA district, but we're going to need to move some folks out. I would propose probably south into IOC,
and then move that population to the east and around to meet up with the other population so we don't have to go through LA. But you know, I have no idea what that's going to look like and what the gory details are until we get into it. But roughly, I mean, you've got roughly 150,000 people you're going to have to march around.

Then we have the POF district. Somehow that district probably gets combined with the Rialto, San Bernadino district to make another VRA district there. It looks like the SBRC is already pretty strong. But you know, we spent a lot of time -- so I mean if we do something like that then Fontana, Rialto, San Bernadino will be together, which is what we wanted before.

Maybe we can unsplit Rancho Cucamonga; we've heard a lot about that. That would be good. But then, you know, then there's just this marching this population around to zero it out. Am I on the track?

I mean, so I was just trying to -- what's the big picture of what's going to happen here? But where would we wind up? We'd wind up with this six -- SD10WE being, you know, probably, we hope, a stronger VRA district. SD60 being a stronger VRA district as POF and SBRC. So we'd have four VRA Senate districts, you know, between the LA and Inland Empires. I mean, is that what our goal is?
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you Commissioner Fornaciari. I think that that looks good. Colleagues can chip in if they see other areas. I think if we go ahead and move Montebello and Pico Rivera south for now, then we do in fact have SD10WE within deviation.

Can you highlight SD10WE instead of SD60? The statistics are on SD60.

MS. CLARK: Maptitude didn't like that direction.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we're at 3.09. We have a Latino CVAP of almost fifty-nine percent. And I think that's a good starting point. I agree with Commissioner Fornaciari that POF at this point would probably mostly go into the San Bernadino district, some might go into the Riverside district.

I had indicted before an interest in seeing if we could achieve separation between a San Bernadino-based district and a Riverside-based district. So I would give that as general direction. And then we'd be looking at how to balance out population. Yeah, we have overpopulation in SD210 right now. We'd be looking at making Rancho Cucamonga whole.

So let's take a few more steps. So Jaime, can you take the population currently in POF and put most of it with San Bernadino? Jurupa Valley would go with Riverside; and then let's see what we need to balance.
Okay, Commissioner Toledo, and then Commissioner Vazquez, and Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I'm in support of the changes and the direction. I also just wanted, because you know, we were talking about regional impact, the Santa Ana district seems to be needing population. So if we could figure out how to move some of the excess population in San Diego down to the Santa Ana VRA district, that might also help; because I think there's very few places to get population to that area at this point. But you know, we'll do one step at a time.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you, yes. Jaime, could you just confirm for our -- our current Senate versions, is the Antelope Valley whole, or is -- did we end up --

MS. CLARK: The Commission's Senate map, I'm going to zoom to this area, which we haven't made any changes to today. The Antelope Valley is whole and it's with the Victor Valley whole.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Got it, okay. Thank you; that's helpful.

MS. CLARK: So this, what is highlighted on the map is everything in SBRC that is in San Bernadino County. Combining it with POF would make the percent deviation of
POF to negative 12.51 percent. And the Latino CVAP would be 56.33 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. That sounds like progress. Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I was just going to say should we -- would having the heat map help at all in these situations?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Jaime, would that be helpful to you?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well --

MS. CLARK: I think that right now, the most -- you know, I think right now understanding what areas the Commission wants to be together would be the most helpful. And then, you know, then I think fine tuning, understanding, okay, what areas have VRA concerns and then being able to adjust CVAP as needed, if needed, for those once these big changes have kind of been made.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I've got to say Commissioner -- Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead, Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I was saying that for -- when we were giving directions to say, can you put these or those areas, it might help in terms of cities or something that Commissioners might pick. It was not for Jaime's benefit. I have full confidence in her, thank
you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, a couple of things, I mean. So as we're doing this, I completely support this change. We've definitely received testimony to take in more of Rancho Cucamonga. And then this is, again, where I feel like we could go back and just take a peek at our Assembly lines. We had worked -- I know Commissioner Vazquez had gone through a lot of the COIs in this area and maybe it makes sense to pick up some of that; maybe not, right? But it could help to just be a guide as we continue to flesh out this district and get it closer to equal population or within the range.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, great.

So Jaime, if we could go ahead and make this change; moving that population into POF, and then we'd be looking at expanding POF to take in the rest of Rancho Cucamonga, as well as the northern part of Upland and San Antonio Heights.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Chair, could I say something about --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- Cucamonga? The reason why we drew it like that in the first place, early on we
got a lot of comments to say there's a north section of Rancho Cucamonga, it wants to be with the forest and they're different than the rest of Rancho Cucamonga. And that's why it was originally drawn that way.

Now, since then, and recently we've been getting, you know, all of Rancho Cucamonga needs to be together. But there was that portion, and it was that -- I think our Assembly district was leaving that northwest portion with the forest. So that was why we originally drew it that way.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sorry, I didn't realize I had my hand up. But I was just going to say, I think adding all of these areas might actually lower the Latino CVAP, is what it -- if I'm looking at that correctly. It may be, and I don't know if Commissioner Vazquez is still on, that we pull in some of the COIs that we had brought in in the Assembly districts, on the eastern edge, that top part. Remember we had looked at the top part of Redlands, and I think a portion of Loma Linda, that that might be -- maybe it's some of this area but not all of it. And as well as more on the eastern edge as well, to maintain the, you know, that range for this district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So instead of making this
change, the suggestion is that we look towards Highland and Redlands, at least part of Redlands, so that we don't strand Lomo Linda? Right.

So if we took in that portion of Redlands that's in the Assembly district, the northern part up against Highland and then portions of Highland.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, some of this area was a bit of a compromise, just based on population, et cetera.

So I would start with Redlands and then -- yeah, I would just start with Redlands, then I would move to Highlands, then I would move to Mentone. That would be my order of operations in terms of grabbing population. But definitely would stay certainly south of the 10 in order to keep the VRA numbers -- sorry, north of the 10, to keep the VRA numbers appropriate.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, so and right now we're just a bit over -- sorry, no we're at 8.35 under still in POF. So our next move would be to incorporate portions, significant portions of Highland?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, correct.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Let's go with that. Okay, so we are now at negative 2.57.

Commissioner Vazquez, thoughts on this?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I personally feel like
keeping Highland more whole rather than a more, probably
more of a fifty-fifty split is probably better. So --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Done.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. So that would be --

MS. CLARK: Yeah, now all of Highland would be
included.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And so Jaime, the pink between
Mentone and Highland, is that Yucaipa?

MS. CLARK: It looks like this is a noncontiguous
piece of Redlands. Would you like me to add this?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: We call that portion Mentone
anyway.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. As well as those two
unincorporated sections.

MS. CLARK: One moment, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. CLARK: And it looks like there's also some
noncontiguous little census blocks in Mentone, that are a
part of Redlands and I can just remove those.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. CLARK: So just so the Commission's aware this
is a city split because of this little, tiny
noncontiguous pieces of Redlands.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: So I might actually
suggest -- so two things, and I'm open to neither. Potentially bringing in more of Rancho Cucamonga. So raising the line, I think to the 210, based on community of interest testimony for this area. And I would walk back some of that -- the Redlands edition, that Redlands are considered Mentone anyway. I would walk that back and maybe try to get more of Rancho Cucamonga.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And Commissioner Vazquez, you had also said keeping the Redlands changes north of the 10?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Correct.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So we would first drop that section of Redlands that's south of the 10?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: And I think we can grab the south of the 10 if we need it for population, but may want to leave it out for now.

This makes sense to me; thanks, Jaime.

MS. CLARK: So then to remove this area south of the 10, from Redlands; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I think so, yes. Let's remove it and then I think my priority would be to try to get more of Rancho Cucamonga in.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Census blocks may not cooperate, and Jaime, some of the census block issues can be handled offline. We're trying to look at the big picture here. Okay.
So now let's look at what we could bring in from Rancho Cucamonga -- and that is the 210, yes. So south of the 210 in Rancho Cucamonga, if we could look at bringing that in.

Commissioner Fornaciari, you had your hand up?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I was just going to say we're above fifty-four until we grabbed that part below the 10, and then it plummeted. We could also maybe consider going back and grabbing that other piece of Redlands. What happened is, when it got grabbed, we grabbed below the 210 and that really knocked the CVAP down.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Below the 210 or the 10? I thought --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Below the 10, sorry. Below that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I thought that was raising the CVAP. I thought it went from fifty-three something to fifty-four something.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: No, it went from fifty-four to fifty -- well, it's fifty-four now. When grab below the 10, it went down to fifty-three.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And Mr. Becker is away for the next hour.

Commissioner Sadhwani?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI:Yeah, just as we continue to explore here, I support this change of bringing more of -- this, just the Rancho Cucamonga, up to the 210. And I believe when we worked on this in the Assembly, we had included Loma Linda in a VRA district. So I just wanted to offer that as a possible area as well, because I agree with Commissioner Fornaciari that additional part of Redlands, it seemed to drop the CVAP. So I'd be curious what happens if we tried Loma Linda.

CHAIR KENNEDY:Okay. So right now in POF, we are at 1.72 percent deviation with a Hispanic CVAP of 53.53.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Does that include the Rancho Cucamonga change? Yes? Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I'm open to trying to see if we can add Loma Linda. My guess is that might lower the CVAP. But I do -- if it doesn't lower the CVAP, let's -- I guess, yeah. There may be portions of it, although I imagine not much; but I do think Loma Linda has -- to our conversation this morning, has an incredible asset of Loma Linda University Hospital. Loma Linda is also a blue zone, which is, like, a World Health Organization, I think, designation for being, like, one of the healthiest areas in the world.

And so I just think it's a really great asset to
include in this VRA district if possible.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So including that much of Loma Linda our deviation is up to 4.36 and the Hispanic CVAP is down to 52.79. Do we want to reconsider bringing in that portion of Rancho Cucamonga, so as to bring in more of Redlands? Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I think we could, as you toward the hills, as in many communities, you sort of shift the demographics. So maybe that eastern portion of Highland. Highland's sort of a bifurcated city like Redlands in that you have sort of folks in the center which are more like working-class, immigrants, et cetera, and then as you get toward the hills you get sort of wealthier areas.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So for example we might continue that line coming up from the western boundary of Menifee --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- and divide there?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yep.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, let's try that.

MS. CLARK: I will try that. And just to note, because the Commission was discussing it, I removed that area of Rancho Cucamonga and Loma Linda is whole, as is Highland. So with this the deviation will be negative
.17 percent and the Latino CVAP will be 53.8.

And I will look into removing this area of Highland now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And then after that, my understanding is that we would be looking at adding back in as much of that area of Redlands south of the 10 as possible.

MS. CLARK: I'll just keep clicking on some of the census tracts here, just let me know when to stop.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry, did we -- is this still including that extra portion of Rancho Cucamonga?

CHAIR KENNEDY: No. That was removed.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I think I would like to include that, potentially even at the expense of Loma Linda.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Is that a -- that's a --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: That portion of Rancho Cucamonga is more similar to the area south of that?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Correct.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And our CVAP numbers were headed downwards as we added portions of Redlands.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so now we are almost seven
percent overpopulated.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Right. And then I would remove all of that Redlands portion from south of the 10.

MS. CLARK: And keep Loma Linda?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: And keep Loma Linda.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, I agree with that.

So this is generally the area. For the sake of time, maybe this is something that Sivan and I could work on to smooth out, okay.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, and if I could just give additional direction, Jaime. That portion of south of Mentone, that portion of Redlands, I believe, south of Mentone, could also I think potentially be removed. That did help the CVAP a little bit. So yeah, this feels like it's moving in the right direction.

I think we probably need to keep an eye on that CVAP and maybe remove more of North Highland. I'd probably feel most comfortable with a higher CVAP.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And we did have -- it was at fifty-four something at one point during this exploration.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I think the Loma Linda piece might be challenging.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Highland doesn't seem to be affecting it much.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, if I may, I think when it was
highest was when Highland was whole and that part of Rancho Cucamonga was not included.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I was just going to suggest that maybe we could work these details offline. But because I think there's going to be some overall major architectural shifts that we all would want to just kind of roughly see the major architectural shifts and see if we're all comfortable with going that way.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. So at this point for purposes of pulling back and seeing where we go next, let's go ahead and commit these and we can come back and undo them later. But let's go ahead and commit them and pull the map back and see where we are.

MS. CLARK: Absolutely. And really quickly, I wanted to note that this little portion of Eastvale is split from Eastvale, and is still assigned, I think, to POF. So I'm wondering if you would like Eastvale to be whole or if I should move that little area in Jurupa Valley?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Vazquez, do you have any thoughts on that?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry, can you repeat that?

CHAIR KENNEDY: The small portion of Eastvale along
the western edge of Jurupa Valley is still assigned to the POF, so it's noncontiguous. So do we want it with Jurupa Valley or with the rest of Eastvale? West of the 15.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I would put it with Eastvale, just because again, freeways really do mark bright lines in communities. So I would put it with Eastvale.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Agree. That's what I was going to say, thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect.

Okay, so let's pull back and recap where we are on deviations and we can --

MS. CLARK: Yep. So SBRC is now negative thirty-five percent deviation. MCV is negative twelve percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. CLARK: SD210 is 30.38 percent, and then the SD60 is 8.68 percent. So yeah, those are the districts now that are not within the plus or minus five percent deviation.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay. So the next step in my mind would be looking at the Victor Valley and seeing what population we could pass through there from SD210
into MCV and eventually SBRC. Does that make sense, Jaime?

MS. CLARK: If I may?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. CLARK: I think that that would depend on whether the Commission wants some of these areas in LA County, along with 210, to be included with either Antelope Valley or Victor Valley or either of those areas? If not, then I would maybe suggest passing population through San Fernando Valley to be able to balance that a little bit better.

And again, that's completely up to the Commission. Some of the submissions that we just looked at did have areas, like La Crescenta and parts of Pasadena, I think, with some of the areas north of the forest. That it just depends on the wishes of the Commission.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani could I ask, if we were to move population out of SD210, where do you see that population coming from?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I would see it --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Where would you recommend it come from?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I would see, as Jaime recommended, shifting it through the San Fernando Valley up that way.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And so we're talking Sunland area --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Um-hum.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- that area west of Glendale?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Correct.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. CLARK: And I would imagine it's going to be more than just that area. It's thirty percent overpopulated. So it's a significant amount of population and we could just go for it and see how much we need.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: If we recall in our Assembly maps we had had Glendale, Burbank, and that whole area paired with the San Fernando Valley in general. So I don't think it's unnatural to pair them, necessarily. Yeah, it could work.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So now SD210 is at 1.35 percent. And we would move this, we would shift this into SCSCV and then continue balancing from there.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, that's correct.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Jaime, did we -- okay, so we've taken a chunk of Glendale there above the -- is that the 134?
MS. CLARK: This is the 210. Oh, yeah, and this is the 134. So I'll remove all of the areas of Glendale. We can see -- you would still need to remove some.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. CLARK: So -- and that was just grabbing a big chunk with the census tract, so happy to look at a more sensical or more intentional split in Glendale or you know, again, that's something that the Commission could sort of iron out after making these big structural changes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, am I seeing further down that the SD210 includes Las Feliz and Hollywood Hills and Atwater Village?

MS. CLARK: Yes, it does.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, those are areas that I feel like potentially we cold be working down into the map as well. Rather than into the San Fernando Valley as we move forward.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. I, just from like a logistical perspective, I would suggest just making these big changes and then, you know, because this is the Senate district, it's almost a million people. That type of change is so much less significant just in terms of population swaps, that maybe just kind of nailing down...
the general structure first and then making more of, like, the smaller changes once population is relatively more balanced.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I hear that. So what are you suggesting? Like, put those areas with San Fernando Valley right now?

MS. CLARK: I would suggest just getting SD210 to within plus or minus five percent. That could include those areas or it could include, you know, some kind of split in Glendale. Knowing that for all of this, you know, the Commission will be able to come back and give more, like, fine-tune direction, once things are just balanced, period.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, and I guess my question would be what is the population of those two, because I'm noticing the SHORELINE district next door is underpopulated. And to me it would just make sense that those generally stay within the Los Angeles area as opposed to they're a part of the City of Los Angeles as opposed to going into the San Fernando Valley.

So that's why I was wondering if rather than sending them to the San Fernando Valley, we can get closer to balancing SD210 by putting them in, perhaps in SHORELINE for now.

MS. CLARK: Okay, yeah. So those were like two
percent of a district, so they could go either way. I
didn't have them included before in moving into San
Fernando Valley. If you wanted to move them there for
now, then SD210 would still be overpopulated. So at this
point it looks like there does need to be split in
Glendale somewhere.

So given what you just said about not having these
with San Fernando Valley, I'm just going to remove those
areas again, and then we should look at a split in
Glendale.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Maybe I'm confused. I was
thinking commit this change and see if it got us to 5.12
percent; so we weren't too far. There's another little
portion of the City of Los Angeles there right next to
Glendale, and that was what I was wondering if that
together would get us to closer to five percent. That
one right there, yeah.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, so I could add all of this to
Shoreline. This is part of Regent Park, I think. And
moving, like, this is Hollywood Hills areas.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right.

MS. CLARK: Moving that with SHORELINE for now; is
that what you would wish?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, that was my thought,
because that gets us to like 4, 4.38 in the SD210; is
that correct?

MS. CLARK: Yes. Okay, so I'll commit this change and then we can look at continuing to move this population that's in the really overpopulated district in San Fernando Valley.

CHAIR KENNEDY: While we're at this, would we be looking at shifting the excess population from NELA district south? Do we need it to the south? Or we could leave it as it is, okay.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, I didn't -- I apologize, Chair Kennedy, I didn't understand the question.

CHAIR KENNEDY: No, never mind.

MS. CLARK: Okay. Okay. Let's keep working here in SCSFV. Just looking at the geography of this district right now, I think it make sense to move sort of Santa Clarita Valley in with the Antelope Valley. Is that the direction the Commission would want to go?

CHAIR KENNEDY: I'm happy with that. Any objections? No.

So please proceed.

Okay. If you can back off that last one.

MS. CLARK: So I'm going to --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so we're at --

MS. CLARK: -- and this change of moving the Santa Clarita Valley out of this district would leave the rest
of the district at a negative 4.6 percent deviation.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. So any objection,

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I don't object yet, but I
don't have a plan as to how we will balance things out, I
will be honest there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So please go ahead with this.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. And then just kind of looking at
where we still need to balance. So we just moved that
population, and instead of combining areas in SD210
directly with Antelope Valley or Victor Valley, we moved
the population through San Fernando Valley. So now this
Antelope Valley and Victor Valley, these district is
again overpopulated. We need to balance between the
Antelope/Victor Valley districts, which is almost twenty-
five percent overpopulated. We need to increase the
population in MCV, which is negative twelve, almost
negative thirteen percent deviation. We need to increase
the population in SBRC, which is negative thirty-five
percent deviation. And we still need to deal with this
eight percent deviation in SD60. So (indiscernible) --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. CLARK: -- still need to be -- yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: The SD60 could conceivably balance
with what we were looking at earlier, what Commissioner
Toledo called our attention to is the negative deviation.

Yes, they're in SAA.

MS. CLARK: Yes, and if I could add to that, please?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. CLARK: So right now, the ones that are overpopulated, so it's like the Antelope and Victor Valley one, MCV, and SBRC, those I guess, like, right now kind of it could look like MCV almost being absorbed into these -- no, not being absorbed. Picking at some of this and then shedding population in Riverside County, joining with SBRC and then potentially, yeah, those could be combined or somewhere else. Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay. So let's look at -- Commissioner Vazquez and then Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, thank you. Here's for me where my priority is and has been really, since the start of this. I would really like to keep the Antelope Valley whole and within -- contained -- the district it's in contained within LA County. So agree with sort of the general direction that Jaime pointed out of sort of shifting population clockwise. But I disagree with, I think, a couple of our submitted and reviewed maps that I don't think we should take a portion of the Victor Valley into the Antelope Valley. And I'd like to follow more closely with the MALDEF lines.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. So if -- Jaime if we could look at what is the population of the Victor Valley?

Looking to move it into MCV.

MS. CLARK: Absolutely. So if it will be helpful, I could even just look at what the percent deviation would be if we added all of San Bernadino County, that's in the Antelope Valley/Victor Valley based district into MCV and then that, I think, will bring these two districts that need to be kind of consolidated and move population, they'll be right next to each other and it will be easier to see sort of what would need to happen there.

Does that sound agreeable to look at adding everything that's remaining in San Bernadino County into the MCV, just to see the population?

CHAIR KENNEDY: If that's easier for you, then yes; that's fine.

We're five minutes from our next break.

MS. CLARK: One moment, please, while the computer is thinking.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Oh, Jaime are you -- yeah, you're muted.

MS. CLARK: Oh, I am muted. Now I'm unmuted.

So the total population of the highlighted area, this is everything that's currently in San Bernadino County and assigned to the Antelope Valley/Victor Valley
district is about 525,000 people. Adding that to the MCV
district would bring the percent deviation of MCV to
forty percent deviation. And then that would be able to
be balanced with the SBRC, which is negative thirty-five
percent deviation. So that's where sort of the balancing
could happen and maybe some more adjusting.

Oh, but this would be negative twenty-eight percent,
okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. CLARK: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And so if we look back at that and
Commissioner Vazquez's desire that we make the Antelope
Valley as whole as possible. Is there population
anywhere else that we need to pick up that could be added
to that Antelope Valley district?

MS. CLARK: I think if the request is to keep it
all in Los Angeles County --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. CLARK: -- I think then that would be looking
back at adding more population, either from San Fernando
Valley or -- this is probably why some of these maps that
we just looked at crossed into sort of the 210 corridor
cities.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay.

Thoughts on this, Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think it makes more sense to cross Antelope Valley into San Bernardino than it does to go into the 210.

I know, Commissioner Vazquez, you're not happy with me saying that, but I think there's more similarities and it'll -- but I'm open, always.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Jamie, could we -- before we go to break, could we just look at the Victor Valley and -- and get a read on how much population that is?

MS. CLARK: One moment, please.

(Pause)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So that's -- that's essentially -- the Victor Valley is, give or take, 400,000 people.

MS. CLARK: That's correct.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we need to take a break for the next fifteen minutes. We will leave it there.

Jamie, if you have any thoughts on how we -- how we handle this, we'll look forward to hearing those in fifteen minutes. We are on break until 4:45. Thank you.

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

CHAIR KENNEDY: Back with you.

Jamie, what did you conclude as far as looking around and seeing how to resolve this population issue?
MS. CLARK: Well, I -- I think kind of as I mentioned before the break, unless you want to cross into San Bernardino County to pick up some population from Victor Valley, either dipping into San Fernando Valley for population or crossing over the forest to pick up some of the cities or communities along 210.

Additionally, the commission has gotten some COI testimony about keeping California City Edwards Air Force Base areas with Antelope Valley. That's not a significant population when you're talking about, you know, a million people, but it's some population. So those -- those are my suggestions.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani, did you have any further thoughts on this?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I mean, I think it's not ideal to dip into Victor Valley and dipping into across the county borders, but that being said -- and I think the ultimate goal of all of these changes is to improve our -- our VRA districts down below. And I think that we are in that general direction of doing that. Certainly, we've already seen the improvement to the -- I forget the name of it. The first -- first one we started working on.

So in that sense, I would be inclined to balance these districts using -- you know, pulling from or
grouping communities in the Victor Valley with the Antelope Valley. I know that, you know, that's, less than ideal. That being said, certainly we -- we do do that in -- in our Assembly maps as well. And I know we've gone back and forth on -- on the extent to which these communities are or are not tied, but I think given all of the other considerations, I think that would be the way to go.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Jamie, the -- so we know that the Victor Valley is approximately 400,000 people. What is the Antelope Valley, not including Acton and Agua Dulce?

MS. CLARK: I will pull that up right now. I believe it's pretty similar population.

(Pause)

MS. CLARK: So -- yeah, that --

CHAIR KENNEDY: It's almost exactly identical. And -- and if that were all we had to do, put together 400 and 400, you know, I think that's definitely something that I could support.

Jamie, were you going to say something else?

MS. CLARK: Well, just a note is that, although in the Sen -- or in the -- in the Commission's draft maps for this area, although Santa Clarita Valley is also included in that district, that's essentially what the
draft maps are. And making that change would definitely 
have some big population bubbles that would need to be 
resolved, including, you know, basically, Agua Dulce, 
Acton, and Santa Clarita Valley would need to be moved 
into a district.

And then also just a note that this area along -- 
north of 210 -- Rancho Cucamonga, Upland, et cetera -- 
currently, we're not really talking about where that 
would go. Just some suggestions or a suggestion is that 
could go into 210 with furthered -- you know, we would 
have to remove other population here in SD 210, but just 
to note that we can't -- we can't forget about those 
guys.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Right, right. Okay. Thank 
you.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes. Sorry I was a little 
bit late.

Jamie, if you could refresh me, if we moved all of 
the rest of San Bernardino County into MCV, how short 
were we in -- yeah -- in --

MS. CLARK: I think we were about twenty-eight 
percent short then in the northern LA area.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Because I'm -- you 
know, I'm seeing that we're -- well, we got the northern
part of Rancho Cucamonga, we got, you know, whatever that is next to it, we could maybe go that -- go west with.

We're four percent here, we're three percent there, were a few more percent. I mean, is there enough floating around in LA to kind of get it in close, do you think, or?

MS. CLARK: You mean by crossing the forest?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: No, by continuing to go through the San Fernando Valley.

MS. CLARK: Yes, I -- I think that that would be -- you know, there would need to be some significant adjustments in L -- the rest of LA County to accommodate that change. But --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, zoom in -- if you can zoom in a little bit there. I mean, maybe -- so we can see all the labels. So we got four percent at SD -- I mean, technically we have ten percent at SDNELA. We have nine percent in SD210. We're a little short there, but we -- in SCFV -- then we add another three percent or probably eight percent somewhere nearby. I don't know. That might --

MS. CLARK: So just to clarify your question, it's about, like, using the plus or minus five percent to try and absorb some of that? I see. Maybe? I think.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: This is probably a
question that requires more thought than we have time to do live.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I mean, I would find it hard to absorb a population through the Los Angeles area and not reduce the CVAPs though. I think that's -- so I think we might be able to absorb it, but -- but it would potentially reduce the CVAPs in that areas, based on just looking at the demographics of -- in this area versus where -- where the population's going to be pushed into. I mean, I could be wrong, but that's what it -- at first glance that's what it looks like.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm -- I'm seeing we've got eight percent in SD60. You know, instead of going -- maybe we can go to the west -- the west with that and bump up the CVAP there and -- and then move up. I mean, I don't know, because it's probably going to break a bunch of COIs, but might be something to think about.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Toledo and then Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I -- I can see that going south. I can also see that going -- portions of that -- that SD60 going into SAA to help us bring that up to a fifty percent minority district, given that it is
VRA. And so — and an area that we'll need to focus, so I can see it going this way. I can also, you know — that one does worry me because it's -- it's below the forty-five and I don't see a lot of -- any -- other than Los Angeles, I don't see other places to get the CVAP to -- to get it to the forty-five -- I mean to the fifty. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. So two things. One, yes, I think that eight percent that's hanging out there, I mean, even when we drew that district during the draft maps, we drew it in such a way as to localize the changes in Orange County. But we had actually said it would probably make sense to bring Le Havre into this district. So I think that would actually pull from SD60X605, and pull it into SAA. So I think I'm -- I'm less worried about that.

And I just wanted to recenter us because I think where we actually were — were focused was on this question of the Antelope Valley, which at — at present we have a lot of population to shift. And I think the key question on the table for the commission is whether or not we feel comfortable grouping a portion of Victor Valley with the Antelope Valley in an attempt to push
this -- this population through the map and eventually
down into Riverside so that we can populate that VRA
district that's further down, which is currently at a
negative thirty-five. Right? I just wanted to keep us
focused on that goal because all of this was really to
create stronger VRA districts.

And so -- so I think that that's the key question
right now, is the appetite to do that. And if that's not
the appetite, I don't know what the solution really is to
resolve this massive population imbalance that we have
right now. Because as we looked at, the Victor Valley
was what was -- what was it, Jamie -- like, close to
500,000 people or something?

CHAIR KENNEDY: 400.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: 400. Right. So I think
that we need some decisions to be made on that. So
again, so that we can just nail down the architecture
here and continue -- continue moving. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I -- I think that's what
Asians Advancing Justice and the Black Hub do, right? I
think in their community maps, they placed the population
towards the San Bernardino into -- into the Riverside
area. I think those are the two -- the Black Hub and the
Asians Advancing Justice maps do that. And the question becomes whether we want to adapt -- adopt that architectural approach, not necessarily their maps, but the architectural approach to -- to achieving population balance. I'm not -- I am not opposed, as long as it helps us further our goals.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Fornaciari and then Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I wasn't trying to say I was opposed to doing that. I was just trying to find a way to minimize it, that's all. I think we should carry on. I think we should -- we should make this -- finish this experiment and see what happens.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, I support carrying on. In the -- you know, crossing the county line is regretful. You know? We really wish we didn't have to do it. We've heard all the unhappiness about doing it, but -- but we have limited choices, and so I think we'll have to do it again.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, thank you. A helpful
suggestion that -- that just came in that will be posted
to public comment from -- no, I'm not even sure because
my inbox is a mess. The -- the suggestion is to consider
taking what we left in Rancho Cucamonga and Upland and
adding that to CD210, which I think in one of our maps we
have -- we've, like, moved the county line below the 210
in order to preserve the county line north of that in
Antelope and Victor Valley.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Is that the first step in

a -- in a --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, and --

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- multistep process?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: And I think there -- there

was some discussion about taking that eight percent in
the SD60 and -- and pushing, I believe, that north wood
(sic) -- northward.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I'm sure there's another way

of doing this. I have not seen it yet, which is why I've
been really quiet. And I -- I think we should finish
this off roughly so we can see if it -- if we can even
get there, like Mr. Fornaciari said.

I still think it -- it looks like we should --

there's probably another way we can do this, and I just
haven't come up with it yet. So if anyone, you know,
let's -- let's keep on thinking outside the box, but I think we should pursue this to -- so we have it, that it would work.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So then our next step would be to take the Antelope Valley and bring in what we need from the Victor Valley to tie that up as a district.

MS. CLARK: Thank you. So if I may, I think I might start including some of these other areas into MCV, and then we can keep an eye on the Antelope Valley, Victor Valley percent deviation to understand where that district is at in terms of population.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

MS. CLARK: And are there specific areas that the commission would like to -- or I guess specific cities the commission would like to try to include with the Antelope Valley or -- any preferences there?

CHAIR KENNEDY: My initial reaction is to say, you know, to try to mirror Assembly and or congressional maps as far as what has been grouped together.

MS. CLARK: Thank you. Oh, so I'm taking too much. Okay. So I'm going to just try to keep everything contiguous here, clean up some of these lines really quickly. Now, I'll try and include Oak Hills so that it's whole. There we go. Okay, so I'll zoom out. This would be including -- including this portion of 210, it's
including whole and intact Pinon Hills, Adelanto, Victorville with the Antelope Valley.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Can we check, Jamie, if Victorville is indeed whole?

MS. CLARK: Yes, I just -- I just made it whole.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good.

MS. CLARK: And this area in Rancho Cucamonga and Upland is still included in the Victor Valley-based District.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay.

MS. CLARK: And so all of this would become part of MCV.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. CLARK: Should I make this change?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

MS. CLARK: One moment, while it's updating.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Is that a part of -- okay. I -- I was just trying to see if that was a part of Apple Valley. No, that's Spring Valley Lake, okay.

MS. CLARK: So now, balancing MCV is also overpopulated -- or is -- is currently overpopulated, SBRC is significantly underpopulated, and then SD60X605 is still overpopulated.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. I'm not seeing -- I'm not yet seeing a way to balance this. If -- if -- if SBRC is
roughly 350,000 people under, and MCV is roughly 125,000 over, we're still way off.

MS. CLARK: So we could, you know, definitely use some of this eight percent here to work with that, and then, you know, can -- you can use your percent deviations here to pull population to this area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay. Are we at a point, colleagues, where we give general direction and ask Jamie to work on this offline and then we begin working with Sivan on Orange County, San Diego, Imperial? Okay. So general direction.

Commissioner Sadhwani, do you have anything to start with?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. So I see a couple lingering issues -- and I apologize, I -- I think I wasn't hearing what people were -- were suggesting earlier about the parts of Rancho Cucamonga that are hanging out out there. But yes, I -- I would agree with -- I think what people were saying -- and please confirm if this is what it was -- of -- of pulling that into SD210 and again, shifting more population around. And then, yeah, I mean, I think that the SBRC is -- is our VRA district.

And so it's about creating that district and -- you know, Chair, earlier you had talked about having it
mostly Riverside-based, which I really liked. We have a lot of COIs in this area as well. We've worked on it a lot in the Assembly. So I think the general direction is building out that district for -- to equalize the population and -- and build as strong of a VRA district as we can, generally following the guidance of the COIs that we had worked so hard on in the Assembly maps, where possible. Right? And at the end of the day, it's a VRA district, so if we can't get them all, we can't get them all.

And then from there, I mean, I -- I think that there's swaps in the Los Angeles area that we're going to need to contend with. I don't know if we want to give general direction on that now or take care of this architectural piece and then come back and work on those smaller swaps that -- that might need to be made. There were a number of districts, for example, where, you know, some small shifts in NELA, for example, you know, or -- or in some of the other districts -- the SPCC -- could shift the nature of some of those districts.

And you know, I think that's -- it sounded like that was a general direction that the commission wanted to move in. But I'm not sure if we want to wait and kind of take that on after this architectural piece is done or if we want to just name that now and then we can work on it.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, I think we want to name as much as we can right now. And -- and that should give Jamie, you know, a better understanding of where it is that we're -- we're trying to go and how we're trying to get there.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I would agree with naming it now so that as she's rotating population, as she -- she'll have to rotate population throughout Los Angeles and throughout this whole region to have the -- she's able to at least get us something that we can opine on and -- and, I mean, we may end up making additional shifts.

But -- but I would name maintaining and expanding the -- of the minority majority districts when -- where possible, and increasing CVAPs for the VRA and VRA districts as -- as population allows throughout this area, especially in the Santa Ana area. But even in the -- in the Los Angeles districts as -- as -- as possible. Because I mean, we're talking about a million people per district. So it's going to be tough.

But as we work -- as we rotate populations, there's a way to shift those, so that would be part of that -- that'd be important. So that -- that's additional guidance I -- just, and I think it reconciles nicely with
what Commissioner Sadhwani had -- had said.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Jamie?

MS. CLARK: Thank you. Just a note about this offline work, this would be general direction for Sivan. These are Sivan's areas and she's, you know, has been working with them throughout this process. She's very familiar with the COIs and tradeoffs in these areas. So of course, I think she's been watching and we will, you know, pass on all of the direction that you've been given to try and meet your goals.

And in terms of direction, in LA County -- yeah, I definitely welcome as specific as possible as commission can get, giving direction. And I can work on that offline to try and make all of your dreams come true for LA County and work Sivan to see that all the populations here balanced.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you. I guess one -- one just further, quick and easy bit of the exploration that I would like to see is if we went ahead and -- and made the city of Riverside whole in SBRC, what does that do for our deviation? Because that would be -- that would be, theoretically, you know, the main -- the main point of having that district is to have Riverside whole.

MS. CLARK: And that's -- that's certainly something
that I can pass on to Sivan and ask her to explore.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani and then Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, so just -- just to -- to be a little bit more specific then, I think some of the areas -- you know, for just some general swaps and changes as we're -- as we're making some of these changes, we've certainly heard a lot from some of the working class communities and essential workers in that SCSFV district in -- in the San Fernando Valley. So I -- I think we have some additional swaps probably to make there if we bring in the Rancho Cucamonga and those other pieces from -- from northern San Bernardino. So to the greatest extent possible, keeping those -- those communities together.

Also in NELA, I think a couple of us have already mentioned that. I mean, I think, you know, looking at NELA, I -- I would, again, I think it's an interesting place because we're pairing, you know, working-class communities of East LA and Boyle Heights with, I think, parts of West Hollywood. So -- so that might be just a -- if possible, a small swap there to -- just to preserve kind of the character and nature there.

And then I'd be curious, I believe portions of 710 to water are -- are those VRA-protected areas as well as
potentially portions of SPPC. So perhaps just working with council on that to -- to make sure that we're meeting our -- any and all obligations that we might have.

And then I do actually have a general question. I totally hear you and agree that the Riverside components are Sivan's areas. How would you -- how would you and Sivan like to work? Because we do need to clean up the SS -- SAA district. And my thought on that is by pulling, you know, pulling some of that population out of SD60. I don't know where everyone lands, but certainly when we were working on this at the draft stage, we had talked about La Habra in particular. So I just wanted to see if that's a swap that we should make with you or with Sivan, and what's -- you know, what is your preference in -- in terms of how to work.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. Is that something you would like to try right now?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm certainly open to it, but I also see Commissioner Fornaciari has his hand up, so he might have some more specific directions as well. But yeah, I'm -- I'm happy to do that.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I was just wanting to get specific clarity on this point for -- for the -- for the line drawers on what we wanted to do, and I think you
just gave it to him. So thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I would just add that I think People's Redistricting Alliance did send some -- some -- some guidance on how -- not guidance, but some suggestions on how to -- how to do this. And I think it -- it goes along with what Commissioner Sadhwani was saying around the La Hambre, some of the -- some swaps in LA County that will help us get to the fifty percent mark. And so that might be helpful just to take a look at it, if Jamie and -- it's in our -- it was sent through public input and -- and certainly if -- it is specifically around this Orange County area, so might be helpful.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So in this -- in this next step, would be -- would we be looking at bringing La Habra, La Mirada, Artesia, and Cerritos into SAA?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I don't think we have enough population to do that. I think it would be La Habra and kind of pulling through Fullerton.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: But again, we should check the -- the population there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Toledo?
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I think the alliance is La Hambra, Whittier, South Whittier, East Whittier, and the portion of -- the southern portion of Fullerton that -- that is a little bit more diverse into -- or maybe diverse is the wrong word, a little more Latino -- and into the Orange County. And then they do shave off around the sides to get it up to the fifty percent mark.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. CLARK: So Commissioner Toledo, are -- are those the areas that you would like to include in SAA, and if so, could you just review that one more time for me, please?

And you're -- you're muted, Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Sorry. So those are potential areas; there might be better areas, but -- you know, Whittier, South Whittier, East Whittier to -- are some of the areas that they look at, as well as the southern portions of Fullerton. And they bring those into -- into the district to get to the fifty percent mark.

MS. CLARK: And is that connected to this SAA district through Fullerton or through --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Through Fullerton.

MS. CLARK: -- Alameda?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So yes, they connect the -- the western side of Fullerton into -- they have a little
neck in -- right there, yeah.

MS. CLARK: Which I think that we've had COI testimony in the past that there's a Korean American community in that region.

CHAIR KENNEDY: In that area that -- that spills over into Buena Park. So then the question becomes -- well, I guess -- I guess we have them whole in there if we have that portion of Fullerton with Buena Park. Okay.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And they do split Buena Park in -- in the Alliance's -- in the People's Redistricting Alliance's map. We -- we probably would want to take a look and see what makes sense for us, but --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- that's how they do it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Just -- just another observation.

We're -- we're significantly underpopulating SD60 now and not along the edges, we're -- we're right in the middle of it. So I just wanted to get thoughts on whether that is the best place to do this or whether there are other options. Do we want to see the heat map?

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I'd be interested in letting Jamie explore this. I mean, my recollection -- yeah, I mean, it's not very hot right around there, right? And so that's the challenge going from this part
of Anaheim into LA, you've got a lot of area that's --
that's not densely populated.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. I mean, as far -- as far as
CVAP, you know, I can certainly see there's -- there's a
bit of a dividing line in Whittier there. There is some
population in South Whittier and La Mirada. The -- the
western part of Fullerton would be to keep the Korean
community united, but isn't going to do -- isn't going to
contribute to our -- our CVAP.

MS. CLARK: Does this --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?

Jamie, go ahead.

MS. CLARK: I was -- I was just going to note that
this is something that we can definitely take a look at
offline. And just some suggestions as I'm looking at it
now is, you know, maybe not having a direct, to like,
district to district based swap, but maybe also working
with some of these other areas surrounding to, you know,
remove population here, add population there. And yeah,
we'll -- we'll, of course, collaborate with your VRA
counsel on this.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And we've -- we've heard
some public input about significant Latino population
east of Euclid in Garden Grove. So I don't know whether
that's an area to be explored in this -- in this
exercise.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, sorry, my internet froze again. Yes, I agree, I think there's exploration to be done here. I was also looking at -- it might also mean taking out Cypress. Maybe keeping it in, maybe keeping it -- I think it depends. But I -- I definitely agree perhaps that that eastern portion of Garden Grove, possibly shaving off on the opposite side of Orange. So I think there's -- there's things to explore here.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I'm fully comfortable with having Jamie work with legal counsel to get us a compliant district in -- in this area. And so -- and I also wanted to clarify the -- that the Alliance did -- only takes a portion of Whittier or South Whittier or La Mirada. And so it's not the whole thing. And they -- they did send -- send some shape files as well. So those are available to us should they be helpful.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank -- thank you. I've been informed that it will take approximately fifteen minutes
to shift from Jamie to Sivan, so unless we have further
instruction, Jamie, are you okay going off with this?

    MS. CLARK: Yeah. And that -- that break would just
be so that Sivan could also be working on the most recent
version of the maps, since there are such significant
changes.

    CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, right.

    MS. CLARK: Unless you wanted to start, for example,
in San Diego County where you -- we haven't really
touched and the changes that are being proposed aren't
necessarily going to bump up against San Diego County.
So if you wanted to start there, we could do a much
quicker shift.

    CHAIR KENNEDY: I actually don't at this point.
Commissioner Sinay has had to go take care of a --
an emergency matter here in town, so I would be reluctant
to proceed at this point.

    Pardon me?

    Oh, she's -- she's -- oh, she's arriving. Okay.

    So yeah, we could -- we could go for a shorter
changeover and work on San Diego Imperial, and the SECA
District in general. Thank you.

    MS. CLARK: All right. Sivan will be sharing her
screen shortly.

    MS. TRATT: Hi, everyone. Just one moment while I
Hello, everyone. We are looking at Senate in Southern California. So would you like to begin by looking at SECA?

CHAIR KENNEDY: If you could -- if we could stand by for about two more minutes, we can -- we can proceed.

If you could, Sivan, as Jamie had done earlier, if you could just remind us what we have currently as far as draft Senate districts for San Diego County and then remind us what we have in the SECA District.

MS. TRATT: Yeah, absolutely. So as far as San Diego County goes, obviously a large portion of East County -- so this is what we would be looking at. Let me turn the Assembly lines on. So SECA includes the large portion of that eastern San Diego Assembly district, as well as the sort of South Bay, Chula Vista district. So it combines those with obviously other VRA areas in Imperial County as well as the Coachella Valley and Riverside.

Then just north of that is this district, which goes from Coronado on the coast, includes part of the central city of San Diego, and then wraps around to include the cities of La Presa, Spring Valley, Jamul. Also brings in Lemon Grove, La Mesa, all of El Cajon. Keeps all of these cities whole.
And then to the north, we have this district, which goes again from the city of San Diego and then stretches all the way north to the county border to include Rainbow, Fallbrook, Vonzell, as well as all of Escondido, and all of Poway.

And then finally, we have our coastal San Diego, south coastal Orange County district, SOC-NSD. And that goes as far south, again, picking up areas on the coast of the city of San Diego, going as far inland as San Marcos and Vista, and then going up to Dana Point in Orange County.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Sivan.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, ideally, it would be great to have a VRA district just in San Diego, but I don't -- I don't think it can be completely done. But I would like to see if we can explore keeping, you know, the South Bay and -- and City Heights, you know, as much of that second district that we created -- Assembly district that we created that went east to El Cajon, see how much -- if we can put -- how much of it, you know, could continue to keep the Latino see that pie. And then move -- and then see if we can connect -- because this was an area where we just kind of quickly did it -- if we
can connect more along the border with Imperial Valley, leaving some of the East County communities not in the VRA district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So the first step then would be to define the area along the border going towards Imperial County that we wanted to keep together with Chula Vista, San Ysidro. And then are there -- did you say there are other areas in the -- in the South Bay in southeast San Diego that you would like to add to that?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I think we have most of the South Bay, but looking -- if we could connect the -- City Heights, maybe going through Golden Hill in that way.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Could -- could you --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: But -- yeah, I was going to say Mr. Becker has his hand up, so --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: Yeah, thank you. I just want to highlight the fact that as with all the maps, the area of Chula Vista, San Ysidro, South San Diego, is part of -- of VRA concerns and it is included in a -- it -- that area only meets the Gingles 1 precondition if included with Imperial County. It would make -- it would raise concerns if portions of that area with -- with significant Latino populations were excluded from -- from
the SECA district, which right now, I think quite nicely
unifies or keeps the Latino community that is protected
by the VRA together so they continue to have the
opportunity to elect candidates of their choice.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Could you clarify that? If what
were excluded from SECA?

MR. BECKER: If there were Latino -- currently Chula
Vista, San Ysidro, kind of that south San Diego area.

Thank you. That is a VRA area, has been a VRA area in
every map. Similarly, the Imperial Valley area is a VRA
area in every map. If you remove significant Latino
populations from that VRA area in South San Diego,
that -- that would otherwise be protected by a map like
this, that could raise Voting Rights Act concerns.

CHAIR KENNEDY: The -- the idea, as I understand it,
would be to -- to connect Chula Vista, San Ysidro, that
area to Imperial County.

MR. BECKER: It -- it -- is -- am I wrong? That
isn't -- that isn't already what's -- what's happening?

Am I reading this map wrong?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, it is happening, but it's
also doing it with a lot of predominantly non-Latino
communities in the East County. And there's some Latino
communities within the city of San Diego that have not
been included. So --
MR. BECKER: Okay, I -- I heard talking about the -- the Chula Vista, San Ysidro, and the area around the bay. If you're talking -- the East --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, we're --

MR. BECKER: -- County area --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- keeping it all together.

MR. BECKER: -- is not an area of significant VRA concern, you can do some population swaps as long as -- I just wanted to warn before you started this that the -- the area of South San Diego, including Chula Vista, San Ysidro, is a VRA area of concern.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, right. We do understand that. So the -- the idea is -- is better stated as better grouping the -- the other East County communities, Borrego Springs, Julian Pine Valley, Descanso, Alpine, Ramona, with more similar communities. And pulling them out of SECA.

So could you, Sivan, what's going to be easier to -- to move those out of SECA first?

MS. TRATT: Well, I -- I was just going to ask what would be connecting it. So it would basically be like a hardline down at the Imperial San Diego County border and then kind of just like a little -- or a -- I can't think of my shapes -- rectangle to connect --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I mean, last time we
found a road and we -- a long, long time ago, we found a road and we wound that road up and down. It wasn't the 8, it was -- it was another one. We could -- I think potentially, we could use the 8 to the 94, but I think a rectangle connecting it works -- will work fine. And then if we can then connect, you know, some of the Latino communities, especially City Heights, because City Heights asked to be with the VRA and I think that that would help. So City Heights, Golden Hill. You know, some of those communities, but I think that should be a good start for you.

MS. TRATT: Okay. I do -- sorry. I do think that that swaps -- sounds like it makes sense. I think what might be the easiest way to go about this would be to unassign some of this area, also just so we know how many people we can move in from the city of San Diego, because obviously that's going to be a lot more densely populated than this East County. So I would just worry about, you know, grabbing too much and then not having enough folks to move around up here.

So I'm happy to start visualizing that if Commissioners would like to keep discussing just so there's not a silence while you all watch me do this.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Toledo?
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I'm just worried --
maybe worried is the wrong word, but just what was --
just wondering about the potential of packing given that
we're looking at City Heights, which, if memory serves
me, was a pretty population-rich area with significant
Latino community, and putting it into district that's
already almost fifty-seven percent CVAP. So just -- just
curious about that in terms of potential risk, in terms
of packing.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: So I think it would depend on the -- on
the makeup of the district that you're removing the
Latino population from. I mean, these are -- these are
districts that are not covered by the VRA. These are
districts where the percent of Latino CVAP is not
particularly high. It would be a question of whether it
could be perceived as -- as -- as intentionally packing.
I think the risk of that is very low.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

(Pause)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. For -- for -- for a start,
that's fine.

MS. TRATT: So it looks like -- whoops. Let me just
adjust this view. So the unassigned area has about
80,000 people in it, which would also be -- nine-ish
percent of a district, so not very much. And then, obviously, I think we should -- well, this isn't, obviously, a very good indicator of what the final Latino CVAP will be, but currently removing this population would put SECA at 61.6 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sinay, the next step then would be to bring what into SECA?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So should we accept this -- this change first or --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, this is just unassigning it.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So we can -- we can --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: All right. I just wanted --

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- easily accept this.

MS. TRATT: And then I'll zoom into San Diego --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: That'd be great. Thank you.

MS. TRATT: -- so you can take a closer look.

Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And my thought was, similar to what we did in the Assembly. I believe it was Assembly district that we connected City Heights to South Bay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And so I think it's -- including that piece probably -- you know, southeast San Diego, you know, this the -- the pieces that just lead up
to there altogether.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Towards Benita?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. Yes, sorry.

MS. TRATT: So I think -- just strategizing where we would like to add population -- I think --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: That it's going to be more than ninety. Yeah, you're right.

MS. TRATT: I do think so. And I think we're also going to have to take kind of a narrow -- a potentially roundabout way -- you know, breaking up neighborhoods in the middle in order to grab that City Heights neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Where's the 94 right now?

MS. TRATT: Yeah, let me turn the major streets layer on.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Because I'm thinking we may just -- we may just want to start with connecting everything that's under the 94. And that alone may be that populated, I don't know.

MS. TRATT: Yeah, let me start selecting population and we can see how populated it is.

(Pause)

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I also wanted to check with my colleagues what thoughts they had, because I know Commissioner Sadhwani, you had talked about the SECA
District, so I just wanted to see what were -- what thoughts you were having on it.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I don't have any specific thoughts. I'm happy to be along on the ride. I think my -- my bigger concern is, you know, SECA, of course, goes up into Riverside and we have that other district that we're building out. So I think for me, that's kind of where my mind is, is how do we still build that out while maintaining this. So that's -- yeah, that would be my concern. My bigger concern.

MS. TRATT: So sorry, I -- just trying to remember what the number we're looking for?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Ninety.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I believe it was seventy-nine?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, I had 90,000.

MS. TRATT: So that'd be 9,000 (sic)? Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I don't know why -- I'm -- sorry. I just ran -- literally.

MS. TRATT: So would it make sense --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I'm wondering, if we don't cross, let's see, the 805 -- or we cross a little -- because City Heights is right above in that triangle right there, right?
MS. TRATT: Okay, so instead of continuing east towards Lemon Grove, once we reach the 805, go north?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

MS. TRATT: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Wait a minute. No. We would be -- hold on, Sivan.

Commissioner Sinay, you want to include in SECA the area that is east of the 805 or west of the 805?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, right now, currently, the -- it's -- it's the area that's east of the -- yeah, just to finish up the -- going up to the 94, finishing up the west side. And then -- and then I think that -- that -- then City Heights is right above it in that triangle.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: But I may be incorrect because --

MS. TRATT: So -- yeah. So I think actually it's the --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Higher up.

MS. TRATT: -- bigger triangle, it's --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, okay. Thank you.

MS. TRATT: -- this bigger area --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Got you. Okay, sorry. I was --
MS. TRATT: -- because these are the COIs that I have for City Heights, and you can see this is kind of the center where they overlap.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. Sorry, I was --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. That's -- that's what I was recalling.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I was get -- I was getting there. I'm so --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so -- so in fact, we would exclude the currently selected area west of the 805. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, that's the hard thing is -- is that little triangle right there where her hand is --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- that is part of Logan Heights, Sherman Heights. And then -- I get -- oh, I see. So if we --

MS. TRATT: What if we -- yeah, we could -- we could unselect this area as long as we just didn't cut it off. It would still have to -- it wouldn't be as --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Down --

MS. TRATT: -- packed, but that would be another option.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. I'm also -- if -- if,
you know, I'm also okay with southeast San Diego, Paradise Hill, all those being part of the VRA area if we can't get to City Heights. Those are all traditionally, you know, lower income communities.

CHAIR KENNEDY: You're going over population.

MS. TRATT: Thanks, yeah. Seeing that. Yeah, it's very densely populated, so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And -- but -- but, you know, if -- if there are thoughts as to where we might reduce population -- are -- are there any areas where we could shed population from this? I mean --

MS. TRATT: I think that's a question for Mr. Becker, probably.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, it -- yeah.

MS. TRATT: Or are you talking about this election or the district as a whole?

CHAIR KENNEDY: District as a whole.

MS. TRATT: Oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Fornaciari's raising his hand.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm just -- I'm just wondering, if we don't go east of the 805 here, and go between the 5 and the 15 up through that little triangle, and then -- and then that way.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: We just need to be careful, because there's an LGBT COI right there that doesn't want to be split, even though it's a VRA district and I -- and I understand that.

The other option I was thinking, I don't know, this is -- this would be where Mr. Becker could be helpful, is is Bonita part of the VRA protected area or not?

MR. BECKER: Could you zoom out and show me where Bonita is? Oh, I see it there. So my -- my maps aren't that granular right now, I can try it, but honestly, can you show the Latino CVAP heat map, please?

MS. TRATT: Oh, the heat map? Yes. One moment, please.

MR. BECKER: Thank you. And then zoom in on Bonito after you do, please.

MS. TRATT: Yes. Let me just turn these COIs off as well.

MR. BECKER: So they're shading here, but am I right that there's virtually -- doesn't appear like there's much Latino population in Bonita?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: There is, but it doesn't look, you know, as high --

MR. BECKER: Unless --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- as other areas.

MR. BECKER: Yeah, unless that shading is covering
it up.

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, that's what I'm trying to figure out.

    MR. BECKER: Yeah, maybe you could --

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: But Chula Vista looks like it doesn't have a lot either, and it does.

    MR. BECKER: Maybe you could remove the city shading and we can take a look?

    MS. TRATT: Yes. One moment, please.

    MR. BECKER: Thanks. And keep the boundaries on if you can.

    MS. TRATT: Yes. Sorry. Just trying to find where (indiscernible).

    MR. BECKER: No problem.

    MS. TRATT: So this light yellow color would be ranging from zero to thirty percent.

    MR. BECKER: Okay.

    MS. TRATT: The next darkest range would be thirty to forty percent.

    MR. BECKER: Right. Now can you zoom out just a little bit more, please? Maybe two clicks?

    MS. TRATT: Yes.

    MR. BECKER: Maybe a little bit more. Let's go a little farther out.

    MS. TRATT: More? Further?
MR. BECKER: No, no, that's -- I don't need Mexico.

Now, back in a little bit, please. Thanks.

This -- this is going to be a close call. I think it's likely an area we want to be careful about. To be honest, this is -- this -- this entire area has -- is there a way to change the gradation from zero to thirty to maybe get a little more granularity there?

MS. TRATT: Yeah, actually. What would you like the --

MR. BECKER: I'd love to see twenty to twenty -- the higher-end of that differentiated, maybe twenty to thirty.

MS. TRATT: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: While this is going on, Commissioner Fornaciari, did you have anything further?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: No, I just forgot my hand up.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: My apologies if I'm -- if I'm getting this confused. Are -- are we working on SECA or are we done with SECA or are you -- I -- I thought you were working on SECA, but now are we on to --

CHAIR KENNEDY: We are.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- the other one?
CHAIR KENNEDY: No, we're working on SECA.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So -- so then my question here is, I -- I see that we have to -- it looks like we're under nine percent and some change deviation. There are a number of similar COIs that we put into a -- you know, we grouped into a district here. Are -- are we doing the right things by this significant portion of COIs in this, you know, kind of central San Diego area, by, in a sense, splitting them up?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, we're -- we're trying not to split them up. The other thing --

MR. BECKER: Sivan, that's --

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- that we're --

MR. BECKER: Sorry to interrupt.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yup.

MR. BECKER: I'm sorry. I just didn't want her to --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. The other -- the other thing that we're trying to do is to remove these dissimilar communities that we have currently unassigned, and that's why SECA is underpopulated by that almost nine and a half percent. That's -- that's population that was in there, but very dissimilar communities, that have asked to be grouped with other, quote unquote, East County or North County communities. So we're trying to -- to move them
to where they are going to be happier. Move in City Heights and perhaps part of southeast San Diego that is more similar to the population in SECA, and -- and not disturb any more communities of interest than we have to in -- in the city itself.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, that's what I understand. Or that's what I figure is going on. I guess my -- I guess I'll just cite it as more of a concern is that, you know, you have -- it -- will it -- will the -- will there be enough room for all of the communities that are very similar immigrant? You know, especially immigrant from different communities in -- in this particular area, I remember that that's the conversation we had -- and refugees and others. And so are we going to leave out a small portion of that grouping because of this grouping? And so -- I'm not saying that we should -- one way or the other is -- is that, but I think I'm just kind of raising -- floating it as a -- as a concern.

CHAIR KENNEDY: As a concern.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, yeah, sure. And -- and we're looking -- we're -- we're finding that -- I mean, it's not a surprise -- that those areas are very heavily populated. And so you know, these -- these moves are
very tricky when -- when we're looking at such densely populated areas.

MR. BECKER: If I can interrupt, Sivan, can you do me one more favor, can you -- can you highlight just Bonita and show me the population in CVAPs, both numbers --

MS. TRATT: Yeah.

MR. BECKER: -- and just --

MS. TRATT: Absolutely.

MR. BECKER: Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Yup. One moment, please.

MR. BECKER: And then Commissioner Sinay, I think one of the other questions it's going to -- that's going to be raised is whether the -- the part of -- the part just north of Bonita is also included because that might -- it might be impossible to go down and get there because there -- it appears like there may be significant Latino populations that could be covered there. So I'm going to -- I'm going to go there next. I just wanted to highlight that.

MS. TRATT: So there are 12,944 people, and let me just -- let's see. It looks like the percent Latino CVAP in Bonita is 19.85 percent.

MR. BECKER: So 12,944 people in Bonita?

MS. TRATT: Yes.
MR. BECKER: And about one in five of them are Latino. Okay. Could you -- could you go a little bit north of there, please? And can you --

MS. TRATT: Farther north?

MR. BECKER: Zoom out just a little bit, because I -- I want to -- I think Commissioner Sinay, I don't want to assume what you're -- what you are trying to do, but there is a portion -- you had highlighted some portion in the southern part of COR-CAJON, and you were going to -- you were -- you were inquiring as to whether you could connect down into Bonita to grab -- to -- to chip some further population, is that right?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, you know, and I think the question that Linda brought up -- sorry, Commissioner Akutagawa brought up is -- is one that we've gone -- you know, we -- and -- and I appreciate you, you know, bringing it up -- and that's why I was trying to figure out how exactly to -- City Heights is a very diverse community. Their majority -- it is majority Latino immigrants, and -- and so that's why, you know, I was -- my -- my thinking, but it is a collective thinking, is -- is kind of when there is an opportunity in a VRA district to connect similar communities.

MR. BECKER: I mean, you don't -- I -- you know, I think, like I said, I think parking is not a huge concern
here. I -- I'd want to be careful --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right.

MR. BECKER: -- because there are other criteria here that need to be considered in terms -- including compactness and continuity and COIs and other boundaries. You -- yeah -- I -- I -- you want it -- I think you'd want to be a little -- little bit careful of -- it if -- if you were taking the Bonita population and trying to take some population north of the current district boundary and place it in SECA, I'll just say, legally, I don't think that raises Voting Rights Act concerns.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, it would be -- yeah.

MR. BECKER: If you were trying to go down into SECA and take some population and --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No.

MR. BECKER: -- add it into COR-CAJON -- okay, that's not what you were doing?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No.

MR. BECKER: So that -- that would have -- that would have meant -- that's starting to get into the area where I'd want to look at that very closely. I think putting additional population, to some degree into SECA, likely does not raise significant Voting Rights Acts concerns.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So -- so my thought is that if
we could at least put that -- that sliver of the 94 to
the 5 just to -- you know, just to make sure Sherman
Heights and Logan Heights, you know, they're -- all those
communities are together.

And then I -- you know, I -- I really do want to
hear from my colleagues on what is our thinking on -- on,
you know, really connecting another vulnerable community
to this at the risk of maybe breaking up some refugee and
Asian and other, you know, community COIs. We would
still have the Lemon Grove -- you know, those would not
be included, Lemon Grove, La Presa, Spring Valley, La
Mesa, and El Cajon.

But -- you know, the other piece is -- is asking, do
we have enough population to -- you know, if we -- we add
that little sliver, we still need some population because
we took some out. It -- can we get that from Riverside?
Because Imperial Valley is already all in. So then we
would have to get it from Riverside. So that's kind of
the way -- that's kind of how I was looking at it, is to
be able to do all the pieces that the -- that the
community was asking.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So are we -- are we
instructing Sivan to bring in that sliver below the 94
west of the -- is it the 5? Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. Ideally, that -- I mean,
that is at the bare minimum what I would like to bring in 
from San Diego, yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: To the -- to the right of that, 
Sivan. Correct. Right?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Um-hum.

MS. TRATT: This is -- okay, this is the 15. I 
just --

CHAIR KENNEDY: All right.

MS. TRATT: -- wanted to clarify --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry.

MS. TRATT: -- because the 5 is here, so I --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct. Yes.

MS. TRATT: -- just want to make sure I got that --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry.

MS. TRATT: -- right. Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry.

MS. TRATT: No, it's okay. It's okay. So I'll 
start to add that right now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And is -- Commissioner Sinay, is 
there a reason to go east of that at all?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: You know, going east so that 
you start going into Paradise Hill and southeastern San 
Diego, and those COIs, in the past, we've connected them 
with City Heights up into Lemon Grove -- you know, La 
Mesa to El Cajon. So the -- it can go either -- either
way, but I'm just concerned. That's why I was trying to figure out how to connect them before without taking them, and I -- I just think that what Linda was bringing -- sorry, Commissioner Akutagawa was bringing up was -- was -- is -- is something I would like to hear a response from from all of you on, on our thinking up for the Senate.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, very good.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Can you please -- Sivan, after you're done with that, can you please zoom out? Because I'd like to see what this looks like and then also -- now, I'm having a difficult time following it, but it looks like we're -- might be pulling in rural with urban, so I'm just trying to figure this out, because in the past, we were trying to keep them separate. So if -- if you can --

MS. TRATT: Is --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- just zoom out, that would be great. Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Could I go ahead and accept this change? This population --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

MS. TRATT: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.
MS. TRATT: And then I will zoom out.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Fernandez, did you have anything further?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Fernandez, to answer your question, we do have rule with Urban because we have to connect it with Imperial Valley, but what we did was we tried to minimize the amount of rural we were connecting with the -- with the VRA. Hopefully that makes sense.

And unfortunately, there isn't a way to do a whole San Diego VRA district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner -- sorry, Commissioner Sadhwani, you're next, and then Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I'm trying to wrap my head around the changes here. This is a tough one, right, because we do have more urban areas in and around San Diego with Chula Vista, and this -- this is a district that goes into the Coachella Valley and all the way up to Needles. So it -- it's -- it's just combining a lot of different folks. That being said, I'm -- I could go either way, but I'm -- I'm kind of leaning towards what we had. You know, filling out the rest of
this county, and then centering ourselves, like, for that second district just north of there.

I think as Commissioner Akutagawa had mentioned, you know, we had spent a lot of time during Assembly and Congress looking at all of those COIs, thinking about -- I remember in Assembly, El Cajon was split. And in Congress, I think it was whole, if I remember correctly. You know, and I'm wondering if -- if this is an opportunity, again, not directly nesting, but -- but thinking about the COIs that we want to -- to keep together and having a district that would allow us to do that.

Because while they may not, you know, I could see the rationale for bringing them into the VRA district. If that's just not possible, I think having -- having a district where a different variety of folks could feel very well represented would -- would make sense to me, especially given the, you know, vastness of this SECA district. Thank you. I hope that's helpful.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, thank you. I -- that -- that's similar to what I was going to say. I think we've had lots of conversations about rural versus urban and my recollection from hearing and reading the
COI testimony, especially from the -- it looks like --
Sivan, if you move it, I guess it would be to my left,
which is I think maybe you're right -- I'm not sure --
but you know, more towards the San Bernardino, Riverside
borders with San Diego. Because the SECA district, I
think, includes -- yeah, it includes the Imperial Valley
in it, too, and I recall hearing from them that -- very
specifically that they consider themselves to be a much
more rural community and so --

CHAIR KENNEDY: That they -- who consider?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Those in the Imperial
Valley here. They -- that's what I heard and that's what
I've read, is that they consider themselves to be more
rural. So I think -- I know these are going to be huge
districts, but I -- I would just echo what both
Commissioner Sadhwnani and Commissioner Fernandez have
asked. If this is what it's going to be, this is what
it's going to be. But I would like for us to see if we
could do a little bit better, perhaps.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: If I -- if I could, and then I'll
call on Commissioner Fornaciari -- what we had with SECA
included not only Chula Vista and San Ysidro down there
at the southern end of San Diego, which -- which are
pretty dense urban populations, but we had all of East County San Diego. And the -- the feedback that we got was that that area of East County really wanted to be with, say, North County, Valley Center, Rainbow, Fallbrook, those sorts of communities rather than part of SECA. And so that's what we're trying to address.

And -- and I will say also that there is ample historical precedent for -- for having a strip along the south of San Diego County connected to Imperial County. I mean, that's -- that's something that we've seen over --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well --

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- the years.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And unfortunately, the only way to create a VRA district, the -- our VRA requirements are that area in San Diego and then the Imperial Valley. And so we try -- we -- yeah. It would be great if we could create two separate VRA districts and maybe nestle the Imperial Valley with another Riverside, but it -- the two Assembly districts that we created, but it won't work. And that's why, as strange as this district is -- and it is how it's been in the past, because of a million people and our VRA requirement in two different points, this is kind of what comes out.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.
Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry -- sausage.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, so I mean, I -- I
kind of support this sort of compromise where we're at,
where we -- we only added a little bit of additional San
Diego city to be equivalent to what we had in the
Assembly. We've moved out much of the East County. And
now we've got a bit of overage and we could take that
opportunity to move more of La Quinta out of the SECA.
And or -- and or see where that population -- you know,
if we need that population to balance out the moves we're
going to be making from the north.

MS. TRATT: I believe La Quinta is whole and is not
in the SECA district currently.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh, okay. I thought --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- that little part that's
Santa Rosa was part of La Quinta; my mistake. Sorry.

MS. TRATT: No, all good. It's hard to tell with
the coloring off so I can turn that on if we're done with
the heat map. But let me know.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so if you can zoom back out?

MS. TRATT: It's the biggest.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, okay. So. We -- we could
do -- we could conceivably leave it here. Oh, let me --
let me stop here. We need instructions for the phone lines. We will be breaking at 6:15 for fifteen minutes and then starting public comment at 6:30.

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

Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call. And 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 back to you, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Katy.

So we will be back from break at 6:30 to take public comment.

So on -- on this district, we've -- we've added a very small portion of population in San Diego to this, we've drawn this line horizontally from the Imperial County line to -- that gives us a population currently unassigned in Descanso, Alpine, Borrego Springs, et cetera, that we now need to find a home for. And whether that's north into MCV or west into SD-POW-ESC, that's what we need to be working on for the next ten minutes.

MS. TRATT: And -- and thinking about what population we want to add --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. TRATT: -- into SECA. Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. So could we -- could we zoom in a bit on San Diego County and --

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually, I was thinking opposite, where it looks like maybe Coachella Valley would be, where we would try to get the additional population.

CHAIR KENNEDY: For SECA?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And then I know that you've discussed this before, Chair Kennedy, but if Sivan zooms out a little bit, you have that -- what's that tail? Is that tail in San Bernardino? Is that where it is? It goes up?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Which? Up to Needles?

MS. TRATT: All right --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. TRATT: -- let me turn the heat map off.

Sorry, Commissioner Fernandez, where -- which -- this portion is Needles. Oh, yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And is that because Needles has nowhere else, kind of, to go? Is that why -- is that why we go all the way up there? I can't remember.

CHAIR KENNEDY: No. The -- the idea of going up there was that that has the Colorado River, which is an incredibly important water source for all of Southern California, in a single district.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I guess my comment it -- it does make it a -- a longer district, that's --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MR. DRECHSLER: And just a reminder, this is the -- the going up to Needles is what we have in the congressional and the Assembly as well. So just -- and -- we're just -- I just noticed we just need to match up the three lines --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MR. DRECHSLER: -- to point up to Needles between the three, so that's something that we will -- will correct as well.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. We're waiting for congressional to be finalized, just because that's the most specific deviation, and then we'll make sure that the census blocks in this area are the same for all three plans. But there's so little population in this area that it's not going to impact the deviation of these districts. So I would just ignore it, unless you are talking about removing the area entirely.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I just want to say a little bit more about the -- the reason why we went up there is the Colorado River basin, and though that -- and then the Salton Sea clean up are the large water issues
in this -- in this whole area. And they're put in the
same district because they are essentially related. A
representative sort of needs to focus on some of both of
those. That's why we put them there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.
So if we can -- if we can go back to San Diego
County then and look at where we want to place the --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: 91 --

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- 90,000 or so people that we
removed from SECA.

So Commissioner Sinay, did you have any thoughts on
where to do this, recognizing that this is going to have
some ripple effects?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I -- I think I would put
it with the San Diego, Poway, Escondido. And yes, that
will have some ripple effects.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So putting all of it with that
district?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes, because I think we'll pull
out some of the ones -- some of the communities that are
in that district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Okay. Any further discussion on this, any
objection?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: But I'm open to other ideas if
someone else -- because you -- did you have a thought on

going up to Rivers -- putting it in --

CHAIR KENNEDY: You know, at one point you had

mentioned that sometimes Anza and Borrego are grouped.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I thought about that

right after I said that. I did see that and go, hmm. I

do -- I do like keeping that whole desert together. And

so I would agree with you if -- if -- if we wanted to do

that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And -- and so what part of this

would go to --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Anza?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think we would need to look

at what the Anza -- Anza, Borrego kind of what the desert

landscape is where the park --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we need we need the

terrain layer and, Sivan, the MCV label is right on top

of Anza.

MS. TRATT: Was there a request to see how much

population was there, or should I go ahead and accept

this change?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Wait one second.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Neither. We're looking to see what

portion of the current selection we might instead want to
group with Anza. Because Anza Borrego is, you know, an area -- a community that is often grouped --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It's a state park, so this is a good opportunity to put a state park together.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So can we unhighlight it? My thought is to take just that kind of from the -- you know, from the bottom. I don't know if I would take, you know, all the light brown stuff.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And add it to the one right above.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Can you roughly highlight the area in light brown around the Borrego Springs and the Anza Borrego Desert State Park?

MS. TRATT: Yes. One moment, please. Let's see if it shows up on this layer. More or less this area?

CHAIR KENNEDY: More or less.

MS. TRATT: I think this might be a small portion, but we can -- there's not going to be people living here, so we can just do this in the clean-ups to make sure that the --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. TRATT: -- actual state park is intact.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay.
Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. I have two questions. One would be, do we have a map of the state park so we can just copy that in there? And then the second question would be, the eight percent that we left at the -- I believe it's minus eight percent over in the SECA, was there a reason why we did not complete that from the population that we added out of San Diego?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, we just took it from San Diego.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: No. Not this area. The area we left in SECA, it's a negative, negative eight --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Right. So was there was reason why we didn't get it within the proper deviation by adding a little bit more of the population in San Diego?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, the bulk of that came from this area that we're working on right now. So you're saying, should we reduce this area that we're working on right now?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Right.

CHAIR KENNEDY: The discussion earlier, as
Commissioner Fernandez brought up, is we're going to be needing to look in the Coachella Valley to replace that population.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Never mind.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Andersen, we looked in San Diego, but it was breaking up too many COIs, and so we thought we would look in Coachella Valley. If that doesn't work, then we would go back to San Diego, but there's a lot of COIs that we had put together in San Diego before that would be split.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I see were Commissioner Andersen was going with that and that kind of makes sense to move that extra, you know, three or four percent to get it into the right percentage. Because if you do this other move, then you're going to have a population going into -- crossing over two counties or something like that. Anyway, I usually prefer to try to stay within the county and minimize those county breaks, but everyone's different.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I mean, this the SECA district has portions of four counties, so we're just moving the lines in, you know, perhaps two of those four
 counties. Because one of the counties is whole and will always be whole in this district.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Thank you. Two things. So first, was just a clarifying question. Are we putting Borrego Springs in to SECA; is that what's happening?

CHAIR KENNEDY: No. The idea is to put Borrego Springs in MCV.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. So I just wanted to suggest that perhaps we pause, and I wanted to just have a lesson learned from Congress. When we approached Congress, we, you know, we came from San Diego up and then we kind of felt like, ah, we've done all this great work and we don't want to have to shift all these populations around. But as we were trying to contemplate, you know, our VRA districts, we ended up feeling kind of stuck, right? And we kind of kept coming back to Long Beach, and what can we do there? In many ways, but it didn't leave open and flexible other places where population can go.

And so I just want to be conscious of that before we kind of get wedded to the idea of keeping the COI of Borrego Springs with Anza, which I'm not opposed to by any means. But we have a lot of VRA obligations that
aren't sorted out yet northern in the map, including in Riverside, as well as population that needs to come down from the map. And so I'm just -- I just want to be a little cautious here that we don't trap ourselves in and wind up in a similar problem.

I know that we've talked about, in general, that we're going to try to localize those changes to the VRA districts. But at the end of the day, I would prefer if we can, you know, even if we do this change now, just remember that we can always go back and change it as opposed to getting locked in, because --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- I think that would be my only concern. Because I feel like that happened to us in Congress, and I wouldn't want it to happen again.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. We could certainly undo it. I'm looking at it also as if we get MCV closer to zero, then that gives us more flexibility on the other side of MCV, if we want to, you know, expand that deviation.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Any further comment?

Okay. Sivan, go ahead and do this, please. And it is we are into break time, so we will break and come back
at 6:30 to again taking public comment.

MS. TRATT: Chair, before we go to break --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. TRATT: -- would you be able to just let me know, should I leave this area for now or because I already have a lot of requests in the Inland Empire as well from what you worked on today with Jaime? I just want to make sure we're leaving things in a place where Commissioners feel comfortable for leaving.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I would be comfortable leaving this unassigned for now, understanding that if we need to pull it up through MCV, we could. If we need to pull it up through Orange County, we could. Other thoughts on that?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I mean, I think we can do that, or we can assign it to SD, Poway, Escondido, and then we have, you know, as we need to pull it up for other areas. We don't want to be worried that we have an extra district, you know, unassigned stuff.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I'm just -- I'm seeing that currently it borders two different districts to the north, and if we move it into SD-POW-ESC, it only borders one district to the north. It does border the coastal district as well, but I would be fine leaving it unassigned for now.
Okay. Thank you, everyone. 6:30.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 6:19 p.m. until 6:29 p.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for bearing with us through our mandatory break for our staff. We want to welcome you to this evening's public comment segment of today's meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. And with that, I will turn it over to Katy, our comment moderator. Thank you, Katy.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much, Chair. This evening we will be doing a minute and thirty seconds for public comment with verbal warnings at thirty seconds and fifteen seconds remaining.

I will be identifying you by the last four digits of your telephone number. Please be alert in the queue for when you hear those last four digits of your telephone number.

We will begin with caller 0983. And up next after that will be caller 2931.

Caller 0983, please follow the prompts. And one more time, caller with the last four digits 0983, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. I do apologize, caller 0983, for some type of connectivity issue for you. I will come back to you momentarily.
Right now we have caller 2931. And up next after that will be caller 4521.

Caller 2931, please follow the prompts to unmute.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, hello. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Did you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. Hello, Commissioner.

Thank you for all your hard work you have done. I am asking you to look at the Little Saigon Assembly district again. We are almost there. During the pandemic, I lost my job and I did not know what to do. And I was able to contact my assembler who can speak Vietnamese and have staff who have -- who can speak Vietnamese to help me.

This is why it is important for the Vietnamese community to have a true representative who understand our needs, our culture, and our history. Adding on not Garfield in Huntington Beach stop at the (indiscernible) Street is the right move to make sure Little Saigon has two representatives with more (indiscernible), because we don't have anything in common with them. We need assembler who can help our community, especially our unique culture. Thank you. Have a good night.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 4521. And up next after that will be caller 7716.

Caller 4521, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. This is Deborah (ph.) with the City of Rancho Cucamonga, and we would like to strongly encourage you to please keep Rancho Cucamonga whole, and do not split the city of Rancho Cucamonga into multiple districts. Rancho Cucamonga has a strong sense of identity and has historically been mostly in all one Senate, Assembly, or Congressional district.

The proposed maps unnecessarily split our community into two Assembly districts, two Senate districts, and even three congressional districts, which separate our neighborhoods and diminishing our community power and opportunity for strong representation. We do appreciate the time you spent today working on this area, and we look forward to some positive changes. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 7716. And up next after that will be caller 7860.

Caller 7716, please follow the prompts. The floor
is yours.

MR. BRYAN: Yeah. My name is Floyd Bryan, F-L-O-Y-D B-R-Y-A-N. I'm the president of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union, Southern California District Council. And this is addressing San Pedro. We feel it would be beneficial to match AD 65 line with SSB (ph.) 35 and CD 44 line along the west boundary of Western Avenue to make San Pedro whole. San Pedro is part of Los Angeles and all of our services and schools are with Los Angeles. Moving half of San Pedro into Assembly district with Palos Verdes would be a disservice to both.

San Pedro tends toward a blue-collar area. While Palos Verdes tends towards the white-collar population. And we in San Pedro have very different issues being part of the LA Harbor. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 7860. And up next after that will be caller 8224.

Caller 7860, please follow the prompts. Caller 7860, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. I do apologize, caller 7860, you appear to have some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I will come back to you.

And right now, we have caller 8224. Please follow
the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. Do you hear me?
Hello?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we do.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Hello, Commissioner.
Hello. Okay. Hello, Commissioner. I called yesterday and will continue to call to make sure that my comment is heard, because it's very important to me and our community. Yesterday, I heard that the Commission talk about add Huntington Beach to Little Saigon for the congressional map, which is a right suggestion. And a lot of the comments yesterday saying the Commission for considering.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 9517. And up next after that will be caller 2044.

Caller 9517, please follow the prompts to unmute.
The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. Good evening, Commissioner. A month I have heard my Vietnamese-American communities in Little Saigon calling in and making that populist command asking you to keep Huntington Beach with Little Saigon. Today, I would like to share with the Commission again why should be with Little Saigon.
Here are the facts again. Vietnamese number one language other than English spoken in Huntington Beaches like Westminster and Fountain Valley. The largest minority group in Huntington Beach are Asian Americans. Our young programs, like the Boys and Girls Club or Young Sports, are in Huntington Beach, Westminster, and Fountain Valley. For the Assembly, PTW include the Inland Pack of Huntington Beach, which is all north of Garfield together with Little Saigon. The congressional and Senate, please include all Huntington Beach.

By doing this, the Commission will allow the Little Saigon to continue to grow and have a voice and more importantly --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- everyone -- but -- everyone that can understand us to represent us at different government level. Thank you very much. Have a nice day.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 2044. And up next after that will be caller 3700.

Caller 2044, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. MCKENZIE: Hello. This is Charlotte McKenzie. I'm a board member with the Citizens University Committee
at the University of California Riverside. And I'm calling to urge the Commission to please adjust the California State Assembly district boundaries that encompass the California Riverside UCR campus located at 900 University Avenue. In the current map, we're associated with southwest Riverside, which splits the campus from the Greater Riverside area and the City of Riverside.

The city and UCR actively partner on various initiatives, including significant innovation and economic development, a UCR arts block, which is in downtown Riverside in a different district. And we would like to encourage you to consider readjusting that boundary, so that the campus can remain contiguous with the City of Riverside for continuity of representation --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. MCKENZIE: -- and also to maintain its longstanding partnership with the City of Riverside on housing, infrastructure, economic and workforce development. It's imperative that UC Riverside be added to the AD58 JRC map, so that we can continue to be --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. MCKENZIE: -- in the same district and get safe representation. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we have caller 3700. And up next after that will be caller 5777.

Caller 3700, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. WILSON: Hi. My name is Betty Wilson (ph.). I'm calling in for our coalition partners, Don't Ask San Joaquin County. I am sure you have received the numerous emails and letters regarding the most recent iterations for the congressional district changes. Our county is probably one of the most diverse in the state, and we have worked hard over the years to build partnerships and relationships with public, private, and nonprofit groups to tackle our issues. Please allow us the chance to continue this progress.

Please consider draft maps dated 11/10 or the congressional map FY2 SSAC San Joaquin. Do not surgically split our communities. I would respectfully request review of submitted maps 1006 202 1112, 1006 202 1123, 1007 202 1124 also. Thank you for all your hard work and dedication to this very important project.

Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 5777. And up next after that will be caller 7087.

Caller 5777, please follow the prompts. The floor
is yours.

MS. HUANG: Thank you. Hello, Commissioners. Thank you for all the hard work that you are doing right now. And this is Tina Huang (ph.), and I'm calling from Huntington Beach. There were comments made yesterday that somehow the calls coming in from Little Saigon are new, which is not true. I have been calling almost weekly, making comments online, so I'm not sure how you can state that our comments are new. We have been asking for the same things for months, which was to add north of Huntington Beach to Little Saigon, which means at all of north of Garfield and remove Stanton and east of Garden Grove. This is what we -- what will reflect the true grid reader, Little Saigon district. I hope you would consider revisiting the Assembly and congressional maps and move all of Huntington Beach or the inland of Huntington Beach, which is all north of Garfield Street to Little Saigon districts, whichever works for us since we understand the population difference. Thank you for your time, and have a great night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 7087. And up next after that will be caller 3108.

Caller 7087, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.
Tonight I wanted to come on here and tell you that as a resident of the High Desert, I'm incredibly offended that you keep ignoring our requests to not be grouped to Los Angeles County. We've been respectfully asking this for weeks now, but it continues to be ignored. Only one small highway connects us in the Antelope Valley, the community that you're currently trying to group us with. And we also have nothing in common with Antelope Valley as a community. And we're asking that you would keep our community with San Bernardino County so that San Bernardino County in the High Desert can be grouped together. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 3108. And up next after that will be caller 3995.

Caller 3108, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. This is Karina (ph.) with Planned Parenthood Mar Monte. And I would like to comment on the redistricting of Stanislaus and Merced County, and share my concerns about how the community will be impacted. I would like to comment on, please keep Stanislaus and Merced part of the Central Valley and reject your draft maps, which pull us out of
the Valley and into the sea areas.

We note that we have different social and economic interests for everything from water to roads. We're just not the same places. By combining in the same district, you're doing harm to both. As you know, Stanislaus is the fourteenth largest county in the state and half is interested vetted in the draft Senate map.

The Valley fought hard for decades to get its first UC campus. There's no excuse for UC Merced not to be in hundred percent Valley district. You can draw your Voting Rights Act districts to the South and we'll respect counties in the north, but not at the expense of --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- drawing hundreds of thousands of Valley residents into districts that make no sense. Please do a better job of balancing the competing concerns and stand up for the unique place that is the Central Valley. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 3995. And up next after that will be caller 7331.

Caller 3995, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.
I'm calling from the High Desert to express my disappointment with the decision to group the High Desert with Los Angeles County. Yesterday, I was thanking you for hearing our requests when it came to keeping the High Desert together. So it's a little upsetting having to make this call today.

We keep trying to tell you that when we get grouped with Los Angeles County, High Desert residents are disenfranchised. That's the current path we are headed down, another decade of disenfranchisement. And honestly, that's just inequitable. There's no commonality between us and any part of Los Angeles County, even the Antelope Valley.

I don't know how many more of our working class residents have to call into these meetings, as they're getting off work to make the point to the Commission, we don't want to be grouped with Los Angeles County. Your drafts were fine the way they were. Just consider going back to those. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 7331. And up next after that will be caller 9747.

Caller 7331, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners.
My name is Aaron (ph.). I've called before, and I thank you again for your hard work to keep communities together. I would like to echo some of the other callers and to draw the Commissioners' attention to the very last big thing that the Commission did just before closing the congressional maps and adjourning for dinner on Monday. And that was the important act of including Sylmar in the San Fernando Valley VRA district. This is good work. Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani, for pushing for this. Unfortunately, the Commission was tight for time at that point, and the way that it happened ended up trading Granada Hills and Porter Ranch out of the San Fernando Valley without the Commission discussing it.

You do have any time to consider how Granada Hills and Porter Ranch and Sylmar could all stay in the valley, I hope that you will look at the suggestion made by Stuart Waldman and VICA. In VICA's proposal, the equestrian foothills community of Sunland and Tujunga is taken out of the current district with West Hollywood, which makes sense anyway, and it groups them together with other semirural areas, like Acton and Littlerock in the Antelope Valley, which are far closer anyway.

This allows Granada Hills and Porter Ranch to go back to the Valley, which makes sense because they should be with Chatsworth and West Hills and the other areas.
affected by the Aliso Canyon gas leak. And it keeps North Hollywood and Toluca Lake together. If you can spare a minute over the next few days --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- please try to go back to the very last thing you did in Monday's rush to finish. And thanks for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9747, and up next after that is caller 7832.

Caller 9747, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MR. ROJO: Good evening. My name is Sylvester Rojo (ph.). I live in the community of Walnut Park, and I live here for over thirty-five years. We have a united community between Walnut Park and Huntington Park and Florence and Graham, as we would like to keep it as such in order to continue our advocacy. That priorities for -- for our communities, as we have state, political, and social (indiscernible). We would like to map cleanup and keeping Florence-Graham, Walnut Park, and Huntington Park, even if it's only part of Huntington Park, together in the 110LA map.

I'd ask you to be very minimal to keep Walnut Park and Florence-Graham together in our next Assembly map, as
this will be the only way to our residents of an
incorporated area of the Los Angeles County will have the
opportunity of having a voice in the Assembly.

Please move Walnut Park to the 110 map and make the
110 -- the 10 freeway the northern border of the map.
Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 7832, and up next
after that will be caller 5944. Wait. Hold on. Where
did caller 7832 go?

All right. Well. Right now, we have caller 5944.
And up next after that will be caller 2648.

Caller 5944, please follow the prompts.
The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, Commissioners. I'm
asking that the Commission not move forward with its
congressional maps in Antelope Valley and Kern County,
which split tens of thousands of federal workers and
contractors into three different congressional districts.

Edwards Air Force Base and Plant 42 are part of the
same military base and collectively make up the second-
largest employer in Antelope Valley and East Kern.
Unlike many other communities of interest, Congress has
direct control over the funding and continued existence
of these military sites. And chopping them and their
huge workforce into three different federal districts 
dramatically reduces their influence at the beginning of 
a decade that will surely see another round of base 
realignments and closures.

Combine California City, Mojave, Rosamond, Lancaster 
and Palmdale into a single district, preferably with Kern 
County, and keep these -- you know, keep this workforce 
united. Refusing to make changes to the Antelope Valley 
district is an artificial constraint that you are placing 
on yourself at the --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- expense of a very large 
federal workforce. Please take a closer look at Plant 42 
and Edwards Air Force Base and the large employment force 
there. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 2648. And up next 
after that will be caller 6059.

Caller 2648, please follow the prompts.

And one more time, caller --

MS. MENDOZA: Hello.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: [Oop], there you are.

The floor is yours.

MS. MENDOZA: Good evening. My name is Alexandra 
Mendoza (ph.). I live in the community of Walnut Park
and have lived here for over thirty-four years. We have a united community between Walnut Park, Huntington Park, and Florence-Graham. As we would like to keep it as such in order to continue our advocacy and priorities for our community. As we have some -- as some of the same political and social challenges, we would like to request cleaning -- cleanup by keeping up Florence-Graham, Walnut Park, and Huntington Park, even if it's only part of Huntington Park, together in the 110LA map.

I ask you to please, at the very minimum, keep Walnut Park and Florence-Graham together in our next Assembly map, as this will be the only way that Florence-Graham residents of unincorporated areas in Los Angeles County will have the opportunity of having a voice in the Assembly. Please move Walnut Park to the 110LA map and make the 10 freeway the northern border of the map.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. MENDOZA: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 6059, and up next after that is caller 0452.

Caller 6059, please follow the prompts.

And one more time, caller with the last four digits 6059, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.
Caller 6059, please double check your telephone.

MR. LOMAS: Hello.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: There you are. The floor is yours.

MR. LOMAS: Good evening. My name is Alfred Lomas (ph.). I live in the community of Florence-Firestone, and I'm calling in regards to the state Assembly 110LA map. We have always been connected with Florence-Graham community, otherwise known as Florence-Firestone.

And we both -- we are both unincorporated communities next to each other, represented by the County of Los Angeles. Our Walnut Park residents have worked with Florence-Graham community on multiple social issues, as we are side by side and both share similar challenges.

Separating the Walnut Park and Florence-Graham would be a complete injustice. And does that benefit our residents? We need to be with Florence-Firestone in order to give us the opportunity to have a voice and a fighting chance. Please move us into the 110LA map, and make the one -- make the 10 freeway an northern border of the map. Thank you for your time and consideration in this minor change to the state Assembly 110LA map.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 0452. And up next after that will be caller 4599.
Caller 0452, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello, and thank you so much for your hard work, Commissioners. You guys should be really proud. My name is Craig (ph.), and I'm just calling to agree with Stuart Waldman and VICA.

You know, Sunland and Tujunga don't really belong together with West Hollywood in a congressional district. Sunland and Tujunga is a great place for filming Westerns, and they would be happy with other semirural, horseback riding communities closer to them than being kind of dragged down towards West Hollywood.

You know, the VICA proposal is to keep Sylmar in the San Fernando Valley VRA district. Keep Granada Hills and Porter Ranch in the San Fernando Valley. You know, it also keeps Toluca Lake and North Hollywood together, and connects Sunland-Tujunga with their neighbors in Antelope Valley, rather than West Hollywood as it is now. You know, thank you again for your hard work. You guys have been doing great. Really appreciate it.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 4599. And up next after that will be caller 4175. Caller 4599, please follow the prompts to unmute.

The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is Jesse (ph.). I lived in Florence-Graham, and I live here for forty-three years. I'm calling regarding the state Assembly 110LA draft map. I am here to ask for help in a minor cleanup.

We ask for you to also place the next-door neighbors from incorporated Walnut Park into the same 110LA map and use -- and make the 10 freeway a northern border of the map. It is a courteous (sic) to have Walnut Park and Florence-Graham together in the same map, as splitting the incorporated islands will only diminish our voices and efforts that we have fought so hard together for over thirty years.

We have united communities between Walnut Park, Huntington Park, and Florence-Graham that we would like to keep it as such in order to continue our advocacy and priorities for our communities, as we have the same political and social challenges.

I understand that Huntington Park cannot be the same map due to the population. However --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- with a minor change of moving Walnut Park into the 110LA map, it would help our incorporated communities of Walnut Park and Florence-Graham to have a fighting chance in having a voice in
Sacramento. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now we have caller 4175. And up next after that will be caller 0504.
Caller 4175, please follow the prompts.
The floor is yours.
Caller 4175, if you will please double check your telephone. Make sure you are not on mute. You are unmuted in the meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi there. Sorry about that.
I was muted.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: It's okay.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. So thank you for all your hard work, Commissioners. When the Commission looks at Assembly maps again, I want to once again ask, please draw two majority Latino districts in the San Fernando Valley. Multiple organizations have submitted maps showing this is possible, and even the Commission itself proved it in one iteration. Please protect the Latino vote in the San Fernando Valley, draw two majority Latino Assembly seats, and a majority Latino Senate seat.
I've heard legal counsel say that you don't have a legal obligation to do so, but you do have a moral
obligation to protect the rights of Latino voters. And I ask you to draw these lines that give Latinos in the San Fernando Valley the ability to choose the candidates of our choice. Thank you so much for this opportunity to speak tonight.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 0504. And up next after that will be caller 6198.

Caller 0504, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MS. DAVIS-HOLMES: Well, good afternoon, Commissioners. This is Lula Davis-Holmes. I'm the mayor for the great City of Carson. And I'm just calling to express my disappointment that you have split my beautiful city and given us two -- into two districts, 65 and 69. That is unacceptable. We are one city, one community, and with a common goal.

I'm asking that you reconsider the decision to split my city in half, north versus the south. That's unacceptable. The communities that we have like commonalities in, we'd like to stay in that district. There are many items that we fight for, and to split us in half would be -- it just would tear our city apart.

So I'm asking you to reconsider splitting our city. We need to have one voice from our Assemblymen, and we're
asking that we stay in Council District 65. Would you
please reconsider splitting us from -- into two Assembly
districts, 65 and 69. As the mayor of the City of
Carson, I speak for the 96,000 residents here, and we are
appalled at the fact --

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

MS. DAVIS-HOLMES: -- that you are talking about
splitting our city into two separate Assembly districts.
Please reconsider your thoughts and revisit the map --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

MS. DAVIS-HOLMES: -- and put us in one district.
Thank you very much. Mayor Lula Davis-Holmes, from the
great City of Carson. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 6198. And up next
after that will be caller 8487.

Caller 6198, please follow the prompts.

And one more time, caller with the last four
digits -- [oop], there you are. The --

MS. TOMAYO: Hello.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- floor is yours.

MS. TOMAYO: Hi, good afternoon, my name is Sandra
Tomayo (ph.). I live in Florence-Graham. I have lived
here for forty years. I am calling regarding the state
Assembly 110LA draft map. Thank you for your
consideration in trying to keep our communities of Walnut Park, Huntington Park, and Florence-Graham together.

As it doesn't appear that this was possible, we are here to ask for a minor change. Please move the unincorporated Walnut Park area into the 110LA map to be with Florence-Graham and make the 10 freeway the northern border of the map.

Both our areas are unincorporated parts of Los Angeles County, and we need to stay together. We are asking for a small alteration to this map in order to truly have an opportunity for our hardworking families to elect a candidate of our choice. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 8487. And up next after that is caller 6625.

Caller 8487, please follow the prompts to unmute.

The floor is yours.

MS. FUJII: Hi. My name is Mary Fujii (ph.), and I'm the Irvine resident for thirty-one years and counting. Since 1990, I have watched Irvine become the fastest growing city in Orange County, and there are many reasons why: schools, good city-wide services, and a master plan that continues to guide our growth for the entire city.

As our city celebrates its fiftieth anniversary, I
am distressed to see a final -- a recent draft of our state Senate's district boundaries, which has split our city at the 405 freeway into two districts. This goes against logic and reasoning and doesn't ensure all of Irvine, like me, are fairly represented by one representative.

Irvine is a cohesive city in which the entire community has shared common interests. We are all served by Irvine Unified Schools, the Irvine Police Department and the Irvine City Council. Also, several of Irvine's schools are not neighborhood schools that are open to the entire city, such as Vista Verde school, which enroll students from all parts of the city. And in fact, my son and daughter attended that school --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. FUJII: -- and we've made life-long connections with others throughout the city. Also, as a Japanese-American and a member of Irvine's cohesive and growing Asian-American community, I have long shared common interests and concerns with other Asian-Americans in Irvine, as well as Tustin.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. FUJII: Splitting our state Senate district would also splinter our cohesive Asian-American community in Irvine and Tustin, and I hope that you will keep
Irvine and Tustin whole under one state Senate district. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 6625. And up next after that is caller 7175.

Caller 6625, please follow the prompts. And one more time, caller with the last four digits 6625, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.

Caller 6625, I do apologize. You appear to have some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I have you marked for a retry, and I will come back around. Right now, we have caller 7175. And up next after that will be caller 9048.

Caller 7175, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MR. PAYNE: Thank you. Good evening, Commissioner. This is Jeremy Payne on behalf of Equality California. I am calling about the LGBTQ+ COI in the Coachella Valley. Unfortunately, some of the shifts in the Inland Empire today resulted in an overpopulated district that pairs most of the high desert and mountain communities in San Bernardino County with the Coachella Valley and Riverside County, with another part of the Coachella Valley in the SECA district.
As the Commission works with the (indiscernible) about population between SBRC and MCV, we would ask that you please unite as much of the Coachella Valley as possible and Riverside County-based district separate from the Victor Valley high desert and mountain communities of San Bernardino County.

This would be consistent with the overwhelming COI testimony that you received from Coachella Valley residents who want to be kept together as much as possible, and Victor Valley, Lake Arrowhead, and Yucaipa residents who want to be kept together in a separate San Bernardino district.

With the remainder of my time, I'd like to talk about Los Angeles, specifically the West Hollywood and Hollywood region.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. PAYNE: We heard Commissioner Sadhwani talk about potentially moving West Hollywood and the NELA district to the shoreline coastal district. That -- we would be okay with that but would urge the Commission to move the entire LGBTQ+ COI together, not just the City of West Hollywood. So if you do need to make a move of West Hollywood into shoreline, please also move Hollywood with it.

Overall, the drafts and the plans kept much of the
LGBTQ+ COI from the state together, and as the Commission makes adjustments this week, we'll just ask that you not inadvertently separate LGBTQ+ COI.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9612, and up next after that is caller 5967.

Caller 9612, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MS. AVENDANO: Hi. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. AVENDANO: Thank you. Hello, Commission members. Thank you for all the work that you're doing.

My name is Paola Avendano. I am an alumni from UC Riverside and a current staff member. I'm making a public comment to urge you to address the Assembly district boundaries that encompass the UC Riverside campus located at 900 University Avenue.

In the current map iteration from December the 8th, it does propose UCR to be part of AD 63, SWRIV, and it splits the campus from the greater Riverside area. I think it's important to keep the campus and the greater Riverside area intact because of how much the area has thrived over the years. I remember being a student and visiting the downtown area frequently to work at the UCR ARTSblock, and I enjoyed what it offered in terms of
nightlife and all the great --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. AVENDANO: -- places.

Even now as a staff member, I can rightfully say that the UCR community is excited to see what will come about from the recent (indiscernible) partnership and the city's innovation district. So the city --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. AVENDANO: -- and the university constantly advocate together at the state level for projects that benefit the region. So keeping their representation in tact is imperative. For this reason, I respectfully ask that UC Riverside is added to the AD 58, JRC map.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 5967, and up next after that is caller 9736.

Caller 5967, please follow the prompts.

And one more time, caller with the last four digits 5967, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star 6.

The floor is yours.

MR. VIENNESE: Hi. My name is Fabian Viennese (ph.), and I'm calling on behalf of the city of Rancho Cucamonga, and I am urging the Commission to reconsider the latest iterations of the congressional, the State
Senate, and the Assembly maps.

For the congressional map, the City of Rancho Cucamonga is currently split into three separate districts. A city the size of Rancho Cucamonga should not be in three separate districts. In one of the districts, a good chunk of the city is in a district that has over half a dozen LA County cities, going as far as Pasadena and La Canada Flintridge, and these are communities that we have no common interests with.

The State Senate map has a good chunk of Rancho Cucamonga in with the high desert all the way up to the Nevada state line. And these are rural communities that have a very different character and interests as --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. VIENNESE: -- the City of Rancho Cucamonga. So I urge the Commission to please reconsider the maps and keep Rancho Cucamonga whole. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9736. And up next after that will be caller 5038.

Caller 9736, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.

I'm calling from San Bernardino County's High Desert, and I asked you not to put us in a district of Los Angeles
County. When we are grouped as Los Angeles County, the concerns of our residents are not heard.

    Nothing about the Antelope and Victor Valley are similar. They have different socioeconomic levels. They do not have to deal with the issues of rural transportation. And a district like this isn't even functionally contiguous.

    Please keep us out of the Antelope Valley, but most importantly, keep us out of any part of Los Angeles County. Thank you.

    PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
    And right now, we have caller --
    UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello.
    PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- 5038. And up next after that will be caller 6675.
    Caller 5038, please follow the prompts to unmute.
    The floor is yours.
    Caller 5038, if you will please double check your phone. Make sure you are not on mute. You are unmuted in the meeting.
    UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I want to thank the Commission for their hard work and thoughtful consideration of public input in Los Angeles and the San Fernando Valley. However, I and others strongly feel you are not giving San Fernando Valley Latinos a fair chance
to elect candidates of our choice.

There are more than enough Latinos in the San Fernando Valley to draw two Latino voting rights districts, and I think you are morally and legally obligated to give our community that representation. I know you have a tough task trying to create districts that represent the diversity of our state. But please, Commissioners, take the time to create a second Latino Voting Rights Act Assembly seat in the San Fernando Valley. We all urge you. Thank you so much, and have a nice evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 6675, and up next after that will be caller 4809.

Caller 6675, please follow the prompts.

MS. ABRAHAM: Can you hear me now?

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

MS. ABRAHAM: Oh, wonderful. Thank you. My name is Theresa Abraham (ph.). I live in -- this -- in Stanislaus County. And I was born and raised here in Turlock. And Modesto is our county seat. And I see that on -- on some of the maps where the redistricting is being done is the west part of Turlock, and even the west part of Modesto, are in an -- another part -- a different
district.

I would very much encourage you to keep this district together in one district so that the cities of Turlock and Modesto are not divided in this way. We have a great deal in common together in our community, and I'd like to see the community maintained together.

And I'm glad you'll be looking at the VRA congressional --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. ABRAHAM: -- maps. And it seems like you could get two really effective Latino seats in the Valley instead of trying to do three and having them all not perform. I'm not sure what is entailed by this idea of an --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. ABRAHAM -- arm, but I'm curious to see how it turns out. Either way, you need to make these seats stronger. Please keep working and fix -- fix the congressional VRA seat, please.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 4089. And up next after that will be caller 5115.

Caller 4089, please follow the prompts.

It is. Sorry.

The floor is yours.
MS. THOMAS: Thanks. Good evening. Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you for all of your hard work. My name is Shauntay Thomas (ph.), and I'm calling regarding the congressional maps. I live in Manteca, in San Joaquin County.

I am worried that you are going to put us with Oak Grove and possibly Sacramento. Those areas are completely different from us here in San Joaquin County. Putting the two together just isn't our area works, and it would hurt everyone in both places. They would drown out our ability to advocate for the transportation infrastructure that we are in desperate need of, and I just am requesting that you please do not pair us with Sacramento. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 5115. And up next after that is caller 0056.

Caller 5115, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. I am calling in regards to your recent proposal to split up San Jose into four congressional districts. San Jose is the tenth largest city in the entire United States, and by drawing lines that prevent us from having a representative that has the majority of San Jose
residents, you would effectively silence the priorities and interests of our very large and very diverse community of San Jose.

No other California city that makes that list is split into four, and no other large Bay Area city is split into four.

I implore you to reconsider splitting up San Jose into four congressional districts and instead preserve our current community of interests, which is our city of San Jose. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have 0056. And up next after that will be caller 8359.

Caller 0056, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, Commissioners. Good evening. I'm calling from Yucaipa to thank you for the map that you grouped us into. We're more than pleased to be grouped with similar rural communities like Big Bear and the High Desert. Yucaipa is still reeling from last year's wildfires, especially my neighborhood. You could see the flames from my home, and those same very real wildfire concerns are also felt by Big Bear not too far away.

So without similarity in mind, as well as others,
I'm sure, between our communities, we do appreciate you hearing our case. So just thank you so much for the map that you've added us to.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 8359. And up next after that will be caller 5328.

Caller 8359, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MS. VILLALOBOS: Hello, good afternoon. My name is Sofia Villalobos (ph.). I live in Florence-Graham and have lived here for twenty-nine years. I am calling regarding the state Assembly 110LA draft map. Thank you for your consideration in trying to keep our communities of Walnut Park, Huntington Park, and Florence-Graham together.

As it doesn't appear that this was possible, we are here to ask for a minor change. Please move the unincorporated Walnut Park area into the 110LA map to be with Florence-Graham and make the 10 freeway the northern border of the map. Both our areas are unincorporated parts of Los Angeles County, and we need to stay together.

We are asking for a small alteration to this map in order to truly have an opportunity for our hardworking families to elect a candidate for our choice. Thank you.
Have a great night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 5328, and up next after that will be caller 2250.
Caller 5328, please follow the prompts.
The floor is yours.

MS. ROBERTS: Good evening. This is Gina Roberts.
I am secretary of the Valley Center Fire Protection District, and I'm very interested in listening to all of these other people complain about our comment about the fact that the Commission has gone greatly out of their way to break up communities and put rural areas -- combining them with -- with heavily urbanized areas, which essentially disenfranchises places like Valley Center.

For instance, in the Senate map that you now have proposed, Valley Center is in the Senate district as Mission Bay and Mira Mesa and all these areas which we have absolutely nothing in common with, other than the fact we're in San Diego County. And we're very rural, they're very urbanized and very high density, and the likelihood that a representative would be as interested in representing --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. ROBERTS: -- a lower district or lower-density
areas is -- is unacceptable.

So basically, my point is, is listen to all these people that are commenting about dividing up communities. Valley Center should be in a --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. ROBERTS: -- in eastern San Diego County, North County -- or -- community of interest. And right now it's grouped in the San Diego city. I appreciate it. You guys are working hard, and I understand that. Make sure you're all looking excited to hear about --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 2250. And up next after that is caller 9399.

Caller 2250, please follow the prompts.

And one more time, caller with the last four digits 2250, please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

MS. SMITH-MCDONALD: Hi. Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you for your hard work. I know this is difficult work. My name is Michelle Smith-McDonald (ph.). I am calling from Dublin, California, up in the East Bay. I'm elected official on Zone 7 board in addition to working for the Alameda County office of education.

First, I want to say thank you very much for the
Senate map, which keeps our community of Dublin within our Tri-Valley region with Pleasanton and Livermore. And I really want to encourage you to leave that map as it is. Senate map is a recognition that the Tri-Valley regions, which shares critical resources such as water, transportation, and workforces that serve, for example, the Lawrence Livermore Lab, in addition to our school systems that collaborate in a multitude of ways. We are definitely a region that needs to be kept together, and keeping consistent representation in this area is critical.

It's disappointing, frankly, that the Assembly and the congressional maps do not do that in that Dublin is orphaned from its Tri-Valley neighbors and matched with communities that are less contiguous and don't share nearly as many common resources. But Dublin is one of the fastest growing cities in the state, and --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. SMITH-MCDONALD: -- it must not be an afterthought. So please leave the Senate map the way it is. And thank you again for your hard work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9399. And up next after that will be caller 1915.

Caller 9399, please follow the prompts.
The floor is yours.

Caller 9399, if you will please double check your phone. Make sure you're not on mute. You are unmuted in the meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Can you hear me now?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay. Great. My name is Fernando. I live up here in the High Desert, and I want to applaud the Commission today for the direction they've taken regarding this Mojave Desert area in trying to keep it whole.

That great -- the original map that you have for November 10th was more -- is more like what we were looking for. I hope they're able stay with that.

(Indiscernible) and taking out the mountain region and allowing the -- the High Desert to be near the congressional district of CD 8 is what we're looking for, and it would look more like -- like the Assembly district.

Our Assembly district should be -- we can include the communities like Victorville, Hesperia, Adelanto, Apple Valley, (indiscernible), Phelan, Pinon Hills, Barstow. That's the High Desert there. And I hope you can take some polls --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- that's what -- so that's what we're looking for. Thank you very much for the Latinos.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 1915. And up next after that will be caller 9816.

Caller 1915, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I am a mother who has lived and raised my kids in San Jose for thirty years. I heard about this important issue from Solution Silicon Valley (ph.). San Jose deserves to keep our voice in Congress. We are the largest city in the Bay Area, and we should keep at least one member of Congress who speaks for us. No other major city in California is losing its voice. Only San Jose. The is a loss that communities of interest should be represented. And we are a community of interest.

Please don't finalize a map that takes away the voice of San Jose in Congress. Please don't split San Jose into small parts of four different congressional districts, which will make it much, much harder for us to voice our concerns. We should maintain a district that represents the majority of San Jose. We want San Jose to keep its voice in Congress.
Please, I'm begging you as a mother, for the future of our children, please keep San Jose as one community. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9816. And up next after that will be caller 6722.

Caller 9816, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MS. BABB: Hi, my name is Lauren Babb. I'm calling on behalf of Planned Parenthood Mar Monte, and I'm a resident of SD Placer ED. I can appreciate the hard work needed to put these map together. Planned Parenthood Mar Monte is concerned with the Placer County and El Dorado County should not be drawn into deep Sacramento County. I live and work in this area, and the health care needs of an urban community is very different from a rural community. Please respect the differences between the Sacramento and the foothills. Planned Parenthood Mar Monte represents marginalized communities that has historically been left out of these conversations in redistricting, which minimizes their voice and continues to affect their communities.

Our concern is that the current Senate district map takes away the voices of patients that support reproductive health care, and to put them in a district
that lacks the urgency for prioritizing reproductive care when it is needed the most. We hope you would consider strongly the November 2nd map. Diversity in urban communities, again, have very different health care needs than the rural foothills communities.

Sacramento has very little in common with these foothill communities and is severely at risk of --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. BABB: -- leaving representation. Thank you for all your time, and hopefully you all have a great evening. Please work hard, smart, and appreciate it.

Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 6722, and up next after that will be caller 8724.

Caller 6722, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MS. JURALOPA: Hi, Commission. My name is Virginia Juralopa (ph.). I am from the Central Valley, and I am addressing the Senate draft for the Valley, specifically SD_ECA for Merced and Modesto. As I'm following your work since this summer, and I've called and written in many times. On November 23rd, I submitted comment and a topography 3D map for the Valley-Sierra region. It is comment ID number 29074. Please look at my comment and
map. I also resubmitted today.

I grew up in Bakersfield, currently live in Fresno, and attended UC Merced University, so I know and I love the Valley. Merced and Modesto are Valley cities and should not be in a big mountain district, like your current Senate draft. Your draft also has UC Merced in this big mountain district, and that is truly disappointing.

The Central Valley fought so hard to get a UC campus. UC Merced is a huge point of pride for us in the Valley. UC Merced and Merced and Modesto must be in a one hundred percent Valley --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. JURALOPA: -- district. These community share culture, demographics, transportation, education, and economy. I echo so many other public comments you have heard about Merced and Modesto. Keep our Valley cities and Valley districts. Do not put us in the Sierras.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. JURALOPA: Again, please look at my November 23rd comment and map. Comment ID number 29074. Thank you so much. Have a great evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we will have caller 8724. And up next after that will be caller 1457.
Caller 8724, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.

I'm calling from Rancho Cucamonga to ask you not to group us into the 210 district. The area we are grouped with is mostly cities in Los Angeles County, and I'm unsure why we are grouped with them. Our concerns are best represented by being grouped in a San -- San Bernardino County district.

The district you want our city in is so much more homogeneous than our community. To make matters worse, the communities we are currently grouped with are way richer than us out here. I urge the Commission to not group any part of Rancho Cucamonga into a Los Angeles County district. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 1457, and up next after that will be caller 1983.

Caller 1457, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, Commissioners. Hi, Commissioners. I'm calling from the San Fernando Valley, and I want you to know that you've got the three San Fernando Valley congressional districts almost right. There is really no need for major changes.
But since you're still tweaking things, I wanted to flag for your attention the impact of the last minute swap that moved Sylmar into the East San Fernando Valley district. You did this by removing Porter Ranch and Granada Hills from the West Valley -- San Fernando Valley district, and instead connected them with Palmdale.

There was and still is a better way to do this. Please keep Porter Ranch and Granada Hills with the West San Fernando Valley. These neighborhoods are a mountain range away from where you have placed them. All the public services are provided by the City of Los Angeles and (indiscernible) --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- is the academic and job hub for the region.

Instead, Sunland-Tujunga is the community that can go with the Antelope Valley. Sunland-Tujunga is rural, but it's presently in --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- a district with West Hollywood, which is urban. Moving Sunland-Tujunga is a win-win. Porter Ranch and Granada Hills has been with the San Fernando Valley and congressional district map you've presented for months.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 1983. And up next after that will be caller 1043.

Caller 1983, if you will please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. WALDMAN: Yeah, hi. Stuart Waldman from VICA. Excited to be moving on to the Senate maps, although as you've heard from many callers, there's still some touch ups that need to be done on the congressional maps. VICA did submit a shapefile, and we resubmitted it this morning. So we hope you'll take a look and make those fixes.

When it comes to the Senate maps, though, we're okay with where they started, although you're starting to move things around. So we just want to make sure that we have three seats that go from Glendale to Woodland Hills and Calabasas that encompass the San Fernando Valley. We think that you can keep the San Fernando Valley mostly whole in -- in two of the seats, and you know, we look forward to that process.

We hope that we don't have to go south of Mulholland again. You know how we feel about --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. WALDMAN: -- those folks down there. And you know, we are -- you know, if you nest it, that'd be great. If you don't nest, that'd be great, as well. But
if things move around, we hope that you don't just grab pieces of the San --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. WALDMAN: -- Fernando Valley for population for other districts.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 1043. And up next after that will be caller 5104.

Caller 1043, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioner. I have been calling in every day and willing to waiting for hour to speak because this is important to me and the Little Saigon community, which this which we will effect for the next ten years. Thank you for Commissioner Kennedy, for suggesting to add North Huntington Beach to Little Saigon for the AD_GGW map. Please add all of North Garfield Street to Seapoint Street in Huntington Beach. Please remove Stanton and east of Garden Grove because the majority of these residents, they all speak Spanish. They would probably want to leave with their community of interest. I don't think so.

For the congressional map, please add the CD of the Seal Beach and all of the Huntington Beach in which Little Saigon. This will complete Little Saigon district
and will give us a two presentation. Thank you, and
please do consider this change so that we can protect our
Little Saigon community of interest.

God bless Little Saigon. Have a good evening. Good
night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have 5104. And up next after that
is caller 9966.

Call 5104, please follow the prompts.
The floor is yours.

MS. ZEPEDA: Good afternoon. My name is Jessica
Zepeda (ph.). I live in Florence-Graham and have lived
here for about twenty years. I am calling regarding the
state Assembly 110 LA draft map. I merely asked for you
to help with a minor cleanup modifications. We ask for
you to also place our next door neighbors from
unincorporated Walnut Park into the same 110LA map. Add
us and make the 10 freeway the northern border of the
map.

It is imperative to have Walnut Park and Florence-
Graham together in the same map. Isolating this
unincorporated island will only diminish our voices and
effort that we have fought so hard together for over
thirty years. We have united community between Walnut
Park, Huntington Park, and Florence-Graham. As we will
like to keep it as such in order to continue our advocacy
and priorities for our community, as we have the same
political and social challenges.

I understand that Huntington Park cannot be in the
same map due to population, however with a minor change
of moving Walnut Park into the 110LA map, it would help
our unincorporated communities of Walnut Park and
Florence-Graham to have a fighting --

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

MS. ZEPEDA: -- in having a voice in Sacramento.

Thank you. Have a good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9966, and up next
after that is caller 6235.

Caller 9966, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MR. LARA: Hi, good evening. My name is Ricardo
Lara. I am the current mayor of the City of Maywood.

I'm calling today because the current maps under
consideration are unfair and placed -- and misplaced
Maywood at a great disadvantage. Maywood had -- has
always been part of the southeast Los Angeles area. And
the current maps, both Assembly and Senate, place Maywood
in Northeast Los Angeles, communities have never been
apart -- we have never been part of and have little in
common with.

I call upon and urge the Commission to keep Maywood with similar cities and communities of interest in the southeast of Los Angeles. Maywood belongs with the cities of Bell, Cudahy, Huntington Park, Lynwood, and South Gate. Not only do we share common boundaries with these cities, but we share common needs and goals.

By placing us in the northeast, we are dealing with -- we will have our voices taken away --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. LARA: -- and all the years of hard work that we've have actually have done to improve the City of Maywood will go to -- go away. We urge you to please keep in mind and leave the City of Maywood in the southeast of Los Angeles area. Thank you very much for all your time, Commissioners, and I do appreciate all your efforts and listening to our comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we will have caller 6235, and then up next after that will be caller 1524.

Caller 6235, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

Caller 6235, if you will please double check your phone. Make sure you are not on mute. You are unmuted in the meeting.
MS. FRECOCUS: Okay. Can you hear me now?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. FRECOCUS: Wonderful. Hi. My name is Pam Frecocus (ph.), and I am part of the northern Central Valley in Stanislaus County. And I am asking you to -- well, first of all, I want to thank you for all your hard work. I know that you guys are listening to a lot of people, and I appreciate all the time and effort that you have spent. And so I would like to thank you for that first.

There's no question that I heard some of you saying yesterday that the VRA districts for Congress need to be reworked. And in the Central Valley, it's about time our communities could be finally heard. And so I really want to just say you're doing the right thing by not rushing through the process and getting them right.

I heard you talking about drawing an arm. I'm not sure what that means exactly, but I sure hope that you could make it better because that sounds better to me if we can make things stronger instead --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. FRECOCUS: -- of weaker. Thank you so much for your time and your effort. I appreciate all your hard work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 1524, and then up next after that will be caller 8174.

Caller 1524, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MS. GRISNABOR: My name is Teresa Grisnabor (ph.). I, too, am calling from Stanislaus County. I live in Modesto and have done so for thirty years. I speak to you from my experience as a reference librarian who worked downtown at the Modesto library for sixteen years.

I'm calling to argue that you redo our congressional district. I have several reasons for saying that.

The -- the map that you proposed on November 27th would split our county in a very disadvantaged way, and it's not functional.

First of all, when you split our county, it creates confusion among the citizens. We've already experienced this. Between 2003 and 2011 after the 2000 census, the county was split right down the middle. I work at the reference desk at the public library. Citizens and businesses would called in needing help. We would refer them to their congressional district, and they would say, yeah, we need -- we know we need our congressman. Who is it? We often couldn't tell them. It was hard to tell because the district lines were so confusingly drawn and hard to determine.
There was a lack of coordination. The western part of our county was headed up by a Democrat. The eastern part by a Republican. The Democrat was concerned with the western issues of the county, principally the --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

MS. GRISNABOR: -- farmers. The -- the eastern one was concern with the foothills. By the way, the foothills, the --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 8174, and then up next after that will be caller 6739.

Caller 8174, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Hi. My name is Sandra Rodriguez. I'm calling from CHIRLA. We appreciate that the Commission has drawn most of the Antelope Valley together in AVSCH (sic). We ask that you include Lake LA as part of the district. Currently, it's part of the (indiscernible) map and connected to the High Desert. This modification will be more respectful of the AV community residents locally. Lake LA is part of the AV. Residents rely on assets for higher education like Antelope Valley College and health care with Antelope Valley Hospital, which are major economic engines for the community.
Thank you for putting Sylmar back in the San Fernando Valley district. As a long-time resident of Sylmar, we can't be separated from the rest of the East San Fernando Valley. As an undocumented student, LA Mission College was the closest and most accessible college my family and I could afford.

By keeping Sylmar in the SFV district, you are ensuring students continue to have access to colleges in their home cities. Valley Village and south North Hollywood is home to higher income communities and have no shared -- no share interests in cities like Van Nuys or Panorama City. Therefore, we ask that the Valley Village and it's -- anything south of Burbank Boulevard and North Hollywood not being included --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.
MS. RODRIGUEZ: -- in this district.

We appreciate today's Senate discussion on the Senate maps, which led to a new configuration of SBRC. The cities of San Bernardino, we also are different communities of interest from Morena Valley and Paris.

Lastly, I want to uplift the need for a BRB -- VRA district --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.
MS. RODRIGUEZ: -- from the Senate that draws the Santa Ana community of interest together in the outline
of South Fullerton and West Anaheim communities of interest. This can be achieved by looking at the (indiscernible) map configuration. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 6739, and then up next after that will be caller 5457.

Caller 6739, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MS. TORRES: Hello. My name is Jessica Torres, and I'm currently the councilwoman from the City of Maywood.

I'm calling today because the current maps under consideration are unfair, and they place Maywood at a great disadvantage. Maywood has always been part of southeast of Los Angeles, and the current maps, both for Assembly and Senate, place Maywood in Northeast Los Angeles communities, a disadvantage.

Maywood belongs with the cities of Bell, Cudahy, Huntington Park, Lynwood, South Gate, et cetera. Not only do we share common boundaries with the cities, but we share common needs and goals. I respectfully ask that you keep Maywood in the Southeast Assembly district.

Thank you so much for everything. Good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 5457, and up next after that is caller 3358.
Caller 5457, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

Caller 5457, if you will please double check your phone. Make sure you are not on mute. You are unmuted in the meeting.

MS. SANCHEZ: All right. Thank you so much. My name is Claudia Sanchez (ph.), and I am a current student at UCR, making a public comment to urge you to make an adjustment to Assembly district boundaries that encompass the university UCR located at 900 University Avenue, Riverside, California, 92521.

The current map iteration last proposes UCR to be part of AD 63, SWRIV, which splits the campus from greater Riverside area. But keeping the campus and the greater Riverside area together is very important, given how much they complement each other.

So as a student, I commute from -- from downtown area to UCR frequently, and I would hate to see how both entities lose from future benefits and its representation does not stay intact. So because of this, I respectfully ask that UCR -- UC Riverside to be added to the A --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. SANCHEZ: -- AD 58, JRC map. Thank you so much for the consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 3358. And up next up that will be caller 7894.

Caller 3358, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening, everyone. My name is Diana, and I live in the Florence-Graham area. I'm calling regarding the state Assembly LA 110 map -- draft map. Thank you for your consideration in trying to keep our communities of Walnut Park, Huntington Park, and Florence-Graham together. As it doesn't appear that this was possible, we are here to ask for a minor change.

Please make the unincorporated Walnut Park area in the -- into the LA -- into the 110LA map to be with Florence-Graham and make the 110 freeway -- then make the 10 freeway -- I'm sorry -- the northern border of the map. Both our areas are unincorporated parts of Los Angeles County, and we need to stay together.

We are asking for a small alteration of this map in order to truly have an opportunity to have our hardworking families to elect candidates of our choice. Thank you very much for your hard work, and have a blessed, good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 7894, and then up next
after that, we will retry caller 0983.

Caller 7894, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. Good evening.

As an employee of the University of California Riverside, I encourage the Commission to add the university located at 900 University Avenue to AD 58, JRC map for continuity of representation and to maintain its long standing partnership with the City of Riverside on housing and infrastructure, economic and workforce development.

It's imperative that UC Riverside be added to the AD 58, JRC map. Thank you so much for your service to the residents of the State of California. Have a good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we will retry caller 0983, and then up next after that, we will go to caller 1456.

Caller 0983, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you hear me? Okay --
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR:  Yes, we can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:  -- hello, Commissioner.

Hello, Commissioner.  I have been calling every day to make my comment because I am a resident of Huntington Beach. And for a long time, the Vietnamese community has been growing and living there.

Yesterday, I heard that the Commission talk about adding Huntington Beach, Little Saigon, for the congressional. Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy, for a suggestion to add north of Huntington Beach to Little Saigon. I applaud you for your effort. And please continue to make sure Little Saigon have a true presentation.

Little Saigon asking you to please listen to our voice and do the right thing. Make sure we have a congressional, Senator, Assembly that can help our community, especially our elders. Thank you. Have a good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR:  Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 1456. And then up next after that will be caller 4340.

Caller 1456, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MS. YU:  Hi. My name is Patty Yu (ph.). I have been living in the Irvine area since college at UCI since
1996. I'm calling today to voice my concern about the proposed border, the new district splitting up Irvine and putting Tustin in a new district with the top half of Irvine.

It seems like it would be better to keep the -- the cities together, as it has been, and to keep a large, unique area like Irvine as one. We -- you know, we have a -- a state university, UCI. We have the great park. We have a very robust business center, with many Fortune 500 companies. We have one -- one school district, and we share state resources.

So to have half represented by one state senator and the other half represented by another doesn't seem to be a very effective way to --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. YU: -- service that community.

As I mentioned, we share city resources, events, and have many common interests to be represented. And to split it up just would really set us back. And it's the very growing and flourishing area that would be best served by a continuous representation. Every effort should be made to keep cities whole as possible. I mean, we're not even talking about a small portion. We're talking about a huge city.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 4340, and then up next after that, we will retry caller 6625.

Caller 4340, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute.

The floor is yours.

MS. LADDISH: Good evening. My name is Kate Laddish, that's K-A-T-E, L-A-D-D-I-S-H. I live in the Yolo County city of Winters, just two blocks from Solano County and near Napa County. Thank you for your ongoing work. Your task is colossal, and I appreciate your thoughtful discussions. And I'm very grateful that our state tasks a Commission rather than the legislature with redistricting. Your meetings, including public comment, are democracy in action.

I'm calling about the Senate district for Yolo County. I support you using your draft district for our area, SD_NAPABYRON draft, rather than trying to nest Assembly district.

SD_NAPABYRON draft groups Yolo and Solano, which matches community of interest testimony and would keep the greater Winters area whole. It keeps Yolo, Solano, and Napa counties whole and groups the delta portions of Yolo, Solano, Sacramento, and Contra Costa County. It includes areas with shared interest and transportation, wildfire preparation and recovery, agriculture, including
specialty crops such as wine grapes and --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. LADDISH: -- oil in the delta. I'm concerned that if the Commission moves towards nesting rather than using the draft Senate district that we might lose some of the community of interest connections and groupings that are in the draft Senate district SD --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. LADDISH: -- NAPABYRON draft. Thank you again for your ongoing work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And all right. Now, we will retry caller 6625, and then up next after that will be caller 2696.

Caller 6625, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Commissioners, the High Desert in San Bernardino County has been absolutely shredded, sliced, and ripped apart. At a similar level, you put Pinon Hills and Phelan, rural communities with dirt roads, into a district with one of the wealthiest and urban areas in LA, Pasadena. Now, today, you ripped apart our desert without looking at other options or pointing to any significant COI testimony. Only Commissioner Vazquez showed any concern for our community.
You are essentially disenfranchising part of our value by dumping them into a majority-LA County district in the Assembly and the Senate and also dividing our desert and preventing us from being able to speak with one voice.

Last week, Commissioners said they wanted to uplift poorer communities, but your actions show otherwise. We were kind of happy with those draft maps. I -- I ask that you go back and look at the draft maps when making your future decisions. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we're going to caller 2696, and then up next after that will be caller 9387.

Caller 2696, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute.

And one more time, caller 2696, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

Caller 2696, it appears you may be having some type --

MR. MEYERS: Hello.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Oh, nope. There you are. The floor is yours.

MR. MEYERS: Yes, thank you. My name is Tom Meyers (ph.), and I live in Modesto, and I'm in favor of keeping Stanislaus County as whole as possible, as presented in
map 2. Modesto should not be split into two Assembly districts, especially one going to Tahoe and Death Valley that have very little in common with the Central Valley cities of Modesto, Manteca, Tracy, and Patterson. One in three people in the tenth congressional District in -- is a Modesto resident, and if you divide Modesto, we would lose congressional representation.

Agriculture is a major industry in the Central Valley, certainly not Tahoe and Death Valley. Water is our most important natural resource, and we want -- need people in power to fight for it. And it's important not to disrupt the economic progress among Modesto, Manteca, Tracy, and Patterson.

In 2019, the mayors of these cities established an economic development plan covering infrastructure and transportation. These communities --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. MEYERS: -- are -- consist of -- consist of many commuters from the Bay Area and Santa Clara, and traffic congestion will continue to be a challenge. The ACE train is scheduled to start up in the Valley in 2022, so that's another thing these cities have in common.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. MEYERS: A realistic Central Valley should consist -- include all of Modesto, Tracy, Manteca,
Patterson, and Turlock. So I urge you to adopt map 2. I appreciate your attention in this matter. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we will have caller 9387, and then up next after that will be caller 9846.

Caller 9387, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Commissioners, for all your hard work during the redistricting process. I wanted to refer to the plan ST iteration. As a Modesto resident, this district map keeps communities of interest together, as we all share similar agricultural and water concerns. Please approve of this visualization. Thank you, once again.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we will have caller 9846.

Caller 9846, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute.

The floor is yours.

MS. SEYMOUR: I'm from the great City of Carson, California, and I'm Verges Seymour (ph.). Carson is the home of Cal State University, Dominguez Hills, and I'm calling to respectfully request that this Commission reconsider splitting our city into two Assembly
districts. I'm afraid splitting our city into two
districts will adversely affect our students at Cal State
University, Dominguez Hills, and we need to remain whole
in District 65. Thank you for your consideration and for
your hard work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And Chair, at that time -- at this time, that's all
of our callers.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Katy. Thank you,
Christian. Thank you, interpreters. Thank you,
captioners. Thank you, staff.

It is time for a break for all of us. So I don't
want to belabor anything. I would just ask if colleagues
could take some time this evening or tomorrow morning,
reflect on how much work we yet have to do, how little
time we have to do it, and if there are ways that you
would see as available to us that we could make faster
progress on this.

So thank you, everyone, for a good day. And we will
see you tomorrow morning at 11 a.m. We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the CRC Live Line Drawing Meeting
meeting adjourned at 8:07 p.m.)
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