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CHAIR ANDERSEN: Good morning, California, and welcome to the Citizens Redistricting Commission meeting. We are going to have a big day today continuing with what we did yesterday. At this time, Alvaro, could you please take roll?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, Chair.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Presente.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Le Mons.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I am present.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Akutagawa. And Commissioner Andersen.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: And I am also here. Thank you very much, Alvaro.

MR. HERNANDEZ: You're welcome, Chair. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: So today we're going to give you -- the run of show is posted. And what we will be doing is we'll be starting off with a recap of the work we did yesterday. We'll make a list of the iterations that we'll be reviewing. And we will also then create a list of outstanding issues that the Commission has, and then we'll review those -- the prepared iterations as we go through the areas of the state.

We will be starting in the coastal area and then we'll go to the North through the Central Valley and then finishing with Los Angeles, Orange County, and a review of San Diego. That is the plan for today.

And before we do that and jump into that, I did want to go over the iterations on our website for the public. There's a great deal of list of iterations, and I know
that's been a little confusing for people. Many of these are ideas that we have explored and we are no longer pursuing.

If you want to grab up the list, the plan -- the first two are areas that there are more details of areas that we -- that is how the map has changed. Then we have many, many of them that are other ideas we reviewed and are no longer pursuing. So the ones we'll be going over today are actually -- there are two at the very bottom of the list, the 1210, the Congressional districts.

You, of course, may look at any of them at your leisure, but I know it's a little confusing in terms of are we still working on these areas or are we not? So obviously, we have the Assembly areas, and that's -- those have all been posted and that are in our map viewer on our website. So I hope that helps a little bit with what the iterations are.

And iterations are, again, just ideas that we've been able to explore and put a map together to save the time -- for it to be more efficient with our time, and it has nothing to do with anyone's plan or anything like that. It's really to be more efficient with our time. So with that, I do see a couple of questions.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. In terms
of the -- I brought this up before, but in terms of the
handouts that are posted, it would be very helpful not
only for me but also for the public if when they're
posted, we actually put the post date, that way -- the
day it was posted. That way, we know as well as the
public knows when it was posted because oftentimes
some -- there's updates and you want to make sure that
you pick up the most recent information. So I'm hoping
that that's somewhat simple to do and it's something that
our staff can do. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. Thank you. That's a very
good idea we'll have the staff look into.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. So
Commissioner Turner inspired me yesterday when she said
let's not forget to turn over every stone and think
things through. And as everybody knows, I wasn't -- I
was unsettled about parts of San Diego. And so I have
asked the line drawers if there -- if we can look at
certain parts to make it more compact and put some COIs
together. And so there will be another iteration, and I
just wanted to give the heads-up, and exploration.

But I just -- I didn't want -- I wasn't sleeping
well at night. And when Commissioner Turner said that
and everybody else encouraged us to explore, I was like,
okay, let me just explore this so I know I did everything I could.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much, Commissioner Sinay. We will, as we get into the work, I will say we'll recap what happened and are there any other iterations out there. And so that's a great time to -- we're just going to get a list of them all so we can sequence when we review those. So thank you very much.

Commissioner Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to reiterate what Commissioner Fernandez said. We have asked staff on multiple occasions to include not only the date of posting but the time of posting because sometimes we post multiple items in the course of the day and we do want the public to be able to ensure that they have the latest version of things. So I would again ask staff to post things with both date and time. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. Thank you very much. And we'll have the staff look into that and see how best to do -- take that on. Wonderful.

Well, at this point, the first thing we actually need to do is we do have to have a short, closed session, and it's 11 -- we will be back by 11:30. So thank you very much, and we'll go into closed session for -- it's a pending -- on the pending litigation issue.
(Whereupon, a recess was held from 11:07 a.m. until 11:30 a.m.)

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Welcome back to the Citizens Redistricting Commission meeting. We just came out back from closed session where no action was taken. So continuing on for the public, we will again be taking public comment tonight at 6 p.m. We will take a break at 5:45 for a fifteen-minute break and start public comment at 6 p.m. So as long as you're in the line by 6 p.m., when the lines close, we will listen to your public comment today. And we appreciate all the public input. Thank you very much.

Now, what we'll be getting back to -- what we're up to today. I'm going to do a recap of what we did yesterday, and then we'll -- there will be a call for all the iterations we're going to be going through today, and then we'll actually jump into the work.

So with that, I'm going to do -- I'm going to make a quick sort of overview, and if anyone -- if there any other items missing, then please add those. And thank you, everyone, for all the great work we're doing and that we've got accomplished yesterday. As a team, we're going to get this done.

So starting in the North -- essentially the Bay Area, San Francisco Bay Area in the North Contra Costa
Solano district. We went through multiple iterations that we are no longer pursuing. I believe Commissioner Yee also reported on his valiant attempt but -- to do something with adding Fairfield back into Solano, was really not able to come up with anything that could -- that was workable. And we did, I believe, come to a resolution on the plan, which is posted, that shows how the district now has incorporated a significant amount of Antioch, and I believe that's how we resolved that issue.

Then going down the coast, we did assign a task to Tamina, and I believe another Commissioner was helping her, to try to see what she could do about possibly increasing Latino CVAP in that area and other communities of interest.

Then going to the North of the central part of the state, we had one organized attempt at seeing if we could put Modesto -- separate Modesto from the ECA. And that was an assignment that was also -- we worked on in public session and then was also assigned to -- we left Kennedy working through that.

Then moving South, we ended up working on Los -- in the Los Angeles area. We did the Cal Pamony -- Cal Poly Pomona area, which we'll go over it when we look at the maps today to make sure we actually include the Cal Poly Pomona with the City of Pomona. In the Angeles National
Forest, they were added to some of the district South, and we'll look at that. I believe we might have a bit more information coming in to finish that area off. We worked on the Thaitown area. And we were balancing population in the Glassell Park/Eagle Rock area, which we can review when we get to the Los Angeles area.

Then in the Los Angeles and also Orange County area, Commissioners Sadhwani and Toledo presented an alternative looking at -- for LBNORTH, which was -- which we discussed at length but decided not to pursue that, and that's -- but there was some feedback which they possibly might have considered.

And now that is what I think we went over yesterday. Were there any items that I missed before we then get a list of what iterations we're going to be going through next? Okay. Not seeing any hands.

Now, I have that the iterations that we're expecting to see is the report back on the San Benito area on the coast. Actually, I believe a couple of attempts at the -- getting the Monterey area separate from the ECA, which is the Sierras. And we will also, I believe, have a couple of iterations -- well, I'm actually -- I'm not --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually, Chair?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- sure if we're having another --
yes.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually, that was Modesto, not Monterey. Modesto from ECA.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'm terribly sorry. It's Monterey from --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- ECS.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And that's a couple of --

yes.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Although they both start with an "m", they're not the same town. So thank you very much, Commissioner Fernandez. Yes. And I don't -- then, so at that point, those are the only iterations that I have that we're expecting today. Are there other iterations that Commissioners would like -- oh, I'm sorry.

Commissioner Sinay did bring up there might be something for Orange County. Any others?

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I think yesterday we also looked at the VRA districts in the Central Valley and looked at potential -- some other potential approaches, but kind of decided they weren't going to work and I think left comfortable with those at that point.
The other thing that I think we need to circle -- or close a loop on today is we've looked at essentially all of the state, but we have to come back to Northern San Bernardino, Northern L.A. County and finish up that reconciliation, the population reconciliation and how we're going to bring that population down from the North and then get those districts finalized, too.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. Thank you very much. All right. And in addition to, if there are any other iterations, then also what other items we want to get to. And that's certainly one of the important ones on the list.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, sorry. I just wanted to clarify it's San Diego, not Orange County.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. Okay. All right. Well, with that, we can either go through the iterations that we have, or do we want to make a list of all the items that might be outstanding first? Do we have any -- do we have a preference?

Seeing no preference, we might just -- let's march through the iterations we have and then we might think of ideas as we go through the state. So at this point, I could -- please, Tamina, share your map with us. Great. Thank you very much. And, oh. This is wonderful. Now,
could you please tell us what this iteration is called in the handouts for the public?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Certainly. We are actually -- the iteration I'm going to show you right now is called iteration -- oh my goodness -- Iteration TF, and it is the purple lines right here. This iteration is focused on two districts, which are the Cupertino district and the Mid-Coast District. It was worked on by Commissioners Toledo and Fernandez.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Wonderful. And could you please put the CVAP on here? And did Commissioners -- any of the Commissioners want to discuss this or -- oh.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Just briefly. I mean, Commissioner Fernandez and I have been looking at how to make sure that the maps are drawn fairly for the agricultural communities of the Central Coast, especially the farmworker communities in the Monterey and San Benito area as well as some of the farmworker communities up in -- that are included from Santa Clara County as well, or rather Santa Cruz County.

We went through and we -- and put as much of it as we could in here that hadn't been and did a few refinements to do so, but we were able to get the CVAP a little bit higher in order to ensure that -- or in order
to ensure that the Latino population in this area has an
opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice.

I think one of the things that that -- as both of
us, both Commissioner Fernandez and I really have strong
connection to the agricultural communities. Both of our
parents' families were agricultural farm-working
individuals. We really care about the Central Valley and
the Central Coast and all farm-working communities as
well as the rest of California. And so we really wanted
to just make sure that we left no stone unturned while
also making sure that the communities around these areas
also had fair representation. And I believe we achieved
that.

I think it's difficult. We were looking at -- one
of the things we were considering also is the Central
Coast versus the Santa Clara population. And I believe
we have -- we struck the best balance we could while also
making sure that we met our legal obligations to the --
because this area has VRA considerations. So just wanted
to share that as the bigger picture for this district. I
believe this district will -- this map is fairly drawn.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner
Toledo. Actually, there really isn't much left for me to
say, so thank you so much for summing that up really
well. Yes, definitely the farm laborers, I want to make sure that they are represented. Dear to my heart and dear to Commissioner Toledo's heart as well. And what we try to do is we try to equally balance, as Commissioner Toledo said, between Santa Clara and then also the San Benito, Monterey, and Santa Cruz counties. And we actually struck a pretty good balance there. So thank you, Tamina, for working with us, and open for questions.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Any questions? It looks -- actually, can we see -- could you walk us through the CVAP, please? Or actually even changes, that would be wonderful.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sure. So as was mentioned, the changes were really minor. The black lines here are what we had before. So we smoothed this out to the purple line. Isn't much population down here, so really just making this a cleaner line for folks to follow.

And then really the little changes that you see with the lines here along the coastal area have to do with what we could do to increase the LCVAP in case this is a potential VRA area to look at. So looking at these particular different communities, what they had in common, if there was a way to keep similar communities together. As was mentioned, the agricultural and farmworker communities, if there were little pieces that
we could rejoin.

As was discussed yesterday, we explored this area West of Watsonville in the unincorporated area, and so that line has been moved. Just a little bit of the unincorporated area of Santa Clara. And I believe it was just one or two blocks up here in the Southern part of the Santa Clara -- Northern Santa Clara County/San Jose section of Cupertino which were moved. And the CVAP which you are looking at on the label here is 50.51 percent LCVAP, 2.77 percent BCVAP, 14.01 percent ACVAP, 0.64 percent ICVAP, and 30.81 percent WCVAP.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Wonderful. Thank you. Thank you very much. No, this is a -- I know the Commissioners worked hard and long on this, and I really appreciate -- the whole Commission appreciates the efforts.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I just I forgot to mention we were able to increase it a tiny bit. It was 50.39, and it went up to 50.51. It's a tiny bit. You know what? Every bit counts. Thanks.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to make sure that this was reviewed by counsel.

MR. LARSON: This is the first time I'm seeing it,
but based on the composition, I think it complies with Voting Rights Act concerns, particularly with regard to the Latino population of San Benito County.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Wonderful. Well, thank you very much for all involved. Does the Commission have a general consensus on accepting this? We like this version? I see a few nods. Any other -- Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Is this version currently --

thank you, Chair, first of all. Is this version uploaded on our map viewer as of yet?

MS. RAMOS ALON: I believe the PDF is up, but the map viewer version is not up yet.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay. Then since I was late, I'll just review it off-line and bring forward any concerns if I have any at a later point. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I definitely am in agreement that we should move forward with this, and I just wanted to really think Commissioner Fernandez and Toledo for their work on this area. It was an area that we heard a whole lot about and certainly was very important to me, too. So I really appreciate all your work. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much.
Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And I did want to thank all the community groups that have been writing to us, calling in, and asking for a district that represents the San Benito and the Monterey district. I mean, we hear you. We wish we could have added the whole two districts together -- both counties together and created a Central Coast district that was just Central Coast. The numbers just are what they are, and we've done, I think, a very good job to capture the two -- as much of the two counties as possible and to fairly represent the interests of the Central Coast. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. Well, I believe the general consensus is that we will pursue this option, and so if you could go ahead and make those changes, please, Tamina.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. And now the next iteration that I have is -- actually, this is -- this will be -- as we leave the coastal and the bay area, are there any other items that we wanted to discuss while we're here or just add to our list and come back?

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I know we've spoken about this a lot, but I just want to do it one last time just to
make sure we're all on the same page. Just looking at
our VRA districts in the Central Valley and just making
sure -- I think Commissioner Turner has already worked
with line drawers as well as -- the line drawers as well
as us have all tried to turn all -- all stones have been
turned or whatever the -- sorry. English sayings are my
downfall. But if we just wanted to make sure that we
say -- yeah, make sure we're all feeling good about it.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. Thank you. Yes. In this
time, this particular time, I'm trying to think about the
coast area and the bay area, and we will certainly
address the Central Valley --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: My apologies. I just --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: No. Thanks --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- for bringing it up. Thank you.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. I'm sorry I didn't have a
chance to work this out with the line drawers, but on
page -- in Solano County area to see if we can get
Grizzly -- the Grizzly Bay and wildlife refuge area there
in with Fairfield, it would improve the look of the
district and we get more of Solano County in with its
county seat. I checked just now. There's extremely
large census blocks there, and possibly as many as 10,000
folks, but it would just involve a change in the split in Vacaville or North Fairfield where we had it before. I'd like to explore that.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah, certainly. If you'd like to explore that, please do so. And you can -- and come back with that --

COMMISSIONER YEE: The Grizzly Bay (indiscernible) water right below (indiscernible).

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Right. And that is the -- essentially (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- waters at that point. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER YEE: And the whole refuge. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, that refuge area. Thank you very much. Any other items for the -- in the bay area or the coast? Okay. Oh, Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I have a quick question on that, Commissioner Yee. Would that be putting that area in with Yolo Lake or with NORTHCONT?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I'm moving it to NORTHCONT and adjusting the split with --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: But it would be about 10,000 people?
COMMISSIONER YEE: Depending how it's done. I draw (indiscernible) district valley in census tracts, not census blocks, so I --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. And we'll -- again, like all iterations, nothing happens on our maps until the entire Commission has reviewed it and kind of, in a general sense, we might pursue that option or not.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Sorry. I didn't take down my hand.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh. That's all right.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you, though.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: (Indiscernible) Fernandez, apparently. So Commissioner Yee, it was putting -- you want to put more of Solano County into NORTHCONT? Is that what you are trying to do?

COMMISSIONER YEE: That's right. Since the whole Grizzly Bay and wildlife area is very thinly populated, I thought I would improve the shape of that NORTHCONT district as well as put more of Solano County in with its county seat.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Turner.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I wanted to see the full -- I thought we were at the coast, but then you mentioned also the bay. So can I just see the full NORTHCONT?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, certainly. Did I review that? Yes. Yeah. Tamina, could we have a bit of a review of that?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Wonderful. Okay. So then I have the next -- thank you very much, Tamina. And could we possibly have Kennedy share a map with us?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Absolutely. One moment, Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Sorry.

Commissioner Turner, were you -- did you have another item? Not at this time? Okay. And now, again, I'm just -- we're just going through the state. We will come back. If there are other items that suddenly occur to you, please mention those because it's certainly not precluding any until we're -- until we feel comfortable with the maps, we will be looking at them and reflecting on them.

So if we could get the -- we'll do just a few minutes of switchover. And I understand now we will be looking at several iterations which are posted, which I list -- they're called the Congressional districts
iteration. One is called Iteration Stockton; the other is called Iteration Parkway. I believe Commissioner Fernandez might be walking us through one or both of these.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sure. Okay. Kennedy?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh. Well, yeah. We're just going to give her a minute to be able to share her map.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. So we had two different iterations. One of them was bringing in entire -- all of Stanislaus into -- out of ECA. And then the other iteration was just Modesto. So once Kennedy brings it up, we -- so we --

MS. WILSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- actually -- are you --

MS. WILSON: I was just going to ask which one you want first since there were two. Just whatever one.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: How about let's do the one with the entire county first. How about that one.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great.

MS. WILSON: Got it. One moment.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: What is this plan called on the website?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think Kennedy would have a better idea of what it's called.
MS. WILSON: It should be Iteration Parkway. I do not --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Is this one Parkway?

MS. WILSON: This is the Parkway, has stuff --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Iteration Parkway.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. I'm looking at the printout PDF map, and it appears that is the Parkway one.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And I'll go over the second option, too, but that was one that Commissioner Akutagawa worked on more so, but I can probably still walk you through that one as well. And then Kennedy actually knows the specifics. So she could probably actually walk it through better than any of us could. But we'll go on this journey.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. No, if you prefer that Kennedy walk us through the details and then you can kind of give us the background, whichever way you feel more comfortable.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: That's fine. Okay, Kennedy, can we do --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Before we start getting --

Commissioner Andersen, can we just get the high level? What are we trying to achieve here? What was the goal of these changes?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Just because, I mean, I think I know, but I just want to make sure that we're all in the same -- and the public, too. That the public understands --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- where we're coming from and what we're trying to achieve from a high level perspective. Then we can get into the details.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Yes. Thank you.

Thank you for that, Commissioner Toledo. Was it yesterday? Yesterday's meeting, we had received input from Modesto not wanting to be with the ECA. And so what we were charged with was going back to see if we could bring Modesto and then also Stanislaus County, so we have two different iterations, back into the -- I think we put it in the -- we put it into -- I can't think of the name of the --

MS. WILSON: San Joaquin?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- district.

MS. WILSON: SAC San Joaquin?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. Yeah. We brought it back into that. And then what we had to do was move the population, go up San Joaquin, Sacramento County, then go up to the Sierras, and then come back down to then populate the ECA. By taking out all of the county, I
believe that was about 427,000 was the population, so we had to walk that population. And so try to -- yeah. Just go up to the Sacramento to -- and then also like the Placer area and all the way up to -- I think it was moving all the way to Plumas, I believe, wasn't it? Yeah.

MS. WILSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And then back around to populate ECA. So we took out 427,000, and we had to put back in 427,000. So that was -- that's kind of like the overall.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So higher -- even higher level than that, is it that we're trying to unite rural -- put urban areas with urban areas or rural areas with rural areas? Modesto being --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I believe --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- a more urban area?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- Modesto wanted to be more of Central Valley and then, yeah.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Be more of the Central Valley.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So it has to do with geographic --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, yes.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. It was geographically based.

Commissioner Fernandez is right. There was a -- the Central Valley issues were more agricultural and housing and issues of that sort and different agriculture where the mountainous area is -- the mountain area, it's broadband. It's also ranching, which are often cross purposes. So it was trying to separate the purposes of the entire area. Oh. I'm sorry.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, yeah. I'm just wondering if we could move the map up so that we can see the upper bounds of this iteration. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: All right. Thank you. Could we get the -- I'm sorry. So the population in here was 427,000 in that section?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. To bring the whole county into --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, that --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- the Central Valley was 427,000.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Wow. There is --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Is it up --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- Stanislaus.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- Kennedy?
MS. WILSON: Yes. This is the Parkway iteration.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So let's start --

why don't we start at -- yes. Thank you.

MS. WILSON: So I'll put on the previous lines, but

it was also including Ripon. It was slightly -- the

previous lines were slightly into San Joaquin County.

And so bringing all of that plus all of Stanislaus in,

yes, was about 427,000 people. We worked it up and

went -- we took a similar -- looking at Iteration CD1107,

looking at those maps, we took the same kind of map for

there.

And so we put Modesto and parts of Turlock with

Tracy, Mountain House, Manteca, Lathrop, and then the

Eastern farming towns in San Joaquin County, and then we

balanced that out. We moved North and into Stockton. We

kept Stockton whole. We also have Discovery Bay and

Byron in here. And continuing to move North to, of

course, balance populations, we did have to find splits

in Sacramento.

And so we have Elk Grove, Vineyard, Wilton, Rancho

Murieta together, and Florin, but we did have to split

within the CDP of Parkway. We split it down the 99 and

then kind of took back so that we could get the right

population. And that is where we had to do a split in

that area.
And then moving up into the Northern parts of Sacramento, we also moved West Sacramento upwards. And I'll show you the previous lines. Before we had a line that was going through Sacramento, and so we moved those up into North SAC, and we also had to do a split in Arden-Arcade at Howe Avenue and a bit below at American River. Then we also have Rosemont, La Rivera, Rancho Cordova, Mather, North Highlands, Rio Linda, and Elverta in this iteration as well.

And then continuing to move North, we kept moving the population Northwards. Then we have PLACER SAC, which has, again, that split in Arden-Arcade on Howe Avenue, and Carmichael, Fair Oaks, Gold River, Folsom, Citrus Heights, Orangevale, Antelope, Foothill Farms, North Highlands. And we also have Roseville. And we had to create a split in Rocklin at the 80 Freeway, so we split there in Rocklin.

And then continuing to move out, our last step was moving in ECA. And so we kept the boundaries that were already there from the Northern counties. So before PLACER SAC, took parts of El Dorado, Placer, Nevada, Sierra up to Plumas and Yuba, and we moved those over to ECA.

So now ECA includes all of El Dorado, Granite Bay, Loomis, a little part of Rocklin that's on the Eastern
side of the 80. We have Lincoln, Sheridan, and the rest of Placer, of course. Oh sorry. Here, you can see better without the cities. The split that we had before from Yuba and then up to Plumas County.

And so, again, we just windmilled the population through Sacramento, created the split in Parkway at the 99, and then up to PLACER SAC, created the split at Arden-Arcade, Carmichael at Howe, and a split in Rocklin at the 80, and then moved up and kept El Dorado whole and the other boundaries that were part of PLACER SAC before for ECA.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. And so by doing this, we actually ended up splitting many more COIs as we move up, Kennedy, to the Parkway area. So right now with this, we are splitting Parkway and Florin, which is a very low income area of Latino, Blacks, Asians. So we're splitting up all those COIs, like, from Oak Park, Lemon Hill, Parkway, Florin. Also Greenhaven, Fruitridge Pocket, from Elk Grove and Vineyard that we've heard many times.

And then as we move further North, we continue to -- well, we continue to split up more COIs in terms of with Rose -- well, we had to go into Arcade, which was whole
before. Then we go further North and we split up the
communities of interest from Rocklin, Loomis, and
Roseville, and Lincoln. And we go all the way up to
Plumas to grab the population. So now this is from
Plumas all the way down to Inyo is the size of this
district. For me, I believe it disrupts more COIs,
especially for the lower income working-class population.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Sorry. My hand was
accidentally raised.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh. Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yep. Thank you, Commissioner
Fernandez and Kennedy. I immediately see as a flag
care about the number of COIs that are being split,
particularly -- and did I see, Kennedy, West SAC is now
in a district with Rossville. Can you go back? How did
that go East to West there? How far did that go?

MS. WILSON: It goes out to Rancho Cordova, so it's
not --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Rancho Cordova?

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. That's still, I think,
a different -- and West SAC and Lemon Hill is over --
yeah, over to Rancho Cordova. I like some of what
happened in ECA, but everything getting to ECA was not, I
think, what many of the COIs wanted to happen. And so I
look forward to seeing the other option. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Kennedy?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. In general,
I like the overall architecture. I am concerned about
some of these communities of interest and would like to
see if we can find a way to address them. I mean, I
remember we were looking last night at the area around
Freeport South of West SAC, North of Clarksburg. And I
know there's not a lot of population there, but -- and I
realize that Parkway is probably much more densely
populated. I'm just looking for where we could resolve
the population issues and the splits in -- particularly
in Parkway. But generally, I think I like the
architecture. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

MS. WILSON: And a note on that, you are correct.
There just isn't enough people down here to resolve that
split. It would have to I guess come from further South,
and that would cause -- oh sorry. I don't know. Someone
was talking.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: No, no. No, go ahead. Go ahead.
Oh. I think that was someone in the background of somewhere.


CHAIR ANDERSEN: So please continue.

MS. WILSON: So just, yeah, this is not enough to really resolve that and probably would just result in more splits somewhere else. But I do understand the thought, but just saying.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I put myself in the queue here. I certainly appreciate, yes, the split in Parkway is certainly not what we want. Could you zoom in on that a little bit, please, Kennedy? But it does keep Sacramento whole, which we've heard of. And I'm wondering if in that if you could rearrange within that -- it's called North SAC -- to put all of Parkway into it if you might have taken some of the other -- either take a little bit more of Arden-Arcade or something within it to shift that line around because I do see Sacramento, the city is whole. West Sacramento is with the City of Sacramento. And Arden-Arcade is with Carmichael. There are actually a lot of good architectural things, then, in it.

This is a problem that I see, but I'm wondering if there's other arrangements within this area that might work. I don't know what the population is in that area, but I'm just wondering if -- to put that in -- to move
that line -- to put that in, something else comes out, if
that makes sense. And Commissioner Fernandez would, of
course, know the area better.

And then going North. The Arden-Arcades, all the
way up through there, those are the suburbs which fit
better. It is a shame that Rocklin and Lincoln aren't
together, but -- and then over -- it does have in one
district, Truckee and all of Tahoe, which is nice. And
then that is a totally Sierra district. So again I kind
of also like the architecture, but there are problem
areas within it, and I still don't know how those could
be resolved. I just want to bring that up.

But we have another option as well.

Commissioner Fernandez, did you want to say more
about this particular one before we look at the other
option?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. And before we leave,
anything you do to -- you continue to break up COIs if we
were to try to bring in Parkway, you also -- there's also
a COI for Parkland -- Parkway and Florin because you do
have a higher concentration of cultural groups in there.
And then if you start taking population from Arden-
Arcade, of course, that's -- so every move you make is
sacrificing a different community of interest, so
that's -- yeah. So that's just something that we would
have to grapple with.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Well, yes. And there are --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And the populations are very dense. Like Florin.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: That section itself is 52,000. It's very condensed --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- population.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah, it is. It's tricky through this area, certainly.

Commissioner Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. So the 52,000 is the total for Florin?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. It's 52,658.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And the total for Parkway is what? Or even how much would we need to change in Parkway to -- if we wanted to bring the rest of Parkway into, I don't know, either one. But if the more significant community of interest is between Parkway and Florin, then we'd would want to bring the rest of Parkway in with Florin, Vineyard, and Elk Grove. So how much are we looking for there? Right.

MS. WILSON: So that would be a total of 6,528 people.
VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we've already said that that area West of Freeport doesn't have all of that, but it presumably has part of it. And I'm wondering also the area between -- if you can pull out just one more click -- between Rancho Murieta and Folsom and Rancho Cordova, the unincorporated area there in the Eastern part of the county.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Trying to find another 6,000 or so to put in the switch.

MS. WILSON: And one moment while I highlight that area.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Fernandez, is the part with Florin the --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. So the communities of interest, they're all combined -- it's Asian, Black, and also Latino -- is Oak Park, also the Fruitridge area, the Lemon Hill, Parkway, Florin, and into Elk Grove and Vineyard. So it's all of that. It's not just one section of it which is highly populated.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. So I guess this -- what we're looking at now, the area there, Rancho Murieta, Rancho Cordova, and Folsom, that would be to bring more population into Sacramento so that we could make Parkway whole in North SAC with Lemon Hill and Fruitridge Pocket.

MS. WILSON: And I haven't finished, but as you can
see, most of it's filled in and it's a total of --

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. WILSON: -- 400.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Right.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

MS. WILSON: To bring in 6,000 would most likely --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Actually --

MS. WILSON: Oh.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- how many people are in Rancho Murieta?

MS. WILSON: It's about 5,000 but let me look. One moment.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. So Rancho Murieta could actually be switched for the rest of Parkway.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Just a process question. Was I right to -- when I heard that there's another plan to review?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, you're absolutely --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: It might just --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- right. Yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- be helpful to review that 1st before we get into --
CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- these swaps --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: True.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- just so we can know what our options fully are.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thanks.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I think the exploration was being done as if this is at all possible, but certainly. Yes, so that's 5,000. So all right. Thank you, Kennedy.

Yes, at this point, let's -- I mean, it appears that may be a possibility, but let's review the other prepared iteration, which is called Iteration Stockton, I believe. Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

MS. WILSON: So here we have Iteration Stockton, and if you couldn't tell by now, they're named by where the split is. The last one was Parkway, and this one is Stockton. So this one also does not bring in all of the Stanislaus County line. I think there was a bit of confusion whether or not it was just Modesto or the entire county, so we just did another iteration that had a different framework.

But whether you brought more people in, then it would just move the lines a little bit farther down. So it's similar in that way, but it follows a more, I would
say, horizontal splits rather than vertical splits that
we saw from the previous iteration. And I don't know if
I leave this to another Commissioner to highly overview.
I can do it as well. Whatever is easiest for anyone.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Kennedy, if you can take
through this because this is the one that you worked
with. I started with you and Commissioner Akutagawa, and
then you two finished it. But I think this is the one
that does split on Stockton and then goes up. Thank you.

MS. WILSON: Yes. So as before mentioned, we just
took the area of Modesto. So this switch was, I think,
about 200,000 less people than the other version moving
things up. So we still have Turlock, Oakdale, Knights
Ferry, and the rest of Stanislaus going out towards the
ECA.

And we move into San Joaquin, and I'm going to move
into the Stockton line. So we have Discovery Bay and
Byron also going down. Mountain House, Tracy, Lathrop,
and Manteca. And then moving into Stockton, there is a
split at a natural resource, at a river that was here.
And I can turn on -- I believe, University of Pacific is
below, but give me one moment while I turn on that layer
so you can see that. So it goes right through where
this --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh. On the river.
MS. WILSON: Yes, on the river. It goes through Stockton on this river, so everything South of the river, including Country Club, August, Garden Acres, everything below, that is going in with Modesto. And we have Peters and Farmington as well going South. And then North of the river, we have the rest of the city, Linden and Waterloo, Lodi, the rest of the farming towns, as well as Terminous, Woodbridge, out to Dogtown.

And then moving North into Sacramento, we were able -- a difference here is that Vineyard, Elk Grove, Florin, Parkway, Lemon Hill, and Fruitridge Pocket are together in Sacramento. We did have a split here at what I believe was Meadowview. And one more moment to verify that. Oh no. It's at Florin Road. So we went up to Florin Road, down on Freeport Boulevard. We went and grabbed a little bit more blocks to the side for population purposes, one above, as you can see as well. So it has Meadowview, Parkway, Valley High, North Laguna in there as well as the Florin, Vineyard area.

And so that was a lot in one district, so I'll back out and kind of repeat that. So again, in Stockton we have Linden, Waterloo, and the river going through Stockton North with Elk Grove and Florin, Lemon Hill, Fruitridge Pocket split at Florin Road going South. And then moving into North SAC, we have somewhat similar as
to last time. It has Mather, Rosemont, La Riviera with West Sacramento, the rest of Sacramento. And then we do have a split through Carmichael, keeping the Punjabi COI together that was in Carmichael and Arden-Arcade plus a few more blocks for population, but keeping that COI whole here. We have North Highlands, Foothill Farms, McCollum Park, Elverta, Rio Linda as well in this North SAC iteration.

And then we have the PLACER SAC again, which has Rancho Cordova, parts of Carmichael that were not a part of that COI. Then we have Citrus Heights, Antelope, Fair Oaks, Gold River, Orangevale, and Folsom. We have Roseville, Granite Bay, Rocklin, Loomis, Lincoln, Penryn, Newcastle. Auburn does have a kind of noncontiguous piece that goes right above North Auburn. So coincidentally, it is split because of that, but it just includes Auburn, and North Auburn is going North in this as well.

And then we have very similar -- identical Northern boundaries as the last one because we just took from what was there before. So close to Plumas, parts of Yuba, Sierra Nevada, parts of Placer shared in North Auburn and then going out to the East. All of El Dorado again, Gold Country, and down to Inyo. And then we also have Oakdale, Knights Ferry -- to Knights Ferry, Valley Home,
and Turlock going out to ECA as well. And that is an overview of those changes, and to you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: All right. Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez and then Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. And I forgot to mention on the other option one, other communities of interest that are impacted by bringing all -- on the first option was bringing in all of Stanislaus. What we have now, the most current version, had San Joaquin almost whole, together. Also had Sacramento pretty much whole in three districts. So it broke up that -- those communities of interests as well.

So on this one, Kennedy, if you can zoom in. Obviously, a major community of interest that's being split is Stockton, splitting Stockton. And again, this is just bringing Modesto into -- the population was less than the first. And then as you continue to move up into Sacramento, you still have -- you are able to retain the Lemon Hill/Florin, but you do not have the Oak Park that is also tied with Lemon Hill.

In terms of how this is split out, I don't necessarily like the configuration of it, but it is what it is. And I think that's it because it's pretty similar to the other one in terms of once you get to the ECA East
CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.
Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. Can we zoom in to see where ECA spills over into Stanislaus County?

MS. WILSON: Yes, we may. One moment.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you. I just want to take a closer look at that.

MS. WILSON: So the split we tried to follow was -- this is the county line between Stanislaus and San Joaquin, so we pretty much just went down and then take -- to take in Modesto and Empire and River Bank. So we have Valley Home, Oakdale, East Oakdale, Knights Ferry, parts of Turlock, Donaire, Houston, Waterford, Hickman, and La Grange going into ECA. And of course, if we were to make the county line whole, shifting that population, this -- oh, I'm sorry -- this line in Stockton would start coming down a little bit more. If you reunited more population, then we would have to pull down the line a bit in Stockton. Just sorry.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you.
Commissioner Kennedy. Oh. I'm sorry.
Commissioner Ahmad, did you want to say anything about this?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Not yet. Thank you.
CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. And thank you for sharing this iteration as well. After looking at both and looking at the pluses and minuses of both -- of course, as we've recognized, neither one is perfect. I think that my preference is very much for the first one contingent upon looking at making some fixes. I think we were on to something in looking at shifting Rancho Murieta into the NORTHSAC district and trying to make Parkway whole. So I would prefer to go in that direction. I'm not ready to say yes to the first iteration as it is, but I just think that that's a better direction to head in. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Thank you. This is tough work, and I appreciate the attention and the diligence and just looking at all of these blocks and census blocks and COI testimony for the Commissioners, and Kennedy, just for your patience and your focus on this. Yeah.

So both iterations are problematic, and our initial draft, of course, we weren't pleased with, and so we wanted to kind of explore some other pieces. The first
for me, the four Congressional districts and the problems that ensue as a result of people being able to have a voice is problematic in splitting up all of the COIs that we have. And I don't see a clear path to not split them in the manner that's been presented.

This second one, again, problematic in particularly where the split is. And I was trying to see what could be taken out to move the line one way or the other. And again, for right at where it is at the river, right by UOP, and there's some housing things that exist. There's a bunch of waterway issues in Stockton, of course, throughout the canals and deltas and all.

And at this point, for me, I think my preference is back to our draft that was initially -- I said I wanted to explore to see if there was something different that can be done to bring in the communities, but it seems that now we're making a switch or swap again in COIs for Modesto and some of the other areas that will now also bring harm to different areas, which is often the case when you're trying to balance between the two. But as of right now for what's presented, it feels to me like the best issue of the iterations in the draft might be the draft that we started with.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Sinay.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: I want to second what Commissioner Turner said, and I also wanted to say thank you for kind of highlighting what COIs were being split. I think that was -- that's really helpful, and that was partially the reason I had asked yesterday when we were looking at Long Beach because we can't keep them all in our head, and it is helpful to do a quick overview. But I think I'm good with the maps that we have.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Thank you so much for all of the work that's been done here, but I'm still a little baffled. When we decided yesterday to have an exploration, it was to leave no stone unturned. And we had heard from communities that they're -- from the ECA folks during the fourteen-day period that they saw the connecting point to be Roseville. Now, in the first exploration map that was shared, the district comes right up to the border to Roseville and doesn't cross in.

And I'm just curious why it wasn't even explored as a possible option, right? And that's not to say that we have to adopt it, but communities are asking for it. And even in addition to that, I mean, we've had all sorts of testimony about Roseville being linked to the Tahoe region. The fact that they're already together in
districts. They have shared water. The Sierra College district spans throughout the region.

I understand that this has been sacred and we haven't touched it. We didn't touch it in the Assembly plan. I'm just on behalf of all of the communities that were calling in and suggesting it, I'm just trying to understand why we wouldn't even look at it as a possible option because that just seems like we're still leaving a stone left unturned in this process. And that just doesn't seem fair or right to me.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. We actually did try to look at that, and I'm going to let Kennedy respond to that because you actually have to go through certain communities to get there, and by the time you get to Roseville, you're overpopulated, if that makes sense. But I'll let Kennedy talk about that. Is she there?

MS. WILSON: Yes. And I mean, there's not much more to it than that. But I guess going that way, it's just -- there's a little bit too much population before Roseville unless, I guess, you kind of split through more of these cities. And also it kind of leaves, without direction, where to put these cities in Sacramento. It kind of leaves them without a home, without a population.
Yeah. These people here kind of rely on either one of these kind of to do that. So that's --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Can we take a look at the first iteration of it?

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: This is the second one, correct? This is the second exploration map that we're looking at --

MS. WILSON: This is --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- right now?

MS. WILSON: -- the Stockton one, yeah. Would you like to look at the Parkway one?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, please.

MS. WILSON: Sorry. One moment while I pull it up.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No problem, no problem.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh. We'll have a look at this, but we are up at a break here in just two minutes, also. We can --

MR. MANOFF: Chair, because we came back at 11:30, we can go to 1 o'clock before our next required break.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh. Thank you very much.

Continue.

MS. WILSON: Okay. So here is the -- sorry, the Parkway iteration. And I'll zoom over to where the border of ECA meets PLACER SAC.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And let me ask you this, though. Further to the North, we're going well above Nevada County. Is that correct?

MS. WILSON: Yes, we are going into Plumas.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Um-hum. And is it reasonable to stop at Nevada and include -- and come further into that area there to pick up the population rather than going to Plumas?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh.

MS. WILSON: We can explore that. I think also we -- as far as what we were touching, we were touching just the districts it was affecting.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I see.

MS. WILSON: So before Placer -- if I pull up the old districts, which I can right now --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. That would be helpful, yeah.

MS. WILSON: I'm going to turn these off. Sorry. That was hot. The previous Placer iteration went up to this Plumas area, so then taking from that starts to affect the NORCA one as well. So I'm not too sure of --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So it's combining those two districts? Is that what it is? And then pulling more of the population --

MS. WILSON: Yes.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- from -- where was it pulling from, Lincoln? No. I'm sorry.

MS. WILSON: Just let me pull it back up. So it was pulling from El Dorado. It kind of took a snake line through El Dorado, parts of Rocklin, Lincoln, Sheridan, Loomis and upwards just because we weren't touching the Northern -- the NORCA --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: NORCA district.

MS. WILSON: -- while as well trying to not -- try not --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: (Indiscernible).

MS. WILSON: Yeah. To vocalize and just snake through and not mess through the other districts that the Commission was okay with. Obviously, it could be explored. I'm not too sure, but this kind of also shows how the line kind of snakes through and it can't make it there. I mean, it probably could if we split different things --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

MS. WILSON: But yeah. So if that kind of shows that line starting to snake through and almost reach there, but it just doesn't reach.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it. And so that snaking part could take different iterations potentially.

MS. WILSON: Yes, potentially, if we probably
change --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: If we reroute the whole area.

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it. Thank you. That's really helpful to hear, and I see others have ideas.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani, for bringing this up. I was trying to figure out if there's another way we can solve for this, if it is something to be solved for. Earlier, I had brought up the dip from ECA into Stanislaus County where we're actually splitting Turlock. That was a significant community of interest that did call in quite a bit so that was of concern to me. This is on the other iteration that you showed.

So just trying to figure out which iteration we're going to move forward with, I would like to see how we can change some of the lines up North in the ECA area, potentially going into Sacramento to make some of the communities of interest whole lower into the Valley.

I know that this might ripple into some architectural changes, but that is, in my mind, what right now is for. We are in the drawing phase, so I'm all game for making changes if that means we can make our
maps more inclusive of different communities of interest.
Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'm sorry. I put myself on mute.
Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.
Commissioner Kennedy.
VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Yeah. I'm mostly with Commissioner Sadhwani on this. I'd be happy to explore shifting Plumas into the Northern district. That might also enable us to resolve some issues in Yuba County as well as Southern Placer. So I'd be happy to go on some further exploration of iteration of Parkway.
Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.
Commissioner Fernandez?
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. And in terms of my preference, obviously, I prefer the current draft that we have that I believe Commissioner Fornaciari worked on.
Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Since there's -- I appreciate that, and the -- do we have some consensus? I believe there's some ideas that -- oh, I'm sorry.
Commissioner Sadhwani.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I just wanted to say I really appreciate Commissioner Kennedy offering to do that exploration, and I would certainly support that.
Just lift up, when we came back from our fourteen-day public comment period, if y'all recall, I think it was the 29th of November, we had done a rapid fire round of one or two minutes for each Commissioner to name their top priorities. Eight of fourteen Commissioners raised this ECA district and the significant feedback that we had heard from the community. So to me, it feels like it's still worth some additional exploration before we finalize these maps. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I appreciate Commissioner Sadhwani having asked that question about going in a different direction, and I would support additional exploration because, to me, the Truckee, North Tahoe, South Tahoe -- having those counties all together, not just because of that, but just in a lot of what we've read from public testimony makes a lot of sense. And I thank you all for going on that explanation. I know I had said I like the original maps, but this kind of opened my eyes to a new direction. A new stone was turned, so I wanted to voice my support in that way.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I just wanted to
respond. In terms of my wanting to work on the ECA, that was for the Assembly because that's when we had Inyo going all the way to Siskiyou. And my other -- I think my other point just flew out of my mind right now. I'll just stop there.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair, and again, for everyone for working on this. And for us to explore further iterations, I think that's great. It takes the collective minds of all of the Commissioners. I want to say my biggest concern with the first iteration -- I forget what it was called -- the first iteration is the splitting of the communities of interest and all of the testimony that we've heard in the Sacramento, the urban areas, that whole split of the Lemon Hill/Fruitridge Pocket, all of that area, to me, is real problematic.

And so as we're moving forward in iterations, in addition to fixing the part further up North, I would want to ensure that there hopefully can be something that would not cause a split in those areas where we're able to keep the Lemon Hill, Fruitridge Pocket, Parkway, Florin, all of those areas together.

And then even if we're -- with West Sacramento into the area, and there's -- again, there's COI into those
that's working on -- if you look at testimony that's
still coming in that suggests what can come in and out of
that area to balance but splitting in that area and then
adding them in with some of the other -- Rancho Cordova,
some of the other areas, to me, kind of ignores some of
the testimony that we've gotten from the beginning.
Different iterations in response to what we're currently
doing, but the testimony of what is required for that
area has not necessarily changed. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. Thank you, Commissioner
Turner. I mean, so much of this comes down to the COIs,
right, and which to honor and which to not.
Psychologically, the struggle for me is you can't just
discount them, right? It's not like Modesto is just one
COI versus five others, so obviously, the five others are
more important. I mean, Modesto's a pretty big city, but
how does that count COI-wise, right, in our thinking and
psychology? And especially when there's such unhappiness
going both ways, the ECA and Modesto, such unhappiness.
So wanting to hope that there's another way. We've tried
so many things. But Commissioner Kennedy and whoever
else that wants to give it a try, sure would like to
explore.
CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you. I believe the consensus is, is let's --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh sorry.

Commissioner Turner? Yes.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Just one more thing. And I thank Commissioner Yee for saying that because I think that was kind of in the back of my mind. Modesto is an important COI and a big city, and I think the iterations we've looked at have had them either whole in ECA or whole in the San Joaquin County area. And they are two hundred and nineteen, I think, thousand people that I think will have a strong voice and opportunity to participate wherever they are, which, to me, makes it a little bit more problematic in keeping them whole as opposed to splitting some of these other smaller areas that rely on the strength of the testimony of each other working together. And so I'm trying to weigh that into the process as well and just wanted to lift that up.

Thank you. Chair, you're on mute.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. I see that there are concerns with the versions we have, but there's also a desire to try to pursue a possibility if there is one. So I would like, since we have volunteers to look
into that. One thing, I would like them to go ahead. We
don't have a great deal of time left, so it would have
been a rather quick exploration.

And with that in mind, I do believe that there
are -- I don't think you need to go up into the other --
you can still do that within what is ECA right now with
some rearrangement of -- after Folsom, is that -- the
next town up. That is also -- you don't really start
going -- that's another suburb. It's the first one in
El Dorado. I think a little investigation right in that.

Yeah. The El Dorado Hills. Those are certainly before
you start going up, that's still -- that's another area
to consider through the Sacramento area. And yes, but
I -- but the explorations have to seriously consider the
Lemon Hill, Florin, that combination.

So with that, I'd like to assign that task and move
on. Is that agreeable to the Commission? We have one
last -- okay. I'm getting thumbs up.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I just want to say
that there are more COIs than just the Lemon Hill, Oak
Park. So when Kennedy -- our mapper, Kennedy, is aware
of all the other COIs, too. So I just want to make sure
that those are taken into account as well and whichever
ones are broken up to please bring back. Thank you.
CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Kennedy?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: And we should go to break.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. We do have a few minutes.

And there's one item that -- the next on our list will be just a quick overview of the Central Valley, the VRAs, and just think Mr. Becker might give us a few minutes because he won't be able to be with us much longer. So if you just pan down to the Central Valley and the -- including also the San Benito, the VRA districts, please. Kennedy, could you move the map down, please? And we want to have a look at the -- that entire area.

Wonderful. Thank you very much.

And so, Mr. Becker, would you like to sort of give us a quick overview of -- and say anything that needs to be said about this entire area, please?

MR. BECKER: Sure. Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

So first of all, we did an initial analysis of racially polarized voting patterns throughout California, and that's reflected in, I think, what was called Appendix A, which was posted on our website, I believe, at the very end of October. And what that reflected was, for each of the three types of districts that we are drawing -- I'm excluding Board of Equalization here -- but for Senate Elections, Assembly Elections, and Congressional
Elections, with those elections alone, given the existing boundaries, did we see racially polarized voting. And that was very informative, because those are the most important elections, when you're drawing a Congressional District, looking at racially polarized voting in Congressional Districts is the most probative, the most relevant, but it's not all that's relevant, particularly if it's a gray area.

So in Appendix A, we have what we found with regard to Senate Districts, what we found with regard to Assembly Districts, and what we found with regard to Congressional Districts.

And throughout the Central Valley, from basically Bakersfield North up to, say, Merced County, we found fairly consistently racially polarized voting with regard to Latinos.

And in San Benito County, we found all three Gingles preconditions, racially polarized voting with regard to both Latinos and non-Latinos in the Senate Plan, but it wasn't entirely clear in the Congressional and Assembly Plan, given the districts that had been drawn before. These are very dependent upon the existing districts.

So what we did is, after we posted that, we ran some additional analysis on other types of elections, statewide elections, for instance, to see if we could
clarify whether or not we found racially polarized voting. And in our opinion, based on the data that we reviewed for all of the elections that we had for the past decade, it's fairly clear that not only is racially polarized voting in existence in the Central Valley, it also is in existence with regard to Latinos in San Benito County. So that's why we're advising the districts be drawn to protect Latino voting rights in those areas.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Becker.

I see, actually, Kennedy has a hand up. Kennedy, did you have a question?

MS. WILSON: It wasn't about this area, so you can come back to me.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, thank you.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Just for clarity, for the public, I just want to make sure that the recommendation from VRA Counsel is that a Section 2 VRA District be drawn in the Central Coast, encompassing San Benito and Monterey areas?

MR. BECKER: Yeah, specifically San Benito.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: San Benito, right?

MR. BECKER: Primarily, yes. Based on what we're finding, based on -- and again, our analysis is always dependent upon the existing districts because that's
where the elections are run, that's where candidates run.

But based on what we have looked at, we advise that Latinos throughout the Central Valley and in San Benito are protected under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. And therefore, the Commission should do its best -- and it's done a very nice job, I think, given the population concentrations, to draw districts in such a way as to protect their ability to elect candidates of their choice.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sorry, my internet's a little unstable here. While we're in this area, I did just want to also note, as we're talking about the VRA Districts, that we continue to receive public comments, in particular about the Kings-Tulare-Kern District. Some come in yesterday. I'm not sure if it's posted yet, though it has been sent to the Voters First Act, so I'm sure staff is going to get it up there soon.

Some specific areas were identified that may need to be removed in order to further improve CVAP in this area. So I just wanted to flag it and see if there's general consensus to have Kennedy look a little bit more closely. I know Commissioner Turner looked at it already, but I think, from a community perspective, there continues to
be concern that this district may or may not perform.

So I just wanted to read out what it suggests. It says: remove East Tulare, North Hanford, and Lemoore. I know that those are also part of some key communities of interest testimony for other communities. Also, only North Visalia, what's known as El Barrio, should be in the VRA District.

In Fresno, there's a potential to make a stronger VRA District, again, by removing Old Fig and Sunnyside. I know we've gone back and forth on this issue. So I just wanted to raise that and see if there's interest from the Commission to continue to look at this more closely.

MS. WILSON: And if I may, I did -- and of course, Counsel can look at this. And it's really just, obviously, the Commission, but I looked at changing those lines and Kings-Tulare, it does raise it, and like you said -- well, for what we have now, it would just lead to, again, I guess like you said, bringing out Sunnyside, bringing out Old Fig, which are things we tried before and have heard push back against from the Commission.

And then making this line a little bit wider out, and then it would lower this one as well. This one, right now, is at fifty. It could probably get to about fifty-three, which is what it's at now. And so --
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: The Fresno-Tulare could be at fifty-three, you said?

MS. WILSON: I think if we moved this line -- I haven't tried that far but --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

MS. WILSON: -- moving this would take more Fresno and take out Old Fig and take out more Sunnyside.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, it might be worth thinking more about.

MS. WILSON: Hearing that as well, I've looked at similar maps from different organizations that also have the same STANISFRESNO, but then their map takes this similar ECA which also plays into that as well with a Modesto and Turlock going out to ECA. So could potentially change that as well.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you for that, Kennedy. I know we're also up against break, so we don't have to have a full conversation, necessarily, now. But I did want to raise it. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani. Yes, we are just up on break.

Commissioner Toledo and Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'll be brief. But if there is a way to increase the CVAPs in the Central Valley, then we shouldn't leave a stone unturned. And I know we
probably have turned many of the stones, but obviously,
Section 2 is above communities of interest. So if we are
able to -- at some point, I think, if we're -- that's
all. If we're able to increase the CVAP with the
additional testimony we're getting from community groups,
then we should take a look at it and see if it's
possible. Thank you.

MS. WILSON: And again, it is, definitely, but you
would lower STANISFRESNO too, which I guess has been this
time trying to keep that one at where it is as well. So
that is another thing, is that STANISFRESNO will lower.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So maybe this is a scenario
where we need to discuss with legal counsel. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I was going to just suggest --
thank you, Kennedy. And again, we are appreciative for
all of the input that we're receiving. My particular
concern about Kings-Tulare-Kern down at the bottom -- if
you would, Kennedy, just prepare the snapshots or go back
to the previous iterations where we have tried it to show
where, yes, we can increase those, and then show where it
lowers, because then the Commission will need to decide
should we be in alignment or go with where the higher
CVAPs are, all the way down that block, because that will
increase CVAP for that one area.

And are we and is our attorneys okay with lowering it in other places. But I think so that it's clear, so that we're seeing more than just saying, this will lower, this will increase, be able to say, here's snapshot 1, Lemoore all out and into this district, this is what it does for the three or four different areas. With it back in, this is what it does for the different areas. And then likewise for STANISFRESNO and if we do or don't pull and in and out Old Fig Garden, because we do go back and forth on that.

And it's not that we're confused; we're trying to be responsive to what -- you do one thing and you get tons more testimony that comes in. And so we're trying to ensure that we are looking at all of it. But if we can show it on the screen with the snapshots there, we'll know why we've made our final choice, and then settle on it and be able to move forward. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

I guess, yeah, I think what Commissioner Turner said, especially about understanding the tradeoffs.

I am curious, Commissioner Sadhwani, you mentioned you just got some additional public input about ways in
which we could raise that Latino CVAP. Was there any
recommendations in terms of adjusting what the ripple
effect is going to be to the STANISFRESNO? We tried
really hard to at least get those up. I have seen the
other testimony, but still, it is raising concerns that
the CVAPs are not high enough. So I understand the
desire to ensure, if we're going to do this, we obviously
want to make it so that it's going to be effective.

With that said, I guess in terms of the -- I guess
it's the Old Fig Garden and that area. I know that there
were other COIs that we've had to split. I'm just
wondering if doing this move might also help unite -- or
maybe not unite but -- yeah, I guess, unite some
additional COIs so that we can create more of a place
where there will be additional communities of color that
could hopefully work in unison and in unity to advocate
for themselves together in a slightly larger block. But
I guess, that, we won't know until we see the options.

Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Quickly, Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, just to respond to
that, I'm largely responding to the testimony that we're
receiving, since we don't have those data points on how
these different regions actually perform. It seems that
the greatest concern is actually this Kings-Tulare-Kern District. Perhaps the voting patterns are different there than elsewhere. But again, that might be something for Counsel or Dr. Gall (ph.) to take a closer look at.

I think the concern -- they don't address the ripple, per se, in particular, the person writing in is uplifting the MALDEF Plan and specifically cites concern for this Bakersfield region and then making changes to boost there. So it seems the concern is really in that area and ensuring that there -- might need a higher CVAP in order to elect. Whether or not other COIs make it into such a district really comes down to questions of whether -- voting patterns, right, and how and to what extent communities actually vote together.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much.

So with that, yes, we will -- if you could have a look at that, please. Now, is that Kennedy by herself or someone helping?

Oh, sorry, Commissioner Toledo.

But Kennedy, did you have a quick there?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm happy to help Commissioner Kennedy and Commissioner Turner as they -- to leave no stone unturned and to see if there's any way to do our due diligence. We have to, for the people of -- to ensure fair maps in the Central Valley. If we are able
to bring -- we'll bring whatever we come up with back. Keep your fingers cross that we'll be able to find a gold nugget underneath some of these stones. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Commissioner Toledo, did you mean mapper Kennedy or Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Mapper Kennedy. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: That's exactly what I was going to say. I think Commissioner Kennedy's going to be looking at the Sacramento area for us, so let's not double dip for him. Well, thank you very much.

And on that, let's take our break. And then we will come back, let's say at --

MR. MANOFF: 1:10, Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: 1:10, would that be okay? Okay. 1:10, please. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Welcome back to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission Meeting. We just did a quick little overview of the Voter Rights Acts area in the Central Valley, San Benito.

Now, we've assigned some tasks to our line drawers. And while the line drawers in the Central area and the North are working on things, we will now come to Los Angeles County. So at this point, I'm going to list off the areas that I believe we wanted to look at and check,
and then let's have a look at what areas we want to -- is there other areas that I'm not listing. Let's go ahead and create a little list if there's other areas.

I'd actually like a volunteer to take notes on that in case there's items we should take care of. Do I have any -- I see Commissioner Fornaciari. Okay. I couldn't see other hands, and someone else really wanted to -- nope.

I think it's yours, Commissioner Fornaciari. Thank you very much.

Okay. So the areas that I believe we need to have a look at were areas assigned to Jaime.

Jaime, do you just want to -- those are: the Cal State-Pomona area, the Angeles Forest area, that Eagle Rock, Glassell Park, and also -- there was one more. I think there's one more.

Jaime, is there one more area?

MS. CLARK: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen. So right now, you're listing areas that made some changes to live yesterday. I will zoom into those changes because I did balance the districts last night.

The first -- where am I here? Okay. We did make the Cal State-Pomona whole in the Pomona-based District. Balanced population here. I did try and use the freeways as guides. There just wasn't enough population just
along the freeways, so just balanced population between Pomona and Diamond Bar.

Additionally, we included this area of Angeles National Forest into GLEN2BA. There is some population here, so again, just balanced population between the SFV and GLEN2BA Districts.

And just so Commission and the public knows, the shape file and equivalency file for this plan has been provided to staff. Not sure if it's up and posted quite yet, but it has been sent up. So if anybody would like to take a closer look, this is available.

Additionally, yesterday, this was a zero-population change, but we included areas of Angeles National Forest into the CDCOV District.

And finally, yesterday, this was also a change that was done in live line drawing. We added areas North of Hollywood Boulevard into CDNELA. This was on request of the Thai Town COI which is down here, to include both sides of Hollywood Boulevard.

And then I received direction to balance between CDNELA and GLEN2BA. And this was -- where is it? This area -- here we go. I think it was this area -- was just changed a little bit per Commission direction. And then additionally, just balancing.

The overall direction was to move population, then
in Eagle Rock -- not move population but adjust the lines in Eagle Rock and Glassell Park areas to balance population, and I did that. Again, all of the districts in LA County are plus or minus one person.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much.

Were there any -- thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thanks so much, Jaime. This is incredible work. I'm actually wondering if you could go back to the NELA District. I'm wondering if -- I know the direction you got was mixed, but now, seeing the final product, I'm wondering if we could potentially move more of Eagle Rock into CDNELA by going further into Mount Washington just to the South. That would be my preference for final numbers.

I'm not sure if -- we've had, earlier, quite a bit of testimony about Eagle Rock wanting to be in CDNELA. We're definitely not going to be able to get all of Eagle Rock in there. But if we can, and hopefully, if that's a change that doesn't impact the other communities of interest, that's what I would like to see in a final version.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay, thank you.

Other input on this area?

Commissioner Vazquez, do you want to work on that right now or do you want to leave that to Jaime to just
clean up?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I'm happy to let just Jaime just clean it up. Like I said, that would be my preference. I think moving all of -- keeping Mount Washington whole, move all of Mount Washington first, I would say, and then take additional population from Eagle Rock to balance it out. That would be my strategy.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Jaime.

MS. CLARK: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez, for that direction. And because Mount Washington isn't part of this neighborhood council layer, I'm wondering if you could perhaps provide street-level boundaries so I can be sure to follow it as you anticipate.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sure. I would say that if you follow this purple line down to the 100 Freeway, that would be the Southern -- those are the Southern boundaries. You can see, the purple line goes up from the 110. The Northern purple line above the 100 is probably that Southern boundary. And then the Western boundary is that purple line going up, I would say, where it says Elyria Drive. I think that might be a park. Roseview Avenue, Altamont -- yeah, that line, I would say is the Western boundary of Mount Washington.

MS. CLARK: So what's labeled on the map as Arroyo Seco, basically.
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, basically.

MS. CLARK: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: But not on the Southern side of the 110. So don't cross the freeway.

MS. CLARK: Got it.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Mount Washington is basically Arroyo Seco plus some change on the Southeast side of the 110. Don't cross the 110.

MS. CLARK: So could I just circle with the --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sure.

MS. CLARK: -- mouse, and you let me know if it's what we're talking about, if it's the same thing?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Yes.

MS. CLARK: Okay, I understand. Thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari, that's a little item to add to the list, please. We can remember to come back to it.

And then, Jaime, were there any other areas -- we did this area. I believe there might be more detail about the forest area. It was coming in as another public input. I don't know if anyone has that, anyone on the staff or -- Commissioner Kennedy might have that but I'm not sure he's available right now.

Can we add that also, Commissioner Fornaciari, to
your list, please? In case there's some -- there might be some additional direction, very specific direction, on the Angeles Forest. I don't think we have that at this time though.

And the Thai Town, I believe that there were no questions on that one.

So Jaime, do you have any other iterations in this area that I have not mentioned? Not at this time, great.

MS. CLARK: No, I don't.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

And do any of the Commissioners have other areas of this that they would like to explore in the Los Angeles area? Just naming those areas first, and then we will decide which ones we would actually work on, what priorities.

I believe we've heard -- Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry. Just a question, actually. What we're seeing overall, this map of LA County, I got lost in the conversation yesterday, so I'm just wondering where we landed in terms of -- I know Commissioners Sadhwani and Toledo put forward an option. I would just like to know where we landed and where we are right now with this map.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, I will give you my understanding. Although it was discussed and reviewed,
the general consensus was we prefer how the map is now to
making any of those changes. That's my understanding.

Now, if other people -- the map that we're looking at now
is, I believe, the general consensus. I'm seeing some
nods, so yes.

Now, if we want to go over it and have a look at the
entire area, certainly, just please ask for that.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Got it, thank you. And this
view of the map is helpful to confirm that, so thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Any other areas that we really want to address at
this time?

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I'm sorry I don't have this
worked out, but there was some COI input about the
neighborhoods North of LAX and wanting a different
boundary there. I'm wondering, Jaime, if this boundary
has good reasons behind it, then we don't really need to
look at it again, or whether this boundary could be moved
for better reasons.

MS. CLARK: Thank you for that question. Here, this
is a similar boundary as is in the draft, I believe, and
previous visualizations of these districts. Should the
Commission wish, this certainly could be changed.

And I think that would perhaps include adding --
just considering other COI input, for example, that the Commission has received, maybe adding Palms in. Just looking at where then this 10CORR District could take in population and still maintain the overall structure of things, I would maybe suggest looking at Palms. Basically, moving between these two would be the least number of districts impacted, and there could be other options if -- oh wait, I'm sorry. This is in South LA.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Sure. So at this point, no?

MS. CLARK: Maybe even this line could make Del Aire and Hawthorne whole. Again, I don't have a precise answer right now.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. It looks like a population balancing line right now, so I'm just -- if there isn't an excellent reason for it to be there the way it is now, then maybe I can take a look at that.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Certainly. Okay.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I forgot was I was going to say. I guess what I would ask Commissioner Yee was, what were you having in mind there? I'm just curious.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. I'll have to look back at the COI testimony. There are some neighborhoods there that, apparently, we're splitting. So there may be actually a zero population -- a net-zero split that would
preserve those neighborhoods better, or maybe one of the possibilities that Jaime mentioned. But just that that split is splitting some neighborhoods that would like to be together -- like to be whole.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. So my question to Jaime, have you had a chance to merge your maps with the other mappers? So can we go to Northern LA and Northern San Bernadino then and see what things look like up there, please?

MS. CLARK: Yeah, so we merged our maps just in anticipation of potential changes. I know in Northern California, there's some negative twos hanging out in here. In the Ventura County District, there's a five-person population. But in this map, throughout the state -- and again, these files have been sent to staff -- I don't think that there's any districts that are more than eight people, certainly not more than ten people out of deviation.

So this is what it looks like right now. I'll zoom in. I'm just going to review the MORCOA District because that's where the change has been. So in LA County, this Eastern part, the very Northeastern LA County, it is East of Antelope Valley. In MORCOA, we have whole Victor Valley, some of these areas up against the RIASB District, and here's the county line.
This Needles area, of course, is not included in this district. So this is East of -- or West of Needles. Up to the state border, the border with Inyo County, this is the border between San Bernadino County and Kern County. And then this here is the California City area.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So this is the same as we saw before? You talked through this split, and this was the option to move 17,000 folks down to come through the FRESNO_KERN into here. Okay. I just wanted to see where we were at up here now that all the maps are merged. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Just a question. I guess what I was going to talk about is a different area from where we are right now. So just a question. Should I ask now or should we just wait until we finish this conversation?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Do the other Commissioners also want to talk about this area? Okay, no.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I was also going to speak to a different area.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, you were.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: But I'll defer to whoever
wants to talk about this area.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Does anyone -- any other hands about this area? No, okay. Thank you very much then.

It was Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I just wanted to come back down to that -- I guess it's the LBNORTH. I know that this has continued to vex us, I believe. I know that we've gotten some more input. I guess I'm just trying to get an understanding. Are we at a place where we're just agreeing to live with it, or are we going to try to see if there's additional solutions? While the majority of the Gateway cities are in the district, there also with very different cities. But I can live with it if I have to. Not really super great, but I can live with it. But I just wanted to ask that question.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

To the Commissioners in line, if you have something to say about this particular area. Otherwise, I'll see if there are others first.

Commissioner Sinay, do you have comments on this one? No.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes. My comment's in a similar vein as Commissioner Akutagawa. The VRA considerations are in the North in this District, LBNORTH
and not so much in the Long Beach area or the Southern parts of the Long Beach area. I would be comfortable with moving in this direction if we can shift the LCVAP up a little bit more. I think it would be -- it's on the lower end, if we're going to leave it like this.

If there was any way to increase it; otherwise, architecturally, I think it would be -- if we're going to stay with this architecture, I think it would difficult to -- if we're going to stay with this architecture, I think if there was a way to do a swap to see if we can increase the CVAP a little bit more and address some of the communities of interest, communities that Commissioner Akutagawa is raising.

Otherwise, the only other option would be to pair Long Beach South, right? And we looked at that. I don't think the Commission -- my sense was the Commission didn't have the stomach for pairing a portion of Long Beach with Seal Beach and portions of the OC. So if that's not an option, I think raising the Latino CVAP in this area might be, if we do some minor swaps and maybe potentially move in that area, without having to break up Long Beach.

Jaime.

MS. CLARK: Thank you. Just a quick follow-up in terms of raising the Latino CVAP in LBNORTH. I think
there are some solutions. For example, it could be to split Montebello and maybe move more of Downey into STH60 or something like that. I think, essentially, at this point, it would be looking at city splits. Just wondering if that's something that you would like me to explore.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Given that there is a VRA -- this is a VRA District. We made it into a VRA District by putting a protected class into this district. I'd want to raise the CVAP if it's possible, given that it's on the lower end and could potentially impact Latino's opportunity to elect candidates of their choice. And of course, I'd never want to split a community if we didn't have to. But VRA does come first.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo. Commissioner Fornaciari, did you have a comment in this area? No, okay.

Commissioner Sinay, you're waiting for the next issue.

Commissioner Akutagawa, do you have one on this one?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I was just curious. Jaime, you mentioned possibly having to split Montebello to bring the Latino CVAP up. Just to understand then, to make up the population there, which way do you think you would go to bring in additional
population into STH60?

MS. CLARK: As there's already a split in Downey, I would think that would maybe be a natural place to do a trade for population, potentially.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: May I suggest that maybe Commissioner Akutagawa, since she has interest in this area, and I work with Jaime on potentially working on some solutions to LBNORTH and Gateway cities?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, I --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And it would be minor refinements at this point, given that the only other option would be to go through OC. And I don't think that was something that the Commission was interested in, or at least that was my sense yesterday. I don't know what it is today.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, I think we have -- Commissioner Fornaciari, you do have a comment about this one?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. How about we just take a look at it right now?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think that's a good idea too.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Particularly for smaller areas, yes. I know the scenario that people have been concerned about.

Before we jump into that though, could I get --
Commissioner Sinay, you had another area you wanted to discuss. That way, we can get it on our list before we forget it.

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: Two things. One is, I remember the public input we got from the community that didn't want to be split near Marina del Rey from Commissioner Yee. I don't remember exactly where it is, so that's why I'm just throwing out Marina del Rey. But there's a lot of other COIs that were in that area, and that was how we created that district, was based on the other COIs in the Inglewood area. So I just wanted us to remember, as we're exploring that, to be careful about the other COIs, because we worked really hard to get that one together.

    And then the other one I wanted to discuss later is the San Fernando Valley, the Latino majority district that we created. We've been getting a lot of input -- well, come input from Sylmar. And I just wanted to understand some of our thinking around this. I know I was there, and I feel good about it, but I just wanted to just explore what the community is asking us.

    CHAIR ANDERSEN: All right.

    Commissioner Fornaciari, could you make sure that gets on our list, please? Sylmar.

    And as far as the area around LAX, in having a quick look at that with Commissioner Yee, we see those
communities of interest. So if Jaime already knows
those, they can take that into consideration.

And then, let's jump into working on LBNORTH, or
playing around with that, please.

I'm sorry, Commissioner Akutagawa, this is about the
LBNORTH, correct?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, it is.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. One minute, please.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: LBNORTH.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. All right. Wonderful.

Jaime, I'm sure you have a snapshot of exactly where
we are right now. So let's do some exploration.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Two things. One is I know
that members of the Commission said that they don't
want -- they're not open to reopening, I think -- well,
I'm going to just say this. I am open -- and I think
we've gotten some testimony, again, about Orange County.
I'm open to also revisiting San Diego as well too,
because I think that that's part of the key to
potentially unlocking something that could make something
work.

Alternately, Jaime, I also wanted to ask for your
thoughts on this. Perhaps instead of Downey, what do you
think about bringing in -- or instead of Montebello, what
do you think about bringing in a part of East LA? The
part that hugs that 5 Freeway area, so taking a small
portion of it. Would that be enough to lift the CVAP?

MS. CLARK: And then trade for what?
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Maybe Vernon, a portion of
Vernon.

MS. CLARK: So Vernon, I think, has 200 people
total. So then it would be looking at moving out maybe
this Northern part of Bell, which is also very low
population; Maywood, which is also very high Latino CVAP
area; or part of Huntington Park.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Jaime, do you have any
suggestions to raise the CVAP in this area, because
you've been looking at this very carefully? I think you
had some.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, I suggested maybe looking at
Montebello, and then as there's already a split in Downey
for population, trying to trade that out. What we did
previously -- just a reminder -- earlier this week, I
don't know exactly when, the Latino CVAP in LBNORTH was
50.83 percent. And now, it's 51.19 percent. That was
accomplished by moving Commerce into LBNORTH in exchange
for a different split in Downey. So that's how the
Commission has already increased the Latino CVAP in
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So I'd be open to the Montebello split with Downey. Exploring the possibility and seeing what happens, since we're doing it in live line drawing. We should try --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Could I ask --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- testing some things.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Could I ask that -- it would certainly help me understand this area. Are there other areas, like you were saying, East Los Angeles, I guess that are not within -- other areas around here that we were trying to incorporate into these areas that we want to be trying to trade? I don't quite understand the whole -- all the communities in this area we'd like to incorporate and others that are not -- they're in a part of a district but they aren't actually part of the areas that would require being protected, I guess is the best way to say that. Just a little bit more explanation. I know Commissioner Akutagawa, and actually, Vazquez and Turner, are all a little more familiar with this area than I am. So if I could just get an overview here as we are getting into the specifics.

Who would like to go? We have Turner, Vazquez, and Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Chair, I just wanted to ask --
I do know that we received maps from Equality California that has also submitted shape files for this area that potentially addresses what we're attempting to do. And I just wondered, at some point, can we see that overlay, if indeed our mappers have it, so that we can either make adjustments or decide that we can't go in that direction? That might help also with the conversation.

MS. CLARK: Could I please respond, Chair Andersen?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Please.

MS. CLARK: The shape files that I have from Equality California mostly look at the Orange County region. So I can turn those on really quick, and I'm going to turn the districts off. So you can see, it includes areas in Long Beach and Lakewood. So that's a pretty big change from what -- I'll turn districts back on. So that's a pretty big change of taking a significant number of people out of this district. And I will look through and see -- I think that also they sent a screenshot. And I can try and pull that up, if the Commission wishes.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Jaime, question for you. One that one of the -- some of the feedback we got earlier that what was shown a couple of days was an earlier version of something that was sent. Did you get an updated shape file or is this still the same one?
MS. CLARK: This is -- previously, I didn't have a
shape file of districts that they were suggesting. This
is an updated shape file. I think I have an updated
screenshot too.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Jaime, just a quick question
on the Equality California map. Were they able to
maintain all of the Latino majority seats in their maps?
I just can't tell based on the shape files at this point.

MS. CLARK: Again, they don't have -- this doesn't
include areas in Los Angeles. I will make this larger --
I'm sorry, their boundaries larger, so hopefully it's a
little easier to see. Let me change the color. Maybe
that will also make it easier to see. I'm going to
change it to this dark blue color. Just based on this, I
don't believe so. But I can look at their screenshot
that they sent, which has more LA County in it, and try
and assess.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Okay.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Jaime.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I guess I'm lost, sorry.
Maybe I'm being slow today. So there's, I think, two
considerations that we're holding in mind right now. And
someone correct me if I'm wrong.

One is, folks are looking at the Latino CVAP in
LBNORTH and wanting to get that higher if possible. And then there's another consideration brought up by Commissioner Akutagawa to include more of the Southeast cities together. I'm not sure -- I may have made that one up or misinterpreted that one. So first, can I clarify what our goals are?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think your first goal was correct --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Right.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- the raising of the LCVAP. And then I believe it's the Gateway cities -- for a more rational alignment with Gateway cities for Commissioner Akutagawa, but she can certainly --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Got it. Okay.

Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: That was actually my point exactly. Are we just balancing between these two districts --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Right.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- or are we trying to incorporate a few more cities into this area?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Right. Okay.

I'll just state, for me, the Latino CVAP in LBNORTH by itself is, I would say, on the lower end. But for me, especially given, I think -- and Mr. Becker or Dale can correct me if I'm wrong -- but I think especially with
the Black and even with the Asian populations there that
district, for me, seems like it would still perform.
And I'm not sure, absent maybe major changes, if we could
get that Latino CVAP up much higher.

And I'd also -- I'm interested to see, Commissioner
Akutagawa, if you have a proposal for which Gateway
cities to swap to include more of them in there. But for
right now -- I don't know -- I think the map, as is, is
pretty good considering where we've been and where we are
now.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Akutagawa, please.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Originally, I was thinking
about maybe trying to bring in the portion of South Gate
that's up at the top, and I think that that's bisected
there. Yeah, I think that's actually the 5 Freeway or
the 105. I think that's the 5. Is that the 5 or the 91?
Okay. But just that portion up above. However, I
realize that if we did that, it would probably throw off
the CVAP for the 710.

Commissioner Vazquez, I would ask you to weigh in on
this part. Are you opposed to perhaps bringing in a
portion of maybe East LA or even a portion of Boyle
Heights that's South of the 5, because that's probably
around the portion that does blend in a little bit too?
Vernon, I'm thinking about that's where Soto, Boyle Heights, I think where the 5 is -- because I drive it. I'm just thinking that if we were to bring in either that portion or a small portion of East LA and then swap out and move a portion of Montebello into the CDNELA District to make up for population to bring up the CVAP.

The density there may bring it up a tick or two, Commissioner Toledo. It's not going to be a large increase, but I'm thinking it could be one to two -- maybe one percent, maybe, especially if you look at that East LA area and then swap in some of Montebello from the STH60, and then you move part of that either Downey or Commerce until the STH60.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Maybe we can attempt a couple swaps while we're here and see if there's any changes. I think the ones that Jaime and Commissioner Akutagawa raised are possibilities. And if we can't achieve it, we can't. But I would also like to hear from legal counsel to see if there's cross-voting between different minority groups in this area.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah -- oh, go ahead.

MR. LARSON: We did see some crossover voting in this area. I think the way that Commissioner Vazquez characterized it a few minutes ago is accurate. As you all know, there's no magic number here. So we're looking
at a range. And this is, admittedly, in the lower end of the range, but we do think it's within an acceptable range right now. If you're uncomfortable with it being in the lower end, then an effort to bump it up slightly would certainly be fine to do.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Quick question for Mr. Larson. Did we see cross-voting with both with Asian and Latino community, or rather Asian and African-American, or was it -- just in terms of the different communities, did we have crossover voting from the Asian-American community specifically?

MR. LARSON: I'd need to go back and check my notes. I can say, with the African-American community, we did. But let me check on the Asian, and I'll have to get back to you.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Appreciate that. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: So I say, let's try a few things in this area, because we're trying to increase -- well, two things actually. Increase the Latino CVAP and also get communities of interest together a little and in a slightly better order, is my understanding.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, if I could respond to Commissioner Akutagawa. I would be pretty opposed to splitting off portions of East LA and/or Boyle Heights
from CDNELA, especially for the purposes of raising the Latino CVAP, which again -- you heard Dale's analysis, which I agree with.

What actually makes me bite my nails a little bit more is the Latino CVAP in the Santa Ana District. So for me, if we're going to spend time in this region trying to get half a percent or a percent, that would be my preference to spend our time. So yeah.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Just under, again, our running thought of no stone unturned, and to be able to answer the question that I did not have, actually Equality California sent in publicly for all of us to say that their map does allow for the same number of Latino VRA Districts. And what they're believing is that, by moving Long Beach in with the Coastal Orange County, that the Gateway cities become a stronger Latino VRA District. Now, of course, I've not done it, but if it's stronger, it's stronger. And if we're saying we're looking for stronger, it just is another option and opportunity to explore.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Turner. My one question on that is, if Long Beach joins Orange County, what do they have that leaves Orange County? I
guess we'd have to look at the map.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: It's on the map.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Wonderful.

I'm sorry, Commissioner Toledo, are you also wanting

to say an additional thing here?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I was just going to concur --

I was just going to say the thing that Commissioner

Turner said about Equality California that they had

raised, that they are able to -- their maps are able to

achieve some of the goals that we had wanted, including

uniting some of the LGBT COIs and raising the Latino CVAP

in the North.

Although it does involve reconstruction of the OC,

and potentially, even more. So I know that's something

that we have shied away from and that I am -- I think

Jaime has a comment about that too.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Sorry, before I get to Commissioner

Fornaciari, Jaime do you have a hand up?

MS. CLARK: Sorry, I was just checking something. I

was going to note that additionally, and I'm not sure

exactly how this lines up with Equality California's

maps, but I do have MALDEF's Plan loaded into here. I'm

not suggesting that the Commission adopt MALDEF's Plan at

all, but that might be a useful tool for the Commission

to understand if you're moving part of Long Beach into
Orange County, the impacts on the current configuration in LA.

Yes, moving part of Orange County -- excuse me, moving part of Long Beach into Orange County would be a redraw or would shake things up a little bit in Orange County, but it also would in LA. And what I've seen, I don't have the exact number for how many people Equality California moves into Orange County. MALDEF moves about 100,000 people from Long Beach into Orange County. And there are impacts to areas that the Commission has ironed out already.

And I think that it does also accomplish things that -- I think that moving the population out gives room to accomplish some of the things that the Commission has been looking at, but it also changes things that the Commission likes right now in LA County. So that's just a note about that, is that yes it gives room for some options, potentially, in Orange County, and it also -- yeah, and just moving any population out of LA right now is also inherently going to change with is possible in LA County.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Right. Thank you, Jaime.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, just from hearing what was being said, it sounds like it is a lot like the
option that we looked at yesterday from
Commissioners Toledo and Sadhwani. So do you have that
one, Jaime, so we can --

MS. CLARK: I started a new plan. I can change
plans to look at that --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

MS. CLARK: -- what Commissioners Toledo and
Sadhwani suggested. And a difference is that -- so what
we did yesterday moved population from Long Beach into
Orange County but also did an equal trade of parts of
Orange County going into LA, whereas the proposal from
Equality California and also proposals from MALDEF, for
example, move population out of Orange County -- excuse
me, out of Long Beach that would need to be rippled
around back into LA County.

So it pulls population South, if that makes sense,
that then ripples through Riverside and San Bernadino
County. So there are -- whereas what we worked on
yesterday with Commissioners Toledo and Sadhwani don't
have impact on further North in LA County, but the
proposal from the groups that we're discussing right now
do have impact.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Right, because their
outlying districts are different that our outlying
districts. So we're talking about, I guess, Jaime,
running 100,000 people through our little -- up through Riverside County. Okay. I just wanted to better understand that. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Jaime, on that very same thought, is it rippled into San Bernadino County? Does it affect that as well? Or is it just within -- essentially, rather just doing it in the Long Beach North and the STH60, if we just incorporated the two other areas around it, would that contain them? How big are we talking here in terms of areas that are affected? I know it's pretty hard to say.

MS. CLARK: I haven't seen a statewide plan from Equality California, so I can't say. MALDEF's Plan, which we looked at yesterday, does have significant changes to Orange County, Riverside County, San Diego County, and also San Bernadino and LA County -- or it has 100,000-person difference, I should say, in those counties.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. And I know that was reviewed yesterday and said, no, thank you very much. And the Equality California, we only have that section of Long Beach and then the section of Orange County? We can't actually see the rest of those; is that correct?

MS. CLARK: That's all that I have loaded into my map, and I think that's all that --
CHAIR ANDERSEN: That's all that we have.

MS. CLARK: That is all that I have right now, yeah.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. All right. I just wanted to understand the extent of things that Commissioner Fornaciari -- okay, thank you.

Commissioner Sinay -- and oh, I'm sorry. We also have Dale. Do you want to switch there?

Mr. Larson, do you want to jump in here?

MR. LARSON: I was simply going to follow up on Commissioner Toledo's question from earlier, if you want me to do that now or hold off.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh.

MR. LARSON: It was the -- the question specifically was about the LBNORTH and SB10 area where we have some VRA obligations. We see some evidence of crossover voting with Black voters and Latino voters. We did not see the same crossover with Asian voters and Latino voters there.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just a few things. I know that Commissioner Sadhwani has done research in this area, and she had informed us that in her research there has been crossover. And we can ask her when she returns.

I did want to say that MALDEF did submit a new plan,
because they didn't like our -- because we didn't like what they did to Camp Pendleton. I haven't really looked at it. The quick piece I looked at; it still didn't address some of the challenges that I see in San Diego.

But I want to remind us that we have over 28,000 community engagements, and those are from all walks of life, all different types of Californians. And a lot of the groups who have created plans, they have spoken with each other, but at the end of the day, their advocacy is usually -- the strength of their advocacy is measured by the community that they originally came together to advocate for.

When we talk about some of these plans from yesterday, they weakened other communities. And that was the same thing we were seeing in the Central Valley. We need to keep reminding ourselves that when we're going into Orange County, there's a strong Asian -- different Asian communities in there. We have spent a lot of time making sure we keep them together. There's Asian communities throughout Los Angeles that we have spent time. Same with Latinos. Same with business communities. And all of those, we need to be careful.

The other piece I wanted to remind us is that there was a time when the VRA -- in the VRA Districts, our Latino CVAP was way too high and we weren't comfortable
because the CVAP was so high. And we asked to explore how to lower it. And now, we're saying, okay, now it's too low, let's make it higher.

This LBNORTH -- I just want us to keep everything in mind of the whole process, versus getting stuck on where we are today. We need to remember that we've been on a journey and that we've learned things along the way and we've made some tough decisions along the way. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay. Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay for what you just said. I was just going to state that I did not like yesterday's proposed option because the groupings are not any much -- the groupings made less sense than the current groupings right now. And as she had said, I think my other concern was just the splitting and the weakening of some of the communities in Orange County.

But also, I guess, like we've tried to do in other places, I think there's ways in which we can find other solutions. But I'm also conscious that we're going to run out of time. So I do appreciate this. And if we could maybe start trying to see what these other suggested changes could be, just so that we can see
whether or not it makes sense, I'd like to see us move forward on that.

Lastly, we did also get some additional testimony last night from communities in and around Signal Hill, that Cambodia Town community that did ask to be put more with the Greater Long Beach community in LBNORTH, less so in the SP710. But I think we first need to work on the Latino CVAP here. But I just wanted to acknowledge that they were heard. Thank you.

And also, Equality California, I just want to thank for -- thank you them for trying to make it work. Just like MALDEF were trying to make it work. All the people who have called were trying to make it all work. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Now, Jaime, let's go with you, because I just want to say, we have about twenty -- a little over thirty minutes to work on something here. So we want to jump into it and make good use of our time. Jaime, please go ahead.

MS. CLARK: I just wanted to let you know that I do have the updated MALDEF maps already loaded into the map from this morning. And I just received the Equality California maps, and haven't had a chance to look at them yet, but they're in the map. And it sounds like the big
difference is that Pomona is put into the San Gabriel Valley Latino seat, and that is how the other seats are maintained. And this note also says that San Bernadino Latino seats can be drawn without Pomona. So that's the difference that I heard just now.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Commissioner Andersen, you're on mute.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Sorry. Thank you. I try to keep my background noise out.

So that would mean to follow this, we'd actually have to address the POMONTFON as well.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Um-hum.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you for that, Jaime.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Jaime, just so that there's some clarity, so is it -- I haven't been able to look at the full details of the MALDEF map. I only saw a couple details. So is the MALDEF map that includes Pomona, or is it the Equality California one that includes Pomona in what I think is the STH60 District? No? That's the MALDEF map?

MS. CLARK: Yeah, this is the -- no, this is Equality California and this includes Pomona with what right is for the Commission called CDCOV. It looks like Almonte is split into three districts. And they also --
and I don't know how much of this would be easy to change or adjust, et cetera. I also have not seen this yet.

So just a broad overview is, it looks like this includes South Central Neighborhood Council and Zapata-King areas with Boyle Heights and East LA. This district includes areas West of the 405 and the Culver City-Jefferson Park areas.

This district is pretty similar. It doesn't include Gardena in that part of Torrance. And it looks like Lynwood is split in a similar way that the Commission previously has had Lynwood split. The Ports are separate. This includes part of Signal Hill, part of Long Beach, Lakewood, up with some of the Gateway cities, and includes Santa Fe Springs and La Mirada.

And then here's what Orange County looks like. I'll just zoom out so we can see Orange County. Part of Long Beach with a Coastal District. Costa Mesa and Irvine look like they're whole with East Orange County. Here's the Santa Ana and Anaheim District. The rest of Anaheim with part of Placentia. Yorba Linda, Chino Hills, and some of these Western Riverside County areas, going up to Beaumont here. So this is it. This is what they have.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: How far down does it go to San Diego?

MS. CLARK: It looks like it does not include San
Diego County. This just includes Western Riverside County, Western San Bernadino County, and Southern Los Angeles County, and all of -- most of Orange County.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Could you also show the MALDEF one?

MS. CLARK: One moment. So the MALDEF Plan is statewide. And just starting in -- I guess I'll start with the areas we're talking about right now.

So the district with Port of San Pedro, Carson, and West Carson. It includes part of Long Beach but the Ports here are separate. It includes Paramount, Lynwood, South Gate, and Walnut Park.

And then Signal Hill with this -- I don't know -- Eastern part, I guess, of Long Beach, with Lakewood and Bellflower, Downey, Bell Gardens. And then this looks like South Central and Zapata-King are split. It does include Florence-Graham and Huntington Park.

I'm just trying to pull out and identify some major differences, I guess, between what the Commission has now. So just give me one moment. And then NELA District, it looks like it has Chinatown and Little Tokyo with Koreatown and Filipinotown. It does not include Thai Town. It does have Eagle Rock and Glassell Park together in this district. It looks like Greater Wilshire is in three districts.
This doesn't have Toluca Lake here with the San Fernando Valley, but that might be drawn off of a previous iteration from the Commission. I'm not sure if that's possible or not, but they do have Sylmar here with the San Fernando Valley-based District.

And just looking around, again, for other differences. In LA County, those are the biggest ones that I'm seeing.

In Orange County, they do have this Coastal District. Garden Grove, it looks like, is split. And Tustin is split here in the Santa Ana and Western Anaheim-based District. Of course, this is a big difference, is having Eastern Orange County and Western Riverside County together.

And then in terms of what they do with Camp Pendleton, they have a Coastal San Diego District here. This is the Chula Vista District. And then with Coachella Valley, instead of Oceanside and Camp Pendleton, they include San Marcos, Bonsall, Fallbrook -- I think this is Rainbow -- with Temecula and Murrieta, and then up to the Cherry Valley County-Mesa area.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much, Jaime.

We can look at a lot of maps. I think we have ideas. And we need to proceed with a plan here, what we'd like to do.
Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: If you could just come back to me, I'm just processing everything. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, certainly. Absolutely.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

And thank you, Jaime, for that. I'm wondering a couple of things. If we are able to show the Equality California maps and the MALDEF map lines would be one thing. And maybe I do or don't want to see that. But in addition to that, I'm wondering -- you're laughing, Commissioner Sinay.

I'm trying to see how that relates to our lines. So I'm trying to see where the big differences are between the maps, because of course, we've listened to now, what, almost 30,000 COIs. So we've got individual COIs. We have group COIs. Equality California has also done a lot of listening. And MALDEF has done a lot. I'm just wondering how they all shake out and where the difference is. Because of our time issue, I'm trying to see if there is some one-shot wonder hit where we would be like, man, we should've saw this a week ago.

Okay, so this is everybody. So I see MALDEF is blue?

MS. CLARK: Yeah, so MALDEF is blue and the
Commission's lines are the black lines. I guess starting just at --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Before you start, is the Equality lines on here also, or just the two of them?

MS. CLARK: Not yet.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.

MS. CLARK: But I can add them all together. And it might be even more overwhelming to look at all together.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Let's look at it, and then you can take it off and explain it.

MS. CLARK: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Jaime, what's the green lines?

MS. CLARK: The green lines is a Maptitude setting, and I'll just change that in one second.

So the Equality California lines are in red.

MALDEF's lines are in blue. And then the lines -- the Commission's lines are in black. So there's a lot of overlap and some differences. Overall, I'm just going to start in -- I'm just going to start and try to show them all together.

So in SP710, very similar in San Pedro, Carson, and West Carson. Equality California uses less of Long Beach, and they also put part of Signal Hill with some of the Gateway cities. Another difference is that right now
the Commission has Long Beach in two districts, and
Equality California and MALDEF both have Long Beach in
three districts.

And then there's also differences here on the
Northern end. MALDEF has Walnut Park separate from
Florence and Huntington Park. Equality California and
the Commission both have those three cities together.

Look at -- sorry, I'm trying to see it all for you
also.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: You're doing good.

MS. CLARK: Okay, thanks. I'm going to keep going.

So for this district that includes Downey and
Lakewood and some of these other cities in the North,
Equality California has part of Signal Hill with this
central part of Long Beach. With Lakewood, they include
Downey. They also -- okay, so they include Norwalk,
Santa Fe Springs, and La Mirada with Commerce, Vernon,
Maywood, Bell Gardens areas.

MALDEF has all of Signal Hill, and then follows the
same Northern part. It includes also part of Long Beach
and all of Lakewood, it looks like, with Bellflower,
Downey -- it does not include Commerce, but they do
instead split South Central and Zapata-King and include
Central Alameda with these Gateway cities and with parts
of the City of Long Beach.
Up here, I'm going to have to take these one at a time because it's hard to look at.

So looking at MALDEF first, MALDEF split -- actually, this is the LA River, so I don't even know if these counts as a Boyle Heights split according to their neighborhood council boundaries, and community members have different opinions about where Boyle Heights is.

But MALDEF splits East Los Angeles. It includes Eagle Rock and Glassell Park, splits Echo Park, does not include Thai Town. Has all of Koreatown according to the COI boundaries. Includes Pico-Union, and it looks like has Little Tokyo and Chinatown in this.

Then just looking at this, Greater Wilshire is in three districts, but this is somewhat similar to what the Commission does, with the exception of not including Thai Town.

Looking at the 10CORR District, they include more of the West Side neighborhood areas, parts of Greater Wilshire. And again, this is the other part of the district into which South Central and Zapata-King are split, whereas the Commission has fewer of these West Side neighborhoods and includes different -- yeah. Basically, it has a different area of Downtown Los Angeles, and includes all of South Central and all of Zapata-King and Central Alameda.
The South LA Districts look pretty similar. This doesn't include the population here North of LAX. In the MALDEF map, that's with the SHORELINE District. And they include this part of Del Aire. And things are looking pretty similar along the edges here, but some population swaps.

And in terms of the districts here in San Gabriel Valley, pretty similar. For CDCOV, it looks like the population swap here mostly is part of Monrovia, parts of Glendora are in this district. And it looks like they did not include North Almonte.

In the STH60 District, they split Chino Hills, making part of China Hills with this district, and also include Commerce.

Now, I'm going to switch to Equality California, because we didn't get to them for more interior parts of -- we didn't get to them for the rest of LA.

So their NELA District is in some ways similar, and they also split East Los Angeles and include Boyle Heights, including Highland Park, excuse me, and parts of Lincoln Heights. They, it looks like, do not include Koreatown. And instead, include all of Downtown, South Central, Zapata-King, Central Alameda areas with this district.

And the 10CORR District, they include all of Greater
Wilshire. They also include Jefferson Park, Mid-City, West Adams areas. They include more of the West Side neighborhoods include Del Rey and have -- yeah, that looks like that's where their population is made up from not including Downtown-South Central areas. Instead, they include Del Rey, Mar Vista, West Side, and Greater Wilshire.

And South LA, they do not include any of Torrance, and they have that split in Gardena. They have the split in Lynwood, as the Commission previously had it, and include these areas North of Westmont, so the Empowerment-Congress areas.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Do you think we need to -- does the Commission want a little bit more, or do you think you've given us the whole overview of our area?

MS. CLARK: I think still a major difference, as we noted previously, is that Pomona is included in the CDCOV District. They have Almonte split here. And then they have different configurations for some of these VRA Districts in San Bernadino and Riverside Counties. And those are some of the major differences.

And my understanding is that the purpose of exploring all of this is maybe to look at other options for Orange County. So it looks like both MALDEF and Equality California have a Coastal District.
And then looking -- as these lines are all over the place, having a hard time quickly saying exactly what the differences are here in Orange County. So I'm just going to turn back on the Commission layers. And that's the overview.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Can you go South for the Equality California one?

MS. CLARK: The Equality California one doesn't include areas South of Orange County.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, they end here.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much, Jaime.

Commissioner Turner, do you have other thoughts come to mind? I could always come back to you.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Jaime, thank you so much. I think it was really helpful. I feel like we keep switching back and forth between COIs, what we've previously seen and set our draft maps up using, versus new COIs coming in. And then with the other groups that's also continuing to receive information. I just wanted to see what it looked like together to see where are the points of agreement that we can perhaps know where we need to do work and where we're settled on. And so I think that visualization was very helpful. And if I
did anything different, I would have you add COIs on so we can look at that. But we don't have time for that. I think you all probably got it by now. And so that's what I wanted to see. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Turner. I totally agree. That was very helpful for me in terms of what was similar and what was different.

With that, we are going to go to Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

So I just wanted -- as a reminder, like, forty-five minutes ago we were going -- we were going to test a couple of options here, and we still haven't, but -- and that's okay, because we had really good conversation and discussion. And I mean, the possibility of rotating population from Pomona through the San Gabriel Valley into the North Long Beach area is a potential for raising the Latino CVAPs in our VRA in these areas while also having strong seats in our Northern area is a possibility. And it's something that I'd be open to and exploring. I just don't know if we have time to do it in live line drawing or if we need to do it off-line. But maybe perhaps we can test a couple of things in the North Long Beach area as that, I think, was the purpose of --
the initial purpose of keeping us in this area.

But certainly, up to you Commissioner Andersen.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much, Commissioner Toledo.

Yes, I do want to kind of get an idea -- we have, well, actually fifteen minutes until it's break. And so I'd kind of like us to have -- do we want to do a little -- what do we want to do here?

At the end of our lunch break, we're going to come back and actually, hopefully, sort of take care of all the areas in the North and then spend the rest of the day focusing Los Angeles and South. So a gameplan here -- idea is to actually draw right now. What do we want to do?

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I apologize because I missed the earlier part of this conversation, so I don't know where everyone stands on this.

I just wanted to raise -- I think that the L.A. maps are pretty similar, actually, to what we're seeing from Equality California, as well as MALDEF. They're not drastically different. On the Long Beach piece -- whether Long Beach stays in L.A. or goes to Orange County -- either way, I could see that happening. I think, currently, Long Beach is with Orange County in
current maps. Right?

Honestly, it doesn't matter to me which way, but we've heard so loudly from them not to be cut. So I understand we're going to cut them once in our current plan. What I wouldn't want to see is for us to cut us -- cut them three times. And they have -- and I said this yesterday, so I'll say it again, I mean, they have had such a strong coalition asking to be kept together. I get it. That doesn't always work out. But I wouldn't want to see them cut three times. That doesn't sit very well for me.

And so that would -- I think that where we're -- where the real interest, it sounds like, is to continue to explore Orange County. I can get behind that. I think that, though, that we had that exploratory piece yesterday that Commissioner Toledo and I had worked on. We had raised either it could be additional swaps there and have it work within the current confines of what we have going on in the Coachella Valley and Riverside and San Diego. Or it could -- would it have to be a much larger change if we wanted to adopt a different sort of vision for that area? Honestly, either way. I'm at a loss, because yesterday folks were saying they didn't want to do anymore exploration. I can totally get behind it, though, because I mean, I'm hearing all of the
testimony. And I get it. It doesn't feel like it's quite right yet. But to me, if there's additional exploration, it's Orange County-based. Not quite so much Los Angeles-based. Because actually, mostly what we're doing in Los Angeles, with the exception of some possible swaps within that Long Beach area, it looks fairly similar to those other maps.

So to me, it's about some of those areas. And we've been talking about this for days. Right? Because those Long Beach, Hawaiian Gardens, Lakewood -- they're not as covered by VRA considerations. So whether they go North or South -- both options could potentially work, because they don't need to be in a VRA district. Right? So I'm open to whatever folks want to do, but I wouldn't want to see Long Beach split again. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. And that is actually -- we are talking currently right now about the L.A. area and just doing a switch and things like that. So you're right. Thank you.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Thank you.

The other part I wanted to say is -- and why that was so -- at this point I know we're looking to see -- we don't want to get to the end and then just do something quick or hastily. We've spent all of this quality time
trying to get it figured out, and we are all, I think, leaned in and wanting to do that. And so I appreciate Jaime showing the maps that I'm aware of. The ones that I could remember. Jaime, do we have any other statewide maps or maps that cover all of this particular area so that we're not excluding anyone? How many more maps of this such do we have? Because we're looking at individual COI testimony. But for me the visual was very helpful as well.

MS. CLARK: For Shapefiles or GIS layers that cover, like, all of L.A. County with all of the rest of Southern California -- I believe that MALDEF is the only one that I have.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Well, thanks. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much, Jaime. We have, like, ten minutes here. Do we want to jump into a little bit of rearranging, or do we want to give just a little bit of direction? Jaime actually has to eat lunch as well, but if we wanted to have sort of getting a jump on something that we'd like to then further explore later this afternoon.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I'd like to explore the swap that we're -- that Jaime had -- or had suggested
earlier, just to try to raise the seat up a little bit. I don't think it'll raise it too much, but just to do -- it was with splitting in --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Right.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- the North Long Beach, with Montebello, and I believe, Downey would be the swap. So could we potentially take a look --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- at that and maybe one or two other swaps if that doesn't work through?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Please --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: In the next ten minutes. Because --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. We'll just --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- before --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: We'll try a --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- we take our break.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- few things, and then we can come back to that. Yes. Thank you, Jaime. If we did talk -- I think you have exactly what you need to run with here, so thank you very much. Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Oh, and Commissioner Akutagawa, while Jaime's working with this?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Jaime, is it possible, since we're going to do a -- we're going to
look at a potential split in Montebello, could you do a
closer, like, zoom in, so we could see what the street-
level view is?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: And also --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- if it isn't going to be too
confusing -- once we look at this -- do we have a quick
view of the -- thank you -- the Latino CVAP? You knew
where I was going. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, and I would just --
at least for the beginning -- if you could stay along
Whittier Boulevard for right now. And then the next
iteration would be to go up to Beverly.

MS. CLARK: So this is a change of 23,814 people,
and the Latino CVAP in LBNORTH would be 52.14 percent.
And in STH60, 54.86 percent. And of course, we can go
back if we are unhappy with the results of this. But to
be able to see then what the results would be for a more
closely deviated district, we would have to make this
change and then go back to a different area to remove
population.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Great.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, please do that. Seeing
nothing but head nods. As we're doing a little
exploration here before our break -- our lunch break.
(Pause)

MS. CLARK: So with this change, the deviation is 560 people off. In the South 60 would be 55.08 percent Latino CVAP. And LBNORTH would be 51.8. So it's in total gaining 0.6 percent Latino CVAP or so from where it was before we made any swaps. I could also try adding some of these areas instead of this area --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. But I was going to say, if you could please do that. Thank you. And Commissioners, if you see, like, an area you think might be a little more appropriate, please just speak up because I --

MS. CLARK: So here again, LBNORTH would be 51.73 percent Latino CVAP, and South 60 would be 55.14 percent Latino CVAP.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Jaime.

Commissioner Toledo, do we think we like that or --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: It's a little bit higher. But it think that's -- without having to do major architectural changes, I think that's what we're -- we'd be trying to get incremental tiny increases at this point, unless we're looking at --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Or if we are looking at -- I understand we're looking at Downey -- switching Downey, because we've cut that. I'm just wondering if there are other areas a little further North which we could
exchange. Some areas that are very low Latino.

MS. CLARK: So the split here, including this part of Montebello, is in the very Northern part of the area, so it would be basically moving Montebello back -- is now the Northern boundary.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I see what you're saying. Thank you. Okay.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, Jaime, would it be possible, instead of taking from Downey, what if you were to --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Take from Lakewood?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, no. No. It won't work. We'd have to put it into the South 60. I was just thinking maybe trying to take a portion of Bellflower. I was going to say, Lakewood, but it won't work. But maybe a portion of Bellflower. Or again, maybe moving part of Commerce or even Vernon. Maybe Vernon and a part of Commerce? Would that make a difference?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So moving Vernon or Commerce would be a swap with the CDNELA.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Sorry. Okay. No, that won't work.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Sorry.

Commissioner Turner.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. As we're looking at this, can we keep an eye on all of the CVAPs? Jaime, can you show all of them, please?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Ahmad. Oh, I'm sorry, Commissioner Turner, did you want to see something after that? I really appreciate that -- adding that extra information.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Jaime, do you know what the change was to the Black CVAP with the changes we've done in LBNORTH?

MS. CLARK: With this swap the Black CVAP in LBNORTH would become 8.22 percent. And I believe I have in here my -- so that's from 8.24 percent, from before the change at all, to 8.22 percent in LBNORTH.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I just want to check in with Counsel. If the swap that's highlighted in red would create any potential neck problems?

MR. LARSON: So we're doing this for VRA consideration, so we have a pretty strong basis for doing it. That said, I'm wondering, and maybe Jaime could explore, if that little population peninsula there could be moved to the East slightly -- it would maybe decrease
that issue slightly. So that square that sticks out at
the very -- yeah, if that is swapped for the area just to
its East where there is that dark red -- that widens that
neck as well.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: What if you go a little bit
more South where there's a -- looks like a little less
Latino CVAP? Yeah.

MR. LARSON: Yeah. I guess I'm hurting the CVAP,
aren't I?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Or yeah. Even over that -- the
area directly at the line --

MR. LARSON: Like I said, if that was the only way
to do it for our VRA goal here, then I think it's
justifiable, so I'm not saying you need to make this
change that we just made.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: And we need to go to our break. Do
we want to just hold this area? Do we want to accept
this area? At this point? Jaime?

MS. CLARK: I was going to say that I can kind of go
with a more fine-tooth comb to refine this area, make it
a nice shape, and come back after lunch, if the
Commission is comfortable with me just quickly working
for fifteen minutes off-line on this.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I believe so. Any objections to
that?
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No objections. And if you can -- as you're making it a nice shape, if you can see what the -- how best to increase the CVAP?

MS. CLARK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Or maintain it? Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. Okay. Thank you very much. And Commissioner Turner, did you have also something?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I did. Thank you so much for this. And I don't have a problem, Jaime, with you moving forward with it. But while we were out, I do understand that there were also statewide maps that were sent or is now available -- whichever the case is. We've looked at MALDEF, Equality California, so I do want to see the Black Census and Redistricting Hub's maps that they've sent through and go through the same process for consideration. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And we can do that --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- when we return.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner Turner. We might have this. We might actually come back to the Northern California. Give Jaime a little time afterwards, and understand we have some of those iterations that we can wrap up and then just continue
working in the South. So I'd like to do that. And at this point, we're going to go ahead and take our break. It's our lunch break. We will come back at 3:15. So thank you very much.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 2:40 p.m. until 3:15 p.m.)

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Welcome back, everyone, to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission meeting. We were working the Los Angeles area. We're just going to -- Jaime is going to give us a review of what we just did, and then we're going to go back to a different -- back to finishing a previous section of the state.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I understand that we've received the statewide maps, I believe, for the Black Hub now, and also Advancing Justice. I'd like to recommend that we do review their maps as well, too, since we did have a chance to see Equality California and MALDEF's map in comparison to ours.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Thank you very much, Commissioner. We will certainly do that. At this point, I just want Jaime to just report on what she just finished, and then we'll put this section on hold and go up to finishing up the iterations from assignments in the other sections of the state so we can return and spend
our complete attention on this. So Jaime, can you just
give us a rundown, please?

MS. CLARK: Certainly. So just balancing population
between STH60 and LBNORTH -- I'll zoom in to this split
in Downey, which goes along Woodruff, Hall, and then
South -- nope -- Northwest, then Northeast roughly along
La Reina and sort of moving North towards the city
boundary. And there's a total deviation -- or excuse
me -- there's a deviation between the two of roughly 350
people that I can work on off-line if the Commission
generally likes this split. And in LBNORTH -- I'll read
the CVAP for all of the groups. In LBNORTH, the Latino
CVAP is 51.82 percent. The Black CVAP is 8.17 percent.
The Asian CVAP, 8.61 percent. And white CVAP, 29.96
percent. In STHLA, the Latino CVAP is 55.06 percent.
The Black CVAP is 2.54 percent. Asian CVAP is 20.93
percent. White CVAP is 20.38 percent.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Jaime. Could you just
tell us what they were before we did this iteration?

MS. CLARK: So before any changes to the area,
LBNORTH Latino CVAP was 51.19 percent. Black CVAP was
8.24 percent. Asian CVAP was 8.65 percent. And white
CVAP was 30.48 percent. In STHLA, Latino CVAP was 55.64
percent. Black CVAP was 2.45 percent. Asian CVAP was
20.95 percent. White CVAP was 19.87 percent.
CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. Oh, Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just wanted clarification. Jaime, you said it was -- STHLA, but it was actually the STH60, right? That's the one you were thinking of? I just wanted to make sure. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: I apologize. Yes, that's correct. The population swap was between LBNORTH and STH60.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Thanks. I appreciate the intent here. I'll tell you I'm not thrilled. I believe Montebello was already sort of slightly split. I'm not thrilled at the idea of making such a big split in Montebello and making the split in Downey even bigger for such small gains. Understanding VRA considerations are greater than COIs, but the change feels fairly marginal. And the Cities of Downey and Montebello have really, like, small town feel to them, so for me it seems a real shame to do what I would consider pretty not insignificant splits in those cities for not a whole lot of gain the way I am seeing it. But this is not a hill I will die on, so if this is something that the rest of the Commission wants to do, then I am okay with it.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.
Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm leaning with Commissioner Vazquez right here. But can you post the CVAPs again? Because I saw very marginal increase in Latino and a decrease in African-American, but I couldn't really see it because the font is a little small. Okay, there --

MS. CLARK: So what's in orange here is the previous -- it's what we started with. And the labels that are in black is the current. So here's for LBNORTH previously. This is LBNORTH current. And then this is STH60 previously, and current.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Okay. So I'm leaning with Commissioner Vazquez given the marginal nature and -- let's hear from other Commissioners.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yep. I raised my hand to support Commissioner Vazquez. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Anyways, I almost did a -- I was going to say I almost did a Toledo, but -- I am in agreement. I would like to ask, though -- I did also ultimately suggested if this change didn't really increase it in a way that -- at least maybe a percentage
point or so -- I did suggest perhaps looking at the East L.A.-Boyle Heights area, since that has the potential to maybe raise the Latino CVAP in the LBNORTH. And perhaps looking at maybe some -- I don't know if there's -- Jaime, if you think that there could be other alternatives to swap out.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. Real quick. I just raised my hand in support of Commissioner Vazquez's statements. Marginal gains for splitting up those COIs. Even recognizing the priorities data set.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Toledo, did you have another thing to say, as well? No. Okay.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. The East L.A. thing is a hill I'd be willing to fight for. I really, really, really don't like the idea of splitting up East L.A., especially since what we just attempted was -- were pretty high concentrations of Latinos in Montebello and Downey. Unless we take a big chunk of East L.A., which the more of East L.A., I think you take from CDNELA, the more uncomfortable I get, and I feel like the more in violation of Congressional districts overall communities
of interest. I think, yeah, I'm really not in favor of breaking up East L.A.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Just to say, I'm with Commissioner Vazquez, Commissioner Toledo, Commissioner Taylor and others on the Downey and Montebello idea. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. Yes. So on that -- oh, Commissioner Vazquez, you also have additional -- no? We can certainly come back to this area. I know there's a request to have a look at the other maps and to see if there's another way to explore this area. At this point, I want us to think about those, and I'd like us to put this on hold.

And if we could get Tamina, please. We're going to review our --

MS. CLARK: Sure. No problem. I, off-line, will revert this change. It sounds like that is the wish of the Commission. And Tamina will be with you shortly.

Thank you so much.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Right. And actually, if you could find those -- oh, I'm sorry.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, Chair. You did not want
to see the other map before we moved from Jaime?

    CHAIR ANDERSEN: I thought we would have a look at
    that, and then -- unless you want to have a look at that
    right now to be able to think about it, as we're going to
    go to a different area then come back to this area. So
    if there's --

    COMMISSIONER TURNER: Well, I think if -- my
    preference would be to look at it now while we're
    thinking about the others while they're fresher in our
    minds, and then go to Tamina.

    CHAIR ANDERSEN: All right. Certainly. Okay. And
    it's general consensus that that's absolutely no problem.
    I think we're getting a -- sounds like a plan. Yes,
    please. Jaime, do you happen to have those maps, please?

    MS. CLARK: Yeah, I sure do. Just one moment,
    please while I am reverting these changes, and it is back
    to how it was before we began this --

    CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

    MS. CLARK: -- exercise. So one moment, please,
    while I pull those up. So I'm not sure -- I haven't
    really had a chance to look at these. They really just
    came in for me, so I'm going to add the Advancing Justice
    lines. So it looks like overall, these are pretty
    similar. A different split here in Long Beach, but this
    does maintain the same boundary between Long Beach and
Orange County. They include Hawaiian Gardens in this LBNORTH District, and oh, I see, there's a slight change here too. Okay. I'll fix that before moving on. And they also, it looks like, split South Central and includes Central Alameda with the Gateway Cities and these parts of Long Beach. Again, they do not include Signal Hill here in the SP710 District. They do maintain the split at the ports. Oh -- yes. They maintain the split at the ports. Okay. So it looks like they are splitting San Pedro. Again, the South L.A. District is very similar. They do not include this area North of LAX, and the population tradeoff it looks like is here just kind of in the Westmont area.

So they also include Palms and parts of Westside Neighborhood Council in their 10 Corridor District, and it looks like that's a population swap once again with areas of South Central, Neighborhood Council, Central Alameda and Downtown L.A. Like MALDEF, they do not include Thai Town in their NELA District. They also don't split East Los Angeles, and they do include Eagle Rock and Glassell Park. This district is also including Koreatown, Historic Filipinotown, Chinatown and Little Tokyo. In CDCOV, they have Monrovia -- they have a different -- yeah, they include all of Monrovia and just have a different split in Glendora.
Moving further South, it looks like they make Chino Hills whole, and in OC -- I'm going to turn off the Commission's districts, but it looks like -- it is pretty similar -- I'm going to turn on the Commission's districts one more time, but -- pretty similar configuration. It looks like for them, Laguna Beach goes with San Diego coastal areas. They have Placentia with this OCSBLA District. Have a different split in Brea, and then also have a different area in Santa Ana included in the Santa Ana District. They also have Seal Beach with this area of Fullerton, Brea, Buena Park, Cerritos, Artesia, et cetera.

And in San Diego -- so this is not statewide -- it's these counties -- San Diego, Orange County, and L.A. County, but it looks like things are pretty similar in San Diego County. They include Poway and the CDCOAST, whereas the Commission includes parts of Escondido. Similarly, having this district that includes areas in the coast in Orange County and areas in the coast of San Diego County. And moving on to -- and it looks like they also include Sylmar in their San Fernando Valley District.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: One minute, Jaime, while we move on.

Commissioner Turner, did you want to have a comment
about this one before we move on to the next?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I was just following Jaime as
she completed what she was sharing. I did have a couple
of questions. Jaime, you said Advancing Justice. Is
this the same map that the Black Census and Redistricting
Hub sent through? Are they one and the same? Or is that
yet another map?

MS. CLARK: It looks like there are differences.
Right now what is -- it might be a little challenging,
but here are some differences. So right now, the Black
Census and Redistricting Hub is in green lines, whereas
Advancing Justice is in purple.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Oh, so this is two more maps.
I just wasn't clear. I was asking for the Black Census
and Redistricting Hub. And then when you said Advancing
Justice, I was just trying to be clear. We're looking at
two additional maps or one? And so this is two?

MS. CLARK: Yeah. I apologize for the confusion.
So now what's in green on the map is Black Census and
Redistricting Hub's map. Would you like me to review
this as well? And I can turn on the Advancing Justice
lines just so we can see -- it seems like there are
slight differences. But as they've noted in public
comment, they've been collaborating closely, so most of
these lines are identical from what I'm seeing. Slight
differences in the Santa Monica area, for example.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And have all of the other
submitted maps come in maintained a coastal district
that's different than ours?

MS. CLARK: So Advancing Justice and Black Hub, they
both have a boundary between Long Beach and Orange
County. And the difference here in their -- the
difference here in the district in Orange County is that
these groups put Seal Beach with Little Saigon, Artesia,
Cerritos, et cetera. Whereas, the Commission excludes
Tustin from this area from the NOCCOAST District, and
Advancing Justice and Black Census and Redistricting Hub
split Tustin instead.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. And I see that there is
also -- ours goes down to Laguna Beach, but theirs stops.
And I'm sorry, Jaime, is that in -- Hawaiian Gardens is
still in L.A. County in their maps where we've moved it
to Orange County?

MS. CLARK: That's correct.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Turner or Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Jaime, so this is a big
ask and either, yes, you know it or you don't, and we can
play around. Do you know broadly the variances, not of
all of all of them, of the CVAPs for all CVAPs. Not off
the top of your head. Here's what I'm trying to get at:

For the different iterations we're drawing and we're trying to ensure that -- first of all, VRA districts, but even for the others, we're trying to ensure that all of the COIs are represented, that like groups are kept together. That people have an opportunity to elect candidates of their choice. And beyond a preference of where lines go based on who we shop with, who we do -- I'm wondering about if we're ultimately achieving the goal to ensure that people have an opportunity to represent who they want, and if there's a way to tell which of these lines are stronger from that perspective?

MS. CLARK: For all groups, do you mean?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Generally, yes.

MS. CLARK: Honestly, I think that that could be a question for your VRA counsel. I don't know that I could answer that.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. That strikes me as a tall ask. Unless does our counsel have a -- just quickly to -- thank you for uplifting that question, Commissioner Turner, because it's a very, very valid one. A lot of groups are looking at their particular constituency, and we are looking at everybody, which is why our maps are usually different. But Commissioner -- I'm sorry, Mr. Larson, could you have --
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Right.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- a comment?

MR. LARSON: Sure. I appreciate your sentiment that it's a tall ask, and I agree with that characterization. We've not had a chance to go through every one of these maps and to do -- to be able to respond to that question as a whole. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. So I guess I'll end by ultimately saying that this, to me, would be a way to honor all of the -- we're trying to represent all Californians. And so based on COIs that's come in and all of the various requests, outside of preference, et cetera, if the ultimate goal is, indeed, to ensure as many as possible have opportunity, it would be great. And I know we don't -- I hear that we don't have the time -- we haven't explored it. But it seemed like it would be a really good way to determine this, and would require probably a lot more research, but this is what I was hoping to be able to see. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Turner. And that's a -- I'm actually struck by how similar many of these have been. I haven't seen any gaping differences. So I was very pleased to see that.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. Thank you. This seems
a little bit different than previous iterations that we've seen before from these two groups where I thought previously there was connection to Long Beach and Seal Beach with the maps from groups. I know these have evolved, especially I think groups are evolving to our thinking and I appreciate that. I do see -- and maybe Jaime can speak to this -- that there is a change in the VRA district in Orange County with the map presented from the Black Hub and the Advancing Justice group. Can you speak to those changes, and what they are?

MR. LARSON: I'll just remind the Commission that in the Congressional maps we did not have the third Gingles precondition met here, so this is not actually a black --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I meant in the majority-minority map in Orange County.

MS. CLARK: Yep. So it looks like -- and the lines that are in green are the Black Hub lines, and the lines that are in black are the Commission's lines. So the Commission has -- basically, there's a different split in Orange. Black Hub includes more of Orange in this Santa Ana District. The split in Fullerton is different. The Commission is slightly further North than the split that Black Census and Redistricting Hub uses. And in Santa Ana, there's also this very Western area of Santa Ana is included in the Commission's version, keeping Santa Ana
whole, whereas Black Hub has a split here.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you, Jaime.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I was just going to remark. I think Commissioner Toledo said this as well that, like, these maps have -- these maps from our folks at the different sort of statewide advocacy groups have evolved as we have evolved but maybe haven't gone quite as quickly as we have, especially as we've sort of made bigger changes in the last, like, two days, in Orange County, in particular, so. But I am also struck at how pretty similar most of these are. It may be worthwhile if we have sort of staff capacity to just go and sort of tally up majority-minority districts in each of these iterations and maybe what those percentages are, to Commissioner Turner's point.

Hopefully, that's not something that takes several days, but can be done with, again, some staff support overnight. But yeah, I think -- I feel in much better shape than when we started with these maps, for what it's worth.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. I think Jaime wanted to say something. But in addition to that, for example,
for -- and then I think I can watch and see how we move forward with this, but Santa Ana area -- Santatana (sic), Santa Ana, however those maps -- the VRA one that I think was a VRA district, we struggled for a while with trying to increase the CVAP in that area and was not successful in doing so. And noticing that the Black Hub's lines being different, it would, to me, be the right thing to look at what their lines -- if that, indeed, does raise it in that area. We've been stuck at around this fifty and each time we comment that we want it higher. It would be fifty -- we would love to get it up higher. I'd love to see what the CVAP is with the boundaries that they've provided.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. If we were to have staff look at the different maps and the CVAP, I would -- I'm wondering from counsel if we need to open up so that all groups who want to submit for that type of evaluation, or can we do it just based on the ones we have?

MR. LARSON: What would the ones we have entail?

How many is that?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: About four, I believe.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, these are -- yeah. In terms
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I'm just concerned about -- are we opening ourselves --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I mean, I --

MR. LARSON: Yeah. I --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- just want to make sure that everybody has the same opportunity in the State of California.

MR. LARSON: I agree with that goal. If there's four that would make sense.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah, I'm --

MR. LARSON: If staff were -- I mean, you all need to decide about the impact on staff of doing that level of analysis.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Yeah. I'm sorry.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. If I could -- I think that's good thinking ahead, Commissioner Sinay. I will just say that it's my understanding that we're looking at these four because they've evolved along with us and with our thinking. And these are most recently submitted maps that take into account all of the different potentially impacted regions in Southern California. If there are other -- I don't know that there are other maps that have
been submitted in the last few days that also take into account, sort of the regional impacts of different changes. So I would say, in order to have a useful analysis, that we should make sure that we are comparing apples-to-apples. And to me, these four submitted maps would be a helpful apples-to-apples comparison if we did it.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez. Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I would -- yeah. I think I do agree. I think we do need to keep it fair, but I also agree with what Commissioner Vazquez said. It has to be an apples-to-apples comparison. Just looking at one city, one region isn't going to be necessarily helpful given the ripple effects that we've all been experiencing. Before we go with what Commissioner Turner has asked on this particular VRA district, I would ask Jaime, if that's what you're going to do -- I'm curious if -- I know it's going to look kind of very colorful, but could we also see all of the other -- I guess, Advancing Justice as well as MALDEF and Equality California maps, all in this very specific VRA district? I'm curious if they are also sharing the same exact lines, or similar lines.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. Just to quickly respond to that.
I don't think that the -- I didn't understand that the suggestion was to make this change. I think it was just to see the difference in the CVAP for this district. And because the -- this Shapefile doesn't have the exact same -- the exact same fields that we have, I didn't want to pull up something incorrect. So the most accurate way for me to tell you the answer to that was just to highlight it -- to pull it all up. And so what the -- well, what I should say what Black Census and Redistricting Hub has for this district in Santa Ana is for Latino CVAP 50.13 percent. For Black CVAP 2.75 percent. For Asian CVAP 16.92 percent. And for white CVAP 28.53 percent. So just wanted to share that with the Commission, and if you'd like I could also pull up the lines for the other groups.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Jaime. Let's see if there's a consensus for this, please.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm sorry --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Commissioner Turner, I think was before me.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- Commissioner Turner. Yeah, so I didn't -- I'm sorry.

Commissioner Turner. I wasn't sure if you --
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- were still --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I put it down and back up. I wasn't ready.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. And Jaime, thank you. That's exactly what I wanted you to do -- was to select it just so that we have an idea. So for that one -- and that is a VRA district -- all of the CVAPs, I believe, went down for this area, as the way it's selected for Black Census and Redistricting, so that may or may not be the case all over the -- all of the other lines, but for this area that would present a problem. And yeah, I don't mind seeing other maps how they're drawn in this area. I think that we can keep assuming and thinking that things are better or different. In some places they may be, but until we test then out or spot test them, et cetera, we don't know their lines. And we're trying to hold a lot in our minds. This was helpful for me to see. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I'm trying to understand the -- so I understand that we want the more information and more data, that's critical. That's
important, especially as we make decisions. But
architecturally, when I look at the architecture of, at
least Los Angeles County -- I think Orange County is a
little bit different -- but Los Angeles County seems to
be relatively -- all of the maps seem to have very
similar architecture as our maps. And if we're intending
to maintain it -- there's slight variations -- but
they're slight. They're a couple blocks here or there,
but for the most part the architecture seems pretty
similar to me. So the decision point, really, seems to
be around this Orange County area, if we're going to make
changes here or -- and I think the two maps that we're
looking at right here don't really make drastic changes.
It's where we put Seal Beach, right? Or where you put
the cut in Los Angeles County -- between Los Angeles and
Orange County. But I thought we had a decision point
yesterday that we weren't moving -- or we weren't
changing the maps in Orange County. And that's where I'm
a little bit confused, because I'm not sure what the
decision point that we're trying to get at is.

Commissioner Andersen.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Yes. We'll hear from a few people, but then it's -- I
think we need to decide what we're actually doing here,
which I'm also a little confused at this point.
Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.

Kristian, do I sound better now?

MR. MANOFF: You sound great.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Great. I wanted to go back a little bit to what Commissioner Sinay said. And I do agree with her, because there's kind of -- I've had, like, an equity issue for those that don't have the bandwidth and haven't been able to follow us, to continue to submit maps. And I understand we want to see what the differences are, and it can help, but I also don't want to rely on it. I guess I'm just torn, because if we're going to use somebody else's map, then why even go through this process for us? So just proceed with caution would be my advice. Thanks.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I guess this is -- I guess I'll do my own little recap, and then hopefully, if it helps everybody, maybe this will help us move on to the next. I think this started because of the question, again, about the LBNORTH District and about -- well, and about seeing if we could make improvements in the Latino CVAP there to strengthen the numbers a little bit. Then what we then ended up seeing is the MALDEF map, I think
just to garner any additional ideas that maybe we were missing, and so we looked at the MALDEF map. We also felt it was important to see the Equality California map. And then since we're getting quite active engagement from both the Black Census and Redistricting Hub, as well as Asian Americans Advancing Justice, and they have also provided us with their Shapefiles for their statewide maps -- I thought it was just important that we should at least just take a look at it and just do a review to see where there may be slight differences. I don't think my intent was to say we should adopt one map over the other. And then I think that's where -- I don't know, this conversation about L.A. -- or straight into Orange County, mostly because I think the Long Beach question. But I think if we're not going to -- I think we're all pretty much in agreement that any additional changes was going to make only slight incremental change, not to the degree that I think we were hoping to see. So with that said, in some ways this is -- this is, I guess, I don't know, maybe settled.

I will only just lift up again the request that we got from the Cambodian community last night about not separating out Signal Hill. I also saw more recently additional COI testimony from the LGBTQ community that also states that separating Signal Hill from the -- as I
look at the map, the Eastern part of Long Beach also
splits the LGBTQ community as well, too. So now we're --
I just wanted to see -- I think we just kind of came to
an agreement that the OC maps are generally just -- I
mean, we know that a lot of people are not happy with it,
but I think anything that we're going to do is going to
be incremental at this point. The only thing I would
just as is if we revisit the Signal Hill cut that we did,
and bring in two COIs that -- one COI that is being
split, and the other one that feels that they are better
served by being in the Eastern part of Long Beach. Thank
you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
Akutagawa.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. 28,000
pieces of public comment spanned over a lot of months is
a lot of information for us to hold and keep up with. I
think that we are really close to the process. We're
trying to work the ten and twelve and however many hour
days we are, go home and do some more reading. I don't
think it's a problem or a disservice to allow those that
have the opportunity to step back or see it at a higher
view and kind of be informed by what they're seeing as
well. We ultimately have to make the decisions, and I
know it's past time for us to do that and to land on
something and move. But a multitude of counsel is where
I'm coming from. It's just being able to hear what other
people -- and if, indeed, they present something that's
drastically different that hits all of our COIs and all
of our concerns and all of our criteria, then, you know
what? We brought them -- we led them to it with all the
discussion, and then we could take -- but we don't see
that right now.

I do appreciate all of what's coming in, and if what
we've seen in the differences of the current maps that's
been flowing with us, sending in new iterations, trying
to keep in mind what we've named as our importance,
because I think a lot of the maps that are coming in --
they're staying based on the Commission's stated
requirements or what we need. I think they're being
responsive to that, too. And if individuals still are
writing in, we sit up -- I do. I know we -- and we write
and we listen to individual comments for hours that comes
in and then we allow those comments to inform us we go
into the next conversation.

So I hope no one feels that we are preferring one of
over the other. We're trying to use technology. We're
trying to use the benefit of people calling in. We're
trying to retain what was already done to draw the best
maps possible. And I think best possible -- that stone
unturned we talked about a little bit ago -- is what
we're doing. And at this point, I think if people can at
least see what was attempted -- what we're trying to
do -- it will help them understand why they're going to
live with what we ultimately decide for the next ten
years. And so I think it's a worthy process. Yeah. I
just think that we're trying to do what we can. And I
think this was -- it was good to see how other people are
thinking about it. At some point we will need to say,
this is where we're going to land, and we will not change
for this area so that we can move on to the next.

But I also know that we don't necessarily have a
good evidenced pattern of stating that and not making
changes, which makes us keep saying, well, here's another
opportunity to do something. Because I'm not one hundred
percent mad at that, because if it can get better, why
would be stuck in something just because of an arbitrary
line that we drew? And I mean, in our mouths by what we
said, not so much what we've literally drawn. So thank
you for the process. Thank you for looking at all of the
maps. For those in the area, if it informed you to do
something different or better, I hope that you say, yes,
let's make that change. And I know we're paying close
attention to our VRA districts, and so for that one Santa
Ana it did not necessarily, but perhaps other areas.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: No, thank you for that, Commissioner Turner. As always, you give a very good framing for how we're looking at the maps, and I really appreciate that.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

Commissioner Turner, I do appreciate what you said, too. And I can't remember who said this earlier, whether it was Commissioner Sinay or Vazquez -- I think there was something similar said, too. I think we're all conscious that there are different groups that are advocating for their communities. There are their own communities that are specifically advocating for their communities, but at the end of the day what we are trying to balance out is all of the communities, all of the Californians, knowing that, yes, not everybody's going to be maybe super excited. But at the same time, I mean, there's others that are going to be and then others that are going to be, like what we've been asking, can you live with it? Is it something that can work? And that's what we're really trying to do is make it so that it can work for all Californians.
With that said, I'd like to just perhaps move on. And I'd like to address the question about Signal Hill and the LGBT and the Cambodia Town COIs. And I'd like to ask if maybe we could swap that particular COI -- both the LGBTQ and the Cambodia Town COI -- and maybe split Lakewood, and put Lakewood into the 710 District, and then put the Signal Hill portion into the LBNORTH? And maybe if we're lucky, we'll even see the CVAP go up for the Latino CVAP.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. We'll take the next questions, because this is an area that I think we'll want to come back to and spend even more time on. This is an item that I want to see if people want to address this one right now, but I know we're going to come back to this area. And I'm just keeping an eye on our time here.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think Mr. Larson has a comment.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Mr. Larson.

MR. LARSON: Thank you. I appreciate it, Chair. I just wanted to -- I had a moment a few minutes ago of too many meetings where I misspoke, and I wanted to clarify the record that what I said about the Santa Ana District -- as you all know and have been operating as -- there is a VRA obligation there, and so you have been
addressing that correctly. I just wanted to clarify that
for the record.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Larson.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And just to that -- it does
meet all three Gingles. And it is a Section 2 VRA
district.

MR. LARSON: Correct. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. I did want to just
comment on the preceding conversation. I don't disagree
with anything anyone said. I love the different
perspectives and I learned so much. I did want to uphold
Commissioner Fernandez's comments, being careful about
giving special attention to certain groups or groups that
have expertise at a certain level. Of course, that's an
asset, and of course, we want to use anything and
everything that people bring, and any assets that we can
bring to this work.

But at the same, we are the Citizens Redistricting
Commission. There are people in the legislature that
know far more about redistricting than we do, and the
State has chosen to not use them. I am sure there are
people in the nonprofit community who know far more about redistricting and have been doing it far longer than I have been. And yet this Commission was formed to operate in the way it does. And it's not simply turn to maps like that, so I agree with Commissioner Fernandez. Yes, of course, we want to value and use everything of value, but also to honor the spirit of the Commission, and it's not just about expertise narrowly conceived. It's about the shared wisdom that fourteen citizens bring to this task.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I think coming back to this district and the LBNORTH District. Because we put -- I mean, I think the Northern part of -- the Northern part of this district certainly has VRA considerations and because it's lumped in with LBNORTH, it is a Section 2 VRA district. And so I am comfortable looking at options, but only if we're able to maintain our CVAPs --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- and so I'm comfortable with exploration but maintaining the CVAPs as are to ensure that the protected group, which is in this case, because of the connection to -- in this case, it's the Latino
community. And that's just VRA compliance. Otherwise, I think if it wasn't a VRA district I think we'd have more ability to work with the communities of interest. But certainly willing to explore. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yes. At this point, Jaime, you have the idea, I'm thinking. Can we have you do this really quickly? We were trying to do this switch here and see what we think about that.

MS. CLARK: One moment.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much.

MS. CLARK: My guess is that it's going to bring down the Latino. Well, let's check it out. Let's check it out.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

MS. CLARK: So I'm selecting Signal Hill. And the area -- what was highlighted in blue is the Cambodian COI. I will move this over so we can see. This is a change of about 70,000 people. And I'll just make this change quickly and then try and do a swap for this Western part of Lakeport, which was Commissioner Akutagawa's direction. So just one moment while I do that. Let's see. So the highlighted area right now is 34,000 people. It's a lot less densely populated. So Commissioner Akutagawa, I'm wondering if it would be okay if I also grab portions of Long Beach?
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MS. CLARK: And I'll clean that up in a second. One moment, please.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: That's a lot of people in that small area.

MS. CLARK: Yes, it is. Let me just double-check that none of Signal Hill is included. So this is roughly an equal swap, and in SP10 the Latino CVAP would become 50.45 percent, and in LBNORTH, the Latino CVAP will become 50.92 percent.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Can you show us all the CVAPs, please?

MS. CLARK: Yes, I can. One moment.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: 50.92 or 52.92?

MS. CLARK: 52.92 for Long Beach North and 50.45 for SP710. So I'll just read all of them. For SP710, the Latino CVAP would be 50.45 percent. The Black CVAP would be 14.79 percent. The Asian CVAP would be 12.98 percent. And the white CVAP would be 19.38 percent. For LBNORTH, the Latino CVAP would be 52.92 percent. The Black CVAP would be 8.74 percent. The Asian CVAP would be 9.45 percent. And the white CVAP would be 27.43 percent. There would be a population discrepancy around 2,000 people, and that I could fix off-line if the Commission is comfortable with that.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Jaime, just a quick question. So if I'm reading this correctly, the Latino CVAP goes up?

MS. CLARK: The Latino CVAP for LBNORTH goes up, and the Latino CVAP for SP710 goes down.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm comfortable with this change.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm just trying to -- before we commit to that change, I'd just like to take a closer look at, like, street level, what we're looking at in terms of the trades. I mean, we've heard so much testimony from Long Beach, I just want to make sure. We've from the Cal States, from so many different folks. I just want to know more of what I'm looking at. From a CVAP standpoint, it seems to be, like, a fairly even trade, but just want to make sure that we're not cutting into other things.

MS. CLARK: So in Lakewood --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think they have an airport or something, too, right?

MS. CLARK: They do have an airport. Yeah. And I'm just walk through or talk through the changes here. So this is Bellflower going through Lakewood. And then following Carson Street, going East, which is at the city
boundary of Lakewood, this is Woodruff. To the South, Wardlow. This diagonal street is called North Los Coyotes Diagonal. The literal name for a street. And then this is East Spring Street. Back to Bellflower, moving South, Stearns or Steering (ph.) Street. Clark Avenue. This is following Pacific Coast Highway. And this is the city limit roughly of Signal Hill. It's Redondo Avenue. Willow Street, and then following the city boundaries of Signal Hill up Cherry. So this area -- going to zoom out -- does include Long Beach Airport. So the airport would be with SP710.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. I would have to go back and look at testimony, but my sense is, like, I don't know if there's interconnectedness between the airport and the ports. I mean, certainly, we've heard a lot from the ports, and are there any of the college areas that are getting cut off doing this? I think we've heard from a couple community college as well as Cal State Long Beach.

MS. CLARK: So Cal State would be in with the port and LBNORTH.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Um-hum.

MS. CLARK: The community college is -- one second. I apologize. I'm having a moment. Oh, I'm sorry. The city college is in the Cambodian COI, so they would be
separate from -- oh, no. They would be together. Pardon me. They would be together.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: They would be together. And is the airport just this area right up here?

MS. CLARK: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Is that what that is? I mean, I'm curious just to see, like, keeping that in the -- I mean, I'm going to guess that there's probably not a ton of population there. But just to keep those resources together since, I mean, we've definitely heard a lot from the ports. I don't know. I mean, I think it would be worth taking a look at it.

(Pause)

MS. CLARK: So the airport is no longer included. In the highlighted area, there's a little bit of population, but not a ton, so that is still about 2,000 people. And the CVAP it looks like has not significantly changed.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Thank you, Chair. So for sure we saw the LCVAP increase for LBNORTH; however, a lot of the other CVAPs did go down. And I think the testimony in this area -- the public comment that we
received -- they're trying to have Signal Hill included.

And I think I missed it -- it looked like the swap --

Signal Hill, according to our paperwork we have, is

11,911 people for just Signal Hill. And if we put Signal

Hill in, could we not just take that amount or close to

that amount out of Lakewood without doing anything

different to Long Beach?

MS. CLARK: Thank you. Yeah. So Signal Hill is

this area, and then it does have overlap with the

Cambodian COI, which I think Commissioner Akutagawa asked

me to look at both of them. So Commissioner Turner, just

to clarify, is your suggestion to just move Signal Hill?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Well, I wasn't trying to break

up a COI. I missed that part. I was wondering why we

grabbed all of it. Yes, I thought we were just trying to

get Signal Hill in.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. So the area that's in blue on the

map right now is the Cambodian COI. And then this area

that has the small outline around it is Signal Hill.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. And Jaime, I'm sorry,

so Signal Hill we're trying to get into -- what are we

trying to do?

MS. CLARK: Yeah. So Signal Hill was in SP710.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Uh-hum.

MS. CLARK: And then the direction was to move it
in -- to move Signal Hill, which is part of the LGBTQ COI, and this Cambodian COI, which is here in blue on the map, into LBNORTH, and that was about 70,000 people. Signal Hill plus this area that's highlighted in blue. And so then, we're looking at the --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Oh, okay, so --

MS. CLARK: -- area highlighted in red, moving that into SP710 for the population swap.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Because there wasn't enough to move into SP10 that was non -- areas outside of Long Beach. So it would increase -- so Signal Hill just 11,900. So that other seventy comes from that other portion of Long Beach?

MS. CLARK: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'm trying to see how the populations gets so high. Okay.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. It's like, this area and these areas basically, make up the rest of that population. It's a densely populated area.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Just a little bit along the same lines with Commissioner Turner. More on the CVAP numbers in terms of it going down.

SP710 went down from 53.53 to 50 -- I'm looking for the
number now -- 50.45. That is a little concerning, but Dale, again, I believe you said crossover here is high?

MR. LARSON: We do see crossover with Black voters here.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: With the black? Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I was just curious to see the CVAP changes for all the CVAPs for the Long Beach North, because I thought they hadn't changed much. I mean, yes, the Latino went up slightly, but I thought the other ones didn't change much. Thank you. That's helpful.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. So what's in orange on the map is where we started today, so I'll read Long Beach North first, because that was the one we were looking at. So we started with Long Beach North being 51.19 percent Latino CVAP. That would change to 52.92 percent Latino CVAP. We started with 8.24 percent Black CVAP. It would change to 8.74 percent Black CVAP. We started with 8.65 percent Asian CVAP. It would change to 9.45 percent. And we started with 30.48 percent white CVAP. It would change to 27.43 percent white CVAP. For SP710, we started with 52.17 percent Latino CVAP. It would change to 50.45 percent. We started with 15.41 percent Black
CVAP. It would change to 14.79 percent Black CVAP. We started with 13.85 percent Asian CVAP. That would change to 12.98 percent. And we started with 16.14 percent white CVAP. It would change to 19.38 percent.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I was going to ask if we could see Equality California's Shapefile or their particular area for the Signal Hill area. I know that they've given us a Shapefile for this. So I think that includes --

MS. CLARK: It's going to be -- these are the Equality California lines. Their lines here in Long Beach are significantly different from the Commission's in certain ways. They have Long Beach in three different districts, and they put Signal Hill with all of Lakewood and the Gateway Cities.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So Long Beach North. I'm uncomfortable splitting Long Beach three times, also. I think limiting -- and I think we've tried to do this in all the cities -- is to limit to no more than splitting it in half, not three times. But it looks like from their Shapefile it included all of Signal Hill. I was just trying to see if there was a portion of Signal Hill
that did not need to be included, but looks like it's all of it. For me, I would say I'm comfortable with this because it does raise the Latino CVAP in LBNORTH. I think we -- it's been mentioned that there's a lot of crossover voting. I also want to note that for the Asian CVAP, the population in Carson and in this particular area that's in this SP710 District are predominately Pacific Islander and native Hawaiian and also Filipino population, too. So my sense is that, again, this is how diverse the Asian-American community is and the Pacific Islander communities are. So for what it's worth, I think they share a lot of similar demographics to the populations in this SP710 district. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. The statement that we are trying not to split cities more than twice is not necessarily an accurate statement as the City of San Jose has been split four times. And I think we talked about this early on that splits don't necessarily mean a bad thing. It means more representation, theoretically. I think what this current conversation what would be helpful for me is to really understand what the options are on the table so we can move forward. I am comfortable with Long Beach being
split three times if that means we can meet some of our
more higher ranked criteria. I would just like to get
that solidified so that we can move onto the next area.
Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.
Yeah. Can we do that? What Commissioner Ahmad just
asked. I'm sorry, Commissioner Ahmad, was I not clear
on?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I don't even know what I asked
any more.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Okay. I'm sorry. I got
distracted for -- so for clarification --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I think just trying to figure
out what are we trying to -- what is our goal here in
this area with this current visualization? With this
current shading right now? And if it's acceptable for
the general Commission, we should probably make a
decision now and move on to the next area.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So the goal is to
bring in the Cambodian Town COI and the LGBTQ COI. I
think with what we have displayed right now, it'll
accomplish both of those. I don't think there's a need
for a further split. The only reason why -- the question
about a further split of Long Beach was just looking at the overlay of the Equality California Shapefiles, but that would then have ripple effects across all of the region, which is not what we want. We were just trying to localize it to just bringing in the Signal Hill and the Cambodia Town COI and then trying to offset that with a swap of populations in Lakewood, which was not as densely populated as the Cambodia Town COI is. And so we had to go a little bit further down. So that's what I believe we are trying to do.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: So I'm seeing that we do -- this would be successful -- Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. So I guess the surprise or the difference for me was that swap would include removing more of Long Beach and wondered if we could look at removing more of Lakewood, Bellflower -- going that direction instead of into Long Beach?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I do worry that if we move into Bellflower and Lakewood that we are going to create a compactness issue, because that neck is small and the higher up we go that neck is going to be even -- it's going to be thin. So I would want legal opinion on that
in terms of about compactness around -- if we go through Bellflower, which we'd have to take a pretty significant amount of Bellflower and more of Lakewood in order to achieve that because they're less densely populated. So I would want Legal to weigh in on the compactness issue around -- or the neck around -- that we'd be creating.

MR. LARSON: So --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Go ahead, Mr. Larson.

MR. LARSON: Thank you, Chair. As you know, compactness is going to be a low criteria. You actually may be violating a higher criteria because you'd be splitting Bellflower to accomplish what you're trying to accomplish. So to me, that would be a higher concern and something you all need to consider.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you for the, I guess, heed or warning and counsel, but until we see it, we've not looked to see what that looks like. And if we go and move Downey into SP10 to save more of Long Beach. Let's see what the neck looks like, and start grabbing. If it's a heavily populated area, maybe it won't get so thin.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Or having an area up in Downey or something from the North than adding more of
Long Beach.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah.
CHAIR ANDERSEN: I like that idea.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I do worry that it will impact the CVAP, though. The areas above this was higher CVAP, so we'd be taking lower CVAP area and replacing it with higher Latino CVAP area. But I'm willing to explore.
CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Jaime, do a read on this? Do you know the outcome before we're looking at it?
MS. CLARK: Let's give it a shot. I don't know the outcome before we look at it.
CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you.
MS. CLARK: So just grabbing this corner, Southwest corner of Bellflower, this is about a 1,000 people off of the ideal population of each district, and I'm just going to zoom out to see what that would look like. I don't know if these are the areas in Long Beach that you wanted to be removed, but with this area of Bellflower, it would be pretty close to your ideal deviation, and the Latino CVAP in SP710 would be 51.08 percent, and the Latino CVAP in LB North would be 52.29 percent.
Commissioner Turner, is this looking better to you in Long Beach, or would you like me to remove other areas in Long Beach?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: I would like to see if you
could remove, because this would be the third split
unless we can get rid of more of Long Beach. Unless we
can -- yeah.

MS. CLARK: I'm sorry. So this would still only be
splitting Long Beach into two different districts.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. The way it currently
is?

MS. CLARK: That's correct, yeah.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. I mean, I think this
looks better, and I don't think it created so much of a
neck issue.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Commissioner Sadhwani, I'm
sorry, you had your hand up?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh, yeah. No, I was just
going to agree with Commissioner Turner. I think this
seems like a reasonable swap to try and preserve more of
the City of Long Beach. I mean, we've definitely had
tons and tons of testimony from them, so. Certainly, it
gets us a little bit a -- little bit closer, I think, and
doesn't seem to have a massive impact to the LCVAPs,
because that, of course, would be a major concern for me.
But it seems here that it's a fairly even swap.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Toledo, you
both have your hands up. What's your direction here?
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm comfortable with this. We are splitting, now, an additional city, though, but I'm comfortable with it, too, if this is the way the Commission wants to go.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I mean, did we have three splits before? Because I thought -- I've only seen two. I've not seen three splits, so I was comfortable the way we had it, with the highest Latino CVAP, which was our goal, and a higher African-American CVAP. This reduces the Latino and African-American CVAPs, and breaks up Bellflower, so. And I only see -- if our goal is to split Long Beach twice, we had accomplished that the way we had it. So I'm trying to understand.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I agree with Commissioner Toledo. I preferred the other way, because he's right, it decreased both the Latino and the Black CVAP.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. And yes, so do we have a consensus on going with this -- wait, I'm sorry. I guess we're looking at two different options here, the previous version of Long Beach, or the switch into Bellflower.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I was just going to see if -- I mean, these are swaps -- I mean, the
percentage of the Latino CVAP that's changing is not a lot. But I think the outcome is that, you know, the Signal Hill, the LGBT COI, the Cambodia Town COI get to be a part of Long Beach, and Long Beach is preserved a little bit more. So it may not be exactly this, but I think it's worth, you know, it could be about one census block versus another to maintain the Latino CVAP because, yeah, they went down, but not by a ton, and so I'm just curious, maybe there's something that Jaime or a Commissioner could work on off-line to just try and see if, you know, we can meet all of those goals, potentially.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: No.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Turner, you also -- nope?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, Yeah. I was just going to say, Jaime, if you can, just flip around a couple of other census blocks and see if we can improve, but I do like the moving into be it Bellflower just to be able to not take more from the Long Beach area. So anyway, if you can --

MS. CLARK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- I think it's great. If
not, I don't think it's detrimental.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: So just to --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah.

MS. CLARK: -- I'm happy to do that. Thank you so much. Just clarifying direction, which is -- and I think I'm a little confused about the direction because it's, like, boosting the CVAP in which one? Because since this is a trade between two districts only, then raising the CVAP in one of them is going to be lowering the CVAP in a different one. So I'm just wondering what the goal is.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Thank you, Jaime. I think that's what we were already seeing, though, was the increasing the CVAP in Long Beach -- in LB North was reducing it, and SP10, and I think the Commission likes the numbers that it was seeing for LB North, and with this change, that came down slightly. So if you can, with this change, choosing different census blocks, get it back up a little bit closer to what it was, perhaps there will be greater comfort.

MS. CLARK: Thank you for that clarification, Commissioner Turner. I understand.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: And Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, so we've heard a lot about Black crossover here, and, you know, if we look at
the relative amount of potential Black crossover, we have
more potential Black crossover now with SP710, with the
lower Latino CVAP, and higher Latino CVAP in the LB
North, with less potential crossover voting. So I mean,
for me, this is kind of heading in the right direction to
help, you know, ensure that these districts will perform.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. I like that -- I've been
looking at the combination, making sure the combination
stays at the same level.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think I'm trying to
understand why it's okay to split Bellflower to retain
more of Long Beach, when the other way around, we had a
higher Latino CVAP in the LB North, and even though the
CVAP went down in the 710, we did see higher numbers, I
believe, or numbers that were, I think, good enough that
the SP 710 will perform because of the potential for
other communities, you know, crossing over. So I'm just
trying to understand it. I'm not necessarily saying one
or the other, but I think I'm just looking for some
perhaps understanding from others who are seeing things
differently. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I just
wanted to say thank you to Commissioner Fornaciari. That
last statement just made so much sense to me and it clicked in my head. I can support this.

And I do not have an answer for Commissioner Akutagawa's question.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Let me attempt it. I think the move -- our desire to move Signal Hill into LB North was to unify communities of interest for both the LGBTQ, as well as, I think, it was the API. And in our attempt to move it into unify COIs, if we further split the same COIs, we really didn't accomplish all of what we intended to do. And by bringing Signal Hill in and taking parts of Long Beach out, you really did not unify the COI at all.

And so that's my reasoning, and my kind of thinking for wanting to move up in a different direction, so that by -- in our first move to unify, we don't turn around and undo what we've done. And if that can be accomplished, where we don't sacrifice the CVAP numbers in this area, I think that's a win-win.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. I think further, to answer Commissioner Akutagawa, I think we all should be looking for veins of consistency in our analysis as we
make these changes in all these districts. So what we hold for one, we should hold for majority. I understand that each place might be different and have a different set of circumstances, but there should be some vein of consistency. So I agree with you in your question, Commissioner Akutagawa. I just hope that we're able to answer those.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I agree with both Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Turner, in the sense of -- so I'm comfortable with exploring, having Jaime take us off-line, see how she can refine it a little bit better, but ultimately, you know, moving in that direction --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- while also, I mean, I do also see Commissioner Akutagawa's point about cutting smaller communities, right? Long Beach is a much bigger community. Bellflower is much smaller. And we've said that over and over again, but this is a VRA, area and I don't know. So I can balance both, and comfortable with the compromise. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yes. At this point, do you feel confident enough to -- you're going to have
direction to work with this one?

MS. CLARK: Yup. I'm happy to --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay.

MS. CLARK: -- check it out online. I'm going to commit this change. And please let us know where you would like to go next.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Well, I believe we'd like to -- we'd like to have you adjust these things and have a look as we go off-line. And I'd like to have a look back at the other portion of the state. I'm just wondering if we want to go to our fifteen-minute break and then just start back with Tamina. Let's do that right now, because we have a sort of a (indiscernible) here. So fifteen-minute break, that's going to bring us back at 4:50, or Kristian, is it 4:52?

So Commissioners --

MR. MANOFF: Something like that, Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- yes.

MR. MANOFF: Something like that.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Can we get an extra three minutes? Can we go to 4:55?


COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Sounds good.
(Whereupon, a recess was held from 4:37 p.m. until 4:54 p.m.)

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Welcome back, California, to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission meeting for the general public. We will be taking public comment at 6, and we will not be taking that (indiscernible) show break at 5:45, as we just came back from break, but we will, at about 6:25, need to take our mandatory fifteen minute break for our interpreters and reporters.

So with that, we're going to jump into -- Tamina has some little revisions that she was going over, and if we could have a look at that, please? And I believe this was with possibly Commissioner Yee, so.

MS. RAMON ALON: Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioners, take off.

MS. RAMON ALON: Just one revision. This is to the NORTHCONT district, which you are looking at right now. The revision will be in blue. This revision takes the Grizzly Bay area of Solano County, adds it to the NORTHCONT, and just slightly shifts the lines in Vacaville to make the bottom part of Vacaville whole with the rest of Vacaville. So the new shape of this district -- I'll turn off the background district so you can see. This is what the new proposed district would look like, I and invite Commissioner Yee to comment on.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. So thank you, Tamina.

You did such a skillful job of selecting this area. So this is mostly an almost all intact wildlife refuge and nature area, so I believe the population shift is only about 141 people. And so just a very small shift in the populated areas, and I believe it makes for a much better shaped district. We'll be losing what we've been calling the dragon district. If anyone sees something different in this shape. But we'd like to go ahead with this change.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just curious. What was this district previously like, or what was included in it? Thank you.

MS. RAMON ALON: So this district is currently cut in this area, and just this area, as Commissioner Yee mentioned, only about 121 people, the wildlife reserve, so that area was not included. So this area would now be included here. And then this small part of Vacaville in the South, which was part of NORTHCONT, is now with Yolo-Lake, which adjusts the line a little bit up here in the Southeast corner.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. And so there was no trade. That that was the extent of the trade; is that
correct? There was no difference in our line in Antioch or actually in Contra Costa County.

MS. RAMON ALON: That was the extent of the trade. It affected no other districts aside from the line in Yolo-Lake right here with that block change. But aside from that, it affects nothing else.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: And the Southern line continues to go through -- right along the county line there in the Waterway, Grizzly Bay, Suisun Bay, and so forth.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. Thank you very much. And Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I just wanted to say that I support this change. It makes for a -- it brings in representation to -- or different representation, and unites parts of Solano County, so I'm supportive.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yes. Given that, from the description, I also like that, but can we have -- anyone who prefers the previous edition?

Commissioner Akutagawa? Oh, okay. All right, great.

Then, Tamina, yes, please do that. Thank you very much.

Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Tamina.
Thank you, everyone.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Thank you very much for that extra work.

And then, if we could -- then, if we could swap Tamina for Kennedy, please, and we'll go to -- I understand we have a few ideas on the ECA fix and in the Sacramento area.

MS. WILSON: And one moment while I pull that up.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. Thank you very much.

(Pause)

MS. WILSON: So here is the iteration, iteration, Rosebell is what I've called it, and exploring Rosebell populating ECA a little bit, keeping Stanislaus going North. On these, it's very similar to what we had before as far as the South Sac, San Joaquin, and the Sacramento district. One thing that we explored was keeping Parkway whole, and so we moved Parkway in, and moved Rancho Murrieta up. So we made a swap there, some blocks in between here and there, and were able to balance those two. So Parkway, again, is whole. All other lines have stayed the same. Sacramento, the city, is whole,

And moving into North Sac, this stayed relatively similar as well. The cities there, Fruitridge Pocket and Lemon Hill are separated from the rest, but they are not split, and with Oak Park, Pocket area. West Sacramento's
with the downtown area. The split in Arden Arcade down Howe and the American River to the South has stayed the same as well. And we have Elverta, Rio Linda, McClellan Park, Rancho Cordova, again.

And then moving North into Placer SAC, we explored taking some of Roseville out. And so we have El Dorado Hills up to Shingle Springs with Cameron Park, Granite Bay, parts of Roseville, down in Northern Sacramento suburban communities. And then, moving out to the bigger ECA, we have Rocklin, Loomis, Penryn, North Auburn, Auburn, Lincoln, Sheridan, the bigger cities here in Placer, out to the Eastern parts of Placer, the rest of El Dorado. So there's no El Dorado Hills in there, as well, and then follows the boundaries that were there before as far as Yuba and up to Plumas goes.

And so the main change came from Parkway is no longer split and there is a split in the Roseville.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Kennedy?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

And one thing that we did not explore but could, I think, be easily resolved is if we want to make Arden whole, we could just be adjusting that line in Roseville.

Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Thank you for this
Do we have Commissioners' ideas on this one?

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair.

Thank you, Kennedy, and I forget who worked on this.

Can you let me see the Sacramento region, please?

The North. Okay. And go down so I can see the Northern part of it. (Audio interference) --

(Pause)

COMMISSIONER TURNER: In the very tail? Okay. So this is Mountain House -- Mountain House is just the name. Mountain House is with Tracy into the San Joaquin --

MS. WILSON: Mountain House and Tracy are South, and with Modesto, and Turlock, and Lathrop, Manteca, and then the Eastern farming cities of San Joaquin.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. For this area, can I see the CVAPs for all of the areas in this current iteration?

MS. WILSON: Yes, one moment.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: While that comes up, may I just make one or two comments about this?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thanks. I was just going to -- just going to note, and I had taken a look at this
earlier, this takes that Parkways district that we saw this morning that I think Commissioner Fernandez had worked on, and just localizes the change up North, as the community testimony had suggested. We actually did not look at anything further South. We just took what was there for the Parkways one. So I think, totally -- we've never made any adjustments to any of this. So I think totally fair game.

And Commissioner Turner, I know, of course, you know this area well. So very curious to hear your thoughts.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. I was writing the current CVAPs down --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- so that when I ask for the others, I'll be able to see the difference.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Do you want Kennedy to read them out? Because sometimes I have trouble reading them.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: That would be great. I see what we currently have. I'm wondering what they were with the different splits starting from right above Sacramento. Is it NORTHCONT? No, not over there. I'm sorry. What was above Sacramento?

MS. WILSON: North --
COMMISSIONER TURNER: North Sac.

MS. WILSON: Yes. This is North Sac. Do you want me to read those out?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. I want you to read out what were the CVAP numbers before this most recent change?

MS. WILSON: So for our -- okay. One moment.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Because I see what's on the screen. Thank you. And I've written those down. And Lemon Hill, West Sac, all of that is in -- what is this area called? Where is the -- where is the line? Where is this?

MS. WILSON: One moment. I was just pulling up the old CVAP from before we made the changes.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Yes.

MS. WILSON: So the old ones -- and I just realized they are in decimals, so hold on, but they are going to be the ones that are in red. And so you can see that CVAP. And one moment while I get those -- I'm going to change that for you. Okay. There we go. That's fixed.

So the old CVAP numbers are from before we started making the changes here. So in Sacramento it would be -- and I can change the color of that line as well. Sorry. My apologies. I don't know if you'd like me to switch on and off between them or what. But North Sac, the line
had -- was going here in kind of the river, and we had -- we moved it down for population, so it went from up here and was pushed down here.

So North Sac before and now, the Latino CVAP, was 16.81 percent. It is now 21.19 percent. The Black CVAP was 16.81 percent, and it was 14 -- or it was 16.81 percent, and it is now 14.02 percent. The Asian CVAP was 11.20 percent, and it is now 16.88 percent. The Indigenous CVAP was 1.25 percent, and it is now 0.297 percent. And the white CVAP was 58.44 percent, and it is now 44.41 percent.

And moving to the areas of Sacramento and Elk Grove, the dividing line was a lot different. So we had a dividing line at the San Joaquin border, and now, you know, that is more fluid and it goes into Sacramento and San Joaquin, but the Latino CVAP before was 20.40 percent. It is now 26.98 percent. The Black CVAP was 12.83 percent. It is now 12.05 percent. The Asian CVAP was 21.11 percent. It is now 21.35 percent. The Indigenous CVAP was 0.90 percent. It is now 0.84 percent. And the white CVAP was 41.293 percent, and it is now 36.54 percent.

And then for the San Joaquin areas, again, they are quite different in composition, as far as, you know, we had some of Modesto going out before, but -- so comparing
those to now, it was -- the Latino CVAP was 31.74 percent, and it is now 28.03 percent. The Black CVAP was 8.79 percent, and it is now 3.79 percent. The Asian CVAP was 15.89 percent, and it is now 9.12 percent. The Indigenous CVAP was 1.03 percent. It is now 1.34 percent. And the white CVAP was at 40.73 percent, and it is now at 56.08 percent.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. And looking at -- just hold for one moment. I'm looking at, also, ECA and (indiscernible) Tracy. (Audio interference) --

MS. WILSON: And this -- oh, yeah, the SCALRATRACY, that was separate from these changes. There are -- I guess those changes don't reflect all of what Tamina has done now, because this is --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.

MS. WILSON: -- from before she made those changes. And I believe the ECA is even different because this version had -- oh, no. It's pretty similar, but it's not -- this -- the ECA is not up to date, either. As far as a swap, as far as where -- this line, we had moved higher here, regardless of that, just from being the 17,000 people.

But as far as comparing goes, I would say, yeah, the Sacramento ones, the San Joaquin ones, and the North Sacramento ones.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Can we also see the Placer Sac?

MS. WILSON: Oh, yes. We can read that one as well. So Placer Sac Latino CVAP was 9.76 percent. It is now 12.47 percent. The Black CVAP was 1.65 percent. It is now 5.6 percent. The Asian CVAP was at 6.31 percent. It is now at 8.14 percent. The Indigenous CVAP was at 1.48 percent. It is now at 1.13 percent. The white CVAP was at 80.09 percent, and it is now at 71.44 percent.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Kennedy. I know you're taking all that in, Commissioner Turner. Do you want me to get Commissioner Fernandez and then come back to you, to give you a little --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.
CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you.
Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.

So I don't like this. It's splitting up COI. And what I want to do is I want to remind everyone that right now, Modesto is whole. And it's just not in the district that it wants to be, so in order to make Modesto whole and bring it into the district it wants to be, you end up, as has been said many times, carving Sacramento, and that's exactly what happened.

So right now, San -- I should say before this. So
in our draft that we have that we've already looked at, Modesto makes up -- or Stanislas County makes up 56 percent of that district, and there's nine other counties in that district. So if you -- I guess I would say it's the big dog in that district. And so what we've done by making this change, or if we do make this change, is prior, San Joaquin was just about whole, except for a corner of it. Sacramento was somewhat self-contained, except for Folsom.

And as we move up, Kennedy, can you move up, please? What we've done is we've disrupted some of the communities of interest. And I guess one of the major ones is in the most marginalized and disenfranchised communities in Sacramento, which would be your Lemon Hill, Fruitridge and Oak Park. Now, that is lit from Lemon Hill, Florin, Vineyard, and Elk Grove. And then we also have another community of interest -- and when I say another community, it's multiple people that have written in. We have the Asian community that is also in that area, plus also Greenhaven and Pocket to be with Vineyard and Elk Grove. And we've also split up the community of interest of Elk Grove, Florin, Freeport, Fruitridge in South Sacramento. I've already talked about the Lemon Hill, Fruitridge, Pocket, Parkway, and Florin AAPI of Del Paso is also in there with Meadowview and the Hmong
community with Del Paso Heights.

So what we have done, however, is we have accepted the -- or not accepted -- we have respected the communities of interests of Modesto to be whole. We've done that. We've also satisfied another community of interest in terms of keeping together Lake Tahoe with Truckee. However, in that prior iteration, I actually liked how it was split up because it did keep it in the communities that it belongs to.

So my frustration is that I heard it many times say that, oh, there's going to be extra population, and what we'll have to do is go in to Sacramento and carve it up. Again, what I said is -- that's exactly what we've done.

And the other frustration is that because maybe Sacramento doesn't have the ability or the bandwidth to listen to every single change that we've made, and because of that, now we're listening to -- which we should anyway -- we're listening to the most current information. And I just want to remind the Commissioners that we have had COI, we've had since June with these communities of interest.

So I'm really not sure what else I can say in terms of we are really taking the part of Sacramento that is marginalized and we are splitting it up, and they are definitely -- you're splitting up their voice, or we
would be splitting up their voice, and I'm just having
issues with that. And so my recommendation is to go to
the prior maps. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair.

I actually kind of like this visualization. I know
before we went on lunch, one of those breaks, we were
trying to figure out a way to bring Roseville back in
with ECA, and this visualization does not bring all of
Roseville in. So to me, it's speaking more, too, about
compromise.

And also, the iterations that I've seen previously,
and I might be mistaken, don't all keep whole Lemon Hill,
Florin -- can you zoom into that area? That area had a
split. Fruitridge Pocket, Lemon Hill, Parkway, Florin,
in the previous iterations, as well, so that part did not
solve for me in this iteration. However, it does bring
Roseville in a little bit into ECA, which I think I heard
a lot about. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Kennedy?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. And I may
have some more later, but just a couple of things. First
of all, as I mentioned earlier, I think, this is not
being put on the table as a final answer. This is a
direction in which we might want to do further
exploration. And for that, I think it has a lot to
recommend it.

You know, the question of Modesto is not just a
question of it being whole. It is more a question of,
you know, is it appropriate to really be -- I mean, to
have it in a district that is not a Central Valley
district, largely? I mean, I do understand the
population numbers. So yes, theoretically, even though
it's not a part of the Sierras region, it could always
elect its candidate of choice if it wanted to. If that's
the perspective that's being taken. But I really -- you
know, I look at this, and I look at some of the solutions
that we've come up elsewhere, and as Commissioner Ahmad
just said, you know, this does represent some
compromises, but again, I think there's some good
compromises, and, you know, it's certainly open to
further refinement. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Well, I'd
definitely be open to seeing how we could refine it
further, more globally here.

If you can zoom in to the -- around the Northern
part of this district, around Rosedale? Yeah. Go further North and then zoom out a little bit.

So you know, I guess I would argue that, you know, the people in Modesto have the same amount in common or less -- or more, I mean, than the people of Roseville and Rocklin with the other communities. So I don't see that that, other than population that -- you know, there's a valid argument there, but I think we should look at this more and look at other opportunities for working through this.

I guess I have a question for Dale. Is there any compactness concerns here?

MR. LARSON: I'm not seeing it, no.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Kennedy?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry. One other point that I wanted to make. As I said, I went into this largely to resolve the issue of Parkway, and the Parkway resolution was a fairly simple one of moving Rancho Murieta into the North Sac district and then just balancing for population. That was the easiest part of this. You know, other than the split in Roseville, things are pretty much whole. You know, the issue, may be one of, you know, where a district cuts between two cities, but as far as cities and CDPs, other than the Roseville
split, you know, I think we've done a very good job of respecting boundaries here and keeping things pretty well grouped with places that are nearby or similar.

So again, we offer this as a as a starting point for some further exploration. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. At this point, I need to state this is a nonstarter for me. You are picking or choosing Modesto, and as Commissioner Fornaciari noted, some of these other communities that you've added also do not have commonality. Again, you're splitting up communities in Sacramento that -- well, you've weakened their voices of those that are the least heard. So nonstarter for me. Very disappointed.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Kennedy?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, I have to say, I'm a bit disappointed, too, because I think that this could represent a way forward, and just taking a stand and saying it's a nonstarter, you know, I think we could make some progress from here.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah. Thank you. I thought
maybe I'd jump in here. And I think thinking of breaking up communities, the lines are going to do that across the whole state. That's just the nature of the game, is communities will be broken up. But how can we draw these lines to, as best as possible, keep intact as many communities as possible? And I do see that there's a lot of communities in this general area that have been broken up, but there are also a lot of communities that we kept together.

And one that I did not see previous to this iteration was that Roseville piece to ECA. And as you can see, it's a tiny chunk of Roseville. We could have drawn this iteration in a different way where more could have been encompassed. However, again, this is where I'm seeing a compromise to at least move forward to some resolution in this area. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Yeah. I'm looking at resolutions, and particularly, I was struck by just kind of the conversation that says that the Northern top doesn't have any more in common than Modesto, or what have you, and I'm wondering if we should be looking at a split in Modesto where we're sharing and not sending across so much population there, and if it would make a
difference in where some of the lines are, and in so
doing, be able to perhaps keep more of the Sacramento
Fruitridge, Pocket, Lemon Hill, Florin, Vineyard, more of
that together, maybe even Elk Grove, and split somewhere
there, and then have less -- do something different with
the split up at Roseville.

I don't know. I'm wondering if we can just split
between the two, so we're not trying to move the whole.
And not just to intentionally cut Modesto, but we are
splitting smaller cities in this process of trying to
make it work.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you, Commissioner
Turner. Yeah.

I'm just wondering if -- I'm hearing that we'd like
to come to a bit of a resolution, but we think there's a
path forward. It doesn't have to be one or the other. I
think there's an area to work in here, and I'm just
wondering if we could get -- maybe Commissioner, maybe,
Kennedy and Fernandez might want to work on this
together, or -- I pulled those names out of the hat. I'd
like us to some -- I would like us to explore this
because, you know, there are a lot of areas that did make
sacrifices on the Assembly map and, you know, I think
there is a way out of this without it being -- without it
being one way or the other, and I would like to see that
But let's hear -- Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thank you. Yeah.

This one, I got to say, I was a little torn. I mean, when we, you know, did the drafts to propose this morning, when we did the work last night, we knew what we were getting into, and we did discuss the splitting of all the COIs and we were a little concerned.

I do like the idea of maybe -- what it is looking at Stanislas County, there's a number of smaller cities in the area. You know, maybe trying to keep those in this district. But I do support what, you know, what's now been said about looking for an alternate way. I think I understand that there's been a lot of pain spread around, but at the same time, I think I'd like to see -- yeah -- I would support just looking for one other -- maybe another alternative, if there can be, to try to prevent breaking up some of those communities, especially in the Sacramento area.

And also, I'll just comment, I think -- I'm not sure what the magic about Roseville is, but I will say that it's a little -- I'm always wary about people from outside of an area trying to say we should include another area, so that's the only other thing I'll say. I think we've heard that in all of the areas in which we
may come from, and so I'm trying to be very sensitive to
that, too.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: No. Yeah. Thank you.

I'm going to go to Commissioner -- sorry,
Commissioner Turner, you still have your hand up. Is
that you -- want to say something new, or? Because
otherwise, we're going --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Maybe it's something
new. Maybe it's a repeat, like an old broken record. I
don't know.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: No, no, no. I don't mean it in
that direction.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I know.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I mean, I'm guess I'm going to come
back to you, but I didn't know if it was --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- if you were directing --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: It's okay.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- (indiscernible, simultaneous
speech) your point.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: What I'd like to say is, in
addition to Commissioner Sadhwani that was already trying
it, if Commissioner Kennedy, or whoever else, I'm also
willing to work on this area, whenever you determine who
the best combination of folk would be. That's all.
CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. And before I ask Commissioner Sadhwani, could we have the instruction for public comment read, please?

MR. MANOFF: Yes, Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed. It is 81149259556 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound.

Once you've dialed in, you'll be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star 9. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it's your turn to speak, you'll hear a message that says, "The host would like you to talk." Press star 6 to speak. If you'd like to give your name, please state and spell it for the record. You are not required to provide your name to give public comment.

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

   Back to you, Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Kristian.

   Going back to -- I'm just realizing that while I was
   having a look at that, Modesto is actually already split.
   It's not whole right there. Part of it is in the
   STANISFRES area, I'm just noticing.

   Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. That's exactly right.

   That's what I was going to raise, the fact that Modesto
   is already split.

   A couple things, right? So as a reminder, this was
   an exploration. And so Commissioner Kennedy and I spent,
   I don't know, what? About twenty minutes with Kennedy
   off-line. And we really tried to localize the change
   based on Commissioner Fernandez's map and based on the
   communities of interest testimony that we had received.

   So this is a starting point, but it sounds like
   there are many who would be curious to see it play out in
   greater detail. And I will just say, you know, some of
   the things that we had kind of thrown around were
   possibly in the Assembly maps, we started snaking through
   the county borders, right? I recall a very fun
   conversation about Copperopolis. So you know, I think
   that there's many different ways to think about these
changes.

And I just really want to raise and, you know, I said this I don't even remember what day it was. But I know I had kind of targeted it at that point to Commissioner Kennedy, right? Like, any time someone says something is a total nonstarter, it does give me pause, right? Because, you know, as Commissioner Ahmad had mentioned, like, we're breaking COIs left and right, and it hurts, and no one -- like, I definitely don't like doing it. That's the nature of this work, though, and so I -- you know, that always does just give me pause when one place is, you know, just completely off limits as something that we can look at, because this is redistricting, and we're trying to get to zero population, and respect wherever we can, and in an effort to explore communities of interest testimony, that's what this is, right?

And so I think that there's plenty more that could be explored, and I would certainly defer to Commissioner Turner, you know, to pick up where I left off because, you know, I'm sure that -- I'm sure that would be helpful. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. You know, this is a
shared experience to all these communities throughout the state, so you know, it's hard. It's hard. It should be painful. It's going to smart, and it should smart. So bearing that fact, I think it would be prudent and wise for us to explore all possibilities and alternatives, so I think we have to be open to exploration. I think that's in our best interests and the best interests of the people of the state.

And we're doing okay. It doesn't seem like it, but I think we're doing fine. We're getting there. Let's continue to slog along. We're doing the work. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thank you for those words, Commissioner Taylor. I think you're right.

I'd like to -- I'd like to make a suggestion that Commissioner Fernandez be a partner in this particular exploration. You know, I think, because she knows the area -- I'm just kind of thinking about like all of the areas, and I mean, you know, we've heard over and over again from different Commissioners, you know, "we're going to share the pain". And you know, I've said it, too.

I think, though, for the people who come from
certain areas, I think there's a nuance that I think we'll need to take into account that, as they read through the COI testimony, I think we should also use to help us understand, can we do something better? And I think it was Commissioner Sadhwani, or maybe it was Commissioner Turner who said, you know, leave no stone unturned. So I'd like for us to do that.

I think, you know -- I mean, we all have areas in which we have wish we could have done something a little bit different. But you know, we've had to just kind of go with it because -- yeah, it's to share the pain, and it's what's in the best interests of, you know, what we're trying to do.

But I think if we're at a place where we're hearing that, you know, we can't just move on, I think we need to try to -- we need to try to do better if we can. And if it's just the addition of time and having that work done, I think we're pretty close on a lot of places, and so I think we can do this. So anyways.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: All right.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I just wanted to say that.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner -- yes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

We have Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner
Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.

A couple things. I find it interesting -- I've never used the term nonstarter. I used it this time, but I've heard others use it, and this time when I used it, I was attacked. So very interesting that now, we have an issue with it, which actually I had issues with it in the past as well. But it seemed to put a point across.

Secondly, I did want to reiterate, I believe it was what -- I can't remember who said it, in terms of wanting to dig into Roseville, was never Roseville saying they wanted to be part of ECA. I believe it was Inyo and Mono.

And my other thing is, I would be willing to work with Commissioner Turner on this, since it's kind of areas that both of us know very well. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Kennedy?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: And I would endorse that. I mean, I got involved in this mostly by accident. You know, my interest was trying to find a solution to Parkway, and I phrased my statement, something along the lines of, you know, I'd be happy to see us go down this road and explore, which colleagues took as my volunteering. It wasn't intended to be a -- I wasn't
intending to volunteer myself for it, but I was happy to participate in it. You know, again, I'm happy to see Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner Turner take this on and, you know, just offer that, yes, as far as Parkway is concerned, shifting Rancho Murieta seems to be a fairly easy solution to that. So thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. Yeah.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I'd just be hopeful for a resolution, whether it's a compromised solution or otherwise, but it would be good to be able to finish up our maps, and I think this is -- so we do need a decision point here. And what that --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Um-hum. Yes.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- what our decision point is, whether we have -- ensure that we have a backup just in case for this area.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Right. Yes. And thank you very much.

Commissioner Sinay -- I'm sorry.

Commissioner Taylor, you also have your hand up. Is that a -- you have something additionally to -- oh, okay.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. This late in the
game, I'm just wondering if it may make sense for those who are working on it to continue working on it, versus those that are close to it, who may have, you know, blind spots, and it hurts. It's more personal. Maybe they shouldn't. I mean, I think in the beginning, it's really important, but we're at a stage where I just feel that we need to -- all of us need to be a little bit removed and be able to look at the bigger picture, and I'm just concerned that -- I mean, I would be more supportive of -- I think Commissioner Kennedy did a very good job of looking at it very analytical and look at the COIs. I understand the desire to have Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner Turner, but I do feel that right now, we need objectivity so that we can kind of move forward.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Kennedy?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry. Commissioner Fornaciari is the other one who has worked on this area, so maybe instead of accidentally volunteering myself, I can purposely volunteer Commissioner Fornaciari. I don't know. You know, I think he's also able to approach this analytically, and certainly is more familiar with the region than I am, so.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Very nicely done,
Commissioner Kennedy. Okay.

I think for me, in response, I would disagree. I think, if anything, this is a time -- well, a few things. One, I think we do a disservice to both Commissioners Fernandez and Turner that they cannot be analytical or impartial in what is best for the entire state. And so I would completely disagree with that. I think that they are more than capable, and I think that they've proven that to us over and over again.

I believe that having a little bit better local knowledge is more important because they know where the kind of places where, I don't want to call it the nonstarters, but the places where it is important to try to preserve, and where are the places where, you know what? Look, it's going to hurt, but this is a place where we can -- where perhaps, the line can be cut better than in another place.

And I think, you know, I'm sure each one of us would feel the same about some of the areas in which we know well, and we would want to make sure that while there's a share the pain, we also want to make sure that it's done appropriately, and I think that's where local knowledge, or at least the more familiarity with an area would make a difference, especially in this time and place that we
are now. So I would wholeheartedly continue to support
Commissioner Turner and Fernandez, you know, exploring
and coming back to us all on this.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Oh, I support me,
too.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. Is that a volunteer?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I volunteered a long time ago.

I absolutely believe I can do it, and I certainly will
not -- I will be objective in this area and analytical in
my approach. I've worked on some of the LA areas, Long
Beach areas, commented on -- I don't know anything about
those areas, either. I'm following the COIs, following
our criteria, and anything less to suggest is
problematic, at this point. I'm not tied to anything
other than getting our maps completed in the manner that
they should be, while taking into full account all of the
public comment and testimony that we have.

And with that said, I'm equally not offended if
someone else wants to take it on, but by no means do I
feel like I can't do it. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

I'll take Commissioner Ahmad, and then I think I might
make a decision here.
Comissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah. Thank you, Chair.

I, too, agree with Commissioner Akutagawa. I have no doubt in my heart that Commissioner Fernandez and Turner can take this on. I also don't think that you need specialized local knowledge to do this job. I have not seen much of California, yet here I am. So I trust that we all have the ability to review all of the public input that we all have received to get this job done, and I am excited to see the starting point that they bring forward to us. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yes. I would say that I was about to say Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner Sadhwani until Commissioner Sadhwani said, look, and I completely believe that Commissioner Turner is more than capable. I was not going to -- actually, as Commissioner Kennedy did with Commissioner Fornaciari, and volunteer her, but since she has indeed said that, I would like to see Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner Turner work on this, because I know that -- you know, passions run high in certain areas. I know.

But I also know that there are a lot of issues here, and I firmly believe that -- I know myself, it's hard to be dispassionate about certain areas. For me, it's the Bay Area. It's also for the -- you know, it's -- well,
it's many of them. But you know, living where you live, it is hard to remove and say, no, wait a minute. Am I being fair and consistent with the whole state? And I have no doubt that these two wonderful, capable Commissioners will do that and will apply -- because I feel that there is a solution here. And I think that with our capable line drawer, also, that we'll come up with something. So I look forward to hearing from them.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm just curious when we're going to receive the solution. Are we receiving it tomorrow, or are we receiving it on Monday? I'm just -- I would be -- I always just want to make sure that we have enough time to discuss it and also, if necessary, any additional deliberation and/or potential votes, right, so.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. We will be meeting tomorrow. So I would say that we will be meeting tomorrow to go over things.

At this point, what I'd like to do, we only have a few minutes left. I'd like for us to quickly go down, actually, to Orange County. Not Orange County. I say that every time. San Diego, because we do have some things to look at in San Diego. And so I do hope that we
can actually get this back to this area to look at by
tomorrow meeting, which will be starting at 1 o'clock,
not 11.
So if we could change maps here, please, and look at
San Diego?
MR. MANOFF: I'm sorry to interrupt, Chair, but did
you want to take a break before we start taking calls?
CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, actually, I thought we would
just go directly in, since we took our earlier break, and
then we would end up having to take our break at, I
believe it's 6:25.
MR. MANOFF: That's right. Sounds good, Chair.
CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. And we do have until 6
o'clock, so we have a short minute here to introduce the
topic, and I don't know if we can -- how much we have to
do on this.
So thank you, both, Andrew and Sivan.
MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you, Chair.
MS. TRATT: Kristian, are you seeing my screen okay,
Kristian?
MR. MANOFF: Looks great, Sivan. Thank you.
MS. TRATT: Yeah, absolutely. Go ahead, Andrew.
MR. DRECHSLER: No, I was just going to do a quick
introduction as you're getting your screen up. Thank
you.
We did meet with Commissioner Sinay. She did have a couple of changes that she wanted to go through, just cleaning up -- just making the San Diego maps. She had some suggestions on the San Diego maps. So Sivan worked on them this morning. And I do believe that this is posted up on the website, the changes that we're going to be talking about now, and I'll turn it over to you.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Thanks, Andrew, for that introduction,

And Commissioner Sinay, if you want to cut in to add anything, please feel free.

This can be found on the website. It's -- it is CD iteration, S1 from today's date, 12/11/21. Just to orient everyone before I show those changes, this is how we left San Diego last time. Just a high level overview of the swaps that we made in this iteration. It was responding to community of interest testimony about Escondido not -- or preferring to be in a district that was more aligned with the orientation of the city, so either in East County or with cities like Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos. And then we were able to do a swap that keeps Carlsbad whole. So let me just pull that snapshot up. Okay.

So the main changes, as I mentioned, were with the City of Escondido and Carlsbad. So previously, Escondido
was split in more of like a North -- it was divided more
North-South, and now the line goes North-South to divide
it more East-West. As you can see, the Eastern part of
the City of Escondido, as well as the San Pascual area of
the Northern part of San Diego City, is now in the East
County district. We also reoriented Carlsbad to remove a
split and place it with the cities of Encinitas, Solana
Beach, in this SD Coast district. The resulting changes
were that we had to make a small split in the Southern
portion of San Marcos, but it's pretty minimal. And then
again, we just changed where the split in Escondido is.

Are there any questions from Commissioners?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So could you -- I
don't know if you could do an overlay of the previous map
and --

MS. TRATT: One moment, please.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And the reason why I'm
 asking is because I believe -- and this is -- I thought
we were all comfortable with this, I believe we kept the
district the way it was because it was going to be an all
coastal district. Now, it's going inland, and I don't
think that that -- I mean, one, we've gotten lots of COI
testimony that the South OC people would prefer not to
have gone into San Diego, but if they had to, they wanted
to keep it coastal, and now we're doing exactly opposite of that. And so I'm just concerned about why this came about now, when there really -- I thought we had pretty widespread agreement on it.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. If I could just respond to Commissioner Akutagawa quickly.

So the district was already orienting slightly inland in this Northern portion. And actually, if you see these red lines, this is what we started with. It's actually improved that orientation by swapping out Escondido, which is more inland, and the San Pascual area of San Diego for the City of Carlsbad, which keeps more of the coastal cities intact. So you can see that it actually does increase the coastal orientation of both the SSCNFC district and the SD Coast district.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I don't see how it improves the OC one. It goes in. If you kept it -- if you stopped it at Carlsbad, even that would at least keep it coastal.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So it -- I mean, it goes into as far as San Marcos, which it did previously, and stops short of Escondido, so it's not a major swap, but --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sivan, I can help explain what's going on. Can we zoom out a little bit on San Diego, please?
And I know that I said I was fine, and when we went through this, we -- you know, I took a step back and facilitated and said, where are some of the pain points in this? And we collectively made decisions. When the decision was made for Escondido, I was very clear that that was not fair for Escondido. It had asked for what -- it had asked for two things. And it's not just Escondido. It is really the 78 corridor. And I think North San Diego County is just as important in this, as is South Orange County. And you're putting wealthy, you know, coastal Orange County communities with working class communities in San Diego.

The idea here was to look at the 78 corridor, which is a strong collaborative that's been built between Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos, and Escondido as a business collaborative as well as a nonprofit and educational collaborative. They serve Camp Pendleton. Cal State San Marcos is in there, and Cal State San Marcos is a commuter school. I think it's, like, eighty percent commuters from that area. And then Carlsbad is actually in the School District with Encinitas, Del Mar, Solana, and part of Rancho Santa Fe and Carmel Valley.

We have looked at a lot of -- the big issue was, you were connecting San Pascual, which is a very, very rural -- if you've ever gone to San Diego Wild Animal
Park, that's where San Pascual is. And it's avocado trees, and orchards, and farms, all the way down to the City of San Diego, which is really the center of power. And people feel like if you're with the City of San Diego, you're not listened to.

And so by doing this, it was an effort to really try to keep the coastal more coastal, and the North county, North inland county, or North county business districts more together. And so it was really looking at that Escondido COI that we were not listening to at all, and trying to -- you know, it's still split, but it's split between two communities that they are working with, and they're together, as well as Carlsbad has a strong affiliation further South in the coast than North.

And for me, I just had to present it, because it was something that was really bothering me. Escondido is really a community that is very, very, very mixed, in a lot of different ways. It's a lot of Latino, low income community as well as a lot of -- you know, it was one of the places where we have had mixed policies on how it helps the community, and I just wanted to explore it. So like with everything else, it's an exploration, and we can go back.

The other piece we had done was cleaned up a little bit between Bonsall and Fallbrook. There was an
unincorporated area that was kind of sticking out, and we took that out so it could be with Fallbrook and Bonsall because it made more sense to keep them all together. So that was the only other little thing we did.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa -- Commissioner Toledo? And we only have two more minutes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I understand what your logic is, but you know, you're still combining, you know, very different South OC communities with Vista, Oceanside, and San Marcos, and if anything, you know, I think the gap has become worse, not better.

And so I mean, another alternative is that instead of -- can we go up just a little bit, Sivan? I mean, I don't know. I mean, the only -- just thinking just right now, very quickly, you know, for me, I mean, I would just say, I mean, you know, you've got Dana Point and San Clemente, for example, including Laguna Niguel. Those are some pretty, you know, higher income areas within South Orange County and very different from those other areas. And so you know, one consideration -- and again, I'm just talking very quickly off the top of my head, is to perhaps move more of the middle income kind of communities like Rancho Mission Viejo, which I know they have an affiliation with Camp Pendleton. I know also,
San Juan Capistrano also has a Latino community there that may have more in common with Vista, San Marcos, and Oceanside in terms of less of a, I'll call it a income inequality range, in this district. I know that previously, Camp Pendleton was seen as just a coastal district and so therefore, it should be, but this doesn't make sense to me right now.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Just Commissioner Toledo, and I think we will start with this area tomorrow, because I think it's worth -- you know, we're going to come back to many different areas, and we have not come back to San Diego.

So I guess a couple more -- I'll give you a couple more minutes to kind of just wrap this up for tonight and we'll jump into this in the morning tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, quickly. Yeah, I thought we had wrapped up (indiscernible) ago, but I think -- I am appreciative of Commissioner Sinay's, you know, providing us with this proposal and, you know, and look forward to the discussion. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you. Yeah. I will say that I have heard --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can I just --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, certainly
COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- since we're going to end, can I just --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- answer?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Please.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Again, the main thing here is that we do have two different groups. In the past, it goes straight down the coast and includes Encinitas and Solano. The reason for Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos, and Escondido coming together is that it does give them a voice in a district that already has the economic -- and Camp Pendleton has that economic difference. So now you have, half the district is wealthy and the other half is not, because of the way that this was kind of set up to go down this way. And so this was to give an opportunity for those cities to have a voice in a district that would predominantly be heard by the far North.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Fernandez, one last item?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I just want to ask for tomorrow, it sounds like we're really close, so I was just wondering why we're still meeting tomorrow, since we can tie it up on Monday. So that was just --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: We don't actually --
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- before we go -- before we go to public comment. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Could I say something, too, on that same point? Just you know, I think the line drawers are pretty -- have been pretty busy, and it's been, you know, a lot of work. And given the 11 o'clock start, it'll be difficult for us to meet and be able to actually turn every rock that we're supposed to be turning and do our due diligence with them. So I just wanted to throw that out there, because I know that's a challenge, especially if I'm -- you know, given the work that we need to do.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. On that note, we're starting at 1 tomorrow, not at 11 o'clock. 1 p.m. will be tomorrow. And the reason we are doing tomorrow is because Monday, we actually, it -- although it was not agendized for -- it was agendized slightly differently. And so today is our day to finish this up -- I mean, today and tomorrow, and then we can, you know, jump into the Senate, then, on Monday. I'm sorry. Not the Senate. Oh, yes. The Senate on Monday.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So just to revisit the original plan, the plan was that we would use Monday to wrap up any loose ends we had on Congress, and if we were able to -- I mean, we specifically -- that was the plan, to finish Congress on Monday. And if we had -- you know, if we were able to finish it up, then we could move forward with the Senate, but the plan was to take on the Senate Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, and BOE.

And I just want to also reiterate, you know, our line drawers need some time to draw lines. If we're going to think creatively about looking at the North state question, I think some time to do that would be useful. You know, I kind of feel like we have one major outstanding question and a few loose ends to tie up, and we should be able to do that on Monday. I'm just putting in my two cents.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Certainly. And Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually, I was just going to (audio interference) Commissioner Fornaciari said exactly what I was thinking, because it was -- on our original schedule was Monday was for --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- finishing everything up.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Just to add to that, I mean,
at this point, I'm only able to get about thirty minutes
worth of line drawing for tomorrow for the Central
Valley, and that just seems like not enough time. So
just throwing that out there. Of course, I'm going to
see if we can work to get to a little bit more, but.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Yeah. I would love to say
that -- yes, I understand that on the original plan, it
was Monday. That got missed in agendizing, and so that's
why we're -- and we have been doing a lot of talking and
not actually, you know, being that productive in terms of
getting our lines drawn, and it's just that we do have
tomorrow available. You know, I would like to make sure
we get this done. I'm concerned if we go into Monday,
that other items will come up, and we might not complete.
And so I'm very concerned about our deadline here. And
also -- but now we're into public comment time.

So Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Just one last thing. On
our agenda for Monday, it does say line drawing. Live
line drawings, so I'm just trying to do one last poll,
just trying to let everyone get a little bit of rest and
catch up on all the committees of interest.

Thank you, everyone, for responding and sending in
your input, but we've got to really catch up on some
stuff. Thanks.
CHAIR ANDERSEN: And Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. I'm just hopping on that bandwagon that my understanding was Monday, we'd be able to finalize the loose ends, and I think the line drawers can use a breath, and in essence, they still would be working with some of the Commissioners on iterations. So it's really not a day off if the full Commission is not meeting. And some of us will be doing some creative thinking as well, trying to tie up those loose ends from Monday.

So I remember, Commissioner Andersen, you wanted -- or Chair Andersen, you wanted a few moments of reflection. Man, Sunday would be a great time to have a few moments of reflection.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Monday, Commissioner Kennedy takes over, and we also have a business meeting, partially, on Monday. So we do not have the whole day on Monday. But I'm hearing that this is indeed what the Commission wants. I'm very concerned about us actually completing on Monday, but if we all promise to really lead off with directions and, you know, and bring this one home, I will -- it's consensus, so. And I'm hearing almost everyone say, no, we shouldn't meet tomorrow.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I hear what you're saying,
Commissioner Andersen. I am concerned. I know we're --
I feel like we're getting close to finalizing things, but
I know we do have a business meeting also scheduled for
Monday.

Just curious if we can perhaps do a shorter meeting
on Sunday, or perhaps start later even? That way --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, we are starting at 1. We're
not starting at 11. We'd start at 1. And we could just,
if we finish up by 3, public comment, we're out of here.

But you know, I am concerned because we -- and it's
understandable. We have a lot of -- there's a lot of
tough issues that we're bringing up and we need to spend
the time on it, but at some we have to say, yep, we're
done. So we have to say, yeah, we're done, so. I --
Commissioner Ahmad, did you want to say something or?
And also have a look around? But --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah, I just.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: And --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Are we meeting tomorrow or not?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, that's -- well we --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I guess you're --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- have scheduled a meeting --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: -- deciding person in this,

right?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. But I feel I'm the --
certainly the minority here. And we do have the crew, since we have scheduled -- we will have our staff. Everyone will get the day off. But we have actually settled them in, so. But do I have any other person who thinks we should meet tomorrow?

    Commissioner Vazquez?

    COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: You all can throw darts at me. I do think we -- virtual darts. I do think meeting tomorrow for a couple of hours does make sense. I -- that's for me, but also, yeah, whichever way. But I just thought I would give my two cents.

    CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

    Commissioner Akutagawa.

    COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I'll make the target a little bit bigger, and I'll join Commissioner Vazquez on that, too. I don't necessarily believe we need to meet for the whole day, but I am -- I think at least two or three hours might be useful. Thank you.

    CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

    Commissioner Fernandez.

    COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I will be the unpopular one and say, I honestly think that if we meet for two hours, it's going to be the whole day. And I'm not sure how effective we will be, in terms of getting through everything versus if we meet on Monday, and we know it's
Monday, we will get it done.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, you know, what's keeping us from the finish line is two -- these two or three, you know, stuck points where we have not landed. So the question is, how do we get past those stuck points? The folks working on those issues on the side, you know, they come up with a brilliant idea that wins us over, then we'll get past them quickly. If they don't, we won't. So it's hard to say, you know.

I definitely think the line drawers need a break. I also know that deadlines focus the mind. So if we take tomorrow off and meet Monday and have to do it Monday, we have to do it, we have to do it Monday.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: And -- yeah, and we do have the business meeting too. So we do not have all of day on Monday. So --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, but I don't believe there's -- I don't believe there are major items of time-consuming business. I mean, I don't think there, yeah.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: There are some items that we -- that are on the business meeting agenda, yes. All right.

Oh, Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Since everyone's weighing in, I figure I'd put something, too. I'm a fan of taking
a break. You know, Monday -- I'm pretty we're agendized or business meetings every day from here on out. So we could also span it out across the week. I think all of us need to just let our minds get fresh again. And you know, when we worked on Assembly, we were here till like 12:30 at night or something, but we finished.

And for me personally, I think I'd rather do that and just get a little bit of a break and have a fresh mind. Thanks.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: All right. Well, like -- that's pretty much a decision for us. I don't -- I do not want to have to say I told you so. Okay? But it's been a pleasure to be the chair, and I will turn it over to my vice chair, who will be the chair on Monday. That's Commissioner Kennedy. And with that, let's go to public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I mean -- oh, there we are. I got muted. Thank you so much, Chair.

Thank you to all of those that have called in. Looks like we have lots of raised hands. For those who have not chosen to do so already. If you will, please press star nine, this will raise your hand indicating you wish to give comment, helps our staff keep track of the hands we have raised.

We will begin this evening with a minute and a half
public comment time, warnings at thirty seconds and
fifteen seconds remaining.

Who -- our first up will be caller 1036. And up
next after that, will be caller 0129.

And please, everybody in the queue be alert for when
it is your opportunity to speak. I will be identifying
you by the last four digits of your telephone.

Caller -- if I have them.

Caller 0129, if you'll please follow the prompts to
unmute; the floor is yours.

MR. LEBARRE: Hi, this is Mike LeBarre, Mayor of
King City. I am calling to one, give my appreciation
regarding CD_MIDCOAST and CD-Clara-Benito. I appreciate
the effort that you put into it, but I'm very, very
concerned that you still allowed CD Clara-Benito to be
connected to San Jose. It's very weird the way you do it
in there to connect a portion of that. It is a
completely different community interest. I urge you to
look at the submitted Central Coast Community Fix map,
and its attached Monterey's Fix Shape files that show
how to properly draw these districts, so they comply with
the Voting Rights Act.

I would like to remind the Commission that Monterey
County was one of four counties in California that
required preclearance before any electric change --
electoral changes. This is the first cycle that that was not required. And what is happening is really unconscionable the way our communities are being divided up, communities of interest being split.

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

MR. LEBARRE: So I asked the Commissioners, please look very, very closely. There is no reason for San Jose to be part of CD-Clara-Bonito --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

MR. LEBARRE: -- connecting San Salinas Valley in this map. Thank you, Commissioners.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 4993. And up next after that, will be caller 5944. Caller 4993, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

MR. REED: Thank you. My name is Jim Reed, I am the chief of staff for San Jose Mayor Sam Liccardo. And we've been watching the Commission's incredible work for so long to come up with district lines and haven't had a strong feeling on anything that's been submitted so far, until what came forward last night.

I'm not a lawyer, so I don't understand if there's a need to have the districts configured, so -- in such a contorted way, to pick up the previous caller, where King City and San Jose are part of the same community of
interest. Maybe that does have to be done, in your in
your perspective, and you're the experts.

But if you're going to have to take the Northern
part of San Jose for an Asian district and the East side
of San Jose for a Hispanic or Latino district, I would
implore you to not split the remainder of the City of San
Jose.

Out of all the largest cities in Northern
California; Oakland, Sacramento, San Francisco, they all
have one district that's primarily responsible for
representing that city.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. REED: Under this map, we have -- we are not
going to be more than one quarter or one third of the
Congressional District of anybody. We're not going to
have anybody who's on the hook to keep the City of San
Jose well represented --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. REED: -- in Washington, D.C. You can correct
that by making sure that at least one district in the
City of San Jose represents at least 50 percent of the
city's population. This is the tenth largest city in the
United States of America --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now, we have caller 5944. And up next after that,
will be caller 9938.

Caller 5944, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. I called in last week to talk about the Assembly maps with Bakersfield that the street level and just commend you guys on doing a good job on that. You guys really did a great job this week in Bakersfield and Kern County, replicating your previous work on the Assembly maps. I'd just like to ask you, as you guys go forward and make any final edits, that you guys don't touch Bakersfield. You guys got it right there already.

Also, if any movement is done to our district, you know, then things need to be connected to the South, Lancaster, Palmdale. Those areas are already in our Congressional District. We have Edwards Air Force Base in East Kern and Plant 42, down in Lancaster, which is actually the second largest employer in the Antelope Valley.

So if things change to the North, and you're having to rejigger things to the South in our county, please think in that direction and not toward the coast or you know, up Inyo, Mono County, any of that kind of stuff.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Great work. Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 9938. And up next after that, will be caller 0919.

Caller 9938, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute; the floor is yours.

MS. SHELL: I can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. SHELL: Great. So my name is Linda Shell, and I'm speaking on my own behalf, as an individual. In Northern California, thank you so much for creating CD_BERRYSUNNY_DRAFT Congressional District, which brings together Fremont, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, Cupertino, Milpitas, Berryessa in a Congressional District. It's also known as GREATERED now.

In support of this type of district, there's cities, I believe, for their city. I believe you've received letters from the Sunnyvale City Council, Santa Clara City Council, each of which has supported this by unanimous vote of their seven city -- all seven city council members. And the majority of the Fremont City Council, including the mayor and vice mayor, also supported this type of district for their city. In addition, this past week, you heard Cupertino City Council member Hung Wei, who is a longtime former school board member of Fremont Union High School District --
MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. SHELL: -- also supported this. And also, I believe, this week you heard former Cupertino Mayor, Rod Sinks, who is a current Rotary Club president in Cupertino, also support this type of district --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. SHELL: -- which is like GREATERED. I wanted to also thank Commissioner Sadhwani and Commissioner Kennedy for speaking out, that this type of district looks good, and it should be maintained, even if you're changing other areas. Thank you all --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we'll have caller 0919. And up next after that will be caller 4768. Caller 0919, if you'll please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

MR. MULDOON: Thank you. Good evening, Commissioners. Again, thank you for your important work towards redistricting. My name is Kevin Muldoon, and I'm the Mayor Pro Tem of Newport Beach calling to comment on the Orange County Congressional seats. I'm calling to generally support what was occurring in Orange County prior to the map Commissioner Sadhwani made in a closed-door meeting without the public being able to watch.

The Commission was asked in a transparent manner when it was swapping within the three non-VRA Orange
County districts. Currently, as you know, in Orange County, we have four strong Congressional seats -- districts, I should say. And I believe the people are best served if it stayed that way.

I know not every community of interest will get everything that they want, but I think we need to come together for the sake of ensuring our county is not mixed in with Los Angeles County and remains whole and united. I hope any additional changes can be kept within these parameters. Again, Commissioners, thank you so much. Have a nice evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 4768. And up next after that will be caller 6196. Caller 4768, please follow the prompter unmute; the floor is yours.

MR. CHAPMAN: Good evening, everyone. My name is Ben Chapman. I'm a resident of Costa Mesa, here in Orange County. I'm calling about some of the changes that this Commission has made to the Orange County since the great meeting on December 9th. I totally understand how difficult it is to balance everyone's concerns. However, the lines that were drawn on December 9th were legitimate and fair to so many of the major COI groups. It kept the Vietnamese community together and whole with other prominent Vietnamese populations in SEAL Beach.
and Huntington Beach. Costa Mesa was together in districts with our coastal neighbors, and we had a strong Inland OC district that respected what the residents there --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: It appears he hung up. All right. Right now, we have caller 6196. If you'll please follow the prompts unmute.

MR. MULDOON: First time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

MR. MULDOON: Thank you again, for all of your hard work. Have a good night.

MR. CHAPMAN: Hello, Commissioners. My name is Craig Chapman, and I am calling with one simple request. Please put the Vietnamese communities of Garden Grove, Fountain Valley, and Westminster back in alignment with the Vietnamese community of Huntington Beach. I understand what a difficult job that you have, and this cannot be easy, but the testimonies that you've heard from other areas, it shows an overwhelming support for the Vietnamese communities to stay together. I thank you very much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And Chair, at this time, we are up against a break.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Katie. Yes, we need to take our mandatory 15-minute break at this time. And we
will be back. So all those in line, please, please don't hang up. We'll be back at 6:40.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 6:24 p.m. until 6:40 p.m.)

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Welcome back to the Citizen's Redistricting Commission Meeting. We are taking public comment at this time. We're just coming back from our mandatory break. Thank you, public, for hanging in there with us.

And please open the line, Kristian -- Katy.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Absolutely, Chair. Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 5181, and up next after that will be caller 7507. And again, as the Chair said, we are back in open session. Please be present and awaiting to be called on for public comment.

Caller 5181, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute.

And one more time, caller with the last four digits, 5181, if you will please follow prompts to unmute by pressing star six; the floor is yours.

MR. O'CONNOR: Hello. My name's Kevin O'Connor. I'm calling about Sylmar. Sylmar is eighty percent Latino, and is part of Eastern San Fernando Valley. Latinos will be disenfranchised, if they're put in Santa Clarita and not San Fernando Valley. Please keep Sylmar
with the Eastern San Fernando Valley to prevent a huge racial disenfranchisement from happening to the Latino community in the current Congressional map. Thank you for your hard work and hope you take this to heart.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have 7507. And up next after that, will be caller 3770.

Caller 7507, please follow the prompts to unmute.

And one more time, caller, 7507, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

I do apologize, caller 7507. You appear to have some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I will come back to you.

And right now, we have 3770. And up next after that, will be caller 7068. Caller 3770, please follow the prompts to unmute; the floor is yours.

MR. GARRETT-PATE: Good evening, Commissioners.

This is Sam Garrett-Pate on behalf of Equality California. I want to start by expressing our deep appreciation for publicly reviewing our plan for Long Beach, Southeast L.A., and Orange County today and for your robust discussion. We recognize that the plan did not line up perfectly with the Commission's structure, because of changes made in the past few days. So we're going to get you a new plan tomorrow morning that would
keep Long Beach as whole as possible, with no more than
one split for VRA purposes.

Unite LGBTQ and coastal COIs and Long Beach, Signal
Hill, and coastal Orange County. Maintain the number of
Latino VRA districts and increase L-CVAP increase API-
CVAP in the Orange County API Opportunity District and
fit within the current structure, requiring no changes to
Ventura, Central Valley, San Diego, et cetera.

I also want to thank Commissioner Akutagawa for
bringing Signal Hill's LGBTQ Plus and Cambodian
communities into LB North. But please don't do that by
moving more of East Long Beach, which also has a --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. GARRETT-PATE: -- significant LGBTQ population
out of LB North, as you did today, to balance population.
The areas around Signal Hill to the East and North, have
significant LGBTQ population. And by trading Signal Hill
for these neighborhoods --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. GARRETT-PATE: -- we're still divided between FP
710 and LP North, just with a different split. Please
try to reunite these neighborhoods in Long Beach and
Signal Hill together in LB North, and do not move out
anymore of Long Beach. That is not our intention. Thank
you so much.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 7068. And up next after that, will be caller 6855. Caller 7068, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute; the floor is yours.

MS. HU: I can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. HU: Hello Commissioners. My name is Bong Hu (ph.), and I am a Vietnamese-American from Little Saigon. I am calling because I am very upset with the Commission's decision to divide the Vietnamese community with Huntington Beach. There are so many Vietnamese families living just over the city border in Huntington Beach. Our economies are completely on twined. I ask that the Commission return to the previous maps that accomplish this, respected our concerns, and that truly empowers the Vietnamese community. Thank you for all of your hard work. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 6855. And up next after that, will be caller 7331. Caller 6855, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

MR. SUKATON: Commissioners, good evening, this is Sam Sukaton from California Environmental Voters Education Fund. I've been following the calls today. Definitely appreciate a lot of the heavy lifting you've
been doing all over the state. I was listening, and I'm actually very excited to see the Sierra map. But I wanted to draw your attention to the North SD, South OC district. I appreciate Commissioner Akutagawa's comments saying that the coast should anchor that, and that actually lines up with the maps that we submitted to you in November, recognizing that the 78 corridor is absolutely like, you know, San Marcos is connected to those communities.

Splitting up the tri-cities, splitting Carlsbad out of the tri-cities and Encinitas and Del Mar actually breaks federal rail corridor, and the federal defense corridor related to MCB Camp Pendleton and San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station. We have emphasized that those closest to a problem, in this case, bluff erosion from climate change, storage of -- long term fuel storage in San Onofre, and the communities that are around that, should be closest to the answer --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. SUKATON: -- folks that are united around that question, as I suggested in the letter -- the response ought to be sent to Director Kaplan. With that in mind, we are still advocating then that you -- when you consider San Diego that you're drawing a North coast district with Encinitas --
MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. SUKATON: -- Carlsbad, Oceanside, Vista, separate from cities along the 15 corridor, as far North as Laguna Niguel. Thank you very much. But again, just want to emphasize that the coast North of San Diego and South of Laguna Beach have a district to its --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 7331. And up next after that, we have 2118. Caller 7331, if you'll please follow the prompts.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: The floor is yours.

Hi, Commissioner. My name's Kim. And I just want to thank you so much for listening to the San Fernando Valley residents about our community. Thank you for understanding that Chatsworth, as well as Porter Ranch and Granada Hills are all West Valley communities.

This is an important -- this is really important from a federal perspective, because there's still fallout from the huge Porter Ranch gas leak a few years back, and we really need the EPA to be there for us. And Chatsworth and Porter Ranch are entirely in the valley and don't have any roads or connections to Santa Clarita. The San Fernando Valley community closest to Santa Clarita in Sylmar, which is connected by the 5 freeway.

So Chatsworth and Porter Ranch are connected to
areas like Westfield, Granada Hills, and Northridge. And all these are together on your map, which is great.

Thank you so much for doing right by the San Fernando Valley. Have a great night, guys.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 2118. And up next after that will be caller 4918. Caller 2118, if you'll please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, I'm calling tonight to express my support for the December 9th maps, and specifically in relation to Orange County. And I believe that is the most reflective of what the public input was expressing. These versions did a few very important things that are essential for the people of this district. So first, it grouped Irvine with Costa Mesa. And next, it kept the Vietnamese communities in Little Saigon, in Huntington Beach together. We've heard a lot about that so far. The outpouring of support behind this has been significant, and I believe the Commission must reconsider before finalizing the maps.

So please put Irvine back together with Costa Mesa, and then, most importantly, keep the Vietnamese community together in Little Saigon and Huntington. Thank you so much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we have caller 4918. And up next after that, will be caller 6445.

Caller 4918, if you'll please call the prompts to unmute; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners, I'm calling about making sure Long Beach is not merged with Orange County. Thank you all for your hard work during this thankless process.

I'm calling about the work you have been doing in Long Beach and how to best accommodate the dozens of callers from both Long Beach and Huntington Beach who each want their cities to remain whole and united. Long Beach should remain separate from Orange County. This is clearly the most dominant testimony we've heard from both sides of the county lines. Residents want their districts to remain within county boundaries, and this is the easiest way to do so. Thank you again for your hard work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 6445. And up next after that, will be caller 6659. Caller 6445, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Kenny, and I'm a Vietnamese-American from Little Saigon. I've been listening as this
Commission has prioritized keeping every other minority community together. But for some reason, you've all divided the Vietnamese community in Orange County. Why is this? Please restore our voting power. Bring back together, like you had before, Huntington Beach, Little Saigon, Westminster, and Garden Grove. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 6659. And up next after that will be caller 7618. Caller 6659, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

MR. TRAN: Hi. Can you guys hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. TRAN: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Henry Tran. I'm calling to ask the Commission to bring back the maps that respected the Vietnamese and Asian community of Little Saigon within the Vietnamese communities in Huntington Beach. This will truly protect the Vietnamese community and maximize our ability to vote for our own representation. We need this. More importantly, these changes are not major changes, but actually something that you can do without blowing up the process. So please restore and protect the Vietnamese community. Thank you for your consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 7618. And up next, after that
Caller 7618, please follow the prompts to unmute; the floor is yours.

MS. NGUYEN: Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. NGUYEN: Hello, Redistricting Commission. My name is Luan Nghi Nguyen (ph.), and I'm a Vietnamese-American and a resident of Huntington Beach. While I live in Huntington Beach, so many of my family and friends live in Little Saigon. This is a case for so many of my Vietnamese neighbors in Huntington Beach and vice versa. I understand that you have a very difficult job on your hands, and you are doing your best. But if you are able to make just one small change, please restore the Vietnamese community and protect our voting power.

These strong Asian-Americans and Vietnamese communities belong together. Thank you for your time, and get this process right. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 6380. And up next after that, we have caller 8951.

Caller 6380, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commission. I
just wanted to make a comment about the Congressional map. I have a few pointers. Please keep Orange County and Los Angeles separate.

In addition, my second point is, please put Huntington Beach with Dana Point and San Clemente together, because they have common tourism, coastal communities, cultural, economic and tourism interests. My 3rd point is, please keep the Orange County beaches together; like Seal Beach and San Clemente. And my last point is, please separate the coastal communities, the beaches from the urban cities. Thank you. And that's all.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 8951. And up next after that caller, will be 8802.

Caller 8951, please follow the prompts to unmute; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. My name is Anna, and I'm here to talk about the Commission's decision to divide the Vietnamese community in Orange County. The Commission has prioritized the voting power of nearly every other major community of interests. While I appreciate the hard decisions, this group has to make, we must restore the voting power of Asian-Americans and Vietnamese people in Orange County.
Please keep Huntington Beach residents together, along with the strong Vietnamese communities of Little Saigon, Westminster Garden Grove, and Fountain Valley.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 8802. And up next after that, will be caller 3480.

Caller 8802, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is Chris. I'm a Vietnamese-American living in Little Saigon in Orange County. The Commission has repeatedly prioritized keeping our community together, and I want to thank you for that; even despite the many changes happening in these maps. Please don't consider any options that split our city to maximize our ability to elect a representative that reflects our interests. We also ask that you go back to the map that had us with Huntington Beach.

Not only are there many young families living just over the city borders in Huntington Beach, but our economies are completely entwined. I ask that you return to very complete maps that accomplish that. These truly empower our community. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 3480. And up next after that,
will be caller 8063.

Caller 3480, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

MR. LEI: Hi. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. LEI: Hi. Yes, my name is Kevin Lei (ph.), and I just like to say that, you know, in Orange County, the Commission has spent a significant amount of time to maximize the Vietnamese community, and we're very appreciative of that. And we know we can't get it to 150 percent Asian district, but I think the Commission can do more work to make this a stronger Asian-American district; either by looking at Fulton, or even the pockets of Vietnamese voters in Huntington Beach.

I hope the Commission can make this a top priority. We deserve our representation to be maximized and have a voting bloc that can truly make a difference in an election. And I hope you can consider these changes.

Thank you guys so much for your hard work. Have a good day.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 8063. And up next after, will be caller 8394.

Caller 8063, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.
MR. NGUYEN: Hello. My name is Dai Nguyen. I'm a resident of City of Westminster. I'm requesting you keep the old Congressional maps that you do on Wednesday. Little Saigon needs to be included there, Garden Grove, Westminster, Palm Valley, and Huntington Beach. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 8394. And up next after that, we caller 3588.

Caller 8394, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. Working class Simi Valley's interests match closer to those of Santa Clarita than wealthier Agoura and Calabashes. For true representation, huge San Fernando Valley is not a good match for Santa Clarita, which would be better served in line with Simi Valley, another bedroom community for L.A. workers and which has a similar topographical situation and demographics. United interests may make for more effective voting bloc. Please do not separate Simi and Santa Clarita, because that would essentially divide and conquer us, which is not a service to voters. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 3588. And up next after that, will be caller 2974.
Caller 3588, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts with the Commission. I know that this process is not an easy one, and that the Commission is doing its very best. So thank you, and keep up the good work. I've lived in East San Fernando Valley, Santa Clarita, and Antelope Valley. They're all great places, but quite different in many respects. I'm, therefore, not sure why the Commission is considering extracting and isolating Sylmar from the rest of the East San Fernando Valley and exiling them to a Congressional District dominated by the entirely dissimilar Santa Clarita Valley and Antelope Valley.

Sylmar is a vibrant community and is geographically, economically, socially, and culturally integrated with the rest of East San Fernando Valley. I'm a big sports fan, so I suggest you check out the East Valley Baseball League, the El Paso Soccer League, or the San Fernando Youth Soccer League. The ties between Sylmar and the rest of East San Fernando are quite clear, natural, and authentic. And these neighbors deserve to stay together, so that their elected officials can more effectively advocate for voters so much in common.

In fact, I would be surprised if anyone in Sylmar
wants to join Santa Clarita and Antelope Valley, as
Sylmar shares almost nothing in common with these bedroom
communities.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So please don't sacrifice
Sylmar to satisfy much wealthier and less diverse West
San Fernando.

In addition, Hispanic representation in Santa
Clarita and Antelope Valley is less than half, compared
to Sylmar and the rest of East San Fernando. If voters
in Sylmar are forced to share representation in San
Fernando Valley --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- I'm concerned that their
very different needs will not be heard or met. East San
Fernando is important, but has challenges like other
communities, and they deserve to be in a district where
the elected officials can best serve their constituents.
Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now, we have caller 2974. And up next after that,
will be caller 0074.

Caller 2974, please follow the prompts. Caller with
the last four digits, 2974, please follow the prompts to
unmute by pressing star six; the floor is yours.
MS. TRAN: Hi. My name is Paulina Tran. I have been calling a few times to ask you not to separate Little Saigon from Huntington Beach city. We are a shared community, which has many similarity interests. I sincerely hope that you can go back to the old map last Wednesday, and keep our Vietnamese community together, Garden Grove, Westminster, Huntington Beach, and Fountain Valley Lake. Thank you so much and have a good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 0074. And up next after that, will be caller 7692.

Caller 0074, please follow the problems; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello. My name is Sonya. Thank you for letting me comment. Thank you for all your hard work, Commissioners. And I just want to comment on Santa Clarita and Antelope Valley. I work in Lancaster and live near Santa Clarita. And those communities are very similar. However, I was very surprised to see that Sylmar was grouped together. We do go to Sylmar from time to time to see doctors, and they really are very, very different districts.

So in Santa Clarita and Antelope Valley, most people are bedroom community working. And now they -- or they work in the Defense tech. And Sylmar is much more of a
San Fernando Valley community. So I would like to ask that you keep Lancaster, Palmdale, Santa Clarita together and not put Sylmar together with us. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, I have caller 7692. And up next after that, will be caller 0594.

Caller 7692, please follow the prompts. Join me; the floor is yours.

MR. BIGFOOT: Thank you. Dan Bigfoot here. Your Assembly and Congressional iterations connect Inland, San Diego County, and San Diego County communities in a way that works. I'd like to actually talk about the Senate maps, because I know you're coming up on those next week, and I wanted to give my input.

Senate District Map SCCA could use some tweaks. We understand it's a voting rights district and must be linked with parts of San Diego County to Imperial County. But I don't know why it doesn't pick up the heavily Latino neighborhoods that are South of 94 in San Diego City, and shed some of those rural parts of San Diego, like Alpine, Ramona, Burgos Springs, that they fit better with cities like, Poway, El Cajon, Escondido, and Santee.

Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 0594. And up next after that,
caller 3406.

Caller 0594, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm a resident of Yorba Linda. And on Wednesday night, I was so pleased to see all of our North Orange cities, like Yorba Linda, Placentia, Brea, Fullerton, and Anaheim Hills together in one Congressional District. Then the very next day, the Commission completely changed the map.

Under your current lines, you split North Orange County in Yorba Linda and Placentia into separate Congressional Districts. All of North Orange County is one community of interest. But Yorba Linda and Placentia especially work well together and even share a School District, the Placentia Yorba Linda Unified School District.

We should all be together. My hope is that you consider -- reconsider the maps to Wednesday night. They made sense. They compromised our community testimony, and, most importantly, they didn't prioritize the coast over the District. They balanced everything. I hope we can revert to those maps.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 3406. And up next after that, will be caller 0801.
Caller 3406, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

MR. TRAN: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Tim Tran, and I'm calling in to protest against the decision to split up Orange County, Little Saigon. This action will weaken the collective voting power of its large Vietnamese-American community. I ask that you please do not proceed with this new map, and please include Huntington Beach, a city which has over 20,000 Vietnamese residents with Garden Grove, Westminster, and Fountain Valley. I thank you so much for your hard work, and that's it. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 0801. And up next after that, will be caller 8642.

Caller 0801, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, good evening, Commissioners. I grew up here in the Santa Clarita Valley, and you know, I see that you've given us Sylmar and taken away Simi Valley, and I'm asking you to please revert that decision, and go back to the previous map. You know, I suggest instead what you can do with Sylmar, is create a, one, San Fernando Valley Latino Congressional VRA District, and then, two, San Fernando
Valley Latino Assembly VRA District, and one San Fernando Valley Latino VRA District.

Okay. The reason being is Sylmar is 80 percent Latino and part of the Eastern San Fernando Valley. And Sylmar really doesn't have anything in common with the San Fernando Valley or the Antelope Valley. As a matter of fact, people from Sylmar constantly move up here, because they want to get away from all that.

And you'll actually be disenfranchising those Latinos, if they are with San Fernando Valley and not the San Fernando Valley.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And Latinos are a huge community of interest, and they cannot be split off San Fernando Valley to be randomly put in with Santa Clarita and Antelope Valley. So please keep Sylmar with the Eastern San Fernando Valley to prevent the huge racial disenfranchisement from happening to the Latino community in the current Congressional map.

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you for time. Have a good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 8742. And up next after that, we have caller 4201.
Caller 8742, please follow the prompts to unmute; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. Thank you for your work to improve the redistricting process. I'm calling to say please keep Sylmar with the Eastern San Fernando Valley to prevent a huge racial disenfranchisement from happening to the Latino community in the current Congressional map.

Sylmar is eighty percent Latino and part of the Eastern San Fernando Valley Latino community, along with San Fernando, Pacoima, Arleta, Panorama City, Sun Valley, Van Nuys, and Mission Hills. If Sylmar is randomly split off from the San Fernando Valley, Latinos will be disenfranchised by diluting their votes with Santa Clarita and Antelope Valley, whose residents have different needs and priorities.

Sylmar does not have anything much in common with Santa Clarita or Antelope Valley. Please keep Sylmar with the San Fernando Valley. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 4201. And up next after that, will be caller 6625.

Caller 4201, please follow the prompts. And one more time, caller, 4201, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.
Caller 4201, I do apologize. You appear to have some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I will come back to you.

Caller 6625 will be right now. And up next after that, will be 7483.

Caller 6625, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

MR. MARTINEZ: Hi Commissioners. Jerry Martinez from San Bernardino County's High Desert. I wanted to call and thank you for keeping the Mercola district pretty much the High Desert. We didn't get everything we wanted. There's a little bit of L.A. in there. And we were hoping not to do that.

But what we would like to request, and I think I'm speaking for a lot of my neighbors, who have called in before; please, please, before you finalize, go back, and look at the Assembly maps, and really weigh the difference of having Pinon Hills mixed in with Pasadena. You're talking about mansions in Pasadena. Pinon Hills with houses on dirt roads. There's not a lot in common there. And it doesn't really make sense to have them mixed. Let's try to go back and fix the Assembly maps.

Anyway, thank you, Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 7483. And up next after that.
is caller 8939.

Caller 7483, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I'm commenting on the current version of 12/11 on your website for Modesto and Turlock. The Central Valley is not a sprawling metropolis, like the Bay Area or Sacramento. If you drive down 99, you move in and out of 16 groups of cities, and this is the case with Turlock in Modesto. It's a relatively small population compared to many cities in California. It's an agricultural area, like the rest of Central Valley, and we belong in a district that encompasses the same needs and issues.

The parkway map that was discussed earlier, put us in the Central Valley district, which is where we should be. I grew up in a mountain community, and the needs of the Sierras are much different than those of Turlock and Modesto. We share a university. We share issues in health care, employment, and agriculture.

I know that you say that this is causing -- will cause some angst in everyone --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- but by not putting us in a Central Valley district, you're causing us lifeblood.

Commissioner Fernandez, I can -- I wish you could see the
value of considering the needs of a smaller, less known area, the Central Valley. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 8939. And up next after that, is caller 1740.

Caller 8939, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you very much. This is David. I'm calling from Mammoth Lakes. We in the Sierra Nevada, have endured wildfire, our water is shipped to L.A., we've been fighting for decades to save Mono Lake and Lake Tahoe. And those are just the obvious issues that unify our district. We need a voice.

If our district is functionally noncontiguous, that's a really important point. If it is functionally noncontiguous, then we are voiceless. Please keep this in mind, as you do your work. Thank you very much for your consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 1740. And up next after that, is caller 9907

Caller 1740, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

MR. LE: Hello. My name Yun Le (ph.). You put Garden Grove, Fountain Valley and Westminster back with
the Vietnamese in Huntington Beach. I want the map on
the Wednesday, December 8th. Please protect my
community. Thank you so much. Have a good weekend.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right
now, we have caller 9907. And up next after that, will
be caller 5921. Caller 9907, please follow the prompts;
the floor is yours.

MS. PHUONG: Hi, my name is Thi Phuong (ph.).
Please go back old map Garden Grove, Westminster,
Fountain Valley, and Huntington Beach together. Change
for your map on Wednesday. Good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now, we have caller 5921. And up next, after that,
is caller 6303.

Caller 5921, please follow the prompts; the floor is
yours.

MS. LE: Hi. My name Tsu Le. I live in Garden
Grove, my family Huntington Beach. We need to stay
together. Please go back old map. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we have caller 6303. And up next after that is
caller 7807.

Caller 6303, please follow the prompts; the floor is
yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioner.
I want to thank you for all the effort that you have done. I just want to make it abundantly clear, the distance between Fresno and Bakersfield is 109 miles. The distance between San Francisco and Sacramento is 89 miles. You would never put Sacramento with San Francisco. The distance from Bakersfield to L.A. is 111 miles. Again, that is two miles difference. And you would never put Bakersfield with L.A.

So I want you to consider Fresno and the Northern Fresno and Clovis area to be considered with other areas closer, and not with another major metropolitan city. Fresno is the fifth largest city in California and has a population greater and a lot of states in the United States and should be heavily weighed in your consideration.

Again, Fresno should be considered and especially Clovis, special consideration. And we ask that you relook at the maps. Thank you. Take care.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 7807. And up next after that, will be caller 2567. Caller 7807, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Hi. Hi. My name is Huynh Tong (ph.). I am a (indiscernible). I ask you to put a Little Saigon with Huntington Beach. I live in the
Little Saigon. My son live in Huntington Beach. Please don't separate me and my son. Thank you very much so you listen.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 2567. And up next after that, is caller 1789.

Caller 2567, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I'd like to comment on the King-Tulare current Congressional District map. It's possible to still have VRA districts in the Central Valley without looking gerrymandered. Please keep Bakersfield whole. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 1789. And up next after that, is caller 3726.

Caller 1789, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

MS. NGUYEN: Hello. Good evening. You hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we can.

MS. NGUYEN: My name's Thuy Thi Tin Nguyen. I live in Westminster. I want Little Saigon to go with Fountain Valley and Huntington Beach. Please do not divide us. Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR:  Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 3726. And up next after that, will be caller 4436. Caller 3726, if you please follow And one more time. Caller with the last four digits, 3726, if you will, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

I do apologize, 3726. You appear to have some type of connectivity issue at the moment.

I will -- oh. Wait. No. The floor is yours.

MR. NGUYEN: Oh, hello. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. NGUYEN: Oh, I'm so sorry about that. All right. Hello. My name is Daniel Nguyen. I'm from Orange County. I just wanted to say, I hope the Commission can revisit maps that kept Little Saigon with Huntington Beach. This will allow the Vietnamese residents of Huntington Beach to be included with their neighbors, and it also acknowledges that there is more to a community than CVAP numbers.

Little Saigon is completely connected to Huntington Beach, and that the Commission has even discussed that it even makes sense to have them together. You know, I honestly think it's just you went a little crazy with changes and dismissed the map created Wednesday that maximizes the community. I hope we can revisit and link
Little Saigon with Huntington Beach again. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 4436. And up next after that will be caller 6743.

Caller 4436, please follow the prompts. Caller with the last four digits, 4436, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you hear me? We sure can.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh. Okay. Hi. Yes. I happen to be -- let me get to my notes, because I happen to be in the 93532 areas, and then I have rentals in the 93534 and the 93550, and then we have family in Simi Valley. So we also have a lot of aerospace, you know, the people from Simi Valley and Santa Clarita come up to the Antelope Valley, you know, commute for the aerospace industry. But we also share a lot of the fire, earthquake, sheriff sources -- you know, resources, and that kind of thing.

So I saw that you were maybe trying to put Sylmar with us, but they really have nothing -- they -- they're a little bit different than we are.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They belong to the San Fernando Valley, and their families would love to stay in the San Fernando Valley, and they work in the San Fernando Valley. So I would like to keep the -- keep us together --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- keep the demographics of Simi Valley and Santa Clarita Valley and the Antelope Valley. Appreciate that very much. So San Fernando Valley is also, like, the second biggest city in the United States, like, compared to Los Angeles. So we --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have a caller is 6743. And up next after that, will be caller 3746.

Caller 6743, please follow the prompts to unmute; the floor is yours.

MS. SEWELL: Hi. Thank you, Commissioners, for your work and this opportunity to comment. My name's Karen Sewell. I'm a native-born Californian, and I've been a resident on and off in Yorba Linda, since 1968. I'm really excited to hear so many comments from my fellow Californians, especially those from Orange County.

I was very happy and really liked the way the lines were drawn for the Congressional Districts on Wednesday's map, and felt that you really listened to the input from
the residents, and that you did draw the lines with their
comments taken into consideration. I know it's difficult
to fairly draw the line, but when the lines were redrawn,
you split up cities in North Orange County.

I believe we deserve a fairer and balanced district,
and we want to be with our neighboring cities --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. SEWELL: -- especially with Placentia. Yorba
Linda Boulevard is the major street in Placentia, and we
also and share the School District with Placentia as
well.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. SEWELL: I appreciate if you would consider
putting the map back the way you had it on Wednesday.
And thank you all for your hard work on this as well as
your consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now we have caller 3746. And up next after that,
is caller 7644.

Caller 3746, please follow the prompts to unmute;
the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. First, I would
like to thank the Commission for all your hard work. I
can't imagine how much work has been put into this. A
couple of thoughts about the Vietnamese community in
Little Saigon.

Please, under no circumstances, separate the City of Garden Grove, Westminster, and Fountain Valley. I know we don't make up a VRA district, but it should certainly be the top community of interests of the Vietnamese community, and make up significant portions of the voting population.

And are Vietnamese community is growing into Huntington Beach. In Huntington Beach, we have over 20,000 Vietnamese residents. Please refer back to your map on Wednesday night. That map really, truly protects the interests of our community and our voting rights.

Thank you for your hard work, and I hope you would hear all the voices of the past few nights day, and please, again, protect our communities. Thank you, and have a wonderful night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 7644. And up next after that, is caller 5428.

Caller 7644, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

MR. PAYNE: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Eric Payne. I'm the Executive Director of the Central Valley Urban Institute. We wanted to make while -- we recognize you didn't make all the shifts we wanted in the
Assembly for Fresno area. And you still split a number
of COI's, specifically African-American families, in the
West Park area, the West of 99, and the area around the
Fig Garden Loop and the areas in the Old Fig Garden area
between Bullard and Shaw.

The Fig Garden Loop areas, as well as the Old Fig
Garden areas, are still paired with Clovis. To ensure
you correct these issues in the Congressional and Senate
Districts, we wanted to reemphasize the hub maps that we
have provided previously for course correction. Again,

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now, we have caller 5428. And up next after that,
is caller 3783.

Caller 5428, please follow the prompts; the floor is
yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Commissioners.
And Katy, thank you so much. We're going to miss you.
After the unworkable versions of Contra North were
dismissed on Thursday night, we expected to see a better
version Friday. Today's version forced and illogical,
splitting Martinez, one of the five refinery cities in
this district, to be able to include suburban Southeast
Antioch, made no sense. This is not the multi-family
Antioch, and does not include the population someone
wanted to include. You've got the swimming pool
commuters, not the essential workers North of Highway 4.
Knowing the communities matter.
Including all of Vacaville in Contra North, adds an
equivalent population for removing Pittsburgh and parts
of Antioch. Pittsfield and Antioch are a historical COI
and a current COI --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- of primarily single-family
home commuters. The negative jobs housing balance drives
the residents to the Central Costa --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- and on to the Bay Area
for employment. The North Contra COIs, made up of
Highway 80 commuters, moving South to the Bay Area and
East to Sacramento for jobs. Their --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now, we have caller 3783. And up next after that,
will be caller 1866.

Caller 3783, if you'll please follow the prompts to
unmute; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners.
My name is Irene, and I'm calling about the Commission's
decision to divide the Vietnamese community in Orange County. Commissioners prioritize the voting power of nearly every other major community of interest. I appreciate the hard decisions this group has to make, but we must restore the voting power of Asian-Americans and the Vietnamese in Orange County. Please keep together Huntington Beach residents, along with the strong Vietnamese communities of Little Saigon, Westminster, Garden Grove and Fountain Valley.

Without combining these communities, the Asian-Americans in Orange County will never have the power to elect representatives they feel are the best for them. Thank you for all of your hard work, and I hope you will consider making these changes.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 1866. And up next after that, will be caller 0052.

Caller 1866, please, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute. And one more -- oh, there you are. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm calling from the High Desert of San Bernardino County. And I just wanted to say, we're very happy with the mark up map, but we really encourage you to go back, and look at Phelan and Pinon Hills, which you've mixed
with million-dollar mansions of Pasadena, which doesn't really make much sense at all.

Please reconsider grouping Phelan and Pinon Hills with High Desert communities, where they should be rightfully grouped. Thank you for all you do. Californians really appreciate it. And I hope you have a great weekend. Thank you so much for having me.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 0052. And up next after that, will be caller, 3995.

Caller 0052, please follow the prompts to unmute; the floor is yours.

MR. STEINWINDER: Good evening, Commission. I am Michael Steinwinder, calling from San Bernardino County's High Desert, myself and fellow neighbors have asked the High Desert in San Bernardino County to be kept whole. And that was achieved by the MORCOA. We didn't get everything that we wanted, but we're still included with Los Angeles County.

We hope that the Commission did their best to respond to our concerns. We also hope you all will take another look at the Assembly map that includes Phelan and Pinon Hills with Pasadena. Because it makes no sense to put a rural community with dirt roads with Pasadena, which is a highly urban community with million-dollar
mansions. Thank you so much for considering all of our testimony, and we thank you all for your efforts.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 3995. And up next after that, is caller 4706.

Caller 3995, please follow the prompts to unmute; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm calling from San Bernardino County, and just wanted to say that, while we are very pleased with the MORCOA map for the Congressional level, please reconsider going back to the DBHD Assembly map, and regrouping Phelan and Pinon Hills into the DBHD map. They are both High Desert communities that are currently with multimillion dollar communities of Los Angeles County, and it's just not fair to them to be represented by a -- to be represented into a map that is not -- that does not resemble their communities at all.

Please put them back into the High Desert map, the DBHD. Thank you, again. And I hope you'll have a great evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 4706. And up next after that will be caller 1991.

Caller 4706, please follow the prompts. And one
more time. Caller with the last four digits, 4706, if
you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing
star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay, great. I am calling
you from the West San Fernando Valley, specifically the
town of Encino. I don't really understand the reason for
the MALIBUSFV iteration, to include Western San Fernando
Valley with Malibu. I mean it doesn't make any sense to
me. Putting those working-class families in the -- from
the middle of the San Fernando Valley and with Malibu,
it's not really representing their best interest, and I
highly implore the Commission to change that.

Also, the other side, obviously, including Shomar in
it; I believe you should also -- the San Fernando Valley
has always been West and East; two Congressional
Districts. Right now, you're splitting between three and
four. I think you need to bring it back to one and two.
West San Fernando Valley, East San Fernando Valley. Keep
it clean and simple, which best represents our interests.

Thank you for your time, and I hope you consider my
suggestions. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right, now we have caller 1991. And up next after that,
will be caller 0240.

Caller 1991, please follow the prompts. And one more time; caller with the last four digits, 1990, if you'll, please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

MR. ALVAREZ: Hello, Commissioners. Thank you for allowing me to speak. My name's David Alvarez calling from the High Desert. Very pleased with the MORCOA map, and I appreciate your consideration of our testimony, but please consider going back to the DVHD Assembly map for a finalization. Phelan and Pinon Hills have been grouped in the Assembly map with multimillion-dollar communities of Los Angeles County, as opposed to the High Desert, which is a much different area for a variety of reasons, especially geographic and other similar items, so.

So yeah, with that, I'm just really appreciative it if you guys can go back and look at that. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 0240. And up next after that, is caller 9392.

Caller 0240, please follow the prompts. Caller with the last four digits, 0240, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

Caller 0240, I do apologize. You appear to have
some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I will come back to you.

And right now, we have caller 9392. And up next after that, will be caller 9016.

Caller 9392, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

MR. SAWYER: Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. SAWYER: Hi. I just wanted to reiterate what some of the other callers said about reuniting Sylmar with the San Fernando Valley. My name is Mark Sawyer (ph.). I'm from Los Angeles. Now, Sylmar really has nothing to do with the Santa Clarita Valley or the Antelope Valley. So -- and it also has a majority Latino population. So I think it is disenfranchising them to move them out of that district. I think it should be kept in the VRA district that's based in the San Fernando Valley.

I know some other callers suggested maybe putting Simi Valley back with the Antelope Valley. And I think that's one good option. Another option is to unify the Edwards Air Force Base area. So for example, Lancaster and Rosamond. Edwards Air Force Base in L.A. County, and it's also in Kern County. And a lot of people who work at Edwards Air Force Base either live in Rosamond or live
in Lancaster. So I think that could be a good option, as well, to make up for the population loss you would get from taking so much out of the Antelope Valley District.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. SAWYER: But anyway, thank you so much for all your work. I appreciate it. And I hope you guys keep that in mind, in terms of reuniting Sylmar with the San Fernando Valley. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right now, we have caller 9016. And up next after that, is caller 0394.

Caller 9016, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

MS. BOLTON: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Linda Bolton, and live in Mona County. Thank you for keeping Inyo-Mono and Alpine Counties together and for -- on the Eastern Sierra District from Inyo going North; that includes Tahoe and Truckee. I only ask that you not include Modesto for population. We are on the East side, and we're rural communities. We have completely different issues than the West Side and different economic drivers.

We have a tourism, recreational-based economy, and we mostly are surrounded by public lands. We would lose our voice if we were connected to a large city, like
Modesto. And we have no idea about each other's communities and can't even drive across the Sierra in the winter. So please give our mountain communities the same consideration as the COIs you're trying to keep together around Sacramento. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 0394. And up next after that, will be caller 0026.

Caller 0394, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

MS. MIDGET: Hello. My name is Kawano Midget (ph.), and I just want to say thank you so much to the Commissioners for all of your hard work. I want to stress please, please, please keep district number 43, please keep it the same. Please do not change it.

It is so important that we keep Vermont Knolls, Inglewood, Westchester, the Airport, and especially LMU. It should all remain the same within this Congressional district. We have the most common interests. And most importantly, they are impacted by LAX. These children, they go to school here, there's the shops that are here that are very supportive, and we really need to keep this district together, so please do not break it up.

And I just want to say thank you so much for all of your hard work and to please consider keeping it the
same. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 0026. And up next after that, will be caller 2641.

Caller 0026, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, Commissioners. Thank you for listening to us, and thank you for your hard work. I just want to reiterate what previous caller said, keep the Sierra and Antelope Valley separate, and keep the Modesto in the Central Valley. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 2641. And up next after that will be caller 3122.

Caller 2641, please follow the prompts. And one more time, caller 2641, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

Caller 2641, I do apologize. You appear to have some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I will be coming back around for those retries after the upcoming break.

And right now, we have caller 3122. And up next after that, will be caller 1036.

Caller 3122, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.
MR. NGUYEN:  Good evening, Commissioners.  My name is Ken Nguyen, a resident in Westminster.  I'm calling to ask you to keep Little Saigon together with Huntington Beach.  The political group claiming Huntington Beach is racist.  It's not true.  Please listen to the voice of the community by keeping Little Saigon together with Huntington Beach.  Please go back to the old map.  Thank you for listening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR:  Thank you so much.  And right now, we have caller 1036.  And up next after that, will be caller 3970.

Caller 1036, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

MS. VARGAS:  Good evening, distinguished Commissioners.  Thank you so much for all your hard work and commitment in this redistricting process.  My name is Anna Lisa Vargas, and I'm a resident of the City of Indio.  I'm an active member of this community. It's located in the Eastern Coachella Valley.

I'm calling in support of the MALDEF, because it draws strong Latino majority CVAP district, which will better serve our communities.  The MALDEF plan creates a new Latino CVAP majority district, Congressional District 36 in Riverside Imperial County, which will perform very well.
This MALDEF also creates two new Latino majority districts; Assembly District 60 and District 61 in the Inland Empire, which complies with the VRA in this fast-growing region. And it also creates a new Latino CVAP majority and also new Latino Opportunity District in Senate District 31, also in the Inland Empire.

And for Senate Districts 40, the MALDEF plan demonstrates a strong Latino CVAP of 59.28 percent --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. VARGAS: -- and the visualizations depict a weakened VRA and the Latino CVAP of less than 56.75. And so we really feel that this is -- this plan really draws upon our leaders and organized organizers --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. VARGAS: -- from across the state, and has really also retaining historic Black districts in Los Angeles and API districts. Thank you so much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 3970. And up next, after that will be caller 5060.

Caller 3970, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. Thank you, Commissioners. I'm calling tonight asking you to keep
Huntington Beach whole and with our friends in Little Saigon and Fountain Valley. Commissioners as an immigrant, I can tell you that the comments made a few nights ago about Huntington Beach being anti-immigrant and racist were comments made by people who are politically motivated to gerrymander Orange County. If you were to take those comments and not listen to the vast majority of comments made by these communities, it would be a blemish on the Commission. Please do not let partisan interests impact this map. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 5060. And up next after that, is caller 6910.

Caller 5060, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

MR. LARA: Yes, good evening. My name is Cesar Lara. I'm the director of the Monterey Bay Central Labor Council, and I'm calling, in particular, around the Congressional maps in the Monterey, Santa Cruz and San Benito County. Our communities of interest in the Tri-County area will be lost if we're split up into two Congressional Districts.

Currently, you're proposing to have an urban center of San Jose connected with a farm-working, middle class community in the Salinas Valley, and at the same time
having a Coastal District that really splits up Santa Cruz County, where you have workers in Watsonville that work in Santa Cruz County now will have to go to two Congressional Districts. So we ask the Commission to really revisit this. And you're disenfranchising Latino, farm-working communities, and giving it up to urban Santa Clara County.

So we ask that you please revisit this. This will be a devastating blow to our working families here on the Tri-County --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. LARA: -- Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito area. And we ask that you revisit it, and try and make us as whole as possible and revisit the Congressional Districts that are currently in play in Congressional District 20, where it takes into consideration --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. LARA: -- our communities of interest and would like the Commission to revisit that. And thank you for all the work you've done. And please, do this wrong, and fix this. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 5832. And up next after that, is caller 9499.

Caller 5832, please follow the prompts. And one
Caller with the last four digits 5832, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi there. I want to thank the Commission for their endurance. I've been in San Joaquin and parts of Stanislaus County for more than ten years, and I've come to appreciate the specific challenges and local interests unique to these areas. In the spirit of conducting earnest attempts to keep those communities with similar issues intact within shared Congressional Districts, it would seem most prudent for Lodi, Modesto, and East San Joaquin Valley to be together. These areas serve as the pantries and supermarkets for the region, state, and nation. It makes sense to marry these agricultural producers together without inclusion of the mountainous region to the East.

To put it another way, Modesto, Lodi, and East San Joaquin County are like the peanut butter and jelly sandwich, a natural combination given their characteristic. But including Tahoe is like adding tuna fish to an otherwise sensible dish. It creates an unpalatable imbalance. Let's keep Lodi, Modesto, and San Joaquin tied at the hip and find a better relationship. I appreciate your time.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 9499. And up next after that, will be caller 0413.

I'd like to ask those that have not done so already to please press star nine. And if you're around for a retry, and you're near your phone and have some different connectivity at the time, please press star nine as well. Raise your hand again. I do see some of those lines -- some of those hands coming up.

Perfect. Right now we have caller 9499. And then up next after that, we'll go ahead and do a retry of caller 7507.

Caller 9499, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

MS. CABAZA: Thank you. My name is Deborah Cabaza. I've been in Santa Clarita for thirty years. I want to thank you for all your service. This is torture. I understand that. We want to keep Sylmar with the East San Fernando Valley and prevent this huge racial disenfranchisement from happening in that -- in that Latino community. San Fernando is a tiny area, for an example, ninety percent -- it's like a three-mile radius. It's ninety percent Latino. Sylmar, Arleta, Panorama; they're like eighty and seventy percent Latino.

We are a separate issue. Simi, Santa Clarita,
Antelope Valley, are very similar. We were surrounded by
the same mountain, we've been in fires together, and I
really think it doesn't make any --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. CABAZA: -- sense at all to consolidate us with
any -- but any -- any of the communities in the valley.
We're Newhall School District. They are LA-USD. It's
totally, I think -- it's disruptive to our families. Our
children are already behind in school. It's been an
issue ongoing for years. I want to thank you for your
consideration and Merry Christmas.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
right now, we have callers -- oh, I'm sorry. We're doing
retry of caller 7507. And then up next after that, will
be caller 0413.

Caller 7507, please follow the prompts to unmute;
the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. I'd like to
comment on a Congressional map in Orange County. And I
really want to echo what some of the earlier callers have
been saying. The City of Fullerton, Placentia, and Brea
belong to North Orange County. And they deserve to be
together with Yorba Linda in a common district to
represent North Orange County. So please keep in mind
revisit the map, and, if you can, try to go back to the
map on Wednesday night. Thank you, and have a good

evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And

right now of caller 0413. And then up next after that,

we will retry caller 4201.

Caller 0413, please follow the prompts; the floor is

yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello? Hello, Commissioners.

I've lived in Mariposa for my whole life. My husband and

I have been watching this process very closely on our

computer, at least when the internet works. Anyway, I

saw that you guys are still changing the lines here in

Central California. I think it's important that the

Commission put Mariposa with Merced and Chowchilla and

Madera.

A lot of us up here in Mariposa and Oakhurst drive

to Merced to work and go to the stores. So please keep

that in mind. Mariposa and Oger (ph.) should be joined

with Merced and Madera especially in the so-called ECA

Congressional seat. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Right

now, we have caller 4201. And up next after that, will

be caller 8065.

Caller 4201, please follow the prompts; the floor is

yours.
MR. WALDMAN: Good evening, Commissioners. Stewart Waldman from VICA, calling. I've heard a lot of callers talk about some changes that they'd like to see, but I don't think anyone's really talked about how to make them happen. So I'd like to make a simple suggestion. It's a simple, four district swap. It would take Sylmar and put it back into SFV district. It would take the same amount of people from Simi Valley and put them into the AVSCV district. It would take the same amount of people from Reseda and put them into the MALIBUSFV district, and then the Los Virgenes-Malibu cog would be united in the VENTURA District.

It's not perfect, but I think it does accomplish some of the ideas that a lot of callers have talked about. And you know, we'd appreciate that if you were going to make those changes, that use our ideas. So thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 8065. And up next after that, we'll have caller 1535.

Caller 8065, please follow the Browns; the floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. I'm calling to ask you to protect Little Saigon. Commissioner Taylor explained it best, when he said just because not directly
coastal doesn't mean it's not a shared community. It's my hope, we can revert to some previous maps that have Garden Grove, Westminster, Fountain Valley and Huntington Beach together. And please, don't divide Little Saigon. Thank you for your services.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller one 1535. And up next after that, will be caller 4967.

Caller 1535, please follow the prompts; the floor is yours.

MR. MALDONADO: Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. MALDONADO: Commissioners, my name is Tony Maldonado. With all due respect, you have a serious problem with focusing and time management. I'm sorry, but this is ridiculous. This week you spent a total of eight minutes saying anything about the San Fernando Valley maps, which are all over the place, and over twenty-four hours discussing the Los Angeles Basin, Long Beach, and Orange County, which you will repeat again tomorrow, as if these are your only focus.

So now will you give us equal time and spend all day Monday to fix the screwed-up maps of San Fernando Valley, which, to be quite honest, you could probably just simply resolve it by swapping Sylmar and putting into San
Fernando Valley East, which should be its own VRA. Maybe taking Simi Valley, putting it into the AVSCV, and maybe take Reseda, and put it with MALIBU? I think that'll work for you. To be quite honest, it's not very difficult.

Another problem you have right now is that when the Chair asks the Commissioners for input regarding other parts of Los Angeles County, all of you remain silent. Not one word is said by anyone.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. MALDONADO: So you please -- I will ask you to please manage your time more effectively, be more productive in this regard, because it's going to affect us all for the next lifetime, to be quite honest. So will I hope that you actually work together, and get rid of this nonsense. Thank you for all.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 4967. And then up next after that, we will retry caller to 2641.

Caller 4967, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. I'd like to discuss that KINGTULAKERN Congressional map. This district, in particular, looks gerrymandered. Please keep Bakersfield whole. Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will retry 2641. And then up next after that, we will have caller 3241.

Caller 2641, please follow the prompts to unmute. And one more time, caller 2641, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six, if you still wish to give comment this evening.

Caller 2641, you do appear to have some type of connectivity issue for you. Please contact the Commission in the various other ways.

At this time, we will be going to caller 3241. And then up next after that, we'll be giving caller 5188 an opportunity.

Caller 3241, please follow prompts.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You can hear me, right?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi there. On Wednesday, the Commission produced maps that showed true compromise and strongly reflected community testimony. The best part is these maps exist in all the teams are contained within Orange County, so they will cause no ripple effects to some of the big changes you are making elsewhere. It was a fair map. We kept North Orange County together, kept Irvine, Tustin, and Costa Mesa together, and kept the heavily Asian district, that's Little Saigon, with
Huntington Beach.

It was not perfect. Some people were upset, but it really pleased most of the communities of interest. I hope we can make these small changes to revert back to some solid districts we had a few nights ago. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And this time, we're giving caller 5188 an opportunity. And up next after that, will be caller 8069.

Caller 5188, please follow the prompts to unmute, if you wish to give comment this evening; the floor is yours.

MS. HO: Hi. My name is Minh Ho (ph.). I'm a resident of Westminster. I want to keep Little Saigon and Fountain Valley with Huntington Beach. Do not divide Little Saigon. Huntington Beach is racist. This is not true. Please go back to old map. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we'll be going to caller 8069. If you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six; the floor is yours.

MR. PHAN: Good evening. My name is Long Phan. I am a voter of (indiscernible). My -- I ask you to keep my city with Huntington Beach. Do not divide Little Saigon. I thank you, the Commission, for old map on Wednesday. Please keep that map. That map reflect our
Public Comment Moderator: Thank you so much. And at this time, Chair, that is all of our callers this evening.

Chair Andersen: Well, thank you very much, Katie. And I just want to thank the staff or videographers, our ASL, our interpreters, court reporters, and everybody involved in this for this week. And thank you very much to our -- the public for calling in.

This will end this meeting, and we will -- and there will be no meeting tomorrow. And we will meet again on Monday at 11:00 a.m.

This meeting is in recess, or this meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the Citizens Redistricting Commission (CRC) meeting adjourned at 8:03 p.m.)
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