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PROCEEDINGS

Wednesday, December 15, 2021 11:01 a.m.

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

Ravi, would you please call roll?

MR. SINGH: Yes, sir. Thank you.

Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Estoy aqui.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Toledo?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hope he's here.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here. Sorry about that. On mute.

MR. SINGH: Thank you.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Here.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa?

Commissioner Andersen?

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Presente.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari?

And Commissioner Kennedy?

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

MR. SINGH: You're welcome.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And welcome to Commissioner Taylor. It is very good to have you here in person with us. We look forward to your participation in today's meeting.

So today's run of show. We will have any announcements, I'm not sure there are any. I don't believe there are business meeting items for today, but I will check. We do have business meeting item for tomorrow, at least. We will review one or two outstanding iterations from previous days on the Congressional maps. Again, as yesterday, that should take us no farther than 11:45, when we will jump back to our work on the Senate Districts. Our intent is to take up where we left off with Tamina -- sorry -- with Sivan
last night in Southern California, provide any additional
instruction that Sivan needs.

We then anticipate reviewing Jamie's progress on Los
Angeles. We may have a brief closed session at some
point today. Hopefully not. But if we need it, we will.

Once we -- once we hear from Jamie, then I would
like to shift us to the Central Valley, starting with the
VRA areas, and then we can move through the Central
Valley and hopefully make it to Sacramento before we open
public comment.

Public comment, as yesterday, will begin at 6:30,
immediately following our break. So there will be an
announcement at 6 o'clock and possibly other
announcements during the course of the day on public
comment. Last night was relatively light as far as
public comment. We were able to handle all of the
callers in one ninety-minute block. If that happens
again tonight, we may be able to go back to some mapping.

And I hope that we can end the day with a very brief
recap and preview, just to take stock of where we are and
what we have before us tomorrow.

So are there any announcements from Commissioners or
staff at this point?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Did you mention the 9:30
start on Saturday?

CHAIR KENNEDY: No.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We will be shifting our starting
times beginning tomorrow morning, Thursday, to 9:30. So
Thursday morning, Friday morning, Saturday morning, we
are now scheduled to start at 9:30. That will give us an
additional ninety-minute block per day. And we
anticipate using those first blocks, particularly
tomorrow and Friday, to try to finish up the
Congressional mapping. That's our priority for those
first blocks tomorrow and Friday.

And then the chair will shift to Commissioner
Fernandez on Saturday, and she can speak now or later as
to her plans, but that is the plan for the next couple of
days. Okay.

So that is announcements.

Are there any business meeting items from
Commissioners or staff? Okay.

Seeing none, as I said, I would like to get us back
to the Senate maps no later than 11:45, but that would
give us almost forty minutes to focus on some outstanding
iterations on the Congressional maps. And I will turn to
Ms. Mac Donald, and I believe Tamina has some iterations for us. Thank you.

We are not hearing you.

MS. MAC DONALD: Oh, because I was muted. I apologize. Yes.

So good morning, Commissioners. Tamina will start walking you through one iteration that was sent up a couple of meetings ago, I think. And then also, a potential scenario that you did not get via a PDF, but that could be explored live. So with that, I will turn it over to Tamina. Thank you.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Good morning, everyone. We'll be moving through the Antioch iteration today, you received a PDF on this a few days ago. You'll -- actually, I'm not sure. It could have just been yesterday, but I think it was a few days ago. The direction that I received was to take a look at the split in Antioch, and to follow direction that had been received via public comment, which gave some street boundaries of where a better Antioch split could be placed.

So the black lines are the current lines that we have now. The red one that you're looking at would be the new split in Antioch. I'll turn -- I'm going to zoom in a little bit so we can see kind of what that area is. The public submission that we received, actually, was too
small. We needed a little bit more area, but it's centered mostly around the Northwest side, saying not to go beyond a certain area. And so that's what I did in creating this new split, is took the Northern areas and then went down. This is Hillcrest Avenue over here, which they mentioned would be a good boundary to take the Western areas of Antioch, staying out of the hill areas over here.

Like I said, I did have to use a little bit more than was provided in that public comment, just because I needed more population, but I did my best to stick to that section that they gave me and move closely around it to stay true to the -- true to the spirit of what was submitted.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much, Tamina. This is indeed very much more in line with my recollection of public input going back months, I would say.

So are there comments from other Commissioners?

Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yes, this is -- I travel through there relatively often, and that is exactly my view of what should have been done and traded. So I really like it. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. Thank you so much.
Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yup. Just wanted to support the work. Thank you, Tamina. Yes, I agree with this shift.

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

Any further comment? Any objection to making this change? Okay.

Tamina, please make that effective.

MS. RAMOS ALON: I'll do that right now. Thank you.

(Pause)

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Chair?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, Commission Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. While we're doing this, could I get possible authority to look into, with maybe Commissioner Ahmad, the idea if we could do something with San Jose to try to put it -- to look at the San Jose area, and see if we might be able to do something to make the city less than four cuts. I don't know if it's possible, but I'd like to exploration in that area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. I understand that there is an exploration currently in process, so I would not want to further confuse matters.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Wonderful. Thank you very much.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for volunteering. Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. As we are making this change, I'm just wondering, I mean, the was this was being kept together as a part of a particular communities of interest testimony. I'm just wondering if we could look at all of the CVAPs and how they change, given this this, you know, slight change in the structure.

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

Tamina, could you display the CVAPs?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Sure. One moment, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: In the meantime, Commissioner Yee?

Commissioner Yee, you're muted.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. When we're ready for San Jose, I'll be happy to present that exploration.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

MS. RAMOS ALON: The labels are now reflecting the name of the district, followed by a deviation in persons, followed by the Hispanic/Latino CVAP, Black CVAP, Asian CVAP, indigenous CVAP, and white CVAP.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So I'm seeing that we do still have some population balancing to do, particularly between North Contra Costa and -- where was it? Yolo Lake, and then a smaller deviation to take care of in
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Commissioner Kennedy, can we see the CVAP for the district as it was prior to the change? Is there a way to do that to compare it to the current?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes. I'm sorry. I'm going to step back a second on this because I think it made an unintended change in NORTHCONT that I didn't want it to make, so --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Okay. Thank you.

(Pause)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Forty-five minutes

MS. RAMOS ALON: So this would reflect what the previous CVAPs were.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Can you read them out out loud?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Sure.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: They're too small on my screen.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Sure. No problem. So for NORTHCONT, it is 22.42 percent Latino CVAP, 19.96 percent Black CVAP, 20.01 percent ACVAP, Asian CVAP, 0.8 percent Indigenous CVAP, and 34.09 percent white CVAP.

For Concord TR, that is 13.63 percent Latino CVAP, 4.57 percent Black CVAP, 16.65 percent Asian CVAP, 0.66
percent Indigenous CVAP, and 63.17 percent white CVAP.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And what is it in the proposed? The proposal that we just saw?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Sure. One moment.

(Pause)

MS. RAMOS ALON: So for this proposed district with the change in Antioch, there is the LCVAP, the Latino CVAP, is 22.76 percent, Black CVAP is 19.33 percent, Asian CVAP is 19.54 percent, Indigenous CVAP is 0.085 percent, and -- sorry -- 0.85 percent, and white CVAP is 34.97 percent.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you very much.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Tamina, do you have any further iterations to share with us?

MS. RAMOS ALON: No further iterations at this time, Chair. We did do a little bit of exploration, which I believe Commissioner Yee and Commissioner Ahmad would like to discuss.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. We have approximately thirty minutes that I'm happy to dedicate to that.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair.

So let's go down to San Jose. And we've all heard
quite a bit of input from the community this past couple
of days about San Jose being split into four different
districts, so I wanted to explore any way that might be
possible to improve that, perhaps reduce it to only three
districts. So Commissioner Ahmad and I worked with
Tamina to visualize one possibility. However, it has
various problems, so we can look at it, if Tamina has a
snapshot of that.

MS. RAMOS ALON: I actually do not have a snapshot
of it, but -- since it was just an exploration.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Great. Okay.

MS. RAMOS ALON: But I can explain what the
differences were. So currently, San Jose is in four
districts. We have the Northern area with Cupertino,
Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, and the Berryessa neighborhood.
We have a section of Cupertino, which was used for the
Latinos CVAP. We have the part that's with Santa Clara,
which comes into mid-San Jose and the areas around
Campbell and Cambrian Park. And then we have the area
with Midcoast, which is the Southern half of San Jose.

The exploration that we did was to see whether or
not moving the Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Cupertino area out
of Greater Ed (ph.) and into Santa Clara would be able to
reduce the number of splits in San Jose, and what the
possible trade offs for that would be. Moving those out
would result in a possible -- we could possibly get it into three. However, we did run into some issues with this particularly narrow area over here, which would have to be joined from greater ED down South. This is due to the fact that we have this section of Cupertino which comes in, and Cupertino being a VRA area, would not be able to be changed very much in order to keep it at the high -- at the 50.52 percent LCVAP it is at now.

So that's where we left off, was with the possibility of kind of a Northern area San Jose district, the Cupertino San Jose district, and then a Southern area, but because it would create a shape that would come down into kind of this South area here, past Cupertino, for the Northern District, it was decided that it should not be visualized and looked at live instead.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Tamina. Right.

And for members of the public, it may be confusing. We do have a district currently named "Cupertino" there, on the right of the screen, that no longer includes the actual city of Cupertino. So I know that's confusing and will eventually change to the actual district numbers.

So the idea of moving Sunnyvale, Cupertino, Santa Clarita to Santa Clar out of greater ED will leave only a very narrow strip of San Jose proper coming past Santa Clara there. And it's actually a double neck. It's not
only one. And we looked at ways we could possibly reduce it. We just could not move Santa Clara over, having too much population.

On the side -- well, you'll recall a lot of COI testimony during the summer, especially interested in Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Cupertino, moving West, and that was in the interest of an Asian community of interest in West Valley. So you know, despite the narrow necks, if we did that, what we found is that the Asian CVAP in the West Valley would go up, but only about five percent. And then there would be a corresponding drop in the greater ED Asian CVAP of about five percent. So you would end up with about a forty percent or so 40, 41 percent Asian CVAP in greater ED, and about a thirty percent Asian CVAP in Santa Clar, which for some, may be desirable but did not seem like a dramatic change despite the drastic change in boundaries.

So the only way to consider it would be to be able to accept that double narrow neck around Santa Clar, and it really just didn't seem even worth the effort to consult legal because, you know, it's just a very narrow neck, and then on the West, there would not be any VRA considerations to justify that neck. So that's where we left things.

Nevertheless, there is one small COI that we did
look at it, and which we would like to improve, down where the city label of San Jose is in red now. Thank you, Tamina. It is a Vietnamese COI, one of several we've received. And a little bit on the Eastern side there, where the "E" of San Jose is, we could bring into Santa Clar, and therefore that COI would be split only two ways, not three, and that would be easily accommodated with a small change to the split in Southern San Jose.

That's the one thing we think is doable, but if you want -- there's further discussion on the four versus three-way split of San Jose, I guess we'd love to open that up now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: If I could just start with a question. When you were talking about the possibility of shifting population from Greater ED into Santa Clar, and you said that it would result in approximately a five percent decrease in the one and a five percent increase in the other. I mean, we've seen instances where communities are happy with CVAP levels in the 30s and seeking a more even distribution. And I'm just -- is that the only reason for not proceeding? And what impact would that have on the split of San Jose itself?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. No, the more important reason for not proceeding is the double neck at Santa
Clara, a geographical consideration. But the comments about ACVAP simply did not seem like a dramatic change enough to, you know, work further on the neck because we just didn't see it any other way around the neck.

I should say, there were -- of course, there were opposite COIs for greater ED wanting to push, you know, an even larger Asian community of interest there and get that ACVAP even higher. So really, it's really two different COI's pushing into opposite directions there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And when you say "neck", I mean, are you talking about point contiguity, or is it just it's narrow?

COMMISSIONER YEE: It's very narrow. It is not point, but it is very narrow.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER YEE: That's one of them right there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Let me let me ask Mr. Woocher, or anyone else from the legal team for advice on this issue.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Tamina, do you even have the -- I don't know -- you don't have the snapshot here, but we saw something that at some point you had.

MR. WOOCHER: Yeah, I haven't seen the actual plan to see where that -- how that neck is. It's, you know, I don't think it would necessarily be preclusive of it, in
terms of legality, but it's certainly not advisable, given that requirement status vis a vis some of the others. So I'd have to really look at it to see how it looked. I mean, at this point, the district shapes, you know, would pass muster, and I think it's defensible. But I don't know how it relates to the other factors, as well, in terms of the COI testimony and things like that that would actually justify one thing versus the other.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa and then, Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thanks for your work on this, Commissioner Yee. I was going to point out, that Southeast Asian COI, that is both Vietnamese and also Cambodian as well, too, I noted.

I also saw that there was a request to -- I guess, two things. One, I hear what you're saying about the necks, or the double necks. We heard quite a bit of testimony from further down South into San Benito and Monterey about being combined or grouped with the San Jose or more the urban technology areas. Did you find that there were other alternatives to maintain that VRA District? That's one question.

And then secondly, I also noted that there was a request to swap out Newark for more of Fremont to
preserve more of a COI, and I wanted to just ask about
that, in case that would also help, you know, give you
other options to reduce the number of splits in San Jose.
Four does seem like a lot. And I'll stop there. Thank
you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: May I respond, Chair?
CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. So for the district
named Cupertino, which has VRA considerations, we did not
explore trying to alter that, especially the portion of
it that's in East San Jose, simply because there were
exhaustive efforts at constructing that district, you
know, earlier in our work, and we didn't want to undo
that and find ourselves circling back again. So we did
not.

The Newark for Fremont split, we did take a brief
look at that, but I think Tamina had other COIs that that
would compete with and undo, so I don't know, Tamina, if
you have any of those handy that you can comment on.

MS. RAMOS ALON: I do not have those handy on this
computer. I will say that that was looked at before, and
there were several -- it's conflicting COIs in both
directions. So it's really -- I'd be happy to explore
that and show who would ever like to work on that, what
the different COIs are.
With regards to the Cupertino shape that comes into San Jose, Commissioner Toledo and I worked, and Commissioner Fernandez and I worked, a lot on trying to figure out if there was another shape that we could have, or use less of San Jose. Unfortunately, that's where the Latino population is that we had to take. And because of that, the necks that it creates, really, the movement, when we move this into three districts, was to move out Santa Clara. So if you can see the space in between the pink and the black, right here, and the pink of Burbank, which I also need, and this pink right here, these are the two necks. So it's a -- it's a very, very narrow area which we would be looking at.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I guess one question that I continue to have is, looking only at the narrowest of the necks, how much population are we talking about in that little kind of bubble? Yeah.

MS. RAMOS ALON: I'm happy to look at that. Just one moment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I mean, sometimes we find that we have spaces like that with little or no population, and I was just wondering how many people are there?

And Tamina, even if we -- even if we remove the Easternmost one of those red blocks.
MS. RAMOS ALON: This area is 843 people.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And if we remove the Easternmost, the one that looks like a C? Yeah, that one. Yeah.

MS. RAMOS ALON: This is 355 people.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And 355 people in a district of 760,000, I mean, is that even going to show up in the percentages?

MS. RAMOS ALON: My guess would be not. It may go to 50.51.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. RAMOS ALON: We can definitely look at it, if you would like to move this one area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Mr. Woocher, do you have thoughts on this?

MR. WOOCHER: Yeah. I mean, you're dealing with a district that is very close to the fifty percent to begin with, which, you know, can be problematic in terms of how effective it is in terms of a Voting Rights Act opportunity district. So you would certainly not want to lessen it, if possible. And I don't believe there's any legal distinction between making that change in terms of the compactness contiguity issue.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

MR. WOOCHER: I don't think you gain anything
legally, and I do think you put yourself at somewhat
greater risk in terms of how effective that district can
be with any lower percentage --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MR. WOOCHER: -- because it's close.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And so even if the numbers remain
the same, there could be concerns.

MR. WOOCHER: I think the existing district, you
know, raises some concerns about how effective it is at
this point as well. I mean, you're right on the margin,
and historically, we've seen that sometimes you need, you
know, even higher margins to be effective. But it may
not be -- it may be that you can't get any higher than
that depending, you know, upon what else is done. But I
certainly wouldn't want to be taking actions that lower
it when they're not necessary.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay. Thank you very much
for that.

Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Actually,
Commissioner Toledo had his hand up before me, and I was
going to ask him, actually, about, you know, he looked
carefully into modifying, you know, to making sure
Midcoast connected all the way down. I was just
wondering if he might have something to say about this
point directly before my comment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I mean, we looked at this very, very carefully, Commissioner Fernandez and Tamina, and this was the highest we could get it based on the constraints that we have before us in terms of Section 2. And we did consider the compactness issues, as well, and received legal advice that all compliance requirements were met. So at this point, I think we should just probably leave this district as is.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, sorry. I did have one other point. You know, we were looking at that greater red area, and I was wondering the whole time, did anyone from San Jose talk about that? Everything we got that I saw was from people from Cupertino or Santa Clara, and the letter from Fremont. But I never heard anyone -- and they actually talk about those cities. They didn't actually name San Jose. So I always wondered about that. It's like San Jose just came along because they're in between. And I was wondering if anyone happens to know anything about that, which is one of the reasons why I really wanted to see what we can do in this area. Does anyone have any input on that?
CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner, do you?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Well, there just are -- in our Airtable, "San Jose deserves to keep our voice in Congress." "We are the largest city in the Bay Area." "We should keep at least" -- you know, they speak about member of Congress. "No other major city in California is losing its voice." So there are people from San Jose, that's calling, you know, but just to comment on, you know, them wanting to have voice. Another one, "The demographics of San Jose are distinctly different." No specific naming, but San Jose is not wanting to be split into the proposed districts. Here's someone else that's from San Jose. But it's kind of the same thing. They're wanting to be whole as possible. They want to ensure that they do have a voice.

I've not come across anything, Commissioner Andersen, just yet. But there's 564 comments concerning San Jose that I'm still looking through.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Yeah, I was looking at anything about the greater ED. That's one thing I did not -- I did not see about that district, so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Thank you. You know,
yes, San Jose is being cut here, but, you know, other
cities are, too, right? Long Beach for sure got cut up,
as well, and is losing a portion of its voice.

I think, in terms of the greater ED district, we
have received a lot of testimony that it looks good. It
reflects the communities of interest that we have been
hearing from since very early on this summer. So I would
be cautious to start making changes there.

So my question actually, for Commissioner Ahmad and
Yee is, in looking at this district, I'm curious. It
seems like there was a lot of interest in bringing that
Northern portion of San Jose back in. But I'm (audio
interference) if there was any consideration to looking
at the split that's further down that swaps between Santa
Clar and Midcoast. And is there any justification for
removing the cut there in that center part of San Jose
and having it go more with some of the Midcoast areas?
Certainly it changes the logic. I understand that. But
I'm wondering if there's an opportunity to keep more of
the city whole. I'm certainly not against trying to keep
the city whole, you know, more whole, or reduce the
number of splits. So I'm just curious if that was an
option that was reviewed at all?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Yee? You're on mute.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I believe that Tamina can comment
on that. It's a --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Tamina --


CHAIR KENNEDY: Tamina? Thank you.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

So a couple of things in this area. First, wanted
to address, one of the reasons you might not see more
greater ED comments about that, about San Jose, is
because a lot of the San Jose COIs and commenters wrote
in about specific neighborhoods. San Jose has over a
million people, so they don't think of themselves as
living in San Jose. They think of themselves as living
in Berryessa, which is what this neighborhood is. So if
you're not looking for Berryessa feedback, then you're
not -- you're going to miss all of the information that
comes in around this area. This is the Berryessa
neighborhood. You have the Alum Rock and Latino
neighborhoods here. Coming down, these are two distinct
Vietnamese COIs. This is Evergreen. And so this is
actually what shaped these different areas. These lines
where they are -- are a bunch of the COIs in
neighborhoods that are currently here.

So yes, definitely could -- because these areas, at
least between Santa Clar and Midcoast, intersect, there
are ways that we could -- we were looking at this part
of -- there's a Vietnamese COI over here, which we were hoping to reunite into two districts instead of three, and trading that out for the Almaden neighborhood COI down here.

So there are different areas that can be moved along this line, if that's what you would like to explore population wise. And yeah, the reason they're -- it's like these is because of these different COI's that come up and take these separate areas.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. That was all I was going to suggest is, I mean, is it reasonable to -- I mean, a big portion of the Southern part of San Jose is already with Midcoast. Is it reasonable to explore keeping that lower portion where Tamina was -- just had her curser all with Midcoast and pulling the line of the district back up towards Campbell, Cambrian Park, and Los Gatos, and potentially swapping that portion of San Jose for some of the regions in the Northern portion of Midcoast.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. I am going to ask Tamina, along with Commissioner Yee and Commissioner Ahmad, to continue this and come back tomorrow with the results of that.
So Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you. Can we see the heat map for the LCVAP?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Certainly. One moment, please.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: And then if you can, because it's kind of dense here, can you zoom into that general region where -- what is covered right now with this info box?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Sorry. Let me get the numbers off there. It's a little difficult to read.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I think I just needed to see this as a reminder for myself on where the population distribution is, and our VRA obligations as well as the unique shape of the city itself, and how it kind of zigzags through the South Bay. Certainly I think, Commissioner Yee and I can go back and explore the option that Commissioner Sadhwani just raised, and see what we get from that exploration.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I hear what's been said about, you know, this is as good as it's going to get. This is my words, not the words of the other Commissioners that have spoken about this Cupertino district, which, yes, is rather ironic. I just want to
just note a couple things that we've had previous conversations around in other areas. One is the mix of urban versus rural agricultural areas, which we definitely have here, and also the COI testimony from those in what I understand is the main VRA area of this particular district. And my question is, you know, someone spoke about the restrictions that we have, and you know, one of the restrictions being that the folks in the San Bernardino, Monterey areas did not want to go into the Central Valley.

But I guess now I just want to pose a question, because they have spoken quite vociferously about this pairing and about how they feel that their voice would be disenfranchised because of the combination, or the inclusion of the San Jose area. Would it be better to then reconsider going into parts of the Central Valley and keeping it a much more agricultural area, and then therefore, being able to bring up some of the CVAP in this area, since we are, I believe, still trying to, you know, look at what is going to be the best VRA districts that we can create in the Central Valley, too.

So I wanted to just raise that, because if, you know, if that was the constraint, you know, maybe that's just something that we have to just set aside and really look at what do we -- what's the larger goal. It's to
create a strong VRA district, and also listening then, afterwards, to COI testimony. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. Commissioner Turner, followed by Commissioner Andersen, and Commissioner Taylor, and Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Two things, Chair. Thank you. First of all, with the iteration, or the exploration, that Commissioner Yee was looking at, I read the response a little bit different, and you were asking about reduction of population from, I think, the Cupertino district that was about 300 people to widen the appearance of the neck. And with the counsel feedback, it seemed to me that the risk increased only if we lowered it, and with such a small amount of people, we may not see any percentage difference. And so I really would hope that as we're going back to look at other things, we just take a look at that actual change and see if there's a difference or if there's not, because if there's not a difference, that still might be a viable option.

And then the other thing is is, again, I was going through the testimony, the public comment for San Jose. And I did want to just take about twenty-five seconds and read the public comment coming from the mayor of San Jose
that speaks to it as well, because we're talking about voices of San Jose. And what it says is, "Thank you for your service. I serve as mayor of San Jose. I write because the proposed Congressional maps would divide our City of San Jose into four parts and dramatically dilute the voice of our one million residents, three quarters of whom are people of color. None of the four San Jose districts would have a majority of San Jose residents, so California's third largest city would become the only major city without a Congressperson primarily representing the city's collective interests. This undermines the voice of San Jose's diverse, less affluent neighborhoods relative to our more affluent and politically connected suburbs. Moreover, by consolidating two of the four districts in the West, South, and Southeast of San Jose, you can preserve majority Latino and Asian American districts in my city, while ensuring that San Jose has a representative who serves a majority of San Jose residents. This is not merely imperative for San Jose. To be sure, farmworkers in the Salinas Valley and coastal residents of Monterey should have strong representation, as well, and deserve the full attention of a Congressperson who does not need to drive an hour North to her office, located near the world headquarters of Adobe and Zoom. Our two smaller
cities in the Bay Area, San Francisco, and Oakland, have representatives in Congress who overwhelmingly represent their city. San Jose certainly deserves at least this much."

So I thought it was just a different perspective to, again, be able to say that, as we're looking at splits in San Jose, if they're split into areas where no one -- where San Jose, again, being the largest city, doesn't have representation or a great voice in any of them, I think that is still a further concern that we need to look at. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

It certainly remains a concern. At the same time, you know, we have been here with our ears open, trying to listen as closely and intently to the people of California as possible, and these districts reflect, to the best of our ability, what we've been hearing from the people of California for many months.

Regarding that neck and the tasking of Commissioner Yee, Commissioner Ahmed, and Tamina to go back and continue looking at this, when we looked at the heat map, it did seem to me as if there might be nearby populations that could be swapped easily for that one neck area. So I just, you know, if, as you're looking further at this, if you can take a look at the possibility of populations
to the North that could be switched for that little piece on the West, I'd appreciate it.

Commissioner Andersen, Commissioner Taylor, Commissioner Fernandez, Commissioner Toledo, Commissioner Sinay.

And all of this is possible because the mapping team has asked me to continue this discussion for a few more minutes as the next mapper is busy preparing. So please go ahead, and please be concise.

Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair.

Yes, I agree with everything that was just said by Commissioner Turner and then what you just said. Additionally, I want to talk about -- yes, the neighborhoods. San Jose, of course, was talking about its neighborhoods, never assuming that it would all be cut up and distributed into other districts. It's just like Los Angeles, when you're assuming that your neighborhood is going to be put with a few other neighborhoods in your area, not your neighborhood's going to be taken and put in a whole different county. And that's what's happening here.

And so it's just like San Francisco, when they talk about their neighborhoods, because they assume you're going to be mostly San Francisco. And that's what's
really has caught San Jose by surprise, that it doesn't have a majority anywhere, and that probably never occurred to any of them to say, hey, keep our entire city whole, because it's a million people. So you don't tend to think that way. But I don't think we should use that as a line -- as a reason to cut the tip of the Southern part of San Jose in half. I think we should really look seriously at what Commissioner Sadhwani said as well. So thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. And that is the reason for asking the team that has been working on this to continue working and come back to us, based on this discussion.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.

Good morning, Tamina.

Yeah. I think Commissioner Andersen and Commissioner Turner just hit it right on the -- the nail right on the head. I think we looked at it, or public input came, and it was related to neighborhoods and it sort of maybe missed the boat a little bit as it went to the entirety of San Jose. We know San Jose has to be split because of the size, but I think it does bear another look. Yeah. It sits not knowing that they do not have a majority. Thank you.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Excuse me.

Tamina, you might have said this already, but could you tell me what the population is in the other three areas of San Jose that are not related to Cupertino? I'm just looking at the amount of population that would potentially have to move, and as Commissioner Turner and I -- moving 400,000 was quite an effort. Yeah.

And you guys know me. I don't like to split cities. I don't like to split anything, actually.

But I think -- was it Rancho Cucamonga that was split three times as well? And there are much smaller city, so I'm thinking, you know, if we're going to look at this, we probably should look at Rancho Cucamonga.

That's 175,000 split three times, so. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I'm --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Can you hear me now? So I --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Toledo, if you could hold, we're waiting for a response from --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Sure.
MS. RAMOS ALON: I can get those exact numbers for you in a minute. When we did look at this, it looked like there were in the neighborhood of 333,000 in each of these three blocks here. And I can definitely get you those numbers. And I'd also like to remind you that we had a previous iteration where we did not include San Jose in Midcoast, but we went and took that 300,000 from going up the peninsula. And that was something which the Commission requested that we look in another direction.

But I can get those numbers for you in a moment.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Tamina.

Commissioner Toledo, please go ahead.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. You know, I'm open to a little bit more exploration, but I do think we need to put a time limit on it because we do need to make a decision on this, whether it's later today or tomorrow. I mean, we've received so much testimony from all of California, and in this area, too, and what I'm saying reflects the COIs that we received, and the community of interest testimony that we've received, and we've tried to put it in the right places, also recognizing that we have other considerations as well. We have a voting rights district in this area and we have contiguity and other requirements to deal with. And so I
just want to have a decision on this sooner rather than later. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yep. Yeah. We should be able to wrap this up one way or another tomorrow morning. Thank you for that, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair.

I just wanted to echo what Tamina mentioned, that at one point, we were looking at a more coastal district so that we could encompass more of the population in the South Bay together. There are definitely solutions to these splits. They might require some changes in a number of districts around the area, right, because there's no VRA district requirements to the West. So we do have that flexibility to continue to reduce the number of splits within the city. However, that does come at a cost rate. So we would be splitting COIs. We would be splitting other cities. Not saying that one way or the other is preferred, just recognizing that by the nature of drawing these lines, something, somewhere along the way will be split.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Certainly, something will be split. Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad. Do you believe that it would be useful for us to look at that old iteration that was more coastal?
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: If it's helpful, Commissioner Yee and I can do that offline and come forward with several options for us to explore, or I shouldn't use the word explore. For us to consider, if that's helpful,

CHAIR KENNEDY: It potentially could be.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: To that point, I do think there's -- thinking about the two central coast districts at this point, the two districts that represent the central coast, if we could get San Jose out of one of these -- out of one of these districts, I think that would also be helpful in terms of their ability to elect candidates of choice that will have the central coast in mind. Just San Jose is the center of population and the center of influence, and certainly, by shifting to a more coastal district, the gravity, where the power is in that district will shift South and give an opportunity for the central coast to actually elect somebody that comes from their area.

And so I just wanted to raise that as something that might be helpful. So it might actually help both the San Jose area and the central coast area and the coastal regions to get more representation, if that's a possibility. I just hate making so many changes last minute. But we have seen it in past iterations. We
worked away from it. I'm not sure why. I can't remember why. But that may be helpful in resolving these two issues that we're seeing in the central coast, and also in San Jose. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. That's very much my hope in asking this group to continue for one more day looking at this and come back to us tomorrow with some options. Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I just wanted to support what Commissioner Toledo said. I think we've had had other iterations. I'm also wondering, you know, would we be better off taking this Cupertino district out of San Jose and perhaps down into San Luis Obispo? I don't think there's enough population, but something that I think, you know, would help equalize some of the centers of power and influence that is going to exist. And if you have it in San Jose, you know it's going to come from San Jose. And that's been the same issue that we've heard from the Sierras as well, too. So thank you.

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

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. And please, San Jose, don't hate me for this, but I honestly don't believe it's
our position as a Commission to decide who's going to have more power in a specific district, and maybe by splitting it up, maybe some other areas, maybe Campbell, and Cambria, and maybe there will be some further discussion and not so one sided, potentially, to look at the entire district and what the entire district needs are instead of one area having so much dominance over a district. So I'm just -- I'm trying to take a step back and just trying to look at it holistically. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Okay. We're going to our --

MS. RAMOS ALON: I have the numbers for you, if you would like.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Please go ahead, Tamina.

MS. RAMOS ALON: The San Jose portion of the Midcoast district is 277,358 people. The San Jose portion of the greater ED district is 225,249 people. The San Jose portion of the Santa Clar district is 297,413 people, and the San Jose portion of the Cupertino district is 215,663.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much for that.

Okay. So we will look forward to hearing from Commissioner Ahmad, Commissioner Yee, and Tamina again on this tomorrow morning. We thank you for your work. So far, you've heard the discussion. I hope that that is...
sufficient to guide you as you explore this further. I have heard from the mappers that instead of returning to Southern California, we’re not able to at this point. So we will go back to Jaime, who will update us on her progress in Los Angeles County. So thank you, everyone, for your participation in this discussion.

And Jaime, we are all ears.

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you so much, Chair. Jaime is just plugging in her computer, and will be with you in one second.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We’re at one half-hour before our next break.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Sure. While we're waiting for Jaime, Chair, I just wanted to ask, or let folks know, that we did have some explorations for the Central Valley districts as well. They are posted for today's handouts. We are certainly beyond the time for our work on the Congressional maps. Just wanted to check in and see if we can anticipate reviewing those tomorrow, or when, just so that the public knows. And they are posted, so hopefully, we can get public comment on them as well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that question. We should be able to get to that tomorrow. I intend to
devote the entire first ninety-minute block to these
Congressional explorations so we could look hopefully at
what Commissioner Yee and Commissioner Ahmad have, as
well as your explorations in the Central Valley.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Very good. Thank you so
much.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Chair, could I ask just a
quick question on that same thing?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much.

Commissioner Sadhwani, is it sort of your intent,
without going through it, but to essentially recommend
these iterations?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: There are three different
options that Commissioner Toledo and I had worked on, so
it would be to discuss them. I can just, in very brief,
say that, you know, I think the explorations do improve
the CVAPs. They don't substantively change, you know,
the questions around Modesto and ECA.

So that being said, I think if there is a desire to
do so, then that would be still an outstanding question
at this point in time. But I don't know if Commissioner
Toledo has --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: What I would add to that is,
we do have a recommendation on preference on these, and also from -- because we've been working very closely with legal and with our line drawers. We do have a recommendation. The recommendation potentially might help us solve some of the issues farther North, and get us to resolve both the Central Valley question and then also, the questions up in the North. But there's options, so we do have two options. And there's, especially if we move in the second or third option, it gives us some options in the North as well. And I think aligns nicely with the work that Commissioner Turner and Fernandez has been doing, and that we can reconcile the two.

And whether it's the initial drafts or the versions that have come after. And so I think we are able to do two things at once, but I do think it will take a little bit longer than thirty minutes to go over. So we just have to have enough time to deal with the Central Valley and then the Sierra district, if we so choose. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo. You know, hopefully we'd be able to look at the at the new explorations or the results of the further exploration in San Jose in the first half hour and devote the rest of the time to the Central Valley in that first ninety-
We'll see how it goes, but that would be my hope.

So Jaime, over to you.

MS. CLARK: Thanks so much, Commissioners, and thank you, Chair Kennedy.

What is on the screen right now reflects the work that I was able to do, and that Sivan was able to do, offline based on your direction. We're going to focus, of course, on Los Angeles County right now. And Sivan will be able to give you a tour of what she could do offline overnight. And also, for the information of Commissioners and the public, this is up on the map viewer. It was posted this morning.

So I will begin, I guess, in the Northern area. This was a change that we did live. It hasn't changed. It's Santa Clarita Valley, Antelope Valley, part of Victor Valley, and then this Northern area along 210, in Rancho Cucamonga and Upland areas. Moving to SCV, this includes Sylmar, Sunland, Tujunga, all of the city of Burbank, and then Northern areas in Van Nuys, out to Canoga Park. And just a note is that this changed to be able to, as best as possible, keep greater Toluca Lake whole in a district, to keep North Hollywood, to keep as much of this community of greater Toluca Lake with North Hollywood and Greater Valley Glen together as possible.
So that really kind of drove this change. And those neighborhood council areas are included in the East Ventura, San Fernando Valley based district, which also includes Granada Hills, Porter Ranch, Chatsworth, West Hills, Tarzana, Encino, Sherman Oaks, and the following areas in East Ventura County, which is Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Moorpark, and such areas.

I'm going to go to the shoreline district now, which, based on Commission direction now includes West Hollywood and more of the Hollywood Hills areas, also including much of Mid-City, Beverly Hills, Westwood Neighborhood Council, Santa Monica, Venice, Marina Del Rey, El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, all of Torrance, Southern Gardena. A change is that, just for population and some of the other swaps that were made in these LA County based districts. Alondra Park is now also included in the shoreline district, also includes Palos Verdes and Rolling Hills.

SPCC. And again, all of these changes are interrelated, so I can answer, of course, any questions should the Commission have any, but SPCC includes all of San Pedro, Carson, and West Carson, Compton, Watts, now including Inglewood. This swap was based on some of the direction for Shoreline, and then also based on some discussion with the NELA district. But basically, it
includes Inglewood, LAX, now in this district. Or it was
before, but Inglewood is now included with LAX,
Hawthorne, Lawndale, et cetera, in SPCC.

Moving on to the district called 710 to water. This
includes more of the Gateway cities with it. So Commerce
and Bell are now included as well. They were moved from
the NELA district into 710 to water, which helped to be
able to incorporate some of the other areas the
Commission was talking about yesterday into the NELA
district, so those are now included in the 710 to water
district.

I will look -- we can look at the NELA district
next. So this includes Eagle Rock, Atwater Village
areas, still including greater Wilshire and Koreatown,
with Boyle Heights, East Los Angeles, El Sereno, and then
Vernon and Maywood are the only remaining Gateway cities
in this district. And that's just for population.

Moving on really quickly to SD 210, this includes
much of the Angeles National Forest, and then cities kind
of along the 210, including all of Glendale, Pasadena,
Monrovia, Glendora, Laverne, and Claremont, and then also
including communities South of the 210 such as Monterey
Park, Alhambra, Rosemead, San Gabriel. Arcadia is
included in this district.

And then just a review of where SD 10 WE is. This
was a change that was made in live line drawing yesterday. But this district now includes Ontario, Chino, Pomona, San Dimas, Covina, Azusa, Irwindale, Baldwin Park, and the El Montes.

And then, looking at SD 60 by 605, changes here really are around -- they're having to do with some of the changes that were made to SD 210, which used to have the Montebello and Pico Rivera, so shifting those down. If you remember, where we last left off, this district was eight percent overpopulated. And then also, interrelated with this Santa Ana based district, where this, of course, is a district with VRA considerations, and where we left off, SAA did not have fifty percent Latino CVAP. So now, it does. SAA is at 50.56 percent Latino CVAP. This is by including all of Santa Ana -- yeah -- Eastern Garden Grove. It does not include any of the city of Orange. So Orange is whole and intact in a different district. Western parts of Anaheim, the same split in Fullerton. It also includes all of Buena Park, and then sort of Northwestern Fullerton, including the city of La Habra, and then the cities of South Whittier and East Whittier. So are along the city boundaries. And then, there's no other city splits involved in either of these districts, actually. So La Mirada is whole and Whittier is whole.
And that is a quick review of -- oh, and I --
actually, I didn't go over West of 110, so I apologize
for skipping over that, and I'm just going to zoom in to
discuss that. So based on some of these changes with
Shoreline, for example, including more of the West
Hollywood areas, moved West Side, Mar Vista, Del Rey, and
then this Westchester area into West of 110. This
also -- I think that the boundary here moved between SPCC
and West of 110 just for balancing population. And also,
much of downtown Los Angeles, excluding Little Tokyo, is
included in the West of 110. This change also made it so
Pico Union could be with Boyle Heights, which had been
requested.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Wow, that's pretty impressive,
Jaime. Yeah. Applause. I had no -- I didn't even dream
that we would come back to see something this well-formed
at this point in the process.

So let's start with questions and comments.

Commissioner Vásquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: First of all, wow. This is
incredible. Thank you so much, Jaime. This is great.
Overall, I like this structure a lot, and more than I
thought that I would. Really more of a question, because
I'm assuming, or at least, I anticipate that you had
certain things in mind when you were sort of negotiating
these lines. And so for me, the area that I am looking at in particular is Vernon and Maywood. I know we've heard quite a bit of comment about, particularly Maywood, but I imagine also Vernon as well, being with the Gateway cities, probably in that 710 to water district. I anticipate that in order for that to happen, probably, I was looking at Los Feliz being moved into, I think that shore -- or one of those districts, but it doesn't look like a clean swap can be made to include Vernon and Maywood, and I just wanted to get your, sort of, read on that.

You're on mute.

MS. CLARK: Yeah. Yes. Sorry. I was, like, looking at -- my zoom little thingy was hiding something. Yeah. So actually, adding Maywood into the 710 to water district would overpopulate the 710 to water district, and it would make it 6.32 percent deviation. I kind of looked at some of what other, like, county-wide or statewide submissions were kind of dealing with that and, you know, just looking at options would be maybe removing Florence-Graham. So having Florence, Huntington Park, and Walnut Park not together. That's one option, just for a population swap, and then, you know, doing a basically three district swap, or moving a different Gateway city into NELA to sort of trade.
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Okay. I don't have any direction right now, but thank you for walking through that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez and Jaime.

I was going to ask about that interface between SAA and SD 60 by 605. Just wondering if you had explored La Mirada and East Whittier instead of East Whittier and South Whittier, whether that might make more sense?

MS. CLARK: Yeah, I'll turn the census block layer on with the heat map. So South Whittier is overall a higher percent Latino CVAP. And I did try that, yes. And in sort of a situation like that, I couldn't keep SAA at over fifty percent Latino CVAP

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And would it help with that -- I mean, we're getting close to the bounds of underpopulation of SD 60 by 605. Taking any part of that Southern portion of Whittier that looks to be similarly dense and adding it to SAA, along with South Whittier and East Whittier.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, I think that that would under populate SD 60 by 605 and a population trade then would be splitting when Buena Park, was also an option.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Okay. Thank you. I don't want to take up too much time on this.
Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I just wanted to recognize Jaime for the phenomenal work in this area. I mean, I see all of the goals kind of being met here, but can you just speak to the number of minority/majority seats that are in this area, and the other goals that we had discussed yesterday around keeping some communities whole, et cetera, and what you were able to achieve, what you weren't able to achieve over the evening?

MS. CLARK: Yup. Absolutely. So SD 10 West-East and SD 60 by 605 are the only districts in this plan to, you know, from most recent -- my understanding of the most recent discussions with VRA counsel that actually have VRA considerations, and SD 10 West-East is at 58.83 percent Latino CVAP. That's the protected group under the VRA in that area. And SD 60 by 605 is 53.73 percent Latino CVAP. That's also the protected group in that area.

And then additionally, 710 to water has over fifty percent Latino CVAP. It's 51.92 percent. NELA, in the current iteration is 53.93 percent Latino CVAP. And then in the San Fernando Valley based district, it's 50.23 percent Latino CVAP. Those are the majority/minority districts in this iteration.
And then additionally, I think, just in looking at other communities that the Commission had really expressed interest in wanting to keep together, for example, Asian communities in West San Gabriel Valley, based on, you know, definitions of what cities are included, this community is whole and included in SD 210. And then, also looking at -- I think that with the West of 110 and SDCC, then a lot of Black communities and historically Black neighborhoods are kept together in these districts.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you so much. And again, I think amazing job and I appreciate all of your hard work on this.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair.

Amazing work, Jaime. I feel like this is the tipping point into hopefulness and positive momentum, at least for me.

Just one small thing. The Northern border of Azusa. I'd like to explore going North to match it into the forest with the border we worked out for the Congressional map. And I believe there's very little (indiscernible) --

MS. CLARK: So just to clarify, making this portion
that is part of National Forest with the National Forest, or moving that further South?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Moving it further North, so that the canyon and the two forks of the river become part of the Azusa district.

MS. CLARK: Oh, I understand. Okay.

COMMISSIONER YEE: And just match the Congressional.

Yeah.

MS. CLARK: Sure. Okay. Could I make that change here really quickly?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sure.

MS. CLARK: And I can -- I'll just grab the general area and then, if it's okay, offline, I can work on making it match exactly the Congressional boundary.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair.

Jaime, phenomenal work.

I just wanted to say to the Commissioners, I think this represents almost all of what we've asked for. And I just want to encourage us to be able to move on from this and not keep trying to tweak it and change it, because every change requires a different change, and we have to be able to move forward and complete this. I
think this looks great. I don't know what would be ever
perfect for everyone, but I think this is excellent work.
I appreciate the increases that we've seen in the shifts
and the changes. I really want to encourage us to let
this be and move on.

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

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I guess -- yeah --
great work, Jaime,

Just a couple questions based on some of the COIs
that I read about, I think in, I don't know whether it's
in NELA or if it's in the adjacent district, but
Koreatown, there's been a request to ensure that
Koreatown remains whole and not split.

MS. CLARK: Koreatown is whole in --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It's whole? Okay.

MS. CLARK: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you for making
that change. Yeah.

And then I hear what Commissioner Turner is saying,
I just want to just -- I'm not going to give direction on
this. I just want to lift up that there was a request to
stick to the previous draft maps, particularly around the
San Gabriel Valley. While there's appreciation that the
core Asian COI cities that have we've heard quite a bit
from are remaining together, there's quite a bit of concern from both the Asian and Latino communities about being paired with some of the other wealthier cities that are now in this. And so just like all of the other conversations that we've had, I just wanted to just say it out loud so that we are aware of it, and making a conscious choice if we're going to go this direction. And also so that, you know, again, people are heard. So thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That's amazing, Jaime, as always.

A few thoughts. I hear you, Commissioner Turner, and I can live with this map.

I wanted to raise a couple discussion points for us, though, before we move on. One of them, I was under the impression yesterday when we left that we had discussed and said that we were going to move the cut portions of Upland, Rancho Cucamonga that were left hanging there into the 210. Am I mistaken in that?

MS. CLARK: I had noted that as a suggestion. I think maybe Commissioner Vazquez had noted that there was -- however, one of the Commissioners had noted there's public input. But I actually never received
direction to do that.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it. I will raise that
only in that that's -- yeah -- that's a big jump from
Victor Valley all the way down the mountains through to
this area that is most certainly connected to the 210
corridor, and that we have connected in other places. So
that that was the one surprise, I think, that I had. And
I would ask Commissioners to share their thoughts on
that.

That being said, the 210 corridor is already
overpopulated. So if we were to move them in, that would
require additional shifts. So you know, that's a
temperature check for the rest of the Commission on where
we would land on that.

I wanted to also just raise and second the concern
that Commissioner Vazquez raised about Maywood. I was
curious, I understand when we looked at it that removing
Maywood, or putting it into that Long Beach district
would overpopulate it. So I was just wondering if
there's an opportunity to swap further down the map.

In other iterations for Congress and Assembly, we do
have Hawaiian gardens with Cypress -- that district, the
North OC coast, is underpopulated, so I was just curious
if that would be a possibility.

That being said, I am also keeping my eye on that SD
NELA district because I think it has done a really great job of combining many different Latino communities throughout that region, whom we've heard from a whole lot, so I wouldn't want to do it. And I think I'm trying to weigh all of those things. And I just wanted to raise it because we certainly have heard from Maywood. They definitely are a Gateway city, so I think those are some of the swaps that I would be just generally curious to explore. Thank you.

And one last thought. You know, on Commissioner Akutagawa's point, yes, we heard -- well, I don't know. I've seen two pieces of testimony that were exactly the same about the Asian-American community. But I think overwhelmingly, we had received so much testimony from groups about having the API community separated in this area from the Latino community. So I'm still in favor of this iteration at this point in time. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Jaime? And we have three minutes until break, so we may have to ask colleagues to hold their comments until after break.

Jaime?

MS. CLARK: Thank you so much. Just a note about this Maywood swap. Maywood is about 25,000 people. Hawaiian Garden's about 14,000 people. So I'm not sure
that it would be quite so simple as like a one, you know, move it here, move it here, and then everyone is populated within the percent deviation still.

And previously, the Commission has instructed me to split Lynwood and have Lynwood with Compton and Carson based districts. And I'm wondering if that's something the Commission would like me to explore, maybe perhaps in addition to having Hawaiian Gardens with the NOC Coast District.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Jaime, could you go a little further into the rationale for making that change?

MS. CLARK: That would just be a balancing of population. I think that including Maywood in 710 to water would overpopulate 710 to water, and it would make that 6.4 percent deviation. Removing Hawaiian Gardens, which is about 14,000 people, I don't think would bring 710 to water below the percent -- or below five percent deviation. So the suggestion then would be to split Lynwood here as Commission has previously instructed for other iterations, and that would further remove some of the population from 710 to water and add it to SPCC. So that would -- the point would be to be able to include Maywood, while still having 710 to water be balanced in terms of population.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And the split in Lynwood
would be at the 105?

MS. CLARK: That's where we've had it before.


Thank you, everyone. My apologies. It is breaktime, so hold those questions and we will be back at 12:45. Thank you all.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 12:29 p.m. until 12:45 p.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your patience during our fifteen minute break. We are back. We are continuing our discussion of the new iteration that Jaime has brought us for Los Angeles County at the Senate level.

So returning to our discussion, Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I wanted to echo the appreciation to Jaime on this version that's being presented today. I think it really does get to the majority of the requests and direction has been provided by Commission.

I also wanted to echo Commissioner Turner's point of accepting and moving forward. I support this particular version. I'm not against any of the exploration -- well, the exploration that Commissioner Sadhwani raised up. However, I'd be perfectly happy supporting the version as
it is current. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons.

And Commissioner Le Mons raises, I think, an important concept for us at this point in the process. We are coming up -- we are less than a week away from the date that we intend to vote on our final maps. And so the question really is not can we live with them. It's can we support them? And I appreciate Commissioner Le Mons framing it in those terms. We need to be thinking in terms of maps that we can support once we get to next week. So thank you, Commissioner Le Mons,

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, thank you. Just wanted to agree with Commissioner Sadhwani's potential swap. Although, that for me is not a priority. I can support the map as is. However, sort of being able to zoom out and spend some thinking over the last fifteen minutes about the map as a whole, I do think we had discussed, although I will admit I don't believe -- I think, Jaime, you're right, that we did not give -- we did not give final direction on the portion of Rancho Cucamonga and Upland that are split and are currently paired with, I think, the Victor Valley. And so for me, that that feels like a piece that I would like to explore, trying to move that into the 210. And an understanding that there will
maybe need to be some swapping, hopefully between just
the two districts, the San Fernando Valley and the 210.

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

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Thank you. Wanting
to just say a bit more follow up on my comment earlier,
because I absolutely get the importance of things that we
see that we didn't see before. But for me, I guess what
I'm saying is that it's starting to feel that, maybe we
don't realize that it is a very real possibility and a
growing concern that we can run out of time. And what I
really want us to do is to lock in certain areas and move
on and put the time at the back end. And after we've
locked everything, and we say, you know, there's this one
area that we think we could have, maybe go back and look
at it. And even then, not drastic changes because, of
course, it means then that Californians can't comment on
what we've changed last minute. So I can't state
strongly enough. I don't know when we'll get in a hurry
and really feel like we're out of time, if it's not now.
And what I don't want us to do is to get to some of the
end portions, Central Valley or other, and then all of a
sudden figure we don't have enough time, and now we want
to rush through the process.
It's time to rush now. We've heard from the beginning from Californians. We've done what we could do to accommodate them. These maps, we like to say they're not going to be perfect. But I have two more things for my area. It's not going to be perfect, but I have three more things for my people. It's not going to be -- and all of them are our people. And we're saying it with our mouth, but our actions don't line up that we will not be able to accommodate everyone.

And I think the sooner we land on something, Californians can get ready to determine how they're going to work together with their new partners, with the new areas, with the new districts, with the new, you know, elected officials that, you know, how they're going to apply -- they can start down that path. But we have to move. We can't keep doing what we're doing, making changes on everything. And then just one more, because you're one more change is going to impact that last area someone else really did want to have moved. And then I'm going to want one more thing. We got to lock it and we need to move. And at the end, if there's time now, let's go back and look at it. That's all. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

That is such an important message for us at this point in time. I urge all of us to take those words to heart and
always have an eye on the end date which, again, is not the 27th. We have requirements to leave the maps as they are for several days before the 27th.

So we really are working towards our target date of the 20th, and we need to understand everything we do in relation to our ability to complete our work by that point in time.

So again, thank you, Commissioner Turner, for those words.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I would agree with Commissioner Turner completely and wholeheartedly. You know, I think this map excerpt reflects so much of what we wanted. The COIs have been kept together. Not perfectly. We've had to split some in some cases. But it is -- it's a good representation. It's something that I can certainly support.

And if we are going to make any changes, I would hope that they'd be minimal, regionalized, and not impact the goals that we set out, which was to maintain the minority-majority, to raise the CVAPs, to keep the COIs that we've identified together. And so limited in that matter.

But I'm ready to lock this in, so I'm hoping that we have support to do that. And I'm hearing that most
Commissioners, even the ones who want a couple of --
would like to see a couple of changes or exploration are
also -- would be also in support of this map, unless I'm
reading this wrong.

Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Yes. I
also agree with Commissioners Toledo and Turner.

However, if there is some minor explorations, I would
recommend that Commissioners Vazquez and Sadhwani work
with Jaime so that they're -- to minimize back and forth.

And then also, as Commissioner Toledo, I would
really like to minimize any changes because any time you
make a move or a change, you're impacting a different
COI, communities of interest. So whichever way, but I'm
just trying to consolidate it and make it as efficient as
possible. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. Thank you. I agree
with everything that's been said. And I'll just add a
reminder in our conversation largely yesterday that we
actually spent very little time on the L.A. region Senate
maps compared to the rest of the maps in the rest of the
state. And so I do feel like these particular maps did not get as much discussion or thought as the rest of the maps in the rest of the state or even as much as the Assembly maps in this portion.

So I think I would be more than happy to work Jaime off-line to try to see what, you know -- what else might be able to be done along the margins and rather quickly. And again, I hope I have demonstrated in the past that when I have requested something, I have been more than willing to accommodate sort of the will of the Commission and in the spirit of moving forward.

So I hope if the Commission will grant sort of some additional off-line time, that, you know, we can move with the proposal. And if that doesn't please the Commission as much as this current iteration, then for me this current iteration is something that I can support.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm being supportive of providing some opportunity to explore around the edges. And just as long as what comes back or maybe doesn't come back as a recommendation meets the goals, right, that we set forward. Because if it's going to create -- if it's not going to meet the goals, then I do find that as problematic. Thank you.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. So I am -- okay.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. And I just wanted to say, Chair, I support that totally, that part of that is what got us to this point of what Jaime just presented was some further thought on it. I just, again, just want to -- that time factor. And even if we did it wrong and even if we didn't spend the right enough time in the right areas, the time is still going to run out.

And so I like exactly what was presented by Commissioner Vazquez and those that's going to do a quick exploration on the outside. And particularly as it comes back where it doesn't impact other areas, I think this is the way to go and move.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that.

I am happy to give the go-ahead for one or two Commissioners to work with Jaime. I will depend on Ms. Mac Donald to serve as gatekeeper to tell us whether this is even feasible as far as her management of the mappers' time as what -- you know, keeping in mind the other demands on them.

As far as who works on this, I would also want to know if there are others, whether it's Commissioner Taylor, Commissioner Le Mons, anyone else who might be interested in working on this.
Commissioner Le Mons, your hand is, I think, still up. But I just wanted to touch base and confirm. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah. Just --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Sorry, Chair.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So I was just going to suggest an addition to that. I am perfectly fine with exploration of whatever meets the goals. But maybe potentially just seeing if there's general consensus for support for this. And if -- so these would be our maps that would move forward if no refinements come up, if the refinements that we are seeking, you know -- and of course, we can always make refinements should there be some exploration that comes back with things that we would -- that we all can also agree to.

But maybe just -- I hate to use the word lock it in, but lock it in for now so that we can -- and hope that Vazquez and whoever is willing to work on some refinements can bring us something that also meets the goals and criteria. And then we can, of course, incorporate that into our thinking. But I'm just thinking about just the path forward.

Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.
I mean, at this point, I would consider this map as being the map that we have for the Senate for Los Angeles County. Commissioner Fernandez will be leading us through the review of all of our districts. And, you know, there may be minor points that could be raised then. I am certainly trying to do my best to get us all the way through the Senate maps and through the Board of Equalization maps by the end of Friday.

And to the extent that there is any time remaining, we can come back and look at, but again, I have to rely on Ms. Mac Donald to ensure that the mappers' time is put to where it is most needed to ensure our overall success in this endeavor.

Commissioner Akutagawa and then Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I just want to state that I think -- well, first off, I am in support of Commissioner Vazquez doing additional exploration. I also want to note that we are already two days over due to continued tinkering on the Congressional maps. And I'm going to also state that I think we're all guilty of that too.

So I think given that we still have additional iterations of the Congressional maps that are still going to be presented over the next couple days is my understanding, I think giving Commissioner Vazquez the
chance to look at this is okay.

And the fact that, for the most part, we're pretty satisfied with these maps I think speaks to the fact that we should hopefully be able to wrap it up in the next couple days, which then hopefully we will also be able to do the same with the Congressional maps. I think we're at the point where I think we're ready to just lock things in, as you said, Chair. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes, Chair. Thanks. So I thought there was some good wisdom in maybe Commissioner Sadhwani taking exploration with Commissioner Vazquez. But if she doesn't have the stomach for it or is not able to do it, I don't have any issues with taking that sojourn with Commissioner Vazquez. And we can wrap it up to see what's available or what's possible.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that, Commissioner Taylor.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Thank you. Happy to work with either of the Commissioners.

Just wanted to clarify and just get, like, a general consensus about sort of order of operations for some of these explorations. That way I know where to spend our
collective time off-line.

So these are my priorities, and please let me know if the Commission would like something different. So for me, now being able to zoom out, I feel like priority for me, number one, is looking at this Rancho Cucamonga-Upland piece because we had discussed it somewhat yesterday.

Number two is the issue of Maywood given that we heard so much public comment about including Maywood in the gateway cities.

And then number three is this proposed change from Commissioner Yee about adding the forest area to Azusa.

Am I missing something? I had three. Is there a fourth?

(No audible response)

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: All right. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Just real quickly. I think the Azusa one got fixed already.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Did we confirm those changes? Okay. Then yes. So then two priorities, first one being Rancho-Upland, second being Maywood. Great. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Sadhwani and then Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. I just wanted to confirm. I would support these maps as is. I do support
Commissioner Vazquez continuing to work on it. And I also most definitely support Commissioner Taylor working with Commissioner Vazquez to try to make some marginal improvements. Thank you so much.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Good answer.

So let's ask Commissioner Vazquez and Commissioner Taylor to spend a little bit of time with Jaime. Ms. Mac Donald will ensure that the amount of time is controlled from an overall management perspective. And we look forward to hearing back from them probably tomorrow.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. In addition to that, I think -- I mean, I'm fine with the two goals. And also just maintaining the CVAPs or -- either maintaining or increasing the CVAPs, as we've always said. I'm just repeating it because I just think it's so important.

And then maintaining the number of majority-minority seats as well as our goals.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Thanks for naming that. Also, I am not interested in doing anything that will reduce our CVAPs and complicate life.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent. Okay. Thank you, everyone. That was a very good -- first of all, again, an excellent bit of work by Jaime, a solid presentation, a solid discussion.

And we are able to move now to Sivan.

MS. TRATT: Thank you, Chair. One moment while I get my screen up.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. We had left population unassigned in San Diego County.

MS. TRATT: So the lines in red are where the Commission left the districts after live line drawing yesterday. And the black lines underneath represent the changes that I made off-line that are also what is posted for the public.

So I just wanted everyone to know that we do have this starting point in case we want to walk anything back. But just kind of pointing out some things, we had some pretty crazy deviations. We had a negative thirty-five in this SBRC district. We had this 17.56 in the IOC district. We had a negative eight in SCCA. Plus twelve in MCV.

So a lot of big numbers and a lot of kind of structural changes in the Inland Empire. So I would love to just today work to kind of smooth things out in the Inland Empire as I know that that's where the biggest
kind of architectural shifts were taking place. But I
didn't want to go beyond the directions that the
Commission had given me because it was going to be
affecting the whole map basically.

So just -- I know that Jaime did touch on some of
these districts because there is overlap between L.A.
But starting in this POF district, the current deviation
is at 3.24 percent, and the Latino CVAP is at 52.88
percent. Again, this is still cutting off the Northern
portions of Upland-Rancho Cucamonga but now includes all
of the City of San Bernardino as well as stops at the
county line for San Bernardino-Riverside.

Moving to the South, this SBRC, which previously
stood for San Bernardino-Riverside County is now a
Riverside County only district. The changes that were
made I will put on the draft lines because you can see
just how different these districts are looking now.

I tried to implement direction to keep Riverside
whole. Unfortunately, there was no configuration I could
find that would keep the Latino CVAP over fifty percent
while including the entire City of Riverside. So
unfortunately, I did have to keep the split, although I
did lower that line a little bit to the South.

I also, again, removed portions that were in San
Bernardino County, moved the district on the East side --
or excuse me, on the Western side slightly to include parts of the Cities of Corona, Norco, Eastvale, and then also includes now all of Jurupa Valley and goes as far South as Meadowbrook, Perris, Romoland and also includes San Jacinto.

So those I would be happy to finetune, but just pointing out a few of the other things that need addressing, we have a negative 8.75 percent deviation in the MCV district. We also have a negative 8.77 percent deviation in the SCCA district. We do have this unincorporated area still -- or excuse me, unassigned area of population in the Eastern portion of San Diego County that will need to be absorbed by a district because currently it's not in any district.

So yeah. Those are the things that I would point out as definitely needing attention. So happy to start wherever the chair or Commissioners would like.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Sivan.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So I have one question on Riverside. We've gotten quite a bit of COI testimony lately about the splitting of UC Riverside. And so I just wanted to ask first about that one.

And then I'd just like to ask a question about South OC, but first I'd like to see about this one.
MS. TRATT: Yeah. Sorry. Just trying to take off the layers that are blocking this.

CHAIR KENNEDY: It looks like we're in good shape.

MS. TRATT: So it looks like University -- yeah. It looks like it is in this Northern portion of the city and is in the SBRC. Commissioner Akutagawa, if you had specific COI testimony with streets, I could double-check that those streets are included, but from what I can tell it looks like it is whole in a single district.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: There was mention specifically about 900 University Avenue.

MS. TRATT: So it looks like University Ave. is North of where the border is --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MS. TRATT: -- because the border is along the 215.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Great. As long as they're all -- I know we just tried really hard to ensure that the universities don't get split awkwardly because that could be very awkward.

MS. TRATT: No. I appreciate that direction. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think it's in Riverside. Can you turn on your microphone?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm sorry. I had written down 900 Riverside Avenue. So maybe that was what was
being cut off. I'm not sure.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: The different COI testimonies that I'm reading now is indicating 900 University Avenue in Riverside. Yeah. I don't know. I don't know if there's a Riverside Avenue too, so --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Let's move on from this.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, I wanted to also ask about Orange County I mentioned.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So South Orange County.

Given some of the deviations, I know that there's been a lot of COI testimony requesting more of a coastal district for Orange County that would encompass the entirety of the Orange County coast. And I wanted to just bring that back up again as we're exploring San Diego. You know, is there ways in which we can bring in Dana Point and San Clemente, particularly since this is a very large district?

And then that will have, obviously, some effects to the North San Diego-Camp Pendleton areas too. But potentially with that unassigned area, perhaps some of the coastal areas can take in more of San Diego city.

And then that inland Rainbow, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Escondido, which I've read a lot of COI testimony
recently is speaking about wanting to stay more inland and to the East. And so perhaps that could be combined with that unassigned area that we have right now and perhaps move up into Southwest Riverside because I believe that area was a concern about keeping it with the SECA districts. So thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. Ironically, we're receiving a lot of COI testimony now asking for Escondido, Vista, Oceanside, Carlsbad, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Rainbow, which was a great one two days ago for the Assembly. Anyway I -- for Congress. I'm sorry. I keep thinking that -- does it make sense -- and I don't know this area that well. But it feels like we're cutting really close to a lot of the Salton Sea issues. If we took Anza-Borrego and we moved it into the SECA district, would that allow people to look at environmental issues more holistically or not?

CHAIR KENNEDY: That certainly seems plausible. We are looking for, what, 10,000 people or so that we need to move? Or is it more than that?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And I don't think it will affect the CVAP data, statistic. But I just kept looking at that and just wondering if it just made sense to
keep -- you know. Boundaries are created by humans, not by nature. I mean, some boundaries are, but these regional -- so that's why I was just wondering if putting that together made sense.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And we would eventually also -- if we're going to move at least Borrego Springs and the area to the East and North of that into SECA with the Salton Sea, we would need to think in terms of moving Anza and the areas South and East of Anza into SECA as well.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I don't know if it gets to be too big, but I was just thinking in the --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay. So Sivan, could we look at the Northeast quadrant of the currently highlighted segment?

MS. TRATT: Like zoom into where Borrego Springs area is?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. TRATT: Do you want the terrain layer on or --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

MS. TRATT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Are you waiting for instruction from us? Sorry.

MS. TRATT: Yes. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Sorry about that. Can
you zoom out a little bit? Okay. And this is the
full -- not just Anza-Borrego and Anza?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. This is all of the unincorporated
area that I had gotten direction yesterday to remove from
the -- it was formerly in the SCCA district.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So could we just look at the
brown? Like we said yesterday, kind of Anza-Borrego,
Anza up above, like, near where the 74 is. Just look at
how much -- I can't remember -- I know we did this
yesterday, so I apologize. How many people are in -- if
we go to Anza to Anza-Borrego?

MS. TRATT: Okay. Yeah. Yesterday, you had asked
just this Southern portion. But let me include Anza as
well. One moment, please.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. And we may just
want to do that.

So Chair, just I'm curious on your thinking if this
makes more sense or the Coachella Valley for the SECA,
the negative SECA?

CHAIR KENNEDY: I think at this point, this is a
good way to go.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I agree with you that the
environmental concerns -- the Anza-Borrego area is an
important area in terms of environmental concerns and
matches with a lot of the terrain in the SECA district.

MS. TRATT: Should I go ahead and move the selected area into the SCCA district? It looks like that would -- it is 12,285 people. And it would make the deviation of SCCA negative 7.53.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we're looking to move eventually 100,000 into SECA. Okay. And Indio is already in SECA. I would say, yes, let's go ahead and do this. We can keep it in mind if we need to back it out at some point.

MS. TRATT: Did you want Lake Riverside and Aguanga also included? Or should I --

CHAIR KENNEDY: No. No.

MS. TRATT: Okay. I'll exclude. I'll readd those back to the other. One moment. But you can keep talking while I do that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we need to resolve the remaining population that is unassigned. And so basically, keeping in mind what Commissioner Akutagawa had said, we might be looking at moving that unassigned population into the SD-POW-ESC district and then passing population from there into the SOC-NSD district and through into Orange County.

So I don't know. Sivan or Karin, if you want to walk us through what that might look like and what we
would need to do or be looking -- keeping in mind as we
did something like that.

In the meantime, I'll take some of these hands.

Commissioner Sadhwani, Commissioner Fernandez,
Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Since we're here,
I'll make my comment here. I actually didn't have a
problem with our draft maps in this area that included
this whole more Eastern portion of San Diego being in
SECA. So I just wanted to raise that. I'm fine if we go
back to that.

Also in this area, you know, I just want to lift up
we're getting a whole lot of testimony. We've always had
a lot of testimony from the LGBTQ community in Coachella
Valley wanting to be kept together. And I just want to
raise -- I'd like to see us attempt to try and keep them
together here.

That being said, I didn't actually raise my hand for
either of those. I'm actually more concerned with our
VRA districts back up in San Bernardino. It seems like
there might be ways to strengthen them. In particular,
I'm noticing -- well, we're actually over population
already in the POF district.

But I'm curious if incorporating portions -- moving
some population from Ontario -- that would mean splitting
Ontario to some extent -- could be moved into the POF district in order to further strengthen that district a little bit.

Although I'm seeing -- why did I -- I thought when I looked at this before it was at fifty percent. So maybe I'm wrong here. But I'll just raise that. I think that is in general an option. I mean, I think it's worth exploring. Maybe not in live line drawing, but it could certainly be something maybe that Sivan explores off-line.

I think down below in that other district -- I'll just note. I mean, I think we're pulling together different communities. I wanted to acknowledge that we are taking in more of Riverside here. And that means that we're not taking in Hemet and East Hemet where we've had communities of interest testimony in the past.

In general, I can live with that. I think that we have kept that COI together in other places. But I just wanted to raise that and acknowledge it. I don't believe that doing a swap there would actually impact the CVAPs particularly based on some of the testimony that we've received and the way others have drawn that area. But I just wanted to raise it and kind of name that, that that has occurred there. Thank you.

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

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I was just curious on Rancho Cucamonga and Upland. Right now they're both split. I didn't know if there was a way to -- thank you -- to either keep either one of them whole by drawing the line differently, like between the cities instead of right across. And there might have been a reason. There might be one of the freeways there or highways.

So anyway, I was just wondering what those populations were on each side and to see if we could minimize splitting one of them. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I think we'll come back to that shortly.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. Very quickly back to Commissioner Akutagawa's comment about UC Riverside. I believe that actually had to do with the Assembly district square. Actually, you separate it from the greater part of Riverside. I'd be happy to look into that. Would be even happier if, perhaps, Commissioner Vazquez is interested in looking at that and having it ready for a future date when we may have time to revisit that.

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

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. I like adding Anza and Borrego to SSC. It does drain marsh -- it would drain from Borrego. Certainly would drain into the Salton Sea.

But actually, I was thinking more of -- kind of looking at the areas that Commissioner Sadhwani was talking about, the POW or whatever they are up in that area. Thinking of moving populations. I know that the High Desert would really like to be High Desert not in L.A.

And if we could go up a little bit on the map, please, a little further North on the map. And I believe that Highland wanted to go with the -- with actually the High Desert and/or Victorville. You know, they're native eight percent. And I noticed that Antelope Valley, who also would rather be with Antelope Valley, we might be able to switch some populations there. Maybe put Victorville back in or something.

The Rancho Cucamonga area, that was -- it was drawn that way because they originally wanted to be with the Angeles Forest. But I also kind of like Commissioner Fernandez's idea of maybe one whole and the other whole. Sort of doing something in that area.

Just a couple of ideas as we move these populations
Chair Kennedy: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Sinay: Thank you. The first thing that just kind of popped -- and I think we've had it like that before, but I just want to bring it up. But it looks like the tribal lands right next to Anza have been split. And so it might make sense to bring that line South underneath those tribal lands. I know we'll be losing some population, but I think it will help the neck as well.

Chair Kennedy: Right. And also I would say I'm not seeing the reason for excluding that area in the middle.

Commissioner Sinay: From which one?

Chair Kennedy: From SECA. So let's finish this. Let's move the line there. The selected area, the green line, needs to come South below those tribal lands.

Right. Okay.

Okay. So then we're back to the question of this unassigned population in kind of central Eastern San Diego County.

Commissioner Sinay: I thought --

Chair Kennedy: Sivan --

Commissioner Sinay: I was just going to say I think what Commissioner Akutagawa said is good. What I'd like
us to do is look first at the -- kind of the City of --
because what we did in Congressional is we created these
vertical lines that don't necessarily make sense for the
City of San -- I mean, for San Diego County.

They do on the coast, but not in other places.

Well, they do in two different places, on the East and on
the -- but I'm good at bringing it over to San Diego POW.

The only question I have -- because I hear what you're
saying, Commissioner Akutagawa, is it looks like we need
population North.

And so I'm wondering do we need to push more of the
East side San Diego North up to Riverside to get it to
San Bernardino.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So this is where I was asking
Karin or Sivan or Andrew, anyone, to walk us through what
we need to be looking at and thinking about as we look to
assign -- and I believe what we're looking at is
something on the order of 91,000 people in that
unassigned area. And helping us think through the bigger
picture issues, the issue of the underpopulation in the
district with much of the Coachella Valley and the High
Desert, the underpopulation currently in SBRC. The
issues that Commissioner Akutagawa raised regarding the
feasibility of creating a coastal district running the
entire length of Orange County.
So just help us think through kind of the big picture issues of process and result along those lines.

MR. DRECHSLER: Hi, Chair. This is Andrew. And I just wanted to weigh in. And as you can -- or Sivan has the number up of that unassigned area, which is about 77,000. If we did move it to -- completely over to the POW, yeah, seed district, then that would be over -- I think we would be about at seven percent. And then over on -- seven percent over on deviation.

The district below that is short about 30,000. The district SOC and SD is, you know, short from -- and this is just getting to zero. Both of those are short about 30,000 for the Southern one and about 20,000 for the Northern district.

So we could take this population in this area and distribute it and have deviations overall, I think, would be in the, like, one -- we could have all three of these districts approximately one -- you know, 1.5, 2 percent over deviation. So that's an idea of where we can start. And maybe start by fixing this and then address a couple of the other issues that were raised in Riverside.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. TRATT: Chair, if I may, just to add to that, I think that before we talk about the coast of Orange County, we should, like Andrew said, address the
unassigned population. But I think we should also get these two high negative deviations below five percent. And then potentially pushing population up through this SWRC and reuniting the Coachella Valley into two districts as currently it's split in three districts with this configuration.

So I think if we can talk maybe more big picture, that will -- because there's a lot of different competing -- directly competing priorities because these districts have so many people in them, so --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay. So if you could just very quickly give us a population figure for that chunk of the Coachella Valley that is in SWRC. I just want to --

MS. TRATT: Yes. One moment, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- know what the population is.

That's Rancho Mirage, Palm Desert, Indian Wells, La Quinta.

Okay. While we're waiting, Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.

If we move that unassigned area to SECA, doesn't that even it out? No. But it will --

MS. TRATT: It would (indiscernible).

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- balance it, right?

MS. TRATT: Yes. That is correct.
CHAIR KENNEDY: It would, but we're trying to be responsive to community of interest input from those East county communities that do not want to be in the SECA district.

MS. TRATT: So Chair, I've selected these cities in the Coachella Valley. And they are total population of 110,770 people.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And I'm thinking we may have to move Anza back into SWRC and just have that Borrego Springs area of San Diego County grouped with the Salton Sea. And then if we looked at -- well, I mean, we still have issues. I mean, Descanso is not going to want to be with Riverside County. But are we looking at possibility of moving them into SD-POW-ESC and then moving Bonsall, Fallbrook, Rainbow, and Pala into SWRC? Okay.

Commissioner Fernandez, did you have anything further? Okay.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thank you for that. I was just going to ask if there was -- it looks like you are already exploring the Palm Springs or that -- the Coachella Valley area as an option.

I think -- what I've been reading is that the East San Diego inland counties want to remain inland and with each other. There's also been COI testimony that I read
about particularly Fallbrook, Bonsall, and Rainbow
wanting to be with Escondido. It seemed like there was
some openness to being with the other inland East San
Diego counties. It wasn't necessarily throughout all of
it.

Then there's the connection -- you know, I think we
know that -- we're reminded that these districts are
going to be really, really large and that we're already
looking at, you know, cross-county, you know, districts.
And so perhaps trying to keep it limited in terms of how
far into Riverside we have to go, that would probably be
better.

But I'm just thinking that maybe, you know, going up
into Temecula and that Southwest Riverside area might
help create that more inland district. And it looks like
because of population they're just going to be really
large districts. But it's probably better than being
with SECA for those areas, which is extremely large and
we already know that they would prefer to be with more
similar types of, you know, cities. So thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you for that.

Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. Two things.
I know the Coachella Valley wants to be whole, but if
you -- just looking at that quick switch, this --
remember, this is a VRA district -- went from sixty-one
to fifty-four.

And the impetus of that VRA district is also water
related and environmental. And I know the valley has
many, many things in mind. So I'm not hugely in favor of
that swap.

But the other thing I wanted to say is any of the
changes in this Anza or Borrego, as we make those lines,
can we please look at the terrain level and make them
accordingly so we don't, you know, make areas that are in
one district but you can't get there because of the
terrain level, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. No. We did look at the
terrain level when we did that. And we can --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Originally, yes, but when
we're making those couple of changes, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. We can certainly continue to
do that.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I was just
wanting to go back to the public comment not in favor of
the swap for Fallbrook. Lots and lots and lots of
testimony requesting that they stay North inland San
Diego with all of the, you know, San Marcos, Vista,
Rainbow, all of what we keep hearing. So to move them
into Riverside for this other swap, I'm thinking maybe --
well, we know we're changing COIs one for another again.
But there is just substantial testimony of them wanting
to remain North and inland. Thank you. And not with
Riverside, per se.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: It's absolutely right that the
newer testimony is saying that. And we've received a lot
in the last forty-eight hours. But if we go back to when
we had the COI input public sessions, the -- what we
continually heard is Temecula wanted to stop at the San
Diego line, but Bonsall, Fallbrook, Valley Center, Pala,
they liked 15 -- there's two corridors. There's a 15
corridor, which is the 15. And then there's the 78
corridor. And Escondido kind of goes right -- both of
them kind of go right through Escondido. So Escondido
could go either way.

But that -- so that's why I said it was ironic that
we got it after we were talking about the Congressional
because that's partially what we were trying to do in the
Congressional, and we weren't getting this -- the
community input wasn't that.

So I think we could go either way. They are
connected now in some of the districts currently. Not
from our perspective. And if we need to -- yeah. It's
going to be we either need to push population North that
way or through Camp Pendleton to Orange County.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.
So yeah. If you can back us out -- and back us out
a good bit because we do need to address this issue of
the underpopulation and where we're going to get that
population from. So one possibility is bringing in more
of the Victor Valley into MCV. I don't know how much of
the Victor Valley we could bring into MCV. Possibility
of bringing in enough to resolve the underpopulation of
both MCV and SECA.
And then to the extent that Antelope Valley, Victor
Valley were underpopulated, then we'd need to be looking
at making that up. We have some excess population in
SD210, but it's hard to see how to get it to that
Antelope Valley, Victor Valley area, particularly if we
were having to go around the West side. We'd have to go
through multiple districts.
Sivan, could you move the center of the map to the
right a bit? Thank you.
And then -- okay. So we've got S coast with some
excess population as well. Okay.
Andrew, you were starting to narrate through some of
these bigger picture questions. Do you have any further
MR. DRECHSLER: I think for MCV, there could be -- I think it's Highlands if we wanted to take that from POF. And I think there might be some areas there that would be -- would do two things. One, it could increase the CVAP and POF but also help the population deviation in MCV. So that's just one big picture thing that I see immediately.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Highland. I was also looking at Loma Linda as a possible candidate there. We've got the Southern portion of Redlands already in MCV. And to me, it would make sense to move Loma Linda to be with the Southern portion of Redlands.

Take some more hands here. Commissioner Sinay, did you have anything further? Okay.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. So a couple thoughts. One, I would support, you know, taking out Highland and, as I mentioned before, having that POF district potentially taking parts of Ontario to continue to populate it but also to hopefully boost Latino CVAP because that is a VRA district.

Another piece is you mentioned pushing population from SD210. We raised earlier -- and I believe Commissioner Vazquez and Taylor are looking at this. We
still have -- we could put -- well, actually, that's
in -- how would that work? I'm thinking it can -- if we
pushed the Rancho Cucamonga and portion of Upland that's
sitting out into SD210, it would require you to take more
from SD210 out and pushing it up, through, and around.
So, you know, a more complicated process, but one that
would potentially lead to additional population in MCV.
Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay.
Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you, Chair. I'm just
trying to wrap my head around all of these potential
changes. And I tend to work best with goals. So and I'm
just trying to understand what the goals of all these
changes are. And as best as I can see them, what I'm
hearing at this point is keeping a strong SECA, so making
sure that the CVAP in that area is strong, maintaining
the LGBT community in the Coachella Valley together,
potentially some ensuring that the CVAPs in SBRC and then
PDF -- I think it's PDF or POF --

CHAIR KENNEDY: POF.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- are improved as best as
possible or at least maintained while also getting the
deviations to the appropriate level. Are those the goals
that we are trying to move in? I mean, I'm just trying
to put all of the pieces together and trying in my head
to understand the direction that we're going and to --
because ultimately, at the end of the day, we can go back
and say we met the goals or we didn't or we met most of
our goals. But just trying to understand where the
direction is -- where we're going, I guess.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yep. Those are pretty accurate.
You know, it's part of the remedying the
underpopulations. But we've got that unassigned
population that we are trying to deal with. So, you
know, that could be included in the list.

Anything further, Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No. Thank you. I just was
making sure that I understood the direction.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Appreciate it. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sure. Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I'm just
thinking at some point we might want to maybe work off-
line on this maybe with one of the line drawers. Because
it does seem to be -- you're going to have to move
population around, so it's -- it make take a while.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So I'm just wondering if
that might be better.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, Chair. And I think shape files were sent on this, but there is an extensive swap suggestion that's coming in from the hub that will maintain our VRA district. And that suggests that for SECA we're bringing in the rest of Southeastern San Diego to keep it whole while maintaining the majority LCVAP area South of 94, East of 805 into SECA. And then there's other swaps that they are suggesting that will be able to help this.

And so I think the team, our line drawers, have this, but maybe we can look at this. Moving in areas into SOC and SD to population. It goes on quite extensive, but it gives a lot of direction. That may have been a newer suggestion that was sent just on the 14th that might help.

And I don't know, Chair, if you wanted -- Commissioner Fernandez talked about taking it off-line -- if you wanted that done or if you wanted me to read out so that you can -- the Commission can see the suggested changes and see if this gets at what we're trying to accomplish.

MS. TRATT: Commissioner Turner, those lines are in green. Those are the latest version from the Black
Census and redistricting hub that I have.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. From the 14th? Thank you, Sivan.

CHAIR KENNEDY: But that would -- as I read the map, that would leave most of East county San Diego in the SECA district. And that is one of the issues that we are trying to address to see if we can find a way to group those East county communities better than having them there.

So yeah. We'll probably come back to getting some overall direction for some off-line work, but let's explore a little bit further right now.

Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Just quickly. I'd like to grab -- balance the MPH -- what the San -- the High Desert with some of Victor Valley, if possible. We need about 30,000 people. But I will stop anything else. And please take Jaime.


MS. CLARK: Hello. Thank you. Just thought I'd pop in since we're talking about the 210 district and have been working off-line on this. It is possible and -- you know, I'm going to keep working with Commissioners Taylor and Vazquez on this. And it is possible to move that
population into 210 and then sort of absorb the population throughout other districts without having to rotate it fully around. Looking at doing a big rotation would potentially throw off the CVAP in NELA or in the San Fernando Valley based district. So just a no on that.

And then additionally, right now, talking about MCV and trying to balance populations there, just removing that area in Rancho Cucamonga and Upland from the Victor Valley based district makes that district underpopulated by negative 6.44 percent.

So then trying to balance MCV with that would further underpopulate it. So essentially, just making this move with this Victor Valley, Antelope Valley based district, again, you're going to underpopulate that district. And essentially it would require probably moving this unassigned area in East San Diego County in with SECA to move population to MCV to then populate this direction.

So basically just note here that if you want a balance between MCV and Antelope, Victor Valley, it's the -- and remove Rancho Cucamonga from that district, then the population balancing actually has to go the other direction than moving from the Antelope Valley, Victor Valley district into MCV.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. That's very helpful. I mean, what I'm hearing is that as much as we might want to and as much as they might want us to, it's just very difficult to work this through and have East county San Diego not be part of SECA.

Is that what I'm hearing, Jaime?

MS. CLARK: Well, this is definitely Sivan's forte. I think she could speak to this better than I could. It -- I mean, in some way or another, this population, of course, needs to be assigned to a district. And right now, with looking at moving this Rancho Cucamonga area out of the Victor Valley, Antelope Valley based district, the population does need to move North in general.

So rather that be with East San Diego County going North to the SWRC district and then areas in the Coachella Valley -- more areas in the Coachella Valley being included with MCV so that there's room for more population to move into the Victor Valley based district -- yeah. So I guess it doesn't necessarily need to be with SECA, but of course all of the districts need to balance and all the area needs to be assigned. So that might be the most direct route to move that population.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Sivan, do you have further thoughts on this?
MS. TRATT: Yeah. I think everything Jaime said is probably what I also would have said. We don't have to add all of this population back into SECA. We could probably get away with adding, you know, some of these Easternmost cities and just kind of trying to see how much we can add until we get this within range.

But yeah. I definitely like the suggestion that Andrew made about moving Highland into the MCV. I don't know if folks were looking at the pending changes box. And I can definitely bring it back. But moving Highland out would fix both MCV's negative deviation, it would keep POF's deviation still within range, and it raises the Latino CVAP to over fifty-three percent.

So I think just that one move might tick one thing off the box. And then we can return back to the unassigned and SECA and move that way. But I think we should address that first because I don't think that pulling from Los Angeles is in the best interest of the overall goals of the Commission at this point.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Right. Right. So unless there's any objection, I would like to ask Sivan to go ahead and make that one change as a first step. And then I think it would make sense to look at moving Loma Linda into MCV as a possible second step and for many of the same reasons as the move of that population in Highland
to MCV.

MS. TRATT: So again -- and I'll pull up both of these before I commit them just so everyone can see.

Moving the rest of Highland into MCV would make the deviation of MCV negative 3.5, so back within range. It would also make the Latino CVAP of POF 53.31 percent.

And then looking at moving Loma Linda in would have a similar effect, although it would not fully fix the out of range deviation. MCV's deviation would still be negative 6.23. But it would raise the Latino CVAP of POF to 53.65 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And actually, a third option would be to move all of Loma Linda and plus part of Highland. I recall that we have Highland split in some of the other maps.

And I'm thinking, unless mappers tell me otherwise, that we could be considering -- I mean, we have to be careful with the CVAP in POF, but underpopulating it is not necessarily a major concern. So we have the CVAP above fifty-four. We have the deviations on both sides within range. Do we want to look at taking any more of Highland?

Commissioner Sinay and then Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was just going to volunteer to work with the line drawers off-line when that time
came.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you. We've got about eighteen minutes until our meal break. And I think that may be when we do give direction for some off-line work.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Before we make these changes, can we -- I'm uncomfortable with making these changes to a VRA district that we worked on yesterday without having the Latino CVAP on, especially in Highland.

CHAIR KENNEDY: With the heat map on?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. Sorry.


COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I am comfortable with these changes. Bummer that we can't keep Loma Linda in POF since we spent some bit of time trying to make that work yesterday. But I am okay with these changes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: The option was to not bring in Loma Linda but to bring in more of Highland. So which makes most sense to you?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: What may be helpful also is to turn on the Black CVAP because I think there are -- there's some within group distinctions and communities up in the San Bernardino-Highland area.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. I mean, my consideration in this is that Loma Linda, you know, does have a good bit of affinity with particularly that Southern part of Redlands and --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Right.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- Yucaipa.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Right. Yeah. I think this is an acceptable change from my perspective given all the factors.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And we can refine it further at some later point if we really have a reason to come back to it. But -- okay.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I wanted to inquire concerning is that a -- kind of Northwest geography to where Highland is, is that a reservation area we're splitting?

CHAIR KENNEDY: There is a reservation there. Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. And was that by design that we're splitting it?

CHAIR KENNEDY: I think we had tried not to. That's the San Manuel.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. It appears to be in the MCV district currently. I'm not sure if it also overlaps with the City of San Bernardino.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So what we're seeing also --
Sivan, could you -- are we seeing -- okay. It's the heat
map that's on also. So if you could turn the heat map
off for a second. Maybe that's going to give us a
better -- okay.

So then we need to fix that. Can we bring the rest
of the San Manuel lands into POF or is --

MS. TRATT: Yeah. That shouldn't be a problem.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- are we better going the other
way?

MS. TRATT: No. That shouldn't be a problem. I
would just have to accept these changes first. But
there's --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. TRATT: -- it looks like less than 100 people in
the census blocks in this area. So it shouldn't make a
big difference in the --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Very good.

So any objection to making these current highlighted
changes -- shifting Loma Linda and part of Highland from
POF to MCV? That will put both of the population
deviations within range and the Hispanic CVAP in POF
would increase from 52.88 to 54.02. Any objection?

Okay. Sivan, please proceed with that. And then
bring the San Manuel lands into POF.
MS. TRATT: One moment, please. All right. Those changes are complete.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And if you can zoom back out so that we can see most, if not all, of this region. So we still have underpopulation in SECA. We still have the unassigned population in East county San Diego. And so we need to decide whether we want to explore pushing some population up across the San Diego-Riverside County line or if we are going to cross the San Diego-Orange County line or some of both.

And if we are going to push population up across the Riverside County line, then I might think of reversing the change with Anza, have Anza back on the Riverside County side.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Sorry to backtrack just a little. Question for the Commission. We just moved the San Manuel reservation to keep it whole and with a San Bernardino anchored district. And I'm just curious if maybe it makes more sense to actually put that whole reservation in the MCV district. While that reservation is definitely associated with San Bernardino, I'm just curious about keeping it sort of with some other critical masses in the MCV area of native reservations.

So just a question. I don't have a strong opinion.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. We can keep that on a list of pending questions. I think it is a good one.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: You know, I think kind of what Commissioner Turner had mentioned earlier that there -- you know, we had kind of explored earlier if we wanted to take more from the South -- you know, the Southeast San Diego, that area, and put it into SECA, which would then -- that's more, you know -- that would allow us to keep some of these other communities of interest together.

The problem is -- I mean, what happened when we pulled this -- the East county out of the SECA district was it really did strengthen the VRA district. And they're very, very, very different areas. And I think that there's more similarity if you add some of the other -- some of the neighborhoods that were dense but near the 94 as Commissioner Turner said.

And that would allow to create communities in San Diego -- you know, create probably two districts in San Diego that would make more sense for the community. And some of it would, you know, continue to push up, but it -- you know. So that's one alternative.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Turner and then Andrew.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. That's exactly what I wanted to go back to. East San Diego to balance population, I'm wondering if we can put the heat map on again to see if there is at least more of that population that we can move back to SECA so we would have less unassigned area to attempt to move.

MS. TRATT: One moment, please. I'm just changing it back. It's currently on Black CVAP. So let me just change it back to Latino.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: The unassigned would probably still be there, but just the SECA wouldn't be negative. Can you zoom in a little bit when you have a chance. Kind of in the -- you know, South of the 94 corridor.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: If there's a way we can take the red off so we can see the heat map because we selected all of this area to try and move it out of SECA. But what I'm looking to see is if we select areas that have heavy concentrated populations -- and maybe they're spread out. We know that. And maybe put the numbers on.

MS. TRATT: I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: The census blocks.

MS. TRATT: So that would -- I would be zooming in really, really close. If you want me to --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. I see.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Yeah.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

MS. TRATT: I can zoom in on an area. Where would you like to see the --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Well, what I'm wondering is, is I'm trying to see -- because we're trying to move population. And right now, we were trying -- what was the number? The total amount of people that we're trying to move.

MS. TRATT: I believe it's around 77,000 people, so --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: So what I'm trying to do is to just determine if there's a way we can reduce the amount of people required to move so we can put some back into SECA based on an area that has more Latino population so that we don't lower the CVAP.

So if we were to grab some of the unincorporated area in the North, this is, again, not based on COI. It's just based on balancing population for right now to see what that looks like. I don't know what these areas are per se.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. We could look at moving the line on the other side of Descanso as I feel like these might be more East county cities. And then Ramona, Alpine, these could be put in with these other districts. We could also look at moving population from the City of San
Diego and shifting things up that way. Yeah.

But most of the population is going to be close to the city anyways. There's not very much population out here.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Andrew.

MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. Thank you, Chair. And sort of going along that suggestion and going back to sort of adding this -- you know, the idea of, again, adding the unassigned population, the 77,000 to the POW-ESC district, from there, you could -- once we do that maybe address SECA first.

Yesterday, we had explored going into the Southern part of the City of San Diego and not necessarily, you know, going all the way over to the City Heights COI, but there was some population that could be added to raise the SECA number and the population number. I think that could easily solve. That would be taking population away from the COR-Cajon district. But as we will be overpopulated in the district North, we can move the San Diego -- the city -- the line that's going in the City of San Diego where we can move that North a little bit and see -- to help populate that out.

And then once we are done with that, we can then look at the SOC-NDS. So that's sort of -- move the unassigned population, address SECA, and then work your...
way North from there would be one way to do this. And
again, happy to work with, you know, this now or over the
break.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. If you could just excuse me
for a moment.

Commissioner Fernandez, if you can just take over
for a second while I'm dealing with another matter.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Looks like it's lunchtime.
No. I'm kidding.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Almost. We are five minutes away.


Andrew, one more time. Sorry.

MR. DRECHSLER: No. Not a problem at all. So we
have about 77,000 in the unassigned area. And if we move
that over to the West and add it to the SD-POW, that
would be overpopulated. But once that is over there, the
things that we could do is first address the SECA
district because that is underpopulated. And if we went
and looked at that population near Sherman Heights,
Barrio Logan just to the East of that, we can add in some
of the population to get the SECA numbers population
number up.

From there, we would move North because we would be
taking population from the COR-Cajon. And we could
address that by moving the line in the City of San Diego
further North. And then we would be doing two things. One, you would be getting the population number back in COR-Cajon. You'd be getting the population number in SD-POW-ESC down as well.

And then, finally, the final step in this would be then addressing the SOC-NDS district. And I know that Commissioner Akutagawa wanted to maybe perhaps move some of the OC beach population out of this. So that's something we can look at. But it's sort of like a ripple effect that I just walked through.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It is a ripple effect that effects quite a few districts, Andrew.

Are there any objections to the path that Andrew just kind of described right now? Are we good with making the initial move of the -- what is it called -- unassigned area into SD-POW. Right? That's what you said?

Okay. I don't see any objections. Commissioner Sinay, is your hand up or is it just -- are you doing a Fernandez there?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No. Well, I was just going to say just to add a little more context for, you know, when we're saying parts of San Diego can go into the COR and El Cajon, that would -- I think the first we would like at is the Asian business COI because that would be a good
combination with those that are already in there.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So let's commit this, Sivan, please. Again, awesome, Sivan. Just wanted to make sure we've given you kudos.

MS. TRATT: No kudos necessary. Okay. So now SD-POW-Escondido district is over by eight. Should we zoom in on the portion of San Diego city that is in the --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

MS. TRATT: -- SCCA district? Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Sivan.

MS. TRATT: One moment.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And then if we don't get done, then hopefully -- we do want you to have a lunch too, Sivan, but it might be cut into a few minutes. Maybe if we can have someone work with you off-line if that would be okay?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. That would be great actually. So yesterday, we looked at adding population South of the 94. Is that where we would like --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: What does that look like number-wise?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. I can start grabbing some blocks here.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I have to use my pieces.
MS. TRATT: So we could add more if we would like. Currently, though, adding this selected population would bring SCCA within the legal deviation. It would be at negative 4.34 percent.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And did it drop our -- wait. Did it drop our --

MS. TRATT: Latino CVAP would be at 60.88.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm sorry. And it's at 61 right now?

MS. TRATT: It is.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: You're hiding it from me.

MS. TRATT: But it's super underpopulated, so --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. I'm ready. Thank you for taking over.

We do need to have a quick closed session. Commissioners will find invites for the closed session in their email. It is also coming up on time for lunch. So as far as the public, we will be coming back after our lunch. That is scheduled to end at 3 p.m.

So thank you, everyone. We will see you -- we will see the public at 3 p.m. And we'll have a brief closed session as soon as we can -- as soon as we can get in
there.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your patience during our meal break. As I had indicated beforehand, we did have a brief closed session meeting while we were away. I apologize for not mentioning beforehand that that was held under the pending litigation exception. We did not take any action in that meeting. And we are back to resume our live line drawing with Sivan here to help us.

Sivan, if you can just pull the map back for a moment, and we can review where we are in the bigger picture here.

So SECA is underpopulated. San Diego, Poway, Escondido is overpopulated. COR-Cajon is underpopulated. South Orange County, North San Diego is underpopulated. Southwest Riverside is overpopulated. MCV is underpopulated. POF is pretty good. SAA is slightly underpopulated. We have some population in SD10 West. And we are needing some population in SBRC.

Okay. Could we start this session by looking at where we might address the underpopulation of SBRC and -- so if we zoom into that. Okay.

So we've had -- we've certainly had some community of interest input over the months wanting Hemet to be in
a district with Moreno Valley and Perris. Could we look
at what bringing Hemet in would do to our numbers?

MS. TRATT: Yes. Sure. One moment while I select
Hemet. So adding all of the City of Hemet in would put
us over the five percent deviation. And it looks like it
would also lower our Latino CVAP to 49.48, which could
likely be addressed when we remove additional population,
but just pointing that out.

If we go to the other end of the -- or maybe if you could
go ahead and put on the heat map for us.

MS. TRATT: Let me turn off the city color fill.
One moment, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Okay. Could we look at the
Southeastern portion of Chino? We're looking -- okay.
SBRC. We are 37,000 or so underpopulated. Okay. If we
can look at that area. Yes.

MS. TRATT: One moment, please. Would you like me
to continue adding population?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. And I would say, you know,
probably the -- well, I would follow the Ontario -- yeah.
Up the county line there.

Okay. So now we have -- wait a minute. How did
that happen? No. If you bring -- if you reverse those
last couple of blocks because we had -- okay. So the
1 population deviations there -- okay.
2 
3 MS. TRATT: Negative 0.65 for SBRC and 0.05 for SD10 West. And the Latino CVAP of SBRC would be 50.6. SD10 West would be 59.33.
4 
5 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Could you reverse one more block there in Ontario?
6 
7 MS. TRATT: Yes. Should I keep removing population?
8 
9 CHAIR KENNEDY: No. Any other thoughts from colleagues? I mean, another thought is if we reshaped this so that Norco and Corona were out of this district and we looked at more of -- maybe looked at more of Chino.
10 
11 Commissioner Sadhwani.
12 
13 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I definitely would suggest removing Corona and Norco. I don't know how much of Corona we have in there currently. Another option also might be taking a look further down at Hemet and East Hemet. Again, in our Assembly maps, we had actually spent quite a lot of time looking at COIs within this area. This is a VRA district, so it's not simply about COIs. But if you notice, we had a line cutting through the Northern portions of Hemet. I don't know exactly what the Latino population CVAP is there, but that might be something that could help us out as well.
14 
15 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Sivan, let's try bringing in
that same Northern portion of Hemet that we have at the
Assembly level.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Should I go ahead and move out
some population in Corona first potentially? I think
that will give us a better --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I'm getting head nods. So
yeah.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Okay. One moment while I add
those to the Southwest Riverside district.

Okay. So it looks like we're looking for about
86,000 people in that Northern portion of Hemet, which I
think is doable. I'm going to accept this change. And
we can always come back to this.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We were also looking at possibly
removing Norco. Do I remember you saying yesterday that
you had tried to add more of Riverside city and that was
not helping?

MS. TRATT: It was not helping the --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. TRATT: -- Latino CVAP, no. But it was
obviously helping other, you know, Commission directions.
But yes. It did not help Latino CVAP in that case.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. TRATT: Do you want me to try and also bring in
East Hemet or focus first on this Northern portion of --
CHAIR KENNEDY: I would say first on that Northern portion.

MS. TRATT: Okay. One moment, please.

So I know this isn't the cleanest selection, but it looks like we could move farther South if the Commission so desired. But currently, we are only at about 60,000 people selected in this area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. We're at 50.33. Okay. I think -- yeah. If you can finish cleaning that up.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Unfortunately, it looks like that's making our CVAP go down. In the more Northern area of this district I was noticing something we had included in the Assembly that maybe we can include here to see if that helps.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Perfect.

MS. TRATT: Where was that area, Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Just right above Woodcrest. You see there's, like, a triangle sticking South? Do you see where I'm talking about on the Western, very Western part of the map right now; right there.

MS. TRATT: Oh, this area right here --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.
MS. TRATT: -- in Riverside?

CHAIR KENNEDY: I didn't know if -- I mean, it doesn't look like we want the whole part, but if you know, have a line kind of on the bottom going up Northeast, maybe if we continued that line and captured those red blocks, that might help. I don't know.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Let me add some population from that part of Riverside. One moment. So that gets us closer to being back in deviation but Lat -- looks like Latino CVAP is at 50.39.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. I think -- I think we're going -- we're not achieving our objectives here. I -- Commissioner Turner and then, I'd appreciate Commissioner Sadhwani's thoughts on going looking more towards Chino.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. It may cross a county line, but I'm looking at a population that's North of Eastvale. Does that go -- oh, that goes off into a diff -- no.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. But that --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. That's right.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I mean, we -- we --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- we explored that a moment ago. And there may have been some marginal benefit going that far North, but no farther because when we -- when we
started going North from there, the numbers started going
down. So I was -- I was thinking more of --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- of looking in Chino --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. And that didn't do
anything; did it?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen, and then
Commissioner Vazquez.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. I like the idea of
ra -- don't try to get all of it in one area but get
little bits. And with that in mind, I might not take the
full triangle that Commissioner Fornaciari was talking
about, but if we go a little further South, there's a --
also, don't know how many people it has, but in a --
little bit from the South --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Oh, Canyon Lake?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- and also East. Correct.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. So it's --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: A little further East.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- it's --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Go to South and East.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. It's towards the bottom of
Menifee, I think.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Right there. That little bit
of --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- Canyon Lake. I don't know how many people are in it, but you know, it was 3 or 4,000, but I wouldn't take all of it. Only the -- say the Northern portion and just see. If -- you know, we take little bits in different areas, only because it's VRA district. If you take that area, say, on the West side of the -- of the reservoir, of the lake.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. It didn't -- looks like it didn't do much for us either way.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Nope. Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Vazquez. And then Commissioner Fornaciari, and then Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Agree with the approach of trying to get a little -- a little bit around the edges and can we zoom into the Grand Terrace portion on the county line between Riverside and San Bernardino? I know I remember that being a strategic ad at one point; it may not be very strategic now because there's no -- there's no Latinos there, or at least not a large-enough portion. That do anything to CVAP?

MS. TRATT: It lowered it by --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: -- about a tenth of a percent.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I like that -- I liked
the -- or I thought maybe it helped a little bit to take
that Southern portion of Chino.  Yep.  Right there.  I'm
wondering if we just follow -- I wonder -- to try to get
North of Eastvale, I wonder if we take a little bit of
Ontario along with Chino.  Are you --

MS. TRATT:  Sorry.  I had the wrong layer on.  One
moment while I reselect that.

CHAIR KENNEDY:  And --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ:  Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY:  -- and another thing that we can
consider is if there are -- if we want to overpopulate
and then remove areas, that might help us reach our
objectives.  So that's just another way to approach this.

Commissioner Vazquez, did you have anything further
right now?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ:  No.  I like that suggestion.

There also seems to be maybe something-gardens down below
Norco.  Yeah.  Right there.  That might be worthwhile,
trying to widen that line to capture that little piece of
Corona.

CHAIR KENNEDY:  No.

MS. TRATT:  So yeah.  We're now below fifty, but we
are within our deviation range, but that is with adding
all of the selected areas.  Would you like me to deselect
any of these selections?
CHAIR KENNEDY: I would deselect that last one.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So I know it's going the wrong way population-wise, but I'm wondering if we have areas that maybe like Norco that are really low in CVAP, if we take those out first and then -- and then go forward from there. But I guess I would also offer that maybe this is a little more in-depth than -- and hit-and-miss kind of thing than we might want to do live, and I don't know. It's up to you, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Now, let's continue for a few more minutes, and then we can -- we can pull back and look at this region more broadly and see if there's any other instruction we want to give Sivan.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yep. Actually, pretty much the same advice or suggestions as Commissioner Fornaciari and Vazquez. Just -- I'm just noting, right, if we're looking at our Assembly lines, and again, not nesting, but note till we've pulled down into Eastvale. We exclude Norco, which was Commissioner Fornaciari's suggestion, and I agree with that. And then we include Corona -- that -- more of Corona, Coronita, and El Cerrito. And I don't know where exactly that's going to get us.
I'm also concerned that this area may not -- we may not be able to get it super high, but at a minimum, I think we could try those. And I would agree also -- I mean, I think, yes, let's work on this. But at the same time, I would feel perfectly comfortable giving direction to Sivan to continue to work off-line to try and you know, boost this as much as possible.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani. So the areas you were suggesting was exclude Norco, exclude the Southwestern portion of Eastvale that is -- that is grouped with Norco in the Assembly district. And then what else?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I think -- I think in particular, let's start with taking -- removing Norco. I mean, let's keep Eastvale for now because we do need population. But definitely Norco and then pulling in more of Corona and El Cerrito --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- possibly -- there's only little dibs and dabs in there, but Coronita also seems to have some population down there. I don't know how much. But you know, as we -- as we kind of similarly did in the -- in the lines. I would say keep Eastvale for now, Sivan --

MS. TRATT: Oh, okay.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- only because we would be cutting off some of those little red dots in there.

MS. TRATT: So before I can add more of Corona, I have to remove this first.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. TRATT: Can I go ahead and accept this change?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

MS. TRATT: Okay.


COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I wanted to see what would happen if we grabbed population at the county line far South of Fontana all the way across if it would -- we could pick up population there or increase our CVAP with those numbers at the county line in Fontana.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry. I think I am repeating what Commissioner Turner just suggested to bring that county line in Fontana, bring the district line South. It may improve the CVAP somewhat.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Bring the line South or bring the line North into San Bernardino?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Oh, so we're -- I think, saying the opposite thing, but trying to achieve the same objectives --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: -- so either take the Fontana line and move it South on the Fontana side or take the Colton side and move it North. I'd be, I think, more in favor of taking the Fontana line South just because the Grand Terrace -- cutting Grand Terrace in half, I would say, is a little less preferrable.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. So that we're going to reduce population in SBRC if we move that Fontana line South.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Right. And I guess I was thinking we could still potentially keep some of the Hemet --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: -- population.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. TRATT: So Chair, what I currently have selected is twofold. These are the portions of Corona, El Cerrito, and Coronita that were in the Assembly lines as well as bringing this line down in Riverside, as suggested additionally by Commissioner Fornaciari. Adding both of those areas into the SBRC district would again raise our Latino CVAP to 51.77 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Any objection to making this change? Okay. Sivan, please go ahead with that one.
Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No. Nothing new. Just if we need it --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- I'm still interested in either way at the -- at that line.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: No. Nothing else.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: What about Menifee? Is -- I don't know if that would boost it a little. I'm trying to think of other ways similar to what Commissioner Fornaciari was saying of taking out some areas.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But right now, we are -- oh, wait. We're not under. Okay. But it's --

MS. TRATT: We're still under --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- we are a little bit under --

MS. TRATT: -- like .41 of that.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- but not as much as I thought in terms of --

MS. TRATT: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- bringing in -- well, part of Menifee.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- we have -- we have two areas we want to explore, the Northern part of Menifee and the -- then moving the -- it was moving the line South of the county line along the Southern edge of Fontana, and that's if we need to reduce the total population. So let's go ahead and add the Northern portion of Menifee first.

MS. TRATT: So just looking to get you under deviation and I can continue to add --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I would, yeah.

MS. TRATT: -- as desired, but we are going in the right direction. The Latino CVAP was raised slightly to 51.81.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Yeah. I would -- I would continue South.

MS. TRATT: Okay. One moment, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And again, I don't -- I don't mind overpopulating and then finding a good place to remove population. Sivan, go ahead and keep bringing that line South in Menifee. You see in -- over towards Winchester where the Assembly line takes a right turn. Yeah. If you can the --

MS. TRATT: Right here?
CHAIR KENNEDY: -- bring the bottom part of that, yeah, just to the left of where your hand is. So if you could bring the line in Menifee South to there, and then let's look at it.

MS. TRATT: Okay. One moment while I clean up this selection. Do you want it all the way across?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

MS. TRATT: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, she's going to clean it up.

MS. TRATT: And I can clean this up off-line, but --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. TRATT: -- is this more or less the area --

CHAIR KENNEDY: That's more or less what we were looking at. Do we -- do we want to remove any from the Western portion of that where we're well within deviation right now as I -- as I read the table.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: But am I correct that our Latino CVAP has declined?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. The Latino CVAP, if this area was added, would be 50.82.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, it --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And before we were at 51.60.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: 50- -- we had at 51.8 at one point.

MS. TRATT: Yeah, that was just with the
Northernmost portions.


COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, that's what I was calling out. We had it initially 51.8, and with adding those additional portions, we've dropped CVAP in the area so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So do you --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And that was just the very -- with the very first selection that she made up at the top.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I see.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, we go -- you see?

CHAIR KENNEDY: So now we're at 51.81.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Uh-huh.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I know we looked at it before by taking the whole strip of Northern Hemet, there's actually one area -- and again, I don't know what the population is just in those blocks further over in Hemet.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Can we go ahead and accept this?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh, yeah. Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.
MS. TRATT: Oh, you did want me to accept -- oh,
okay. Yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just that -- yeah, that top
portion that raised it to 51.8.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. TRATT: All right. One moment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Okay. And then -- yeah, I
want to give direction and ask Sivan to continue working
on this off-line.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Um-hum.

CHAIR KENNEDY: But we'll take Commissioner
Sadhwani's --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- suggestion first.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right. So just that area
kind of coming straight downward, dipping down into it.
I wonder if you (audio interference) take that portion as
opposed to that full longer strip if that might --

MS. TRATT: This portion right here?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

MS. TRATT: One moment, please.

MS. TRATT: So we're --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And it looks like we're --
MS. TRATT: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. It went -- yeah, it's an off-line thing. So Sivan, we won't -- we won't accept this one. We'll ask you to continue to work on this off-line if you could -- yeah, zoom out.

MS. TRATT: Yeah, I think if before I go and work on this off-line, if I could get some like, nonstarters from the Commission because I think -- I just -- I don't want to -- in making an effort to strengthen the voting potential for this district, I don't want to disrupt any of the other architectural kind of changes that the Commission has already made. So just any specific noes, specific yeses would be really helpful in addition to if anyone wants to volunteer to embark on this off-line and make an iteration, I don't know how that's happening, but if that's a possibility still, that would probably be best.


COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I mean, happy to work with Sivan if she needs that, but also happy if someone else wants to take it on, no problem. I would just say in general, totally okay to cross into county borders. That being said, I would be concerned if we lowered the
I also just wanted to note, yesterday we spent time looking at a few of the maps that had been offered by some of the community groups. And we were looking, kind of, in broad strokes. And I just wanted to note, in this area you know, the Black Hub, for example, draws a similar district, but they only top out at 50.63. MALDEF draws also similar in this area, not the same, but similar, and they top out at 50.94. We're already doing better than some of those community groups. So I'm excited to see what Sivan comes back with just noting that we're already at 51.81. So thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Okay. So if you could pull the map back a little bit farther.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair. And I am also okay with county -- crossing county lines. I would prefer to get this Latino CVAP higher, though, higher than the 51.81. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Akutagawa. Okay.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Let's see. We have another -- a number of other kind of changes that we've been looking at in Sivan's area here. Do we want to have
somebody just work with her globally on the whole area to come back with a -- with a proposal?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. So we've got the underpopulation SECA; we've got the underpopulation and MCV; we've got the split in the Coachella Valley that we need to see if we can address. I would be okay with reversing that change, having Anza back in Riverside County based district. Sivan, if you could pull the map back any further.

MS. TRATT: Let me turn the heat map off.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please. Okay. So we still have the overpopulation in San Diego/Pala/Escondido district. Again, depending on where we need population that could go through Southwest Riverside District or through the South OC North San Diego District depending on where we need the population.

Anything -- any other instructions, Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm willing to work on this area --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- with the line drawers.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Do we -- do we want to ask Sivan also to look at Southeast San Diego as a potential source of the -- of the additional population that we
need in SECA? Okay. So we would -- we would want some
further exploration in Southeast San Diego to address the
SECA underpopulation. The -- my understanding of the San
Diego POW Escondido excess population is that most of
those would want to go not with the -- could you -- could
you zoom in a bit? Yeah. So the -- there's a
possibility of grouping -- keeping Ramona, Alpine
Descanso, that general area with the San Diego portion
with Santee, et cetera, and then we might look at Valley
Center, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Rainbow, Pala as potentially
being in the Southwest Riverside District as a way of
moving some of that population. So if you could explore
that, if you could explore raising the Latino CVAP in the
Riverside City District and looking at how to address the
split in the Coachella Valley.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I think I just want
to state, I think we're at a point where we can't have
too many nonstarters, I guess, right. That includes,
yes, there's a desire not to cross counties, but I think
we just have to be open to that --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Right.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- right?

Lastly, I just want to maybe suggest that maybe one
way to rotate that San Diego area once we get the VRA
districts put in place, is moving that you know, San Diego Poway. I know they didn't want to be with Coronado, but I'm wondering if that might be better because it's a big district anyways. And then you know, you could move out at least -- then you might be able to you know, group them a little bit differently. That's just a thought so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Right.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Okay. Sivan, are you -- do you have sufficient direction at this point?

MS. TRATT: Yes. And who should I be coordinating -- or I guess if Commissioners who are willing to work with this could email Karin, that would be the best way to get the set up to work off-line.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. We've actually asked them to email Anthony, and Anthony will liaise with Karin so.

MS. TRATT: Thank you for that clarification. Yes, email Anthony first.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Sivan. And in line with our run of show, we would next like to sit down with our friend, Kennedy.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. Sorry. I should have said this before, but I forget that the one area
that was unassigned initially, I realize I don't want
to -- they don't want to go into Imperial, but if they
have to, that -- they may have to stay there so --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- I just want to make sure
we --
CHAIR KENNEDY: I mean, that's --
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- state that.
CHAIR KENNEDY: -- that would be part of the --
yeah. All options on the table.
MS. CLARK: And Kennedy is setting up right now, so
we just need about one minute.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good.
MS. CLARK: Thanks for your patience.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.
MS. WILSON: And hello.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Central Valley.
MS. WILSON: I will be -- hi. Sorry. Can you hear
me? I wasn't sure if --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.
MS. WILSON: -- I could hear you.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. We can hear.
MS. WILSON: Oh, okay. Okay. So let me just pull
up my screen really quickly and we can get started. So
here are our current -- your current Senate districts for
the Central Valley and Northern California.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. So we're going to -- we're going to start with the VRA areas in the Central Valley.

MS. WILSON: Okay. Sounds good to me. Let me zoom in on those. And would you like me to describe kind of what we've got going on here?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

MS. WILSON: Okay. So starting in Kings and Kern, we have a similar configuration to what we've had in the Assembly maps and the Congressional maps. The Country Club is not included. Neither is -- let me zoom closer to Bakersfield Country Club and Old Stockdale are not included in this iteration. If you want to further refine and pull in the lines even closer, we can do that as well. We have Shafter kept whole; Delano, McFarland, Wasco together. And then moving up into Kings and Tulare, we have Kings' whole, and Tulare carves out Visalia. So Visalia is not a part of this district at all. However, we have Farmersville right next to it included Lindsay, Strathmore, Porterville, Tulare is whole. And then moving to the North, we have --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Kennedy, could you speak up a little bit?

MS. WILSON: Oh, yeah. Sorry.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.
MS. WILSON: This better volume or maybe me -- let me move closer as well. Okay. Is this better?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. WILSON: Okay. Do you want me to repeat anything?

CHAIR KENNEDY: No. I think we're good.

MS. WILSON: Okay. So moving into Fresno County, we do have the cities of Fowler, Parlier, Reedley, Kingsburg, Selma, and Orange Cove, a part of this King/Kern district. So it really spreads out between the Southern parts of Fresno, all of Kings County, portions of Tulare, mostly the Eastern -- the Western portions excluding Visalia and then down into Kern County, and again, the familiar shape that we've seen before.

And then moving on to the SBENFRESNO, which includes Fresno, the city of Fresno, it goes atop the cross off Shaw, and then cuts up the 99 as well. And then you have the Southern portions, and you have Clovis, and then the Northeastern and then parts North of -- North and East to the 99 going up to the Fresno/Kern District.

And then we also stop at the Fresno County line. We reach into Madera. And we have the city of Madera, Madera Acres up to Chowchilla, and Fairmead, and again the entire county of San Benito. And then we the Salinas Valley from Salinas down to King City as well as
Greenfield, Soledad, Gonzales, Chualar, Spreckels as well. And those are the two VRA districts that have been constructed in this area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioners, are we able to support these as they are?

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I'd be interested in seeing our Assembly districts because we have --

MS. WILSON: Just one moment while I bring those up.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- please. We had four, right, Assembly districts in the Valley and then one on -- in San Bernardino; is that correct, four VRA Assembly Districts? Yeah. I just -- I just want to compare.

MS. WILSON: So looking at our Assembly Districts, they are in blue. I'll follow. So from the bottom, so it comes in blue. It's a little bit tighter in the circle that it makes here. This one stretches out a little farther on almost all sides, except for this middle part near La Cresta.

And then we -- moving North again in blue, it does come down to Buttonwillow, but then does move in closer here as well. We do take a part of Visalia in our Assembly district and move out to Woodlake and Lemon -- and Ivanhoe as well.
And then come and taking similar parts in Fresno, the boundary differs just slightly as you can see some little divots above that black line. And I would say a main difference is definitely the inclusion of San Benito and the Salinas Valley. And the Assembly districts, you did not cross that county border line and I continued to move North. And as you can see, the district stops in Merced and cuts right above this Atwater, the City of Atwater, as you can see here. And so that is a difference of why this line moves higher and this one stops at the Fresno County border.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So yeah, just an interesting difference here is the current district is -- the current Senate district in San Benito and the Salinas Valley and it goes over and includes Merced County, which is not included this time, just FYI. And I guess I would -- I would wonder aloud if that is a better match for San Benito and Salinas Valley.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari, do you have thoughts on that.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- the road definitely -- I mean, there's a road that goes between the two counties --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- that -- yeah. There's no -- there's no connection between San Benito and the counties we have them paired with. But then -- yeah, I guess -- I guess we need to -- need to do some thinking about how we would design that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Any other colleagues have thoughts on that? Is this -- is this a change that we would like to direct the mappers to go off-line and develop options for us and bring those back at some point?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I didn't understand the change. Can you say that again?

CHAIR KENNEDY: The change, instead of linking San Benito and Salinas Valley to Fresno County as we have it in the current Senate draft, we would link San Benito and Salinas Valley to Merced County with which they are currently grouped in a Senate district, not our maps, the 2010 Commission's map. And Commissioner Fornaciari was pointing out that there is, in fact, a road link between San Benito County and Merced County, where there is not a road link between San Benito and Fresno County.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'd support a linkage that would keep more of Monterey, San Benito, and Merced, and possibly some Santa Clara if we need it, to get to the
million mark if there was a -- if there -- if there was a
way to do it. I just don't know if there's enough
population to make it all work out and also maintain the
districts in the Central Valley. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Kennedy, can we hear from you?

MS. WILSON: Yes. I was just going to say, so
taking out San Benito and the Salinas Valley would
obviously under populate the Fresno district as it is
now. And to keep this a VRA district as well, it would
have to go into Merced. So San Benito -- it -- like this
has to -- what -- it has to go with one or the other --
well, Fresno has to go with one or the other, because if
you take away San Benito, then this is underpopulated.
And if San Benito goes with Mer -- Merced, then Fresno
has nowhere to go.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I'm with Commissioner
Toledo. I -- I'm just wondering what that paring's going
to look like. I think that we might have to go back and
do Santa Clara, which is we've already done that in the
Congressional. So I guess I'd be open to exploring, but
I'm just not sure how we're going to be able to tie the
communities from San Benito area or the Salinas area --
Salinas Valley to the Fresno that is also VRA.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Right. Okay. Kennedy, and then Commissioner Andersen, followed by Commissioner Turner.

MS. WILSON: And my apologies, I meant to lower my hand.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Andersen, followed by Commissioner Turner, followed by Commissioner Sinay.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. I know this is -- this is a problem, but I would prefer to keep -- try to keep the VRA district in the Central Valley. You know, Fresno, and Merced have more in common than Fresno and San Benito, the Salinas Valley. I mean, you can't get there. And I see the problem. I don't think we'll have enough population if we try to go -- yeah, the San Benito, Merced, Santa Clara, I don't think you get there. I think you've got to do the Fresno/Merced area. I would try that first, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I'm totally in support of the Fresno/Merced and certainly can work off-line as well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you for that.
Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to say how impressed I was by how high the CVAPs were for the VRA districts. And I would be curious -- I mean, I think Merced/Fresno makes sense, but I would also be curious to know you know, is San Benito -- does it feel close to the Central Valley or to -- or to you know, we're getting all these emails saying, don't put us with the Silicon Valley. And I know it's not the Silicon -- parts of it, but I just -- I'd like us to be open.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I was wondering if Kennedy has some of the community maps that have been drawn for this area and how they draw the Central Coast in particular, but all of the VRA districts, if she has the shapefile -- obviously, if she doesn't, then we can take a look at them off-line.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Kennedy.

MS. WILSON: Yes, I do have MALDEF, Black Hub, and Asian Americans Advancing Justice loaded into my plan right now, if you would like to look at those.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.
MS. WILSON: Okay. So I'll start with MALDEF. They have a similar configuration down in Kern County. However, in Tulare, they do take some of Visalia and then take out again that part of Hanford that we spoke about earlier. And then they reach into Tulare from the top and still take some of Fresno County that looks just like Laton and Kingsburg. They bring into their Kings/Tulare/Kern version.

And then again in Fresno, it's very similar. However, they do take out Old Fig Garden, so they follow Shaw and then dip below Old Fig Garden and then go out to the 99. And then they have Sanger, Fowler -- Fowler, Reedley as well as the rest of the Western part of Fresno County. And then they go up and take Merced as well as Madera -- Madera, Madera Acres, Chowchilla, Fairmead.

And then going to the San Benito District, they have San Benito paired with more of Monterey, and then up into Santa Clara, and taking more of San Jose as well as Morgan Hill, San Martin, and Gilroy as well. And those are MALDEF's.

And I can go ahead and put on Black Hub as well or if you want to talk about that one or you let me know the one you want to show.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Kennedy, do we have the CVAPs for the -- for the MALDEF map?
MS. WILSON: Yes. One moment. So one moment while I select that. I don't know the exact numbers, but I do know that their Kings/Tulare/Kern version was at fifty-eight, and then their Fresno/Merced -- Merced version is at fifty-three. I don't remember the .00 or what that was, but I can look that up for you right now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And could I ask Mr. Becker for his thoughts on our current Senate draft in this area? And it --

MR. BECKER: There were four -- if memory serves, there were four Assembly districts in these VRA-covered areas and there are two Senate districts which are exactly twice the size of the Assembly districts. So I think this -- these compositions and given their population concentrations, I think that the current iterations adequately protect the Latino population protected by the Voting Rights Act in this area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

MS. WILSON: So for this district, the one that spans across Kings, Tulare, and Kern, they have a Latino CVAP of 58.9 compared to this version at 58.06. And then their Merced/Fresno is at -- and one moment while that loads up, 53-point- -- and we'll have that in a moment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh, I don't think we got
there. Did she -- Kennedy say with the San Benito?

CHAIR KENNEDY: She's coming back with that.


Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: You want to wait until after that?

Okay.

MS. WILSON: And sorry, I don't have in the file, it
doesn't have the numbers the same way, but from looking
at them before, again, so this is 53.22 and ours is at --
yours is at a 55.31.

And I will now go on to look at the San Benito one.

I believe it was around forty-three. And so we will see
right now as I open that up.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: While she's doing that, did
you get Fresno/Merced she said was fifty- -- someone had
wrote it down here?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 53.22.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: 53.22.

MS. WILSON: And so there San Benito configuration
is at 43.12 percent Latino CVAP. And if I may talk about
when we were constructing this, we -- you chose to put
San Benito with Fresno under the -- you know, under the
knowledge that San Benito could not be with a VRA
district if it was not put in with the Central Valley.
And that's why it's this configuration today.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So basically where we're at, it seems, if I can just summarize, we have five Assembly VRA districts, but we only have enough population, LCVAP population, to draw two VRA Senate Districts. And our drafts had chosen to cross to San Benito. Other versions we're seeing both districts are in the Central Valley. So I guess we have a decision to make on how we want to ultimately draw our VRA Senate districts.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And what changes are needed from the way we have them drawn currently, which, according to counsel, are compliant with our obligations?

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I just wanted Kennedy to continue. We still did not see the maps for the Black Hub, so I wanted to be able to see those as well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

MS. WILSON: Yes. We still have the Black Hub and Asian Americans Advancing Justice.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Why --

MS. WILSON: So I will --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. While you load those, I'll continue with some of the hands until you're ready.
Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I just wanted -- I think Commissioner Fornaciari said that we have five in the Assembly, but we only have four in the Assembly VRAs. And then in terms of preferences, I would -- I would prefer to keep San Benito with Monterey because in the -- in the Congressional, we paired them with Santa Clara, so I would really like to be able to you know, share the pain, and then work off the other VRA in the Central Valley. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I mean, I think for me, the question is are we comfortable leaving the folks in -- sorry. I'm blanking on where we are in the map here, Merced, hanging out outside of a VRA district. I mean, it seems to me that the -- that there's a responsibility to include them in there. Maybe I'm wrong, but maybe if we could get some clarity on that, that would be helpful.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So the choice seems to be, and Mr. Becker, correct me if I'm wrong, protecting a population in Merced County versus protecting a population in San Benito County and the Salinas Valley. We could -- we
could -- you're on mute. We could draw --

MR. BECKER: Yeah --

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- a district -- a VRA district in either direction, but not both directions simultaneously.

MR. BECKER: So what I can't comment on is whether those are the only two choices available. There are --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MR. BECKER: -- VRA concerns in both San Ben -- San Benito and Merced County as well as Fresno County. And I'll just leave it at that as to what direction you want to -- want to go with that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MR. BECKER: I think the -- Kennedy, can you show the current -- the current Fresno/San Benito district? Can you make -- thank you. So I think it's a question as to whether or not -- whether or not it's impossible to draw a district with both those -- with all of those areas in it in which case you're not required to. But if it's possible within population limitations, which are the top criteria, that would be desirable.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Becker.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I mean, it's -- it seems like our current maps do cover the protected groups at this point. I mean, when I look at who's protected and
they're pretty much all in the VRA district at this point. Although, it's not my preferred -- it's not my preferred map. My preferred map, I think, would have from a policy perspective, more of the Monterey and San Benito area outside of a VRA district, mostly because they were in the past under Section 5 of the VRA. They've worked together for so long and that is the Central Coast. And we're putting them in a district that is not quite as -- the connection's not quite there. But I also see the importance of protecting the voices of those who we need protection.

And so I'm just struggling with that at the moment and thinking through that and see if there's any other configuration that might meet all of the requirements. It doesn't look like the population is there to create the -- enough of the VRA seats, but still thinking through that and processing.

Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And we do have a strong CVAP right now. I think it was six--fifty-five percent, something like that. And we tend to always look at how they're not connected, but they are connected. It's that Latino voice that's very important
to have, and it's at fifty-five percent. So my initial vote would be to keep it as is. And then if we're going to go somewhere else with that, then I would look to have San Benito with Monterey. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. I have to say that no, it -- I mean, right now, the way we have it drawn, Merced is not covered which bo -- we just heard is indeed a VRA. And I would like to see it in the Central Valley.

I also think that San Benito, you know, we've been hearing a lot from the San Benito and Monterey that they do not want to be with the Central Valley. And they do want to be more with their -- with Monterey and their coast. And their -- despite what our numbers are saying, they're saying that they're numbers say that's different. Although, I haven't seen any of their numbers. So I'm also kind of torn, but I would prefer to really look at the Merced and see what we can do there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Can you be a little more specific?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I would like to pursue the two VRAs districts -- or the Senate in the Central Valley.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Keeping the boundaries of both VRA Senate districts within the Central Valley?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: That is correct.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I -- you know, to be consistent with what we have done with all the other plans and districts, I would want us to explore as much, as we can, that our obligations to all individuals versus geographic areas, and see if we can create -- this one's not the current -- is this the current lines? No. Can you put the -- yeah, I was -- I was getting a little confused.

I would -- you know, really see -- I mean, as I said earlier, I think the Latino CVAP is strong. It's the first time you know, we come to the Central Valley and there's a strong Latino CVAP in all the areas. And that was because we could pull in more population. But maybe there is a way to do part of -- you know, part of San Benito, part of Merced, and part of Fresno you know, seeing which one -- you know, creating a VRA district that encompasses the three VRA obligations. It might not cover all people, but at least it gives voices to Latinos in all three. I'm not sure if I'm making sense.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So you would be proposing a VRA district that included the Salinas Valley, San Benito County, a portion of Merced, and a portion of Fresno?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Um-hum.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: If it works.

CHAIR KENNEDY: If it works. So let me ask Kennedy, from a mapping perspective, what are the -- what are the -- what are the chances of coming up with something like that?

MS. WILSON: If you want to split communities more -- you know, I kind of see it going one way or the other.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So Salinas Valley, San Benito, and either part of Merced or part of Fresno?

MS. WILSON: Yeah. If you -- it's hard to pick up the population. You know, taking just a part of -- San Benito already is not taking very many people, but then you just would have to then split up the community that is here to take part of both. And that would be a decision you have to make about how to --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. WILSON: -- split in both areas.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. So yeah, the CVAP numbers in San Benito is very strong, but it is not the Central Valley. San Benito is not the Central Valley. And I really want the -- to be able to support the
Central Valley having two strong Latino VRA districts. And I think that it can be done in the Central Valley. I think Central Valley is where I want to make sure we're doing what we can, that we're not just choosing to not concentrate on folk -- you know, on ensuring that they have strong representation as well.

San Benito has requested to be with some of the other districts in Monterey. It's where they've told us they want to be. It's where we can look at to see if that can even be carved up differently, to keep strong representation there. Perhaps there are other options.

I'm still waiting to see the other two maps that we asked for and get sidetracked each time. I want to see where the numbers are for the Black Hub and for the -- I think you said the Asian Advancing Justice as well, because I want to make sure we're not just saying, oh, there's two -- we need the now go -- I mean, I know everyone's looking hard at this, but it feels like we're going one or the other. And I want us to keep working and exploring options here, too, now that we're in the Central Valley. I think that the Central Valley deserves focus this time as we're working on these maps.

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

Could we pull back a little bit, Kennedy? Okay.
Thank you. And can you walk us through what -- and these are -- this is a map from the Black Census and Redistricting Hub. Could you please walk us through their districts in the Central Valley and Central Coast?

MS. WILSON: I can; and I would like to point out that the Black Hub and Asian Americans Advancing Justice lines are the same in the Central Valley. So if I toggle them on and off, Black Redistricting Hub has a color fill, and the green lines are the Advancing Justice. So they are identical. So as we look through them, this will be both of these districts.

And so they have a similar configuration in Kern County. Again, they include all Shafter, Wesco, McFarland, and Delano. Moving North, they keep King's County whole, but they do take out a portion of Visalia, which was similar to MALDEF, except for MALDEF also cut out in Hanford as well.

And then moving into Fresno County, we have Reedley, and Kingsburg in the Black Hub and Advancing Justice maps. And then in the other MALDEF maps, they -- Reedley was not included and put into the Fresno district.

And then moving into the city of Fresno, MALDEF, compared to the other two, takes out Old Fig Garden and dips a little bit lower into the City of Fresno, and then they meet again on the 99.
And then moving up into Madera County, there's a slight difference here and between Madera Acres and Madera, but it's just the unincorporated area between the two. And then we have Chowchilla and Fairmead also conclude -- included.

And then moving up to Merced, we have a similar line following Livingston up to Winton as well. And if you allow me to put on our Assembly -- our Assembly lines, it does follow that line as well up in Merced, so we have the same line there.

And then going out to MIDCOAST, MALDEF as you can see, the red lines takes more into San Jose. It still has Morgan Hill, San Martin, and Gilroy. And the Black Hub, and Asian Americans Advancing Justice has a wider line and grabs more of this coast than MALDEF does. So the Cities of Carmel Valley up to -- into Santa Cruz County up to almost Santa Cruz, they have those cities as well included in their San Benito district.

And then moving further down, MALDEF stops. You see that it comes in around where it says Monterey and down to the county line whereas the Black Hub and Asian Americans Advancing Justice goes down into Santa Barbara.

Here, as far as CVAP goes, the Latino CVAP is at 57 percent where MALDEF has of around 50.9. And the Merced to Fresno district, they have their Latinos CVAP at 52,
where MALDEF has it at 53.14, and this one is at 52.29. And then in the MIDCOAST District, their Latino CVAP is up 30.8 percent, while MALDEF had it at around 43, I think it was at 43.17; somewhere around there. And those are the differences between the three plans.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Kennedy. That was very helpful.

Commissioner Turner, do you have something further at this point?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No. I don't have anything further. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Kennedy, I'd like to see if we can make a comparison of what we have now and then compare that to what if we drew two Central Valley districts and how the those districts would compare.

MS. WILSON: As far as line live draw -- live line drawing goes or --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Can you do -- can you just -- can you do me a favor and just swap out San Benito and Monterey County for Merced and -- so we can kind of compare the CVAP between those two

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- options.

MS. WILSON: Yes, one moment while I do that. I will do that now.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Thank you.

(Pause)

MS. WILSON: And one question about moving up into Merced, would you like me to take the entire county, or would you like me to take the Assembly district boundary that we had up to there?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I would say let's start with going as far as the Assembly District boundary.

MS. WILSON: Okay. One moment.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Kennedy, you -- did you say that our Assembly line is the same as both the MALDEF and the Black Census Hub in this coun -- in this county?

MS. WILSON: It is not the same as -- I'll put them on right now. So this is MALDEF's line; there's goes up to the county line. And then Black Redistricting Hub, there's -- oh, sorry, let me turn ours off. There's are the same; Black Redistricting --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great.

MS. WILSON: -- Hub and American -- Asian Americans Advancing Justice. However, MALDEF's goes up to the county line.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.
(Pause)

MS. WILSON: And let me pull up my pending changes before I make any change. And sorry, this is a little small, so let's bump up the font for everyone. So to bring in the -- that much of Merced would put our deviation -- for what -- how the district is currently assembled in all other parts would bring us to a negative 8.54 percent deviation. And then the Latino CVAP is at 51.46.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So then if we went up to the county line.

MS. WILSON: Let's try. Up to the county line brings our deviation to a negative 5.99 and the Latino CVAP to a 51.08 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Could we have the heat map on, please?

MS. WILSON: Yes. One moment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we are -- we are still underpopulated beyond the margins and our Hispanic CVAP is lower with this configuration than with the Fresno/San Benito/Salinas Valley configuration.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. My apologies. I didn't write down the numbers. What did the other -- what MALDEF and the Black Hub have for their district
like this?

MS. WILSON: MALDEF was at a 53 -- if someone could help me there. I know someone wrote it now. MALDEF was at 53-point --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: 22 --

MS. WILSON: And I'd have --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: 53.22.

MS. WILSON: Okay. Thank you very --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

MS. WILSON: Thank you, very much. And Black Redistricting Hub had it at 52.29.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sinay, followed by Commissioner Turner.

And we've got ten minutes until break.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Couldn't we just -- there -- I mean, there seems to be -- I don't know how much population there is, but with the heat map on around Fowler as well -- yeah, there seems to be a good number you know, it seems red. I don't know what the numbers would be, but if we added that, would that help?

CHAIR KENNEDY: And the question, I guess, we could extend the question to, would that help without harming us in the Kings/Kern district?

MS. WILSON: Well, something I do see, I -- I do
think it would harm your Kings/Kern. I don't know how much we would need to take. However, something that the other maps did draw was taking into Visalia and this Northwestern area. And so you could potentially do a swapping of populations that way. You took some here and brought in some from the Fresno/Kern. And then possibly released some out at the top of Merced if you took so much out and kind of worked it that way.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay. So if we -- if we took that sort of approach, how close would we come or could we in any scenario, surpass the Latinos CVAP in our current configuration? I'll --

MS. WILSON: That -- oh, yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I'll --

MS. WILSON: I haven't tried --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. WILSON: -- that exact configuration. However, I would say I don't know that it would get you past fifty-five percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, no, I'm not asking about past fifty-five. I'm asking about past 53.18, which, as I read it, is the Latino CVAP in our current configuration.

Let me go to Commissioner Turner, and then David Becker, and Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair, and thank
you for those -- the way that we should be thinking about it. I just wanted to say again, I'd love to work with Kennedy off-line to be able to play with adjusting lines, keeping within COIs and what we've talked about before to do exactly that, to see if we cannot create the two or retain the two strong VRA districts with the shift in how we're thinking about having the maps aligned.

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

David Becker.

MR. BECKER: Hi. Kennedy, I just have a question. Can you tell me what the total Latino CVAP is in each of Merced and San Benito County as a whole? And can you also tell us all what the total number of Latino citizen -- citizens of voting age both those -- in each of those counties?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Mr. Becker, are you -- you're just limiting it to San Benito County, or did you want San Benito County --

MR. BECKER: San Benito and --

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- plus the Salinas?

MR. BECKER: Both San Benito County as a whole and Merced County as a whole?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. But leaving out the Salinas Valley?
MR. BECKER: That's correct. I just --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MR. BECKER: I just want -- I just want --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect.

MR. BECKER: -- the county-based data. Yeah.

Thanks.


MS. WILSON: So for Merced County, the Latino CVAP for the entire county is at 46.28 percent.

MR. BECKER: And wait, the total -- and the total Hispanic CVAP in the county is 69,496; is that correct?

MS. WILSON: Yes.

MR. BECKER: Okay. Thanks.

MS. WILSON: And then one moment while I go to San Benito. That is the Latino CVAP in San Benito is 49.92 percent and the population is 19.20 -- I mean, 19,203.

MR. BECKER: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Nothing further, Mr. Becker? Okay.

Thank you. We've got six minutes or so before break.

Commissioner Fornaciari, would you be willing to work with Commissioner Turner and Kennedy at looking at this? Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Absolutely.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. Thank you. We do, I think, unless Karin, unless you have some other thought
on this, I was hoping that after the break we could -- we
could continue with Kennedy up towards Sacramento. Does
that still make sense or -- that would be one more
ninety-minute block?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. There may be -- I thank you
for that question, Chair Kennedy. There may be some
changes based on what's happening with the VRA districts
that may affect the Sacramento area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. MAC DONALD: So we could, of course, go up
there, but it might make sense to perhaps go to someone
else. And I'm going to check in --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. MAC DONALD: -- with my team and see who might
be ready. And if I could get a couple of minutes to
assess that and get back to you --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. MAC DONALD: -- that'd be great.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Let's go ahead and go on break now.

And let's be back as scheduled at 4:45.

Thank you, everyone.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 4:25 p.m.
until 4:45 p.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your
patience during our break. We do appreciate it. We are
glad to have you here with us. We are just waiting for a few moments for -- to get some further reaction on an iteration that we had asked the mappers to work on during the break. If we can stand at ease for two minutes, we will not go anywhere. We're just waiting for a response so that we can move forward. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just want to remind everyone that's out there that our meetings tomorrow, Friday, and Saturday will be starting at 9:30 in the morning. So it's been posted, but just in case you don't see the updates, it's there for you. And I'm sure everybody's excited about being here early.

(Pause)

MS. CLARK: Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, Jaime.

MS. CLARK: I just got confirmation that this iteration looks good and so I'm ready to share.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Very good. Okay.

MS. CLARK: Okay. Thanks so much. I'm going to share my screen now. And just so that the Commission knows and so the public knows, we're currently working on getting this iteration PDF'd. I literally just finished it during the break. And so it's getting PDF'd and good as is, and that will be posted shortly. We'll send it to staff as soon as possible for posting. So thank you all
for your patience.

And I also did have time right when she left the meeting to collaborate with Sivan on this. This won't negatively impact Sivan's areas, and it won't -- it -- you know, there won't be any districts that could not be balanced, for example, with these changes. So got the green light from Sivan to present this as well so. But there are four districts that are impacted by this change. It's the ANTVICVAL District, SD210, SDWE, and SD60X605. So that's just a preview, and I'll go over the changes right now.

So the whole point of this -- these changes was to add these areas here in Rancho Cucamonga and Upland and San Antonio Heights, areas in San Bernardino County North of the 210 into SD210. So to make up for that population in the Victor Valley area, I included Apple Valley. So now Apple Valley would be with the rest -- most of the rest of Victor Valley would be with Antelope Valley and the Santa Clarita Valley areas. Wrightwood and Lytle Creek would still be included in these areas and not with the 210.

In the 210, the changes are to include these areas in Rancho Cucamonga and Upland and San Antonio Heights into this district. To adjust for the deviation discrepancy, La Verne was moved into or rather, out of
SD210, as were Duarte and Bradbury.

Moving on to SD10WE, this line was adjusted to match that in Congress that goes into the National Forest. And then the areas that I just noted, Laverne, Duarte, and Bradbury were added into this district for population purposes.

And finally, to make up for that population of adding -- adding the aforementioned cities to SD10WE, we moved West Puente Valley, Valinda, South San Jose Hills into SD60X605. We did have a chance to make sure that the VRA requirements in these two districts were still met and counsel said that everything looked okay to them.

And that is --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Mr. Becker, will you --

MS. CLARK: -- the iteration and the changes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Jaime.

Mr. Becker, you've come on, so I'm guessing you have something to -- some words of wisdom for us.

MR. BECKER: I just wanted to say -- I mean, I just remind everyone that Latinos in this area are a VRA consideration. They meet all Gingles preconditions. And while there are -- there are significant Asian populations in here, Asians are not large enough to form a majority of a Senate district, which are very, very large. They are, however, large enough in the Assembly
map. And there is a district with VRA considerations there. I'll say that these current configurations, I think we're really talking the VRA context only relating to SD10 West and SD60X605, both look adequate to protect Latino voting rights in those areas. I think they're -- I think they're sufficient.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you. I'll lead off the questioning, as it were. Jaime, could you tell us what the population of the Antelope Valley, Victor Valley District, how that population breaks down on either side of the county line? I'm just looking for percentage in San Bernardino County versus percentage in Los Angeles County.

MS. CLARK: One moment, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

(Pause)

MS. CLARK: So the highlighted area is the area in San Bernardino County that's included in this Antelope Valley/Victor Valley district, and that represents 290,940 people, or about 28 percent of a -- of a Senate district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. A further question is -- am I correct -- or you can remove the highlighting now. I'm just wondering is Phelan whole or is there a split there? There's something going on -- that -- or is that just the
shape of Oak Hills?

MS. CLARK: Yes, Phelan is whole. There are no city splits --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. CLARK: -- in Antelope Val -- or excuse me, in Victor Valley. So Apple Valley is whole, Oak Hills, and Phelan are both whole.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you. Any further questions from Commissioners, comments about this new visualizations?

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry. Yes. I had another conflict, but just wanted to thank Jaime for obviously working her magic on, on this map. And I think this reflects the priorities that were given by the Commission. And this map, I can support.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I know this is probably not something that could ever happen, but is there any way you can grab something from San Fern -- the San Fernando Valley, put it in Ante Val -- Ante -- with Antelope to put Victorville back in the high desert? It's, what, 200- -- 281,000?

MS. CLARK: I think that a -- I think that a
tradeoff that would look something like that would be to, for example, and you know, without, for example, crossing Mulholland or you know, trying to maintain also the architecture of the rest of LA County, would -- an option would be looking at pulling Burbank, potentially even Glendale, into the East Ventura/San Fernando Valley based district and then pulling population parts of Santa Clar -- or excuse me, parts of San Fernando Valley into there.

I'm not sure the exact other tradeoffs that would be required. I think it would also include, instead of ending this boundary here between LA and Kern County, definitely taking parts of -- you know, like, taking California City, Edwards Air Force Base area, and including that in the district with Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley, and San Fernando Valley.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. I know it's just -- you know, the -- they've wanted to be separate in every single time and I -- they started out that way and I think in every single map now they're with the Antelope Valley so. I --

MS. CLARK: I do --

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- yeah.

MS. CLARK: -- believe they're separate in Congress.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: In Congress. Thank you.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I just wanted to acknowledge Commissioner Andersen's desire, that is that -- that was one of my priorities. It didn't shake out that way, especially given the major architecture change that happened in the San Gabriel Valley. I will say that again with just how large these districts are, I would be a little concerned about like pairing -- we've heard some testimony to the effect of pairing the Antelope Valley with parts of the San Fernando Valley. And it would -- you, in some ways, would have to break up particularly Latino communities of interest in the San Fernando Valley to do that. And I do think while they're absolutely, absolutely different, they're both high desert communities separated from you know, really, the urban and suburban populations on the other side of the San Gabriel Mountains.

And so I loved the way that Commissioner Turner phrased it at one point earlier today of folks getting to know their new partners, right. These are -- these are new partners and allies. And I do think there are strong, high-desert community interests that can pair these two communities who have historically not worked together because maybe they haven't necessarily had to
work together. So I'm hopeful that this -- that this sort of splits the difference and a lot of our competing priorities across LA County so. But also I want to acknowledge that I have been a fan from the -- from the get-go of keeping both separate. And I just -- I don't think that that is possible, especially in a district this large.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

I -- my take is slightly different. I have been less concerned about separating them than I have been about balancing them. You know, I -- my sense is that -- I've driven the road between Lancaster, Palmdale, and the -- and the Victor Valley. I know that it's not a very pleasant experience, but I'm also aware of plans for a high-density transport corridor between the Victor Valley and the Antelope Valley at some point in the future. And you know, as far as projects for those two communities to work together on, that certainly going to be a big project to work together on.

I'm more sensitive to the folks on the San Bernardino side saying, we're the -- we're the stepchildren; we never are going to be able to elect a candidate of our choice because we are always going to be outweighed by the folks on the Los Angeles County side of the line. So I'm less concerned about splitting them,
than I am about balancing them.

And again, I see how difficult it would be to balance them because the population of the entire Victor Valley you know, isn't a half-a-million. It doesn't really come close enough to half-a-million for there to be effective balance. But I just -- I just wanted to share that.

Any further thoughts from Commissioners? Okay. Is this something that we are -- Jaime.

MS. CLARK: I'm sorry. I have one more iteration to show. And I was --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Oh, okay.

MS. CLARK: -- not trying to interrupt this conversation, so apologies.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: No, but this is very timely. Please, go ahead.

MS. CLARK: Okay. I thank you. The other one was just in the 710TOWATER district. Previously we had rec -- I'd received direction to work on an iteration of moving Maywood into, and potentially Vernon, into the 710TOWATER district and to remove Hawaiian Gardens.

If you recall, I was like, I don't know if it's all going to fit; we might have to split Lynwood. But happily Lynwood is whole. Hawaiian Gardens is with the N-OC-COAST. Vernon could not be included in this
district just in an attempt to keep Latino populations
together in SDNELA, so that CVAP is at 50.00 percent,
including NELA. And Maywood was moved into the
710TOWATER district with Hawaiian Gardens moved out. So
everything is balanced within plus or minus five percent.
And again, this was also an iteration I had worked with
Commissioners Vazquez and Taylor on.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Any further thoughts on
these changes to our Senate maps in -- the Senate map in
Los Angeles County?

Are we -- Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: No changes. Just wanted to
also, I think, Commissioner Akutagawa noted it earlier
today, but also just wanted to acknowledge the growing
public comment around the change in our Congressional map
in the West San Gabriel Valley.

As, I think of many of you remember, this -- we
actually had a visualization that looked -- that had --
we started off with a visualization from Jaime that had
the West San Gabriel Valley split. And I and
Commissioner Akutagawa asked for more of the West San
Gabriel Valley to be included in that -- in that
iteration with the idea that you know, there are economic
differences contained in sort of between the foothills
and the more valley-based dis -- or valley-based cities.
Ultimately, I think, again, we heard a lot from the community. We had conflicting testimony; we're having conflicting testimony right now. There was a very, very, very strong sense from the community that the entire Asian Community of Interests in the West San Gabriel Valley wanted to stay together. And so I think this is just a testament, again, to having to balance different factors.

And one of the things in our playbook was to if we -- if there was conflicting testimony, if we could meet other objectives with a change, that we would do that. And one of those objectives is strengthening our VRA district. And so just wanted to thank Commissioner Sadhwani for helping us envision that. And again, just wanted to acknowledge at the community input around you know, there's -- there is a tension here in this -- in this region. And I hope we did our best to sort of balance a lot of these tradeoffs.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez. I believe that you and Commissioner Taylor did indeed.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I wanted to add my voice to this. You know, I know I lifted up what we were hearing. And I -- you know, I think what we're trying to do is to acknowledge what we are hearing. However, just
in comparison, I wanted to just also acknowledge that our Congressional maps are essentially just like this particular one, too. So I think that the work that Commissioner Vazquez and Taylor did -- you know, I think is meeting our various objectives with the intent that VRA is number two. And therefore, we still can maintain an important COI that has given us a lot of input that they wanted to stay together. And since it reflects a lot of the Congressional district, I think that, you know, I just want to say kudos on all that we have in the LA area, and the fact that I think we can keep moving on to the other areas. I'm so excited. So thank you, everyone.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. So just wanting to get a general sense. This is -- this is -- or is this a map that we are able to support? Okay. So Karin and Jaime, thank you for this. This is a map that we feel we will be able to support.

Do we have Tamina next?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes. So this will take a couple of minutes. We --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. MAC DONALD: -- are going to switch over to Tamina in a second.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.
MR. MANOFF: We are standing by for maps. Thanks for your patience, everyone.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Apologize for the delay there. So Kennedy and I are going to be working on the San Benito area because now I've been informed that there have been some changes while I was away working in other areas that might -- that definitely will affect my area in Senate. So Kennedy is going to commit those changes right now, so we can take a look. And then if we could get some direction on where you would like to go with the bay area maps, given this new thirty percent. Really? You left me with thir -- okay. Now, if we can -- if I can get some direction on where you would like me to go with this in Senate, then I'd appreciate it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We're waiting for map.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Sorry about that. Too many mappers, one --

CHAIR KENNEDY: That's all right.

MS. RAMOS ALON: -- too many mappers, one computer.

CHAIR KENNEDY: That's all right. Okay. So if we can get a quick recap.

MS. WILSON: So in my area, we were going to be exploring bringing the VRA district up into Merced, which
means bringing San Benito and the Salinas Valley back into the MIDCOAST district. And that is why we see a 30.58 percent over deviation in Tamina's area and a negative 34.44 percent in the Fresno district. And that's an overview of the change that we made.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So then we had -- we had started by looking at what a -- what a valley-based VRA district starting from the North from Merced County would look like. We came up, I believe, a little bit short in population, and we were starting to look at where we might make up that population. So if you could take us back to that point.

MS. WILSON: Oh, so we're coming back to my area. Sorry. There's a little confusion. So we could make up that area by taking in Merced. And I can go ahead and highlight that again. And so with the addition of the County of Merced, again, it left us with a CVAP of 51.08 and we were still under -- negative 5.99 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. We were working on some further explorations. We were able to identify some additional changes that got it up to 52.5. And that was just really quickly looking at a few things. So we didn't have enough time to explore further, but that -- we didn't commit any of those changes. We were just in
exploring space.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So essentially we're fairly close -- reasonably close to having something to look at on that side. Okay.

Do we -- do we then want to start looking on Tamina's side on the -- on the -- in the MIDCOAST area and seeing how we balance out that population? Okay.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sorry, Chair. I thought we were actually going to try to work it right now, and I was just going to ask for the Latino heat map, but if we're not, then I don't need to see it. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Apologies to the mappers.

Commissioner Fornaciari, are we -- are we at a point where we want to move forward with this exploration in live line drawing?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I don't -- we could -- we could show you the changes that we had proposed.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: But then it's a little bit of a fishing expedition to find additional swaps to bring it up a little bit more.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Understood.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So I defer to Commissioner Turner, too.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And we were just getting started probably all of about five, six minutes when we had to come back, so they can switch out the computer, so we don't have a lot. It's moving in the right direction and it's very positive, but we're not ready just yet to be able to show you our whole plan.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

MS. WILSON: Chair, if --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. RAMOS ALON: If perhaps I could get some direction of maybe what the circle is going to be. So taking from where, and how is the circle going to complete, like what is the rotation going to look like.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Okay. So then -- so then let's start working on the MIDCOAST side where we have thirty-plus percent excess population and looking at where we want to shift that population to. And I think it would be -- it would -- it would certainly be helpful to be enlightened by Commissioner Ahmad and Commissioner Yee in relation to work that they've been doing at the Congressional level. So any thoughts that you might have would be welcome as we go through this.
Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I'm just curious -- I mean, and maybe -- I don't know if this will help because we're overpopulated in this area, but I'm just thinking about maybe shifting this down. So maybe taking out some of the San Jose population so that we can have more of a Central Coast. See if we're going to -- so maybe taking out some of the San Jose population, so it's -- so that the -- so that the population could be more focused around the counties of San Benito, San -- Monterey, and Santa Cruz as opposed to -- as opposed to where they are now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you for that. So Tamina, what areas -- what are the urban areas -- San Jose urban areas that are currently included in this MIDCOAST District?

MS. RAMOS ALON: There are just a few blocks around Cambrian Park.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Came up.

MS. RAMOS ALON: This is very different from the Congressional iteration. Let me just --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Most definitely.

MS. RAMOS ALON: -- remind you kind of what they looked like, because they are very different. So in
Congress, we had the Cupertino District, right, which
came up from the bottom of Monterey through San Benito,
and then came into San Jose. We do not have that same
configuration. We did not have the same configuration
even before this swap, so this actually keeps most of San
Jose in the San Jose district for Congress.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. RAMOS ALON: I mean, sorry, for Senate.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And we have thirty percent
excess population in this area that we need to shift out,
so do you have suggestions on where we might start
shifting?

MS. RAMOS ALON: So let's see. You could either
go -- because there's very little popu -- you could take
out all of Santa Cruz, and these areas, and shift that
North, or we could take out San Luis Obispo and shift it
South, more, or less.

CHAIR KENNEDY: It seems like we're better off
shifting population North in order to bring it back down
into this valley-based VRA district encompassing Merced,
part of Fresno, and part of Madera.

MS. RAMOS ALON: So you would like to maybe make a
circle this way?

CHAIR KENNEDY: I -- that seems to me to be the most
viable.
Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. So just the -- kind of the Northern -- or the Southern parts of those counties, is that we're looking at, Chair?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, we need to -- we need to figure out. So thirty-thou -- thirty percent.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: (Indiscernible).

CHAIR KENNEDY: We're talking 300,000 people that we need to move? Wow. Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

MS. RAMOS ALON: So that would mean taking San Jose and putting it with the --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

MS. RAMOS ALON: -- with the Stanislaus/Merced area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. I was going to say, let's take as much -- you know, fill -- you know, take a bit of a chunk, send it South. What we could do, which I think is only a few percent. But -- so we're looking at twenty-five percent we got to get rid of. And so I'd throw what you could into those next you know, going South. And then if -- you could take it a little further North and then use it -- bringing it through like the -- through -- you know, the Tracy, that -- that's a very --
you know, kind of going up and then down into that direction as opposed to directly across. The reason is because -- yeah, a little bit more like that. Then take kind of the rest North because peninsula's aren't -- you know, you can't go up very much. You know, there's already -- that's -- there's all positive, positive, positive. So you can't do a lot there without running it through. So -- yeah. That -- because I see there are many more roads from the North than there are right in this area.

I was going to talk about something else but go ahead. Go to the next person, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So basically what's going to happen with that negative thirty-four percent is going to wind up in ECA when we add Merced County about and make the other swaps -- or generally going to go in ECA or around there. But I guess I was just curious if -- can you -- can you grab the whole Southern part of Santa Clara County that is in the MIDCOAST District and let us know how many people those are? Because you've got Los Gatos, Cambrian Park, Campbell, I know those aren't huge cities, and you've got San Martin, and all those guys.

MS. RAMOS ALON: This is 296,236 people.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So that's basically our thirty percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. So --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: It looks like a good start.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. So unless there's objection. Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. I was trying to look at some populations, but you can -- you know, Campbell, and I can't quite see what else is there of that Saratoga and those areas, they wanted to be up on the peninsula. You know, I'd sort of grab a couple of those; put them into the peninsula for -- until you get just below five percent. And then move the rest in the other direction, so you can -- that's a nice, easy switch, getting rid of some.

And then the rest, I would take up into in with San Jose, and then you might have to move -- you know, actually take a little bit of that other portion of San Jose you know, wi -- that's gone up. You'll have to do the next switch.

Like, you know, do the fir -- do the -- do take the portion of -- that you can put into the peninsula and do that first. And then you'll see what kind of numbers you're dealing with. And it'll -- you can take the next
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So if we -- if we took from that narrow -- the narrowest point just above where the MIDCOAST label is, can we look at just the population in that segment to the left of that and see about the possibility of moving that into peninsula without overpopulating it, without going beyond the five percent?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I think that's going to be too much. I'd sort of grab the -- a couple of cities first, then walk down -- walk it back down. Like, Campbell, you know, the Northern cities that start way, but give it a try.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Let's just get --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Campbell is 44,000. So that's already going to take you over if you put that into the peninsula. It'll take you to -- unless Campbell's not whole in this. Is Campbell whole in this one, Tamina? It is. That would -- that would get you to about a 6.5 percent in peninsula, so you'd be over by a percent-and-a-half.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Can we pull the map out?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Saratoga's thirty-one.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just say we take the whole amount, even with Saratoga, it would take you above five percent in peninsula. I would say you take the whole amount, and you start moving it. And the reason I say that is because in all the other iterations, correct me if I'm wrong, we've really split up Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Monterey. And I'd really like to keep them together in one of the --


COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- iterations so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So let's, for now, let's move all of this from MIDCOAST into San Jose.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Chair, Kennedy and I were -- may I make a suggestion?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Kennedy and I were just discussing that if we're going to do love line drawing either way, you might want to finish what you started because you have an aim over here in the Central --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. RAMOS ALON: -- Valley. And then we can figure out how it resolves itself in the other areas.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. If that's -- if that's going to be best for you, that's how we'll do it.

Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I mean, I -- I mean, I'm a little concerned that we have -- we've been told we have a protected class in San Benito and not putting them in a VRA district is concerning to me, or at least not trying to ensure more of a voice at the minimum, right.

And so I'm almost thinking we tried to do our best to -- and this doesn't solve the problem at the end, try our best to get -- to connect the Latino portions of San Jose down through -- like we do in the Congressional map, through the agricultural areas of San Benito, Monterey, and into the San Luis Obispo area deep -- where we -- where there are Latino populations as well, and try to create a coast -- a district that is a little bit more coastal, but outside of the Central Valley. Because otherwise, I think here we're going to end up a CVAP that's quite low and might prevent the Latino community from having a voice and electing -- or an opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice.

I know that the -- because some of the community maps actually got this area to mid-40s. And that might be possible if we do a longer district, although, I am
seeing the problems with rotating the population,
figuring out how to rotate that population. The
population either has to go South, or East, or in some
other direction. And so -- but I just wanted to raise
that, given that we do have a protected class --
protected population in the San Benito area. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We had discussed this earlier in the
day. And my understanding was that coming up with a VRA
district in this area, the MIDCOAST area, meant that we
would not be able to create another one in the -- in the
Central Valley. And so what we're facing is, do we
create the second VRA district to be entirely in the
Central Valley, or partly in the Central Valley, and
partly in this MIDCOAST area, but that would leave Latino
populations in Merced County, not -- outside of a VRA
district. So just wanted to check that that is a correct
understanding, and to ask Commissioner Toledo for his
thoughts on that specific tradeoff.

So Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: But my understanding is that
if you have a protected group, that we have to do our
best to try to include as much of it as possible in the
VRA. And any -- and I know we're -- that's our goal, and
that's we're trying to do here. And -- but at this
point, we'd be leaving all of San Benito out of a VRA
district. And maybe --

CHAIR KENNEDY: And --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- it's -- yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And we looked at the number of -- at the -- at the CVAP numbers for both Merced County and San Benito County. And Mr. Becker, correct me if I'm wrong, we found much higher numbers in Merced County than we found in San Benito County?

MR. BECKER: Yeah, that's right. I think -- so I don't know that there's any iteration where three Senate districts can be drawn including the Central Coast, San Benito area, and the Central Valley area. I don't know that anyone's been able to do it. I think it's -- I think it's likely very difficult.

So assuming that, there are populations that are -- that are protected in San Benito and Merced. The Merced -- the numbers of protected Latinos under the Voting Rights Act in Merced are significantly larger overall than in San Benito. It's about three-and-a-half times as much population -- Latino population in Merced.

Probably the first choice, which might not -- which might not work, this is just a -- is can a district be drawn that encompasses basically the rough areas of SBENFRESNO, including some of Merced, the Latinos populations protected there and the San Benito County
protected populations. I'm somewhat skeptical that can be done. Maybe even respecting equal population, given the challenges, the num -- just the raw numbers of people that would be in that, in which case it's -- I think it's probably acceptable to, and probably preferable to try to encompass the Merced populations given the large numbers there, include them in the VRA district.

That's probably where I would go with this because there's -- these districts are just so large. It's very difficult to -- even though they're very large given the concentrations of populations where they are, it's really hard to encompass all of the populations in exactly the same way. Maybe in the Assembly districts you can -- you can do that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Becker. That was indeed my understanding of where we were, why we were there, and what we were trying to do.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I promise I have no solutions, but I just -- I did want to -- you know, as Commissioner Fernandez said, we have recei -- heard over and over again that you know, we have split up Santa Cruz a ton of times, and it would be nice to keep Santa Cruz with Monterey, as they've requested, and San Luis Obispo has requested to be with Santa Barbara, and San Benito with
Monterey and Santa Cruz.

The other piece is I'm looking at our districts right now and when you look at the handouts that we've shared in the past on the Gingles precondition for the State Senate, we've got you know, the right -- we've got the right grouping for the -- for the coast, but we may need -- since we're over, we may want to just -- I don't know if taking out -- you know, using a scalpel --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Scalpel.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- scalpel might help us because you know, just to kind of get us higher up and that's how we remove the population we need to remove versus just -- I think it's going to be difficult unless we do it that way to increase the CVAP.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Kennedy or Tamina, sorry. It says Kennedy but.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yeah. So actually, Kennedy would like to request that we deal with VRA first.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And I agree that's --

MS. RAMOS ALON: Please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- that's a good idea.

Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: For this area, I believe what we would like to do is keep San Benito, the Salinas
Valley, the Monterey, and Santa Cruz as the dominant of this district. And so what I propose is we take as much of San Luis Obispo -- group as much of San Luis Obispo as we can further South with Santa Barbara and Ventura, which is not that much, but it will help. And then if we want to increase the -- rearrange the population, if we grab that area that is also Latino area of Santa -- of San Jose, but as a little tiny sliver from the West instead of from up from up from the East, which would enable us to push a little bit of population into the peninsula and then continue the rest of that Santa Clara area going North and then East into -- as we'll need to walk it through either Stanislaus or San Joaquin.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair.

I wanted to go back to the numbers in San Benito and in Merced, because what I'm clearly trying to do is to work towards the two strong VRA districts in the Central Valley. The Central Valley, when we looked at Merced, the numbers that we received when Mr. Becker asked earlier was 69,496 Latino people in Merced as opposed to 19,203 in San Benito. So to me, it does then force more of a pressure or desire to protect in the one area, and particularly since we have to do equal -- so the
population that we're trying to balance out now, I don't
know that we need to still look at population and CVAP
numbers for San Benito, unless we are still trying to
also make that a VRA district and we're not.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're not going to be able
to.

MS. TURNER: So from that perspective, we're trying
to balance numbers here.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. And as Tomino said, you know,
the next step that we want to take is we want to go back
to the Central Valley. We want to nail down what is
going to be the second VRA district in the Central Valley
and then we can start pulling population over from the
coast up and over through as -- as Commissioner Andersen
said, Stanislaus, San Joaquin, somewhere up there to --
to bring it back down and balance our districts.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And Chair, that was the charge
that I think you all gave Commissioner Fornaciari and I,
but we just got started in that and got pulled from it.
So we've not been able to solidify those two districts at
a CVAP number -- LCAP number that we desire, but that is
exactly what we were attempting to do.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'd be supportive of just
having Commissioner Turner and Fornaciari just work
through the Central Valley and get -- solidify the VRA
districts there as we also try to create a central coast
district that is -- that meets the needs of that region.

Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Toledo, are you saying
that you would want them to continue the work that they
were doing off-line and report back to us or you are
wanting them to lead our exploration here during the Live
Line drawing? We've got about half an hour left in Live
Line drawing for today.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm comfortable with them
going back and doing it off-line and coming back and
reporting what they did. And but certainly up to you,
Chair. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

MS. SADHWANI: I certainly agree with Commissioner
Toledo that, you know, I would support Commissioner
Turner and Fornaciari working off-line to -- to figure
out some options here. I'm wondering if we can just look
up the map slightly at the SSAC-STANIS district? We're
underpopulation here by quite a bit. I would also be
curious to find out if there is a way of building a
district. Currently, we, again, we actually have Merced
in that ECA District. And I know that we have, you know, done -- had valiant efforts to protect this Sierra coastal district on all three maps. And I just want to note that for me that I'm okay breaking up that community of interest, if it means building out and providing coverage for these different areas. And I think -- I went back and took a look at how lines are currently drawn in that area. And it just covers such a broad array of counties and areas. And my guess is that there's been a lot of population expansion over the last ten years throughout this area, which makes it very difficult to keep all of the same communities protected. And so I would be curious also if we were to keep the -- the VRA district as we have it drawn, which is, you know, San Benito being connected with the Central Valley, are there options to cover Merced County, perhaps in a different way that we haven't explored by going further North as opposed to having it be a part of ECA? So I just wanted to offer that, but happy to have Commissioner Turner and Fornaciari look at it. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Ms. Mac Donald, if we are going to ask Kennedy to work with Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Turner on this, and so we don't want to be working on in Tomino's Mid-Coast district at this point, what would you
recommend for our next half hour before we have a break
and then shift to public comment?

MS. MAC DONALD: So I think -- thank you for that
question. I think everybody's busy at this point, so I
don't know if we might consider going to a public input
earlier, perhaps, but it's either I would say at this
point, it's either Live Line drawing or we just don't
have anything to present right now --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

MS. MAC DONALD: -- because everybody's working.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that. That's very
helpful.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

MS. SADHWANI: Yeah, Chair, just -- I'm not sure
that you want to go in this direction, but we do have
pieces that we were saving for tomorrow on the
Congressional maps in the Central Valley, if we wanted to
take a look at that now. But however you want to
proceed.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Ms. Mac Donald, does that make sense?

MS. MAC DONALD: That -- we could absolutely do
that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. Let's do that then.

MS. MAC DONALD: Okay.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Give me one moment while I transfer and go to the Congressional map.

So Commissioner Toledo and Commissioner Sadhwani, is there a version -- we have three -- so one you want me to pull up first that you -- whatever you prefer.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So maybe we can give a high-level overview of what we did and the options, and where we're at right now.

So we've been -- as charged by the Commission, we met with Kennedy and worked very closely with legal counsel, with Mr. Becker on reviewing options for this area. We came up with three scenarios. The first just balances the population within the region. The other two require some shifting. But allow us to raise the CVAP in some of the districts where we wanted to, and we felt that where we're getting community input to do so, and potentially may even help us with some of the decisions up in the in the Sierras and so we have the three options.

The first option really doesn't increase the CVAPS too much. At least, it increases one and decreases the other. So our recommendation, based on working with our line drawers and with legal counsel was to -- to look at and explore the possibility of doing two or three. And so maybe we can start with the first one, which is the
more -- the most of the regionalized map, and then go to
the two maps that address the issues a little bit better
in our opinion. So just the regional --

MS. WILSON: So it's --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- approach first.

MS. MACDONALD: The 5K swap?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: That's right, but just the
swap.

MS. WILSON: So that -- that's up right now and does
that -- do you want me (indiscernible)?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, can you just go over it
and what we did for the swap?

MS. WILSON: So for the swap, as we'd shown you
earlier before, we were left with 5,000 -- around 5,000
people over in FRESNO-KERN, and around 5,000 people under
in STANISFRESNO. And that had a lot to do with taking
out Old Fig Garden and slightly moving the line here
between Stanis, Fresno, and Kern. And so what we did to
balance was move over 5,000 people on this line. Let me
see where our previous lines were -- one moment. So
previously we had a slight divot out this way, and we
just pulled it into the straight line here. And that is
all that changed. It really didn't make too many impacts
on the structure of the districts. And let me zoom out
to show you. They stay very similar. And that was,
yeah, that was about it.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So some of the negatives with
this one is that some of the COIs had to be pulled out,
including Old Fig and some other neighborhoods, as well
as the CVAP for FRESNOTULARE did not increase. And our
goal was to not just increase the -- the King-Tulare, but
also the FRESNOTULARE, her -- our advice from counsel.
So that was our -- we were moving in that direction. So
maybe we can go to Proposal Number 2, which address --

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- some of these other issues.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Andrew, before -- before we
do that, can I just give a little bit more of that --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Oh, sure.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- background on this?

Recall you've seen this before. We actually
presented this on Monday. But at that point in time, we
had left that approximately 5,000 people there. And the
problem, as we discussed on Monday with this, is that
while these changes allowed us to increase the -- the --
that Bakersfield district, the KINGTULAKERN, it actually
decreased the FRESNOTULARE, right? And so that was --
that was kind of this issue with this iteration when we
looked at it even on Monday.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.
Do you have something further? Thank you.
Commissioner Turner?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I just wanted to align
the description and the conversation with the number and
name on the maps that's been posted.
So, Commissioner Toledo, what you just talked about,
was it the iteration STCV-2 or because you're saying the
first one, the second, and the third, but --
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Oh, so the --
COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- what's been posted has
different numberings on them. So I just want, as you're
talking, tell us which iteration you're talking about.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So we're talking about the 5K.
I think it's -- Kennedy, remind me which one it is --
it's Number 2.
MS. WILSON: So it would be STCV-2 was that one.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: That's my --
MS. WILSON: (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- understanding.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And yeah, Kennedy says, yes.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. And now you're moving
to STV -- STCV-3?
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Let me pull, yeah. That's --
and yes, that's the 3.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: These copies aren't very good. We can't tell.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that, Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: (Audio interference).

Commissioner Andersen?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. And could you read what the CVAPS are? They're -- they're a little small on my screen. I cannot read what those are. So if you could read those, as you do like each different number, each iteration, please, for these three districts.

MS. WILSON: And you would like me to read them off?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please go ahead.

MS. WILSON: Okay.

So for KINGTULAKERN, we have -- and this is going to go on the order of Latino CVAP, Black CVAP, Asian CVAP, Indigenous CVAP, and then White CVAP. So I am going to start with the KINGTULAKERN district. And the first one is 58.07 percent, and then we have 6.09 percent, and then we 4.01 percent, then we have 1.09 percent, and lastly, 29.86 percent.

And now I'll move onto FRESNOTULARE. Is that good -- is everyone good? Okay.
So we're going to start with again, Latino, Black, Asian, Indigenous, White. First, we have 51.16 percent, then we have 4.71 percent, then 8.15 percent, and 1.07 percent, and then 34.11 percent.

Moving on to our last one, STANISFRESNO. We're going to start with 51.49 percent, then we're moving 5.25 percent, then we have 6.87 percent, then we have 1.03 percent. Lastly, we have 34.32 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Kennedy.

Commissioner Toledo, do you have -- or Commissioner Sadhwani, do you have anything further was far as description or rationale that you want to share with us?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Well, for this one, we're just trying to balance the population that was left. We had already presented this, and we had been charged with looking at other options that might raise the CVAP, especially in FRESNOTULARE where community and KINGTULAKERN, where -- if you remember, we're hearing a lot from community groups, from advocates of the protected groups from the Central Valley and -- and members of the public that -- that CVAPS in these two areas were not enough to make them effective. And so that was the concern. The concern is mostly around these two districts. And so that was our charge was to look and see if there was a way to increase the CVAPs in
these. And the next two iterations allow -- will allow us to see some options --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, very good.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- for doing so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

So Kennedy, if you can go ahead and shift to the next one.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Wait, wait, wait, before you go. I apologize, Kennedy. What happened to the 5,000? I was writing down numbers and you went through it really quick. Sorry.

CHAIR KENNEDY: It is --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Where did they get shifted to -- thank you.

MS. WILSON: They swapped between each other. So what happened --

CHAIR KENNEDY: (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

MS. WILSON: -- in -- oh yeah, you can go. Sorry.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thanks. It was a little divot coming down from Highway 99 and they just eliminated the divot.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Kennedy.
At this point, can we have Katy read the instructions for our call-in? We will begin taking public comment at 6:30 after our break, but let’s go ahead and get the instructions out.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Absolutely, Chair. In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone.

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

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

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

And Chair, I'll have to refer to you for when the lines are closing. I am not privy.

CHAIR KENNEDY: The lines will close at 6:30 and that is when we will begin taking calls.

Okay. So Kennedy and Commissioner Toledo, and Commissioner Sadhwani, back to you.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. So let's go to the second iteration.

And Kennedy, remind us what's-- for the public, what's the name of the file that was posted.

MS. WILSON: This is iteration STCV-3. This is in the third one.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

MS. WILSON: And it's up right now.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And can you go through some of the changes and what doing this would allow us to do -- some of the opportunities, some of the -- the challenges that we faced?

MS. WILSON: Yes. So in KINGTULAKERN, if you remember from our previous version, Kings County was whole and what the purpose of this iteration was, was to create this piece where we carve out parts of Visalia, parts of Tulare, and parts of Hanford, and take Lemoore
station out of VRA districts completely. So we went in here and tried to find a way to get them out. And so FRESNO-KERN actually reaches into this -- parts of Visalia-Tulare and into Kings County to take those parts out. And that brought our CVAP in KINGTULAKERN to a 59.42.

And then moving North in FRESNOTULARE, of course we had to balance population differently. And so that led to taking a lot more of Fresno, which actually put together a lot of opportunities to put more COIs together that we hadn't before. So Old Fig Garden, Old Fig Loop -- Little Loop -- that area is also in with Old Fig Garden. The areas between Shaw, Ashland out to North Hayes are together as well as West Park, Belmont out to Chateau, and down to American as well. Those areas were all able to be brought together in this iteration as they were never before as long -- as well as the Northern parts of Visalia, Farmersville, out to Wood Lake and Lemon Cove. And again, another difference was that Three Rivers was in here, but now it was taken out. However, there is parts of Visalia that it is connected to. It's just kind of that Northern part it's taken from.

And so then we had to bring in more population into STANISFRESNO as well, since we took out most of the City of Fresno. So we went North. We changed a little bit of
the lines in Stanislaus. We took out to Empire. Ceres is now kept whole. The Turlock is now split. However, it was split before as well, too. And then we went up and grabbed Lathrop and an unincorporated area underneath Tracy and got to the CVAP to a 50.24.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So I think one of the --

MS. WILSON: Oh, sorry. I left --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Oh, go ahead.

MS. WILSON: -- out a really important piece.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Oh, yes, you did.

MS. WILSON: FRESNO-KERN was over 17,000 people.

ECA was left under because we had to take from it when I took parts of Modesto and so forth. And when I took out Lathrop, I had to extend the line in San Joaquin, so I started to take from ECA. And so what decision was made was to take the Northern parts of Clovis and the Northern parts of Fresno --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah.

MS. WILSON: -- moving North into ECA.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Which they requested to be in with ECA. I don't know if ECA really wants them there, but Clovis has requested in some of the conversation. So what this does do, and we did look at the numbers holistically. We weren't just looking at Latino CVAP, we were looking at Latino CVAP and African American CVAP
especially as you -- as we move up through the districts. There's much more cohesion in the Northern parts than the Southern parts. And so we were able to increase CVAPS for both the Latino and the African American community, and the STANISFRESNO, you know. There was a slight dip, but still within the -- the legal ranges that we were looking for. And -- and so far, the input that we're receiving from the community around the VRA districts has been very positive what's coming in through public input so far.

And so we wanted to bring that to the Commission for your review. And certainly some of the splits outside of the VRA districts can be modified, can be changed. But we wanted to bring -- we wanted to bring something that was worked out and certainly we can undo some of the things outside of the VRA district should we -- should we all choose to do so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, thank you for this work that you all did. I just want to just ask you, we know that in the -- in the Central Valley, particularly in the Fresno area, there's also a sizable Hmong community as well as -- we heard quite a bit of testimony from the Punjabi Sikh community, which is also quite --
quite long standing in that area as well. And then we
had received COI testimony about trying not to break up
that Punjabi Sikh. And also, there's, I believe a Muslim
COI specifically centered around one of their houses of
worship in the area. And I just am curious if you're
able to -- I know they've been split in the other
districts. Have you been -- were you able to really look
at that and address trying to keep as much or most of it
together?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: We were able to keep some of
it. I do know that there's some, like, maybe Kennedy can
go over that. And one of the things is that there's much
more cohesion with the African American community in this
area than there is with the Asian community. The
crossover isn't as great. And because we're looking at
all of -- the totality of everything, you know, there
were some splits that had to happen with some of the
COIs.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: My understanding is that
there's actually quite a bit of cohesion even within the
Asian communities, too. So that's why I was curious
about that, too.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And there is. There
absolutely is. Because of course, the Asian community is
not monolithic, you know, and so --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Kennedy, tell us what we're seeing.

MS. WILSON: So there are lots of COIs. I think this is about twelve different ones. They're overlapping so you can't, you know, some of them are kept together. There are some splits. I think a notable one that was before Split 2 was this one above the 99 and kind of going to the West of the 99. However, it is -- there is some that are kept together as well. So some -- there are some splits, but there are some that were left together I guess is what I could say about that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And, you know, I'll just add, you know, we were doing our best to accommodate as many communities of interest as possible, but at the end of the day, these are -- these are VRA districts, and we wanted to really center our focus on that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good, thank you.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to thank the team for really looking at this, and you know, three -- three iterations is -- explorations, it takes a lot of time and a lot of brain cells. So thank you. And it's quite impressive, the work. In the three iterations, do you all have a recommendation? Oh, we haven't done the last one, sorry.
MS. WILSON: We haven't done the last one yet.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. Well, we were jumpy.

Sorry, okay.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And we're looking two different -- but the 2 and 3 I think -- between 2 -- or in this one and the next one we're going to see, I think they're quite similar, except there's how it plays out in the rest of the district kind of is different. And so --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And then --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- we wanted to give the Commission options.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And then for the public, can we clarify which one has the arm since so many people called in yesterday asking about the arm?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, this one has the arm.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This one has the arm. And the next one that we're going to see also has the arm. And we can -- oh, it looks like Kennedy's maybe saying something here, but we can certainly show you that in a moment. The difference in that one is actually how we cut into Clovis-Fresno.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah.

MS. WILSON: And those iterations are Iteration STCV Iteration 3 and Iteration 4 are the ones with the arm.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And Kennedy, can you just
highlight the arm just so the Commission and also the public are able to see the arm that we --

MS. WILSON: Yes, one moment. This isn't my district working layer, so it's just on there as a CDF, so I'm just going to zoom in to --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: That works.

MS. WILSON: -- show you a little closer.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Perfect, that works.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And just a reminder, and I think Mr. Toledo said this earlier, but we've received significant public testimony about these areas in particular as a concern and as an area that communities on the ground really felt like might be lowering -- lowering the protected communities' opportunity (audio interference).

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I'm going to say I apologize if you already spoke about this. I think I'm just -- had a brain fart here. But did you all consider or talk about -- I've seen some comments about, you know, is it better to have two strong VRA districts instead of three semi-okay districts, you know. And I know that that's been a conversation that we've been hearing here
and there. And I know that the direction that -- or the
counsel that we've gotten is that we need to have three.
But I was just curious about, you know, for those of you
who are working on this and thank you for your work. I'm
just curious about what you found. Thank you.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I think we went in with
the notion of creating three districts because that's
what we're hearing from the community. And in fact, the
community groups and also our internal analysis shows
that we can create three. I mean, we believe we have two
very strong districts here, the Tulare and the
FRESNOTULARE and the King Lake Lucerne -- King -- THE
Tulare-King-Kern (sic). We wish we could've gotten
FRESNOTULARE a little bit higher, but I think we did --
with totality between the different groups, it's a pretty
strong district, both of these. San-Fresno, the totality
there it went down slightly in San Benito CVAP, but the
totality is still quite strong. It's when, you know, all
the community maps draw these districts in about these
configurations. And we're very close to CVAP in all
three.
And so when you look at the community maps, look at
ours, I mean, obviously they're different because we make
different cuts, but the percentages are very close.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'd just add --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead, Commissioner Sadhwani.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. I'd just add, I mean, I think what you're referencing was perhaps some of the testimony from the Dolores Huerta Foundation early on. But certainly, they've also come back and said that they were predominantly looking in the Southern Central Valley as opposed to thinking about the entirety of the Central Valley or the entirety of the State of California as is our job. And so, you know, I -- I think all of the analysis both from the community as well as that of our counsel has suggest three districts.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, and just for the record, it wasn't just the Dolores Huerta, it was just I think just other individuals. But I think this explanation is helpful for anybody who's listening in. So thank you very much for your work.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah, it's STVC4 so that we can have all the options in front of us and hopefully narrow down our options in the next four minutes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, we've got four or five minutes
before we go a break. Will have the opportunity to contemplate all of this overnight and we will return to this discussion tomorrow morning. But if we can see the third option now?

MS. WILSON: So now we have STCV4 up. And all of the things that I said before about the districts remain true. And the difference was how we decided to let go of the 17,000 that were in FRESNO-KERN. So before as you saw, we made a sliced through Clovis and Northern Fresno, the city, and here we just took the City of Fresno and left Clovis, and just kept grabbing population until we got to 17,000. And so now as well as before, Fresno and before Clovis are with the Inyo, Modesto, Amador to Mariposa up to El Dorado iteration. And the CVAPs in all the districts remain the same as well.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So if I may just mention really quickly, I mean, I think one of the things we were doing in general in all three of these versions was working within the general structure of our map. So you know, I think the big picture, we could've gone in a totally different direction and split up ECA or done something totally different, right? We didn't want to, you know, put a lot of big changes throughout the entirety of the map. So we see these as options to meet our goal of developing strong VRA districts that are in
compliance with the law and also respecting our
timelines.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, I love this work. I was
just wondering if you explored a taking off Clovis
option. I imagine you did. I just want to hear why it
didn't work if it didn't work.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, we did, actually. I
don't know if Kennedy wants to take a closer look at
that. One of the challenges with Clovis is that
currently, that population in Fresno is to the left of it
so it has to go somewhere. So I don't know if, Kennedy,
you want to talk through some of the different options we
looked at?

MS. WILSON: It starts to become a contiguity issue
if you just take Clovis and then you leave Fresno on the
side away from it. So you kind of come down and take
this unincorporated area and take Clovis out, however
then Fresno is no longer with the rest of the population
there. So that is why we decided to try and just take as
much North. And Clovis alone was I believe -- was it 120
or 20,000. I think it was 120 and we needed 117. So
taking more and more, and more, you get very thin line
underneath to keep it connected.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And our preference was to go through Clovis. We just couldn't because of the contiguity problem.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you all for your amazing work on this. As I said, we will start off with this tomorrow after roll call. It is now 6:15, time for break.

Commissioner Andersen, Commissioner Turner, please commit your questions to paper or memory so that we can hear them first thing in the morning.

Thank you, everyone, for your patience during our break. We have finished our mapping for the day, so we are ready to hear from the public.

Katy, would you please take it away?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Absolutely, thank you, Chair.

For all those that have called in, if you have not done so already, please press star nine. This will raise your hand and get you in the comment queue line as we work our way down.

The public comment period will be one minute and thirty seconds. You will receive a verbal warning at thirty seconds and fifteen seconds remaining. I will be identifying you by the last four digits of your telephone number. Please be alert and be paying attention as we
are beginning public comment now.

We will begin with caller 5704, and up next after that will be caller 7840.

Caller 5704, please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

MS. NORMAN: Good evening. My name is Jacqueline Norman, campus architect at UC Riverside. First, I want to thank you for the great care you have taken so far in ensuring that other universities are being cared with their greater surrounding communities. Additionally, I was pleased to hear the attention that several Commissioners were paying to our requested changes in the Assembly map during today's California Citizens Redistricting Commission Meeting. Thank you for the comments to ensure that that UCR community of interest is kept wholly within a Senate district. But my comments to you today are with the respect to the Assembly plan and how the December 8 iteration can be altered to better acknowledge the UCR community of interest.

They UCR community of interest can be defined as our main campus as well as surrounding infrastructure, landmarks, and communities that support UCR specifically and includes UCR's main campus at 900 University Avenue, the UCR Innovation and Economic Development Corridor, the UCR Arts Block, including the Culver Center of the Arts,
the UCR School of Medicine --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. NORMAN: -- the AmeriCorps University Eastside Community Collaborative, the California Air Resources Board at 4001 Iowa (indiscernible), and the significant off-campus student housing population found off of University Avenue --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. NORMAN: -- University of Riverside.

Institutes of higher learning aren't just confined to the campuses, but really are a part of the larger ecosystem of student housing, related research, recreation center, and other supportive facilities.

Thank you for acknowledging that in your work today. I believe you --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right we'll begin with caller 7840, and up next after that will be caller 5060.

Caller 7840, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. My name is Gevork (ph.), and I am calling from North Hollywood in the San Fernando Valley in Southern California.

First and foremost, I want to thank you all for the
incredible work you've done in serving our state and helping to draft these new maps. I do want to give my opinion and my voice. The last Assembly district maps that you will created in the San Fernando Valley, specifically with the Assembly maps, offered on December 6th -- sorry, I'm getting corrected, December 8th, have greatly frustrated and upset constituents, residents, Californians, such as myself, as well as local leaders and activists. After a great deal of conversation, a coalition of neighborhood leaders and activists through from throughout the San Fernando Valley are calling on you to adopt the San Fernando Valley Firefighters Assembly maps.

The LA firefighter map is supported by neighborhood leaders, such as myself --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- and community members because the map creates Latino majority seat and a Latino (indiscernible) district expanding representation that unifies Armenian communities in the neighborhoods of the East San Fernando Valley and it combines the unincorporated foothill communities of Burbank, Glendale, Sunland-Tujunga, and Santa Clarita into one district who consistently face fire danger. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 5060, and then up next after that will be caller 7331.

Caller 5060, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. LARA: Thank you so much. Good evening, Commissioners, Cesar Lara (ph.) with the Monterey Bay Central Labor Work Council. We represent members in Monterey and Santa Cruz County and in San Benito as well with the union members. And we're really concerned at the Congressional maps. And I want to ask the Commission why are we being punished for the Supreme Court getting rid of the Civil Rights Act affected by pre-clearance. What you're doing is you're splitting up our communities. Not all Latinos are created equal. We have very little communities of interest with Silicon Valley and San Jose and this needs to be fixed. We have submitted a central coast fix (ph.) map that would have Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Benito, part of Santa Clara, into one Congressional district, and would also map out some districts in the San Jose area that would give you what it needs and would fix what you're doing with our community. You're really splitting --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. LARA: -- the communities of interest that are tied by media markets, by agriculture and others. And
we're really diluting our voice in Congress if you do this.

And the second thing with my last seconds is the State Senate map.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. LARA: I have a particular concern with the proposed maps that includes Fresno, and I'm really encouraged by what you're looking at fixing. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 7331, and up next after that will be caller 3726.

Caller 7331, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello and thank you Commissioners and line drawers for your hard work. Thank you once more for including Sylmar in the San Fernando Valley VRA district on the Congressional maps. Please try to find the time to go back to the Valley and to do this in a way that keeps Granada Hills and Porter Ranch in the San Fernando Valley. Sunland-Tujunga make more much more sense in the Antelope Valley district sense since they are also semi-rural horseback riding folks and don't belong together with West Hollywood like it currently is. Stuart Waldman and VICA have submitted a plan that fixes all of this and also keeps North
Hollywood and Toluca Lake together. Thank you -- thank you so much for all your good work and please try to keep Granada Hills and Porter Ranch the San Fernando Valley.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 3726, and up next after that, is caller 8951.

Caller 3726, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. NGUYEN: Hello, my name is Daniel Nguyen from Orange County. There are many organized groups participating in this redistricting process. But I feel like the Vietnamese community is the group being dismissed for having a lot of callers. We are excited that we have the opportunity to call in and keep doing so to make sure our community is protected just like (indiscernible) organizations. We are so close to getting our full community in one Congressional district and the proposal for Huntington Beach is a compromise that accomplishes that. Please actually enact this compromise. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 8951, and up next after that, it would be caller 6659.

Caller 8951, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Watts (ph.) and I'm calling from Westminster. I was concerned because on Monday when one Commissioner dismissed the Vietnamese callers because there was too many of us and personally, I think that was disrespectful and somewhat racist. I hope we're not being dismissed simply because we are organized and engaged. It's also not dissimilar to the other groups whose map you literally put up on your screens. We don't have fancy maps drawing systems, right, but we do know where the heart of the Vietnamese community lives. So I'm asking please add back in at least a portion of Huntington Beach to our Congressional district so we can get a true Vietnamese and Asian influenced district in Orange County. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 6659, and up next after that will be 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: Hi, my name is David Tran. Please approve Commissioner Kennedy's idea to include part of the Huntington Beach in which -- in with Little Saigon.
It might seem small, but it is a line that better reflects our growing community and would increase the Asian population in this Congressional district. I know why you don't want to add all of Huntington Beach and that is fine at this point, but an even swap seems easily done. Thank you and have a good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 7618, and up next after that will be caller 7576.

Caller 7618, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi, can you guys hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Great. Hi, my name is Paige and I'm calling in support of now splitting Huntington Beach.

At first, I did not want it split, but this late in this process, it seems that this is the only way to get the Vietnamese population fully together in the Santa Ana district. Please make the split you proposed to truly create an Asian influenced district in Orange County.

Thanks for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 7576, and up next after
that will be caller 4006.

Caller 7576, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours. Caller 7576, if you will please double-check your telephone and make sure you are not on mute. And if you will please press star six one more time -- you did re-mute yourself. You are now unmuted. You may want to double check your telephone, make sure you are not on mute on your telephone, as we cannot hear you, but we are -- you are unmuted in the meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes, I just want to say thank you so much for, you know, taking the time to review the maps and ensure that they are equitable -- our communities. My name is Sokoro (ph.). I am Regional Director for Public Affairs (indiscernible). And we have several health centers in the Central Valley providing an array of health services.

Historically, the Central Valley has not received its share of resources regardless of the endless contributions to the State. We are in support of map 4. The purpose of redistricting to ensure there's true representation of our residents, which will lead to more prosperous, thriving communities. So we thank you for taking the tie to create a map that's more equitable.

Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now I have caller 4006, and up next after that will be caller 4735.

Caller 4006, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello and thank you, Commissioners. Oh my gosh, you guys have been doing amazing work for a state so large as California -- amazing. I'm calling to ask you guys to return Grenada Hills and Porter Ranch to the San Fernando Valley when you mark up the maps for Congress. You know someone in Tujunga are far closer to the Antelope Valley and they're also semi-rural. And they shouldn't be together with the West Hollywood anyways, which is where they are now.

You know, culturally, West Hollywood, and Sunland-Tujunga, and Topanga are so far apart, almost as far apart as the distance. So hopefully we can keep those together. Please take a moment to look at the proposal from Stuart Waldman and VICA which fixes all this and keeps Sylmar Valley -- Sylmar in the Valley, too. It's really a smart map. It works, keeps everything together as neighbors. It also keeps Toluca Lake and North Hollywood together. It's really a great solution and you guys are doing great work.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you again for all of
your hard work, and we really appreciate you guys.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 4735, and up next after that will be caller 7051.

Caller 4735, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. VONGORA: Hello, thank you. My name is Chris Vongora. I am a longtime Fontana resident, and I really want to thank the Commission for all of your hard work. I know you've been meeting daily and dealing with a lot of comments. I'm actually calling in because I am speaking in regards to the Pomona Chino Valley area because as a resident of Inland Empire, I'm very concerned that the latest version of the SD10WE map places us in the same district as San Gabriel Valley. The communities of the Inland Empire have a very distinct identity -- our challenges are different. But for a long time we've identified common interests and worked together to solve them. Our state representatives are from the Inland Empire, understand the Inland Empire, and provide representation that best serves the residents of the Inland Empire.

This is much more deeper than crossing county lines. This is about two different communities of interest that regionally have little in common. The current iteration
could leave us without representation familiar with the
needs of the Inland Empire in the State Senate for many
years to come. And we hope -- and I hope that you
consider --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. VONGORA: -- (indiscernible). The Commission
has recognized its different communities of interest as
it drew the Assembly Congressional maps. And so we're
asking that you please approve a map that keeps state
Senate representation in the Inland Empire. Thank you
for your work, and I hope you have a great evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have Caller 7051, and up next after
that will be caller 0349.

Caller 7051, please follow the prompts. The floor
is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi, thank you so much.
My name is Julie. I'm from the San Fernando Valley. I
first want to thank the Commission so much for all their
hard work, but we're not done yet. There's still some
work left to be done at the San Fernando Valley. I do
want to note that the last Assembly district
visualization for the San Fernando Valley Assembly map
offered on December 8th had great frustration and upset
local residents. A lot of my neighbors, a lot of leaders
in the community were really upset by the maps that were put forward.

After a great deal of conversation, a coalition of neighborhood leaders and activists from the San Fernando Valley are asking that you adopt the San Fernando Valley Firefighters Assembly map. This map is supported by neighborhood leaders and community members because the map combines and incorporates foothill communities of Burbank, Glendale, and Santa Clarita into one district who consistently face fire danger.

They also consolidate neighborhoods impacted by the Hollywood Burbank Airport and keeps the Los Angeles neighborhoods along Mulholland together while unifying working class (indiscernible) community in a separate district.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: We ask that you consider these thoughts and go back to the LA Firefighter map. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 0349, and up next after that is caller 0762.

Caller 0349, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. SHAW: Yes, ma'am. My name Kay Shaw (ph.).
I've been a resident of the San Fernando Valley for the past twenty years. And I would like to say how difficult I find the map to be on December 8th. It has greatly frustrated those of us in the local community and the leaders and activists alike. And I would, like the previous caller, like you to please look at the LA Firefighter map -- the San Fernando Valley Firefighters Assembly map. And please consider the fact that this map, you know, it unites the Filipino community in Van Nuys, (audio interference), East Panorama City in North Hollywood into one district instead of current district which divides the growing population into three districts. And finally, the map also aligns traditional Jewish neighborhoods and keeps LGBTQ+ populations in the Valley unified. Please consider the LA Firefighter map in support of our neighborhood leaders and community members. Please consider the San Fernando Valley Firefighters Assembly map.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. SHAW: Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 0762, and up next after that is caller 7175.

Caller 0762, please follow the prompts. Caller with the last four digits 0762, if you please follow the
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, hi. This is Patrick (ph.) in North Hollywood in the beautiful San Fernando Valley. I'm also calling about the Assembly district maps. I'm sorry, I understand how difficult a job this is, but that last map that was posted for the Assembly district in the Valley just made no sense at all to anybody that lives here. I mean, Glendale with East LA and Burbank with Santa Monica. It did not work at all. I heard people calling in about the firefighters' map. I've looked at that one. That one does make sense. I also heard people calling in about the Valley Industry Commerce Association map. That one also makes sense. If you look at those two maps, you'll see they have a lot in common.

People have talked about uniting the fire risk neighborhoods in the foothills. But also, the districts in the middle of the Valley make more sense on both of these maps. You've got North Hollywood in the San Fernando Valley District, and you've got the districts ending at the Hollywood Hills, La Jolla Drive, keeping the Valley separate from the rest of Los Angeles, and you really need to do that.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: These districts are not
going to make sense or work for the people who live in them if you try to mix the Valley districts with the districts down in the Los Angeles basin.

So please look at the firefighter's map, look at the VICA map. I think you can come up with something very good. You've done a great job elsewhere in the state. I think you could do well on these. Thank you. Bye-bye.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 7175, and up next after that is caller 0011.

Caller 7175, if you'll please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Katy.

Good evening, Commissioners. This is Jeremy (ph.).

I'm calling on behalf of Equality California. I'm calling today to respectfully express our disappointment with today's Senate iterations in the Coachella Valley, which split our local LGBTQ+ community into three districts, MCV, SWRC (ph.), and the SECA district. We understand that every COI cannot be kept together, but this three-way division is deeply concerning to us because the LGBTQ+ community of Coachella Valley is already particularly vulnerable with LGBTQ+ seniors, retiring communities, lower income, and working-class LGBTQ+ folks in communities around Palm Springs and the
first generation of people living with HIV into older age
living in this region.

And so far, this community has been divided into
Congressional and Assembly level and this Senate division
only worsens if by dividing our community into three
Senate districts.

Please help us unify our Coachella LGBTQ+ community
by uniting Palm Springs Cathedral City, Desert Hot
Spring, Palm Desert, and Laquinta into a (indiscernible,
simultaneous speech) --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- district separate
from San Bernadino's high desert (indiscernible)
communities and separate from the counties of San Diego
and Imperial. Doing so will allow us to protect our
community, our civil rights, and our ability to elect
candidates of choice. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 0011, and up next
after that it will be caller 8802.

Caller 0011, please follow the prompts.

Caller with the last four digits 0011, if you'll
please follow the prompts by pressing star six. The
floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, good evening. Thank you
for the work that you're all doing and for the opportunity to speak tonight. A member of the Neighborhood Rights Coalition, a county-wide coalition that's calling on the Commission to please reconsider the separation of Glendale and Burbank, two sister cities that have historically been together, worked together, and have advocated together for their constituencies. They share much in common from school districts to business, economic factors, and we hope that you can reconsider and bring these two sister cities back together in one single district so we have representation in Sacramento that can be a part of it. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 8802, and up next after that will be caller 4373.

Caller 8802, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi, my name is Kevin and I wanted to call in and thank Commissioner Kennedy for working on a proposal that better represents the Vietnamese community and Little Saigon. I think the proposal was dismissed a bit too quickly and is one (indiscernible) easy change you can make to an Orange County map before we finalize. Thank you. Thanks for always hearing our community and letting us engage in
this process.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now we have caller 4373, and up next after that it will be caller 2648.

Caller 4373, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. COMBS: Hello, this is Janice Combs in Madera County. And as you are doing the Central Valley and Eastern part of California Map, can you keep please keep Madera, Merced, and Mariposa Counties together as we are -- all doing the same thing from wildfires to flash floods, health care, recreation and going back and forth to work. And all of our backgrounds are pretty equal in those counties (indiscernible). I would really appreciate it. Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 2648, and up next after that is caller 3993.

Caller 2648, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is Crystal, and I live in the community of Walnut Park.

Commissioner Kennedy, thank you for all of your support of our communities of Florence-Graham, Walnut Park, and Huntington Park. Today I would like to request
a simple small cleanup for keeping Florence-Graham and
Walnut Park together in the 110 LA map. I ask you to
please, at the very minimum, keep Walnut Park and
Florence-Graham together in our next Assembly map as this
will be the only way that (indiscernible) residents and
unincorporated areas in LA County will have an
opportunity of having a voice in the Assembly. Please
move on the (indiscernible) 110 LA map and make the 10
Freeway the Northern border of the map. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 3993, and up next
after that it will be caller 1327.

Caller 3993, please follow the prompts. And one
more time, caller with the last four digits, 3993, please
follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

Caller 3993, if you will please double-check your
telephone and make sure it is not on mute. You are
unmuted in the meeting.

MR. BWARIE. Hello, my name is John Bwarie. I am
the CEO of the Alhambra Chamber of Commerce in the San
Gabriel Valley, and I'm calling to share my concern about
splitting the West San Gabriel Valley from the East San
Gabriel Valley and reducing the voting power of our API
and Latino communities here in the San Gabriel Valley.
Our Western Gabriel Valley communities, Alhambra,
Monterey Park, San Gabriel, and Rosemead are currently being connected with much more unaligned communities in the North, including Bradberry, La Quinta, which are some of the more affluent communities in the county, for that matter. And so I really, as we look at protecting and really giving voice to these important communities, not just in this region, but in this state, it's really important that they remain together for us, that the idea that Alhambra and Monterey Park remain together with the other communities that reflect similar values, similar demographics, and are really communities that are contiguous.

We have unique issues in the San Gabriel Valley and we're constantly fighting for resources as many smaller cities working together in the community. So it's really not acceptable that we're lumped with the Northern communities as currently proposed and that we need to make sure that the West San Gabriel Valley deserves the representation by remaining in a Latino majority API influence Senate district, particularly that adequately represents the diversity of our (audio interference). Thank you so much and I appreciate your consideration at this point.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 1327, and up next
after that caller 6059.

Caller 1327, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours,

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Commissioners, after you make the highly requested change in the Congressional maps to keep Sylmar with the Eastern San Fernando Valley to make a Latino VRA district, we need you to focus now on the Assembly and Senate map. Please create two super majority Latino VRA districts and one super majority Latino Senate VRA district to truly represent the diversity of the San Fernando Valley.

Specifically for the Assembly map, please, add Acton, Agua Dulce, Lake Elizabeth, and Northwest LA County to the City of Santa Clarita. Acton and Agua Dulce are a hundred percent part of the Santa Clarita Valley, while the other mentioned areas are recreational areas and geographic communities of interest for the Santa Clarita Valley. With all these changes, Los Angeles will be golden for the next decade. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 6059, and up next after that, it will be caller 6758.

Caller 6059, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. SMITH: Commissioners Sadhwani and Sinay, you
have been an instrumental part of advocating for communities like mine of Walnut Park. My name is James Smith (ph.). I live in the community of Walnut Park. I have lived here for over twenty-five years. I'm calling in regards of the Assembly, 110 LA Map. Walnut Park has always been connected with Florence-Graham community and we are both unincorporated communities next to each other represented by the County of Los Angeles.

Our Walnut Park residents have worked with Florence-Graham community on multiple social issues as we are side by side on both, share similar (indiscernible).

Separating Walnut Park and Florence-Graham would be a complete injustice -- does not benefit our residents. Please move Walnut Park into the 110 LA Map and make the 10 Freeway the Northern border of the map. Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani, Commissioner Sinay, and the rest of the Commissioners for your time, consideration of the matter to clean up, change the Assembly 110 map. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 6758, and up next after that it will be caller 3686.

Caller 6758, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening. I am
Lisa (ph.), and I'm a resident of Westminster. The Vietnamese community has fully engaged in this redistricting process, and we are asking for one final swap in the Congressional districts when you revisit the maps later in the week. Please make the Huntington Beach swap for Los Alamitos and Rossmoor that you proposed. It's contained, simple, and a compromise that our community can live with. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we color 3686, and up after that will be caller 3979.

Caller 3686, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Good evening, this is Lou (ph.). I'm a resident of the San Fernando Valley. I'd like to remind the Commission that the San Fernando Valley strength lies in its diversity. In particular, our Latino community is integral to the makeup, culture, and lifestyle in the San Fernando Valley. Your maps do draw one Latino Voting Rights Act district in the San Fernando Valley, and I appreciate that. However, you released a version of maps that include not just one but two Assembly Latino VRA districts.

Furthermore, you've heard a lot of talk today about the Senate VRA seats, and the Commission doesn't draw --
if the Commission draws two VRA Assembly districts, those
can be drawn together to create one Senate VRA district
as well. The Latino community deserves to have its
representation protected. As a representative or as a
resident --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- as a fifty-year
resident of the North San Fernando Valley, I know what
I'm talking about. The San Fernando Valley is a huge
area and would in fact be the sixth largest city in the
nation by itself. I'm asking that you honor --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER -- the intent of the
Voting Rights Act and draw two Assembly VRA districts in
the San Fernando Valley. Let's keep the San Fernando
Valley group together by itself. Thank you so much for
your work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 3979, and up next after
that is caller 6090.

Caller 3979, please follow the prompts. The floor
is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello. My name is
Mellin (ph.). I'm a (indiscernible) member of Pacifica
Islander Health Partnership located in Garden Grove. We
serve the Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander communities by providing health access to those that are disproportionately low income and share the need for social services and affordable housing. I'd like to thank the Commission for today's revisions to the state Senate draft map in Orange County. Thank you for your dedication and continued efforts to ensure that there is a VRA district both in and around Santa Ana, West Anaheim, South Fullerton, and La Habra. Building upon this move, we would like to ask the Commission to unite the Irvine and Costa Mesa community of interest by moving Costa Mesa and surrounding unincorporated areas from NOC Coast into IOC. They will be able to ensure that Pacific Islander communities in Costa Mesa and Irvine stay together as there are shared (indiscernible) and on affordable housing, health access, and other critical services that our communities need.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Please look at the revised map from the People's Redistricting Alliance for guidance on how to make this pivot and ensure that our most underrepresented communities can remain together in their respective districts. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 6090, and up next after
that will be caller 0203.

Caller 6090, please follow the prompts. Caller 6090, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MR. QUATCH: Good evening, my name is Nicholas Quatch (ph.), and I live in City of Alhambra, serving as the President of the Alhambra Youth Commission and Sophomore Class President at Alhambra High School. I'm calling in tonight to share my concern about the state Commissions reducing the political power of Latino API voters in the West San Gabriel Valley. West SGV cities such as Alhambra, Monterey Park, San Gabriel, and Rosemead are currently being connected to white, affluent foothill cities such as Pasadena, La Canada and Bradbury. Bradbury is one of the wealthiest ZIP codes in California, with an average household income of 146,000. In La Canada, the annual household income is 175,000. These cities are predominantly white. But in Alhambra, Monterey Park, our annual household income is 61,000. In both these cities, Whites make up less than ten percent of our residents.

Affluent White communities in the foothills put an enormous amount of political power over small working-class cities in the West SGV. West SGV cities are constantly fighting over resources to improve our
neighborhoods, such as in the Assembly 710-10 freeway debate.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. QUATCH: All residents continue to carry the burden of poor air quality and traffic congestion. The Cities of the West SGV deserve to maintain the political power by remaining in the Latino majority API influenced Senate district that adequately represents the diversity of our region. Thank you for your consideration. Nicholas Quatch.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 0203, and up next after that is caller 4857.

Caller 0203, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. DE LA VALENCA: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Maria De La Valencia (ph.). I am a Santa Ana resident and a community organizer with Orange County Congregations Community Organization. OCCCO works with congregations across the county on the issues of housing and immigration justice and education equity. We also work to ensure that our leaders feel empowered as they're advocating for their communities. I would like to first thank the Commission for today's revision to the state Senate draft map in Orange County and ensuring that there
is a VRA district both in and around Santa Ana, West Anaheim, South Fullerton, and La Habra. Building upon this move, we would like to recommend strengthening the VRA District SAA even further and increasing its Latinx CVAP a full percentage point by following the recommendations sent a few minutes ago by The People's Redistricting Alliance. Thank you for your time and consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 4857, and up next after that is caller 5115.

Caller 4857, please follow the prompts. And one more time. Caller with the last four digits, 4857 please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. One more time. The floor is yours.

MR. LICCARDO: Good evening, Commissioners. This is Sam Liccardo, the Mayor of the City of San Jose. And on behalf of our one million residents, I thank you all for taking seriously our concerns about splitting San Jose into several Congressional districts and for your thoughtful deliberation. We appreciate your juggling many complex and conflicting considerations. And we support your creation of proposed Latino and Asian American opportunity districts in San Jose in whatever fashion is required by the Voting Rights Act. I'm not
asking you to alter either of those two districts.

However, the remaining two districts encompassing San Jose's West, South, central, and Southeast can and should form the basis for a San Jose majority district. Nearly 600,000 San Joseans in those neighborhoods would know that they would have a representative in Washington who will not subordinate our urban concerns to those of more affluent, less diverse suburban communities around us. We share the view of many in Monterey and Santa Cruz counties that their coastal communities deserve attention to their unique environmental and economic issues.

(Indiscernible) Silicon Valley's urban center has uniquely technology-focused economy, demographically diverse community, severe affordability crisis --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. LICCARDO: -- and multi-billion-dollar transit projects needing federal funding. Congress works best when its members can speak clearly for all of our communities. Thank you again for considering my thoughts.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 5155, and up next after that would be caller 7832.

Caller 5115, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. I'm calling to ask that you not split up San Jose into four Congressional districts. San Jose is the 10th largest city in the entire United States, and we need at least one representative whose district has a majority of San Jose residents, something that almost every big city has. We agree with our neighboring counties that our different communities of interest would be best served by representatives focused on each of our respective needs. You could accomplish this while still maintaining the very important Latino and Asian American opportunity districts in our city. I implore you to reconsider splitting up San Jose into four Congressional districts and ask that we have at least one member of Congress who will stand up for our current community of interests, which is our City of San Jose. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 7832, and up next after that is caller 0805.

Caller 7832, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening. I want to thank all of you, but especially Commissioner Turner and Kennedy, for hearing our community and helping us advocate to keep our communities together in Walnut Park.
area.

My name is Jeanette and I live in Florence-Graham. I'm calling regarding the Assembly 110 LA draft map. As you have heard our community before we are part of a coalition in Walnut Park and Florence-Graham communities with its several hundred members. We are here to ask for a minor small change. We are asking for a one-for-one swap. Move the small communities of unincorporated Walnut Park area into the 110 LA map, then give the small parts of downtown LA that you currently have in the 110 LA map move back to the AB54 NELA map. And lastly, you can move the small City of Maywood from AB54 NELA map to the Gateway map. This is an even swap that will put these small community areas with other similar communities where they have more in common.

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Commissioners, asking for a small clean up to ultimately have Walnut Park in the same 110 LA Map as the Florence-Graham community --

MR. MANOFF: Ten.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- in order to (indiscernible) have the opportunity for our hardworking families to elect a candidate of our choice. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 0805, and up next after that is
Caller 7483.

Caller 0805, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. ROSE: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Yvette Rose, a voter and renter from Van Nuys in the San Fernando Valley. I want to thank you guys tonight for all of your hard work, but we're not done yet. The last Assembly district visualizations in the San Fernando Valley from December 8th have extremely upset local renters and activists like myself. I support the LA firefighters map because it creates a Latino majority and Latino opportunity district in the Assembly and in the Valley, expanding representation for Latinos in the Valley. It also keeps Los Angeles neighborhoods along Mulholland together while unifying working class renter communities like Van Nuys in a separate district. It also unifies the Latino community in Van Nuys North of East Panorama City and North Hollywood in one district, instead of the current district, which divides a growing population in these three districts. It also consolidates the neighborhoods impacted by the --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. ROSE: Hollywood Burbank Airport, which is such a huge issue here, and incorporates North Hollywood and Toluca Lake in a single district, and the map outlines
traditionally Jewish neighborhoods and keeps the LGBTQIA
populations of the valley unified.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. ROSE: Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 8121, and up next after
that is caller 5181.

Caller 8121, please follow the prompts.

MS. OLMOS: Hi, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. OLMOS: Hi my name is Gloria Olmos. I'm the
Mayor of the City of South El Monte. And I'd like to
thank first off, the Commission for all its hard work in
crafting the maps. I know it's been a lot of work and
for the representation I'd like to see as a resident of
South El Monte in the San Gabriel Valley, it concerns me
that the latest iteration Map SD10DWE does not secure the
proper representation for our San Gabriel Valley. We
need to keep us together. I don't want to see us be put
apart -- put together with San Bernadino. We need to
stay -- it would be such an injustice. We need to stay
together to make our communities and our cities, our
regional areas that have common interests in which we
share distinctly a lot of identities. We work together
as a team and I'd like to keep those similarities
together, as well as needing to keep the map that states
the state representative, we voted for Senator Susan
Rubio. We'd like to keep her as a representative. And
it's kind of telling us our vote doesn't matter and we
need to know and let the people know their vote matters.
So I speak for many on behalf of the City of South El
Monte --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. OLMOS: -- in the San Gabriel Valley. Please
keep us together. Thank you so much for all your hard
work. I know it's been a lot to hear us all through the
night. Thank you. Happy --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
for all those that have (sic) calling in, your public
comment is being translated. If you can do your best to
take your time with cities, counties, numbers, and just
everything in general, that'd be great. Thank you so
much.

Right now we have caller 5181, and up next after
that is caller 9843.

Caller 5181, if you'll please follow the prompts.
Caller with the last four digits 5181, please follow the
prompts to unmute by pressing star six. Caller 5181, I
do apologize. You appear to have some type of
connectivity issue at the moment. I do have you marked
down for a retry and I will come back around.

Right now, we have caller 9843, and up next after that will be caller 8853.

Caller 9843, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. PASANTI: Good evening. My name is Laurie Pasanti (ph.). I am Director of Civic Engagement the Dolores Huerta Foundation and have been facilitating the Equitable Maps Coalition. We reviewed the Central Valley Congressional District iterations and recommend adoption of Iteration Number 4. Iteration Number 4 prioritizes the creation of three effective VRA districts -- CVAP levels look great. They totally reflect performance analysis and are validated by our own extensive experience doing redistricting at all levels of government throughout the Central Valley.

You have captured key COIs, especially in underserved areas. You've protected our farm workers throughout the Valley, Terra Bella, Delano, West Tulare, and beyond. You've kept VRA communities in VRA districts in Fresno and Bakersfield. The splits I see are very rare and clearly necessary, and well executed.

Iteration Number 4 also recognizes COIs that I am familiar with having personally lived in North Hanford and West Bakersfield and gone to school in Lake Isabella.
along Highway 198, Lemoore, North Hanford, and Visalia --

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

MS. PASANTI: -- (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) Northeast Tulare, and the Census recognize Visalia-Tulare urban corridor. And thank you so much for putting California City in the Antelope Valley District.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 8853, and up next after that will be caller 1915.

Caller 8853, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. I'm calling as a concerned resident of the Central Coast, specifically as it relates to the Congressional map visualization. I'm very worried that the visualization splits apart our Tri-County region of Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Monterey County. I would hope that the Redistricting Commission follows suit of what a previous public commenter had made and takes a look at the Central Coast community map fix. We have a very large farmer (indiscernible) population, which within all three of these counties and if any one of those counties are separated from one another, that would largely dilute those immigrants, monolingual Spanish speakers, and I also think it would be only be fair to San Jose, as Mayor Sam Liccardo said earlier in
his comments, to keep them as one and not split them to
an area which would include them within King City which
is hundred miles away from San Jose. So I am really just
asking you all to really consider this and consider the
voices of the countless community members that have
spoken against this, whether it be from San Jose,
Monterey, Santa Cruz, or San Benito. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 1915, and up next
after that is caller 2638.

Caller 1915, please follow the prompts. The floor
is yours. Caller 1915, please double-check your phone,
make sure you are not on mute. You are unmuted in the
meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, hello, Commissioners. I
ask that you're (sic) not split up San Jose. As the
tenth largest city in America, we need one representative
whose district is mostly comprised of San Joseans,
something that virtually every other city in the country
has. We agree with Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties that
our different communities of interest would be best
served by representatives focused on each of our
representative needs.

You can accomplish this while still maintaining the
important Latino and Asian American opportunity districts
in the city. We ask for one member of Congress we know
that will speak up for the tenth largest city in the
country. Please keep San Jose whole. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

Right now, we have caller 2638. And up next, after
that, it would be caller 7446.

Caller 2638 please follow the prompts. The floor is
yours. Caller 2638, if you will please double-check your
phone, make sure you are not on mute, you are unmuted in
the meeting. One more time. Caller 2638 you are --
there you are.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry about that.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I didn't realize I had it on
mute. I'm looking at these maps, and the way you've
divided up Fresno is -- because there's not a lot of
experience in Fresno, you've divided it up into multiple,
multiple Congressional districts. Also, I looked at the
way you've -- trying to push the VRA numbers up so high.
What you don't understand is when you push these VRA
numbers up, how is someone in central California going to
be able to be represented with somebody in the
Congressional ECA districts all the way to Lake Tahoe to
Plumas County, North. I don't think you understand
what's happening with the various districts and how
people live in California -- how people go from East in
the mountains to West down in the Valley. The reality
is, you're trying to push the Hispanic numbers up because
of the Dolores Huerta Foundation, and their ideas which
are all self-centered, and you're not trying to think of
how do people have representation. You need to
understand that it's okay if a VRA district is at fifty-
two percent or fifty-three percent -- it does not need to
be fifty-eight percent. Building arms to take out white
people to put in brown people or vice versa is racist.
And what you're causing is a racist district. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now we have caller 7446, and up next after
that is caller 9370.

Caller 7446, please follow the prompts. The floor
is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi there. I'm calling to ask
that you not split San Jose into four Congressional
districts. As the tenth largest city in the United
States and the third largest city in California, I feel
that we need one representative whose district is mostly
made up of San Jose residents, like every other large
city in the country has, and agree with previous callers
about how our different communities of interest would be
best served by representatives focused on each of our
respective needs. And this can be done through -- while also maintaining the Latino and Asian American opportunity districts in the city. And again, all I'm asking is for one member of Congress who will speak for the tenth largest city in the United States, third largest city in California. Thank you very much for all your hard work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9370, and up next after that is caller 7644.

Caller 9370, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello. My name is Jose. First, I would like to thank you for the work you guys have done for the Los Angeles County. I am a member of the Rights Coalition. We're a country-wide coalition fighting for representation. And tonight, I'm here to ask that you please keep Irvine and Glendale together. If you split these cities up, it will diminish the unified voice for fair representation in Sacramento. These cities have worked together throughout history as gateway cities to the San Fernando Valley. We urge you guys to please keep these cities in the same Senate district. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 7644, and up next after that is caller 3989.

Caller 7644, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. In the Senate draft, you're still splitting Fresno metro communities of interest near Fresno State and Old Fig Garden between Bullord (ph.) and Shaw, impairing some of those areas with Clovis. You've also not included Selma in the Fresno VRA district, which is a historically significant city for the Black community and should be paired with other Black COIs.

You also split communities of interest on all levels, often splitting West Park and the COI West of 99, which -- and Old Fig Garden area and the college COIs and communities near the Fig Garden Loop that we've continued to lift up.

It's important that you're considerate of and try to pair these communities, at least one of these on -- at one of the levels of these maps. We support VRA districts, but we want to list that you don't have to break up Black and API communities --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- in order to maintain that seat. And you shouldn't do so just to raise the LCVAP.
Black and Latino communities often share similar issues, and there is evidence of crossover voting that supports pairing these communities. A slightly lower Latino CVAP in a district that keeps Black COIs together and can still be an effective VRA district.

I'd like to thank the Commission for receiving testimony so late in the evening. Thank you for all your work that you continue to do.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 3989. And up next after that is caller 3995.

Caller 3989, please follow the prompts.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I'm calling from Manteca in San Joaquin County. I'm very upset to see our county split up in the Congressional district maps. There has to be a way to make sure that we aren't looped in with Sacramento or Elk Grove, as is seen in a few drafts. I want my community to have a voice, and the minute we're with Sacramento, we lose that. Please keep us as whole as possible.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 3995. And up next after that, it will be caller 2567.

Caller 3995, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Commissioners, today was a gut punch to San Bernardino's High Desert. Thank you to Commissioner Vazquez and Andersen for advocating for us. But to Commissioner Vazquez' point, we've met this neighbor. Look at maps going back decades. We've had plenty of representatives who have come from Los Angeles County. We always get left behind.

To Commissioner Kennedy's point about balance, this map is very unbalanced. Somehow, every community in Los Angeles County is kept whole, but our High Desert has been cracked again. I would urge the Commission to look at the draft maps. At least we were -- at least we were kept whole.

And parts of Rancho Cucamonga, like Alta Loma, that were with us, would have given rural areas in our county a chance. It really feels like the Commission is wholly committed to Los Angeles County and not the Inland Empire, and it's just deeply unfair. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 2567, and up next after that is caller 4125.

Caller 2567, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. Commissioners, I would like to share my strong opposition to last night's
Iteration S.T.CV2 of Kings-Tulare-Kern Congressional visualization.

As a resident of Kings County, this visualization dramatically changes the way in which our community and overall region is represented at the federal level. I think the way we go about it is that things need to be balanced. The Voting Rights Act is very important, but not to such a degree that communities that are not shared are joined together.

This effort is extreme. The Kings-Tulare-Kern visualization from last night's handout is not in the best interest of the community. We have asked repeatedly for you to keep Kings County whole. We are a VRA district, a small county, and it doesn't make sense to split us up.

The iteration that was presented on the map viewer for today, December 15th, will better serve the community as a whole. We strongly urge the Commission to keep Kings County as a whole, as they have no interest in being separated into two Congressional districts.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It is a disservice to its people and will harm their ability to be represented in an equitable way. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 4125, and up next after that is caller 2402.

Caller 4125, please follow the prompts.
The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, Commissioners. I've called before, and I want to thank you again for your hard work throughout this process. It's been pretty impressive to watch.

I'm calling regarding the Congressional maps. A few days ago, you put Sylmar with the San Fernando Valley seat, and this is good work. Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani, for pushing this. Unfortunately, the Commission was tight on time and the way that it happened resulted in Granada Hills and Porter Ranch being cut out of the San Fernando Valley, without the Commission even discussing it.

VICA has submitted a revised map that keeps North Hollywood and Toluca Lake together and puts Sunland-Tujunga in the Santa Clarita-Antelope Valley seat. Sunland-Tujunga is the semirural part of the Valley, cultural -- culturally similar to the semirural AVSCVC (ph.). It is imperative that the areas affected by the Porter Ranch gas leak are represented by a member of Congress who will bring in the EPA.

So I'm asking you to please keep Porter Ranch
together with Chatsworth and West Hills. You've done right by the Valley thus far, and now we're asking that you make this small change --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- in Porter Ranch and Granada Hills back in the San Fernando Valley. Please make this change, and thank you again for your hard work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 2402. And up next after that is caller 8174.

Caller 2402, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MS. HALL: Thank you. My name is Hillary Hall, and I live in the Santa Clarita Valley. I've been a thirty-year resident here. Before that, I was in the San Fernando Valley for twenty years. So I understand the area very well. I would like to thank you for your latest iteration, which unites the Antelope Valley and Santa Clarita Valleys. It's a significant improvement over your draft map.

We strongly support Commissioner Vazquez's exploration to further improve these lines, specifically by shifting more of the Victor Valley to San Bernardino and shifting portions of Upland and Rancho Cucamonga to SC201, balancing the districts through the San Fernando
Valley.

As Commissioners have noted, Upland through Santa Clarita is a real disconnect. To be honest, I don't know how to get to Upland without using Google Maps. And you've heard consistently about trying to keep the Victor Valley whole when possible. Extending Santa Clarita into San Fernando Valley, recognizes the --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. HALL: -- city's growing diversity. This final exploration will impact a handful of districts but should yield further improved districts.

Two additional requests, which I know I won't get to all of it. First, if you're going to split the Victor Valley, I strongly --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. HALL: -- urge you to use the same split you used in the Assembly plan. The Senate plan, as presented this evening, breaks up the African-American and Latino communities in the Victor Valley. Using the Assembly line in Victorville -- in Victor Valley would be consistent with both a Black hub and a --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 8174. And up next after that is caller 6198.

Caller 8174, please follow the prompts.
The floor is yours.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Hi. My name is Sola Rodriguez. I'm from the Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights, CHIRLA. I've also lived in San Fernando Valley for over twenty years. The San Fernando Valley is home to 1.8 million residents, of which forty percent are Latinos and of which many are immigrants.

The communities in Van Nuys, Pacoima, San Fernando, Canoga Park, and Sylmar are home to low-income working families. There are communities with apartments and trailer homes, and we face the same issues, such as access to affordable housing and the dire need for rent control.

Since my time living in the Valley, I have moved several times because my family could not afford the high rents. The City of Van Nuys, Pacoima, and Panorama City are also among the highest numbers of COVID cases. The lack of COVID testing and vaccine clinics affected my community. And because they could not miss a day of work, we were unable to secure vaccines early.

Last year in December, we lost our organizing director, Antonio Bernabe, due to COVID. He lived and died as an undocumented person, (indiscernible) dedicating his life to organizing immigrant communities across the Valley for over twenty years. He helped --
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And as a reminder to those that are calling in, if you please take your time with your public comment, and just all of your public comments, so that we can capture it properly with the translators and with our captioners and for our Commissioners. Thank you so much.

Right now, we have caller 6198. And up next after that will be caller 2770.

Caller 6198, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. Our committees and our communities in Walnut Park, Florence-Graham, and Huntington Park want to thank you and the vested Commissioners for helping communities like ours. My name is Sandra, and I am calling regarding Assembly 110 LA draft map. We are here to ask for a minor small change. We are asking for a one-for-one swap.

Move the small community of Walnut Park area into the 110 LA map, then give the small parts of downtown LA that have nothing in common with us that you currently have in the 110 LA map, and move that small downtown area to the AD54 NELA map. And lastly, you can move the small City of Maywood from AD54 NELA map to the Gateway map.

This is a close to an even swap (indiscernible)
community areas, as with other similar communities that they have more in common.

Commissioners, we are asking for a small cleanup to ultimately have Walnut Park in the same 110 LA map as the Florence-Graham community in order to truly have an --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- opportunity for our hardworking families to elect a candidate for our choice. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 2770. And up next after that is caller 7317.

Caller 2770, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MS. LEE: Good evening. My name is Am Lee. I am a lifelong resident of Orange County, with the last thirty years in Irvine and more recently in Tustin. First of all, thank you for the most recent iteration of a district map in which the cities of Tustin and Irvine have been preserved into one district and now keep our voices whole.

I respectfully urge Commissioners to stay on this course for the following reasons. As you may already recognize, Tustin and Irvine share common interests, and we should be considered a single community.
Geographically, the City of Tustin shares the entirety of a long stretch of an Eastern border, as well as all of our Southern border, with the City of Irvine.

Tustin and Irvine are closely tied with one another as big sister, small sister cities with similar identity and shared resources. In times of emergency, such as the recent storm and past wildfires, our communities are often lumped together. One of the prized schools in the Tustin Unified School District, Beckman High School, is located in the City of Irvine, and one of Orange County's retail/dining destinations with over 120 vendors is the Market Place, which straddles both the cities of Tustin and Irvine.

As an Asian-American, I identify with the community in Irvine versus North Orange County communities of Fullerton and Yorba Linda. My Korean-American community has thrived in Irvine, which is where I worked for more than a decade and where my neighbors attend school and church and where we shop and eat out.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration and keeping Tustin and Irvine --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 7317, and up next after that will be caller 3499.

Caller 7317, please follow the prompts.
The floor is yours.

Caller 7317, if you will please double-check your phone and make sure you are not on mute. You are unmuted in the meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Jenny, a fourth-generation Oakhurst resident. The recent statements, thoughts, and maps regarding Congressional districts in central and Eastern California do not represent my region well. One idea even had Clovis with the mountain region named ECA.

Clovis is a city heavily populated and is the definition of urban suburbia, the exact opposite of areas like Madera Ranchos, Chowchilla, Mariposa, Oakhurst and Coarsegold. Clovis, and even North Fresno, has many different needs and a completely different way of life. Should not be with the mountain communities. Thank you. Have a good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 3499. And up next after that, we have caller 5249.

Caller 3499, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MS. LOPEZ: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Michelle Lopez, and I am calling you from the City of Grand Terrace. I'm calling you this evening because I'd
like to ask that we keep -- that we stay grouped with similar communities for the Senate maps.

I know that we've been split at certain points in this process, but I would really like to ask that you keep us neighbored with communities such as Loma Linda, Redlands and Yucaipa. I've lived in the Inland Empire for decades. My family has been here for over four generations, as well.

And I want to reference a gentleman earlier who said the Inland Empire has very different needs, as well as needing to stay within our own county district mapping. And so with regard to Redlands, with regard to Loma Linda, with regard to Yucaipa, we have very similar demographics in that our median household incomes, those are very similar, as well as the housing prices in our areas. And so we have --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. LOPEZ: -- very different needs. If you look further at it, at our areas, our demographics also have a very strong presence in the hospital setting, as we are located central to Loma Linda University Hospital, as well as Redlands Community Hospital.

And so I'm just asking that, with many of our residents in those areas, we have -- resemble similar demographics, and we're just asking that you please
consider keeping us within that area. Thank you for taking our calls so late in the evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we will have caller 5249. And up next after that is caller 8575.

Caller 5249, please follow the prompts.

Caller 5249, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

MR. KUN: Hi, there. Well, thank you, Commissioners, for all your hard work. It's not an easy job. And my name is Ho Yun Kun (ph.). I am a long-time resident of San Francisco, and I actually worked on three census focused on San Francisco Bay Area, and I'm very familiar with the area.

I support the current Congressional district, GREATERED iteration district map, which includes City of San Jose with Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Fremont, Santa Clara, and Milpitas. A lot of common interests in this community, with the tech industry, with the emerging green tech industry, with the large immigrant population from Asia, from Latino community.

And --- and I also -- you know, we deal with similar climate change issues. And the map is supported by many community organization, as well as climate groups. I
also support the mayor of San Jose's comment that we should really keep the rest of San Jose in one district because our city has many challenges --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. KUN: -- and we really need one representative in Congress to help us allocate our appropriate resource to address homeless, transportation, housing, and many other challenges. Thank you so much for all your hard work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we will have caller 8575, and up next after that will be caller 8198.

Caller 8575, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. Your last San Fernando Valley Assembly maps did not work for any of us community leaders. I'm a former vice president of a neighborhood council, and I appreciate you recognizing that these maps did not work.

Sam Stewart (ph.) and VICA have submitted three maps today. Map B that Stewart submitted stands for bad. It splits Pacoima from San Fernando and Sylmar and does not work for the San Fernando Valley, but map A by VICA works for the San Fernando Valley. None of these maps are perfect, but map A by VICA works.
Similar to that is the coalition map provided by the firefighters for the San Fernando Valley. This map is best. It keeps the East Angeles Forest communities of Burbank, Sunland-Tujunga, Glendale, and the Santa Clarita Valley all whole, allowing for them to have appropriate representation.

As we face climate change, and wildfires are going to be a bigger factor, we need an Assembly member who understands these issues --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- and will work on them for all of their communities and work closely together. So please look at the San Fernando Valley Coalition's map provided by the firefighters or VICA's map A. VICA's map B stands for bad.

Thank you very much, and thank you for your commitment to our state. We owe you a great gratitude.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 8108, and up next after that, we have caller 9575.

Caller 8108, please follow the prompts.

Caller with the last four digits, 8108, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

I do apologize. Caller 8108, there appears to be some type of connectivity issue for you at the moment. I
do have you marked for a retry. I will be coming back around after the break for those.

Right now, we have caller 9575. And up next after that, we will have caller 9938.

9575, please follow the prompts.

MS. DIAZ: Good evening -- good evening, Commissioners. My name is Karen Diaz, and I'm part of the Coalition for Human Immigrant Rights, CHIRLA. CHIRLA wants to commend you on your sense of duty to serve and always taking up and listening to our public comment and make it inclusive for all residents of California.

And a immigrant myself, I am really grateful that this is a process that I can participate. Today, I will be providing feedback on LA County and Orange County.

We appreciate (indiscernible) by keep the whole Antelope Valley together in SDIANTVICCVAL (ph.) map for the Senate level. A concern that we have is that it's breaking up the communities of the High Desert by separating the City of Hesperia from Victorville and Adelanto.

While low-income immigrant communities understand that at the Assembly level they have to draw Hesperia, Adelanto, and Victorville for VRA obligations. We would like -- they would like to be separated from an LA County-based district at the Senate level. This
modification will respect COIs and the community of Antelope Valley and the High Desert --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. DIAZ: -- and suggest that once you draw the Senate district in Antelope Valley with Santa Clarita and Antelope Valley, you had no to Kern County, including the City of Rosamond and Mojave in the Central Valley.

Also, we want to thank you for your work on the Senate district on the Orange County district. We appreciate --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. DIAZ: -- that you draw Fullerton with Anaheim and other parts of Orange County.

Lastly, we want to uplift the -- the -- the Senate mapping of the San Fernando Valley district, and we want to make sure that (indiscernible) represent the level that are (indiscernible) --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And as one more reminder, please speak slowly when talking about names, cities, and numbers, and for all of your public comment, so that we may capture it with our capturers and our translators and so that our Commissioners can follow along. Thank you so much.

Right now, we have caller 9938. And up next after that will be caller 0669.
Caller 9938, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MS. SELL: Hi. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. SELL: My name is Linda Sell. I live in Greater ED Congressional district near San Jose. San Jose mayor made clear that the people of San Jose do not want exploration in the region that puts Greater ED Asian district with a small map connecting it to San Jose.

So I think Commissioner Sadhwani and Commissioner Toledo for suggesting and supporting that San Jose population be exchanged between Santa Clara district and Midcoast districts. Thank you to Chair Kennedy for asking Commissioner Yee and Commissioner Ahmad to explore this exchange.

This matches San Jose Mayor Sam Liccardo's -- what he spoke tonight in his letter. It would point to, you know, making a majority district -- San Jose district of San Clare (ph.), which all would --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. SELL: -- match up Greater ED, many COIs since the summer, which included COIs from MALDEF map, Asian Law Alliance map -- which is based in San Jose -- unanimous vote by San Jose --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.
MS. SELL: -- Sunnyvale city council, a unanimous vote by Santa Clara city council, and it also maintains the Cupertino Hispanic VRA district. Your line drawing playbook says it priorities that prioritizes council votes --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we will have caller 0669, and up next after that will be caller 3783.

Caller 0669, please follow the prompts.

Now, one more time, caller with the last four digits -- oop, there you are. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER Hi, everyone. My name is Amir, and I am a sophomore in high school. I am fifteen years old. I spent all of my fifteen years in Temple City, a city in the San Gabriel Valley. I am very dedicated to my community. I'm currently an appointed youth committee member for the City of Temple City.

And I just wanted to talk about our Senate district real quick because as previous speakers have mentioned, the West San Gabriel Valley and the East San Gabriel Valley are completely split. My city (indiscernible) in the middle, but we're being grouped with the West San Gabriel Valley. And by grouping us with cities like Glendale and Burbank, we're taking away the voting power of minorities, API voters, and Latin (indiscernible)
voters in the district.

Previous speakers also mentioned that for -- that they wanted Glendale and Burbank included in the San Fernando Valley. So I think a perfect solution would be to give them what they want and give us what we want by splitting our --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- side of the district in two. And then also for the East San Gabriel Valley, combining the West in San Gabriel Valley, and as previous speakers also mentioned, giving back Chino and Pomona back to the Inland Empire, so that, that way the San Gabriel Valley could really be grouped together and we could really have --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- our voting power truly recognized while giving neighboring districts exactly what they've been asking for. Thank you so much for your time. Hope you have a great evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 3783. And up next after that is caller 0682.

Caller 3783, please follow the prompts.

And one more time, caller 3783, if you'll please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi, there. My name is Irene, and I'm calling regarding Commissioner Kennedy's proposal regarding the Vietnamese community in Huntington Beach and Little Saigon. Tomorrow, when the Commission revisits the Congressional maps, I would like to consider the request that you all consider this proposal.

I know you want -- I know you won't be making substantial changes to the OC maps, but this idea seems to be reasonable, fair, and something the Commission can do without blowing up all of its hard work to this point. Thank you for all your hard work, and I appreciate your thoughts in this Congression (sic).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 0682, and up next after that is caller 9672.

Caller 0682, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. I am a resident of the Antelope Valley, and I'm calling to support tonight's iteration, the -- the 12/15 iteration of AVSCV, which again includes Sylmar, which we support.

Callers continue to reference a change in which Porter Ranch and Granada Hills were drawn in with us a few days ago. However, this was not the iteration that was posted tonight on 12/15, so I'm not exactly sure if
they need to update their scripts or if I'm not looking
at the correct iteration.

Regarding the callers who continuously -- who
continuously try to lump Santa Clarita or the Antelope
Valley with Sunland and Tujunga, please stop. Our
communities have nothing in common with that area. And
to get there, you have to drive through the Valley.

VICA also referring to us as semirural is offensive.
Santa Clarita is the third largest city in Los Angeles
County. Lancaster and Palmdale are the fifth and sixth.
We're suburban and extremely diverse. I've lived here
nearly my whole life, and I've never even seen a horse on
any of our streets, so referring to us as horse-riding
folks is ridiculous.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Stewart Waldman and VICA need
to keep their concerns over our community to themselves.
They don't even live here, and as a gay Latino, I am
appalled at their attempts to disenfranchise us in favor
of white communities in North Hollywood. It's racist,
plain and simple.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I appreciate you not taking
directives from special interest groups who wish to
benefit certain Congressional representatives. Please,
if you could clarify whether the 12/15 CD iteration is correct or not. Happy holidays, and best of luck to you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And Chair, at this time, we are up against a break.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much, Katie. It is going on 8 o'clock. We will be on break until 8:15.

There are some forty-five callers in the queue. Some of those have already spoken. We have twenty-five hands up. So those of you who are still in the queue, please remain in the queue. We will get to you as soon as we can, after we come back at 8:30. Thank you so -- sorry, at 8:15. Thank you so much.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 7:59 p.m. until 8:15 p.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your patience during our fifteen-minute break. We are back with you and looking forward to hearing from our remaining callers tonight.

Katie, please take it away.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much, Chair.

And we will begin with caller 9672. And up next after that will be caller 9611.

And just a brief reminder for all of those who have called in, if you will please speak at a steady pace with all numbers, counties, names, and just everything you
have to say. It allows us to capture it properly, and it allows the Commissioners to hear it. Thank you so much.

Caller 9672, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MR. GONZALES: Thank you, Commissioners. I appreciate all the hard work that you've -- you've been doing. I am Mayor Robert Gonzales from the City of Azusa, and my concern this evening is the redistricting map that you're looking to do for Senate District 22.

You know, expanding that district into San Bernardino County will really affect the San Gabriel Valley.

We are one of the most dense -- densely populated regions in LA County, and extend resources that go into San Bernardino County wouldn't be prudent to the San Gabriel Valley. I mean, we are fighting for resources within our own small area, and expanding that into San Bernardino County would be a disservice --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. GONZALES: -- not only to the districts, but just to the voters at well -- not -- as well. So I am just calling tonight, just to express my concerns with expanding the District 22 into San Bernardino County.

We'd like to keep everything in -- in the San Gabriel Valley. So thank you again, and have a very merry
Christmas. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9611, and up next after that is caller 3788.

Caller 9611, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MR. EVERSOLE: Hi. My name is Bob Eversole (ph.), and I've lived in San Joaquin County for fifty years. And I've been following your Commission for months now, and you can't split us up. I'm -- I'm calling to make sure that you understand that we should be our own area with a solid voice that people can hear, not grouped in with Elk Grove or Sacramento, who are totally different than us. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 3788, and after that, it will be caller 1082.

Caller 3788, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening. Thank you for taking my comments. My name is Cathy, and I live in the City of Turlock, Stanislaus County. I have some real concerns about the redistricting. I'm talking about map -- the Congressional District map CD ECA, iteration 12/13/21. I'm calling about the Congressional maps, and
I'm encouraged to hear the Commission is taking the time to get the Central Valley VRA districts right.

I believe, and I'm sure you'll agree, that securing representation for Latinos is central to your mandate as Commissioners. However, honestly, I'm a bit frustrated that it's taken so long, but better late than never. We often get overlooked here in the Central Valley, and I'd love to see you all back this trend.

The iteration number 4 was a great way to redraw the VRAs. And thank you for committing to that. And thank you for all your hard work, Commissioners. Merry Christmas. Happy New Year. Bye-bye.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 1082. And up next after that will be caller 3636.

Caller 1082, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello. My name is Sayed (ph.). I'm a homeowner in Porter Ranch. Recently, Porter Ranch and Granada Hills was taken out of the San Fernando Valley. I'm calling to express my concerns regarding this, as we have both commercial and cultural interests and ties to the San Fernando Valley.

And then, I want to reiterate the point that someone Sunland-Tujunga should go with the Antelope Valley.
These communities have a lot more in common. And yeah, that's practically what I wanted to convey. Thank you so much, and have a great day.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we will have 3636. And up next after that will be caller 0209.
Caller 3636, please follow the prompts.
The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. Can you hear me?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: As a lifelong Angelino and resident of Glendale, I do not understand why you -- why did you consider to be Glendale and Burbank as separate in the Senate maps. We are two different cities. Our demographics, economic growth, social district changes are (indiscernible) work together to supply our local economy. Our kids play in the same sports teams (indiscernible). We shop in each other's cities and worked together to provide strong public services, including police and fire services, to the residents of both cities. Remember once -- sorry. Remember once when we are broken apart, there is only loss. Loss of service, suppression of our voices, and overall disservice to the residents of both Glendale and Burbank.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We know you have to make hard choices, but splitting Burbank and Glendale apart from each other is the wrong choice. Thank you so much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 0209, and up next after that is caller 4425.

Caller 0209, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, this is Bing (ph.) speaking. I'm in Santa Clara County. I'm a community organizer and immigration leader. I'm calling to comment on the Congressional district of Santa Clara map, which is currently District 18. And first, thank you all to the Commissioners for your hard work you've done so far.

However, on the Congressional level of Santa Clara County, the growing Asian population is not reflected in this district in this time. The facts are, Asians are the largest ethnic group in Santa Clara County, around forty percent, up substantially from 2010. But the current map only reflects twenty-three percent of Asian population. This means the current proposed Congressional Redistricting map in Santa Clara County (indiscernible) is creating districts that preserve the outdated racial and ethnic mix of a decade ago.
Asian-heavy cities like Cupertino are carved out of the proposed district, instead, including Asian-light cities (indiscernible). Such are city Palo Alto, Mountain Views are separated from similar tech-centric cities, like Sunnyvale, Cupertino, City of San Jose, City of Santa Clara --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- who share this common value, education, cultural business, technical infrastructure background. As with mayor San Jose just stated, these Asian-Americans are splitting up, reducing the community voting power. Silicon Valley should be viewed as an integrated community, as mentioned by previous callers, and it's imperative to keep all Silicon Valley cities together, such as Palo Alto, Cupertino, Santa Clara, Mountain View, et cetera. I'm merely echoing Mayor Sam -- Sam Liccardo and --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 4425, and up next after that will be caller 3358.

Caller 4425, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MS. SARRAILLE: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Lynn Sarraille, S-A-R-R-A-I-L-L-E. I have been a resident of Turlock, California for thirty-four years.
I'm concerned with the Congressional Districting maps. As a member of the League of Women Voters, I've registered voters all over this area. My concern is that Modesto and Turlock be included with their neighbors.

Thank you for strengthening the VRA districts in the Central Valley, especially with Fresno iteration. Thank you for helping Modesto and Turlock to be included in a Congressional district that recognizes and supports our common needs for infrastructure, health care, and transportation along the Highway 99 corridor. Thank you, and good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 3358. And up next after that will be caller 3592.
Caller 3358, please follow the prompts.
Floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. I want to thank all of you, but especially Commissioners Turner and Kennedy, for hearing our community and helping us to advocate our communities together, Walnut Park and the Florence-Graham area.

I'm calling regarding the Assembly 110 LA draft map. As you have heard our community before, we are part of a coalition in Walnut Park, Florence-Gram with several hundred members. We're here to ask for a small but minor
change. We're asking for a one-on-one swap.

Move the small community of unincorporated Walnut Park into the LA 110 map with the LA -- with the small parts of downtown LA that you currently have in the 110 LA map, move those to the AD54 NELA map. And lastly, can you move the small City of Maywood from AD54 NELA map to the Gateway map.

This is an even swap that will put these small community areas with other similar communities, where they have more in common. Commissioners, we are asking for a small cleanup to ultimately have Walnut Park in the same LA 110 map as the Florence-Graham community, in order to truly have an opportunity -- opportunity for our hardworking families to elect the candidate --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- of our choice. Thank you all very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 3592, and up next after that is caller 7712.

Caller 3592, please follow the prompts.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is Dan, and I'm calling from Modesto and the Great San Joaquin Valley. Thank you, Commissioners, for your time tonight.
Time and again, we've come -- keep coming back to these Congressional maps, only to have to come back to them again later. The time has come to really double down on getting the VRA districts right and get real, substantive Latino representation from the Central Valley.

Let's create at least two districts with well-upwards of fifty percent CVAP, as is represented in the most recent Fresno iteration number 4. History teaches us that the more spread out these communities get, the less voice they have. Once these VRA districts are done right once and for all, which is shown in the most recent Fresno iteration number 4, then this is progress and then you can finally move on. Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 7712. And up next after that will be caller 7507.
Caller 7712, please follow the prompts.
And one more time --
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- oop -- there you are.
The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.
I'd like to speak to the two new iterations proposed by Commissioner Sadhwani and Toledo to raise LCVAPs in King-
Tula-Kern and the Fresno-Tulare district. In the event that you choose to adopt these maps, I'd like to speak to the Stanis-Fresno district. For some reason, this district includes the City of Lathrop in San Joaquin County, a rapidly growing suburb with an industrial economy closely tied to Tracy and Stockton in the largely rural Stanis-Fresno seat.

The rapid growth of Lathrop, driven by Bay Area commuters, is quickly going to drive down the LCVAP and efficacy of Stanis-Fresno as a VRA seat. To uplift the voice of the farmworker communities that form the basis of Stanis-Fresno, I highly recommend you move out the City of Lathrop and instead include the communities of North Hanford and Lemoore in Stanis-Fresno.

This swap would raise CVAP in Stanis-Fresno and would greatly improve the compactness of your maps by eliminating the so-called arm that connects the sliver of Kings County to the Sierras and distant population centers in Bakersfield and Fresno. And Stanis-Fresno, North Hanford, and Lemoore would be reunited with similar West Valley communities like Coalinga and Mendota.

Again, swapping Lathrop out of Stanis-Fresno and bringing in Lemoore and North Hanford from Fresno-Kern will create a stronger VRA district, better unite communities of interest in the Western San Joaquin...
Valley, and result in much more compact districts. In other words, it's a no brainer. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 7507, and up next after that is caller 2956.

Caller 7507, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. I'm calling to request that the Commission would revisit the Congressional map for Orange County. And if they have a chance to revisit the map tomorrow, please take into consideration West Santa Ana and -- and incorporate West Santa Ana into the new Congressional district.

The population is about 30,000, and it can be done without disrupting any other district. So please take that into consideration. Thank you, and have a good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 2956. And up next after that, we will retry caller 5181.

Caller 2956, if you will please follow the prompts.

Caller with the last four digits 2956, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

The floor is yours.

MS. PEREZ: Hello. Can you hear me?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. PEREZ: Okay. Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Sasha Rene Perez. I'm a council member from the City of Alhambra, a board member with Asian Youth Center, and a lifelong resident of the San Gabriel Valley. Thank you for the time you've dedicated to this Commission.

I'm calling in to express my deep opposition to the current West SGV and East SGV Senate maps. These maps dilute API and Latino communities in the West SGV and combine our region with cities we share no interest with. The East and West San Gabriel Valley need to be kept whole. We need to continue to have representatives who understand the unique needs of a predominantly low-income immigrant communities of color and the challenges facing our region, such as air quality, lack of green space and transportation.

Our communities are consistently competing for resources with many of the outside communities we've been combined with. I've heard a number of Commissioners share that these Senate maps were created as a result of feedback that was provided around the West SGV Congressional maps. I've spoken to several organizations, such --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. PEREZ: -- such as Active SGV, Nature for All,
and API Forward Movement, who have submitted letters to make clear that their comments were only directed towards the state Congressional map and that they do not want to see the San Gabriel Valley split apart.

Please --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. PEREZ: -- make the SGV whole again and move forward with the SGV Senate map iteration from November 10th, 2021. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we will retry caller 5181, and then up next after that, we will retry caller 8108.

Caller 5181, if you will please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. O'CONNER: Hello. My name is Kevin O'Connor, and I'm a long-time resident of Simi Valley, California, and I want to urge the council to -- that we need to keep Santa Clarita separate from San Fernando. San Fernando Valley and -- and Santa Clarita have nothing in common. And -- what is it? Oops. I lost my place.

So the San Fernando Valley is -- is such a massive valley, it can't be split off into the Santa Clarita. It has -- it has to join the rest of San Fernando Valley. Please do not separate -- or please do not include Santa Clarita in the San Fernando Valley. Thank you for your
time and your public outreach.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we will retry caller 8108, and then up next after that will be caller 7414.

Caller 8108, if you'll please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MR. MENORE: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Ben Menore (ph.). I lived in Santa Clara Valley for sixty-six years. Twenty years of that has been in San Jose and twenty years currently in Sunnyvale.

I support the current CD Greater iteration district map, which includes cities of San Jose, Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Fremont, Alviso, Santa Clara, Milpitas. And although there's an effort to have one major district that would represent San Jose, I'm afraid of the dilution of the populations of Asian-Americans and Hispanics being endorsed into those -- in this one district.

I believe that the district that I'm in, District 17, has provided a base to provide great services to the immigrants and minority population with regards to language and cultural competence services. And so I would like you to look very seriously, as these --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. MANORE: -- cities have -- these cities have developed a tremendous bond within their own communities,
with their religion, language services, as well as their
culinary attributes to the rest of the community of this
district. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, I'll be going to caller 7414. And up
next after that will be caller 2988.

Caller 7414, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. My name is Willa.
I'm calling about San Jose. I'm very concerned with the
way that San Jose has been cut into four districts. I
was very surprised to hear from other callers that this
is unprecedented among the other cities state, and San
Jose is literally the only city this is being done to.
San Jose is a very diverse and extremely cohesive
community, and I believe that we deserve to remain a
united community and not be split up this way.

I've heard that Mayor Sam Liccardo has advocated for
combining certain areas to keep our community more
cohesive, and I fully support this idea. I would ask
that you please listen to the many people who have
commented and who want to keep our community together,
and I ask that you please don't divide San Jose. Thank
you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 2988. And up next after that will be caller 5955.

Caller 2988, please follow the prompts.

And one more time, caller with the last four digits 29- -- oop, there you are. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners.

My name is Sarah. I'm also from San Jose. I ask that the City of San Jose, the tenth largest city in America, gets at least one representative whose district is mostly comprised of San Joseans such as myself, something that virtually every other large city in the country has.

When you (indiscernible) Monterey and Santa Cruz counties, then our different communities of interest would be best served by representatives focused on each of our respective needs.

You can accomplish this while still maintaining the important Latino and Asian-American opportunity districts in the city. We asked for one member of Congress we know who will speak out for the tenth largest city in the country. Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 5955, and up next after that will be caller 2297.

Caller 5595, please follow the prompts.

Caller with the last four digits 5955, if you will
please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. I'd like to comment on the map ADJ RC iteration. I'd like to begin by thanking the Commission for keeping the communities of interest in Corona, Jurupa Valley, and Riverside together. But Grand Terrance is not part of that community of interest.

Grand Terrance is in a different county with a different school district and different local priorities. Grand Terrance is a very much connected to Colton and San Bernadino and should be grouped with San Bernadino-based districts.

We ask that you remove Grand Terrance from the district -- from that district and include (indiscernible) instead. Happy holidays, and thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 2297, and up next after that is caller 7592.

Caller 2297, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm calling about the Northern Los Angeles County state Senate map called ANTZICVAL (ph.) to express my general approval for the
map you've drawn for this Senate district, which
correctly depicts the Northern Los Angeles communities of
interest. And thank you for keeping Santa Clarita Valley
together after ten years of voting for two different
state senators here where I live.

I understand that the Senate districts are a lot
bigger than our Assembly districts and that we may be
grouped with other cities, but wherever it is necessary
to do so, please keep in mind our neighbors in San
Fernando Valley, with whom we share common geography,
community culture, county services, and of course, our
commuter pathways on the 14, 5, and 405 freeways. That
would mean including the cities of Northridge, Granada
Hills, and Porter Ranch, rather than going further into
another county such as San Bernardino, into Victor Valley
and Apple Valley.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Residents in San --
residents in San Bernardino agree with me, as an earlier
caller stated, and they also prefer to vote in their
current county. Karen Diaz from CHIRLA, the Coalition
for Humane Immigration Rights, agrees with this plan and
also requests that San Bernardino --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- be removed from this map.
Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 7592. And up next after that is caller 2229.

Caller 7592, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, and good evening.

In regards to Congressional Redistricting, while the specific plan may be regarded as extreme, the Hispanic CVAP percentage for CD Cupertino could be increased. Please see public input number 38855. 38855, San Jose.

Having San Jose divided among four Congressional districts would not be a good idea. For a visualization of the San Jose in three districts plan, please see public input number 40536, which was posted earlier today. 40536.

This plan has a San Jose-majority Congressional district, which includes Los Altos Hills, Los Altos, Loyola, Saratoga, Monte Sereno, Los Gatos, Campbell, and more than half of San Jose's population. Mountain View would be split. District Greater ED would have more of West San Jose, CD Cupertino would be modified also, and there would be a coastal district from Pacifica to San Luis Obispo County.

(Indiscernible) --
MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- Commissioners Ahmad and Yee would see public inputs 40536 and 40585 before their line drawing session with Tamina. Thank you, and have a good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

Right now, we have caller 2229. And up next after that will be caller 1595.

Caller 2229, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: My name is Anita, and I'm calling from Modesto. I'm here to comment on Congressional districts. I've been watching the process from the very beginning, and I thank you all so much for the work that you've put in. Before yesterday, I was very concerned about the VRA seats in the Central Valley, but now that I've seen you're on your way to making them actually effective, which is so important for Latino -- our Latino community.

So I hope you finish that work, and I hope you do it by choosing the Fresno iteration that you posted this week. And that will give our valley the voice we deserve. Thank you so much for your work. Bye-bye.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 1595. And up next
after that is caller 6131.

Caller 1595, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you very much, Commissioner Toledo (indiscernible). Our communities of Walnut Park, Florence-Graham, and Huntington Park want to thank you and the rest of the Commissioners for helping our communities. My name is Ramsey. I am calling regarding Assembly 110 LA draft map. We are here to ask for a minor small change. We are asking for one-for-one swap.

Move the small community of Walnut Park area into the 110 LA map, then give the small parts of downtown LA, that have nothing in common with us, as many other callers have previously mentioned, that you have currently in the 110 LA map, and move that small downtown area to the AD54 NELA map. And lastly, you can move the small City of Maywood from the 54 NELA map to the Gateway map. This is close to an even swap that will put these small community areas in sync with other --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- communities, where they have more fiscal commonality and educational commonality.

Commissioners, we are asking for a small cleanup to
ultimately have Walnut Park in the same 110 LA map as a Florence-Graham community in order to truly have an opportunity for our hardworking families to elect candidates --

MR. MANOFF: Ten.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- who will suit our choice. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 6131. And up next after that is caller 4967.

Caller 6131, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

CALLER 6131: Good evening, Commissioners. I'd like to reference the Kings-Tulare current Congressional map. Kings County is a collection of small rural -- rural towns economically driven by their agricultural industry. During the September recall election, some towns in Kings County did not have vote centers or ballot drop boxes. Residents of these towns rely on neighboring Kings communities to vote in person. It would be irresponsible to split up Kings County because of its former Section 5 designation. Please keep county -- keep Kings County whole. Thank you, and good evening.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 4967, and up next
after that is caller 7483.

Caller 4967, please follow the prompts.
The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners.

I'd like to reference the Kings-Tulare current Congressional map. Last night iteration -- last night's iteration handout was not okay. The Kings-Tulare-Kern visualization is not in best interest of the community.

We have asked repeatedly to -- to you to keep Kings County whole. We are VRA district, a small community, and it doesn't make sense to split us up. Please keep Kings County whole. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 7483. And up next after that is caller 5038.

Caller 7483, please follow the prompts.
The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. While I appreciate you joining Modesto and part of Turlock, you still have Turlock split, and they now are again in the CR district. Stanislaus County is a Central Valley county. It's not the Sierras. We are an agricultural area, not forest hills or forest land or high desert.

I've been hearing from many callers that current lines put them in areas where there's no commonality.
Well, this current iteration puts Stanislaus and its agricultural interests with the Sierras and the High Desert border of San Bernadino County, which is absolutely -- has no agricultural interests whatsoever.

We have a number of issues revolving around agriculture, transportation, education, health care, and housing. We have water issues, like all of California. However, we are a large supplier of food, for not only California but our whole country. We have a large --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- Hispanic, Syrian, Punjabi, and Portuguese communities in this small area, and these voices will be diluted with the latest iterations. Diversity is our strength, and it needs to be protected and listened to.

As the current California 10 District, we have been making progress in solving these issues. Please do not create a district where all of our advancements will be for naught. Thank you so much, and have a nice holiday.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 5038. And up next after that will be caller 2206.

Caller 5038, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Spanish language spoken).
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 2206, and up next after that will be caller 6043.
Caller 2206, please follow the prompts.
The floor is yours.

MR. SUZA: Hi. Joseph Suza (ph.). I was just calling in to talk about how I believe it's not right that the City of San Jose is broken up into multiple districts, where -- while every other major city in California has a representative that encompasses the majority, at least of the cities themselves.

I agree with Monterey and Santa Cruz that their communities are far too different for San Jose to be wrapped up in part of their district and that they San Jose have its own district representative. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 6043. And up next after that will be caller 2252.
Caller 6043, please follow the prompts.
The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is Matthew, and I'm a resident of Alhambra. Calling in to share my concern that the state Commission is splitting the West San Gabriel Valley from the East San Gabriel Valley and reducing the voting power of API and
Latino communities in the SGV.

West -- West San Gabriel Valley cities, like Alhambra, (indiscernible), San Gabriel, and Rosemead are currently being connected with white, affluent foothill cities, such as Pasadena, La Canada, and Bradbury. The SGV has its own unique issues and challenges with green space, transportation, and air quality.

Small SGV cities are constantly fighting for resources to improve our neighborhoods, and competing with foothill cities in policy decisions, preference is often given to affluent communities in the foothills, such as in the 710-10 freeway debate, while the residents continue to carry the burden of poor air quality and traffic congestion.

This is unacceptable. The cities of the West San Gabriel Valley deserve representation by a -- by remaining in a --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- Latino-majority, API-influenced Senate district that adequately represents the diversity of our region. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 2252, and up next after that will be caller 8025.

Caller 2252, please follow the prompts.
The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening. Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Rebecca. I am a member of the Neighborhood Right Coalition (ph.). We are a county-wide coalition fighting for fair representation. Thank you for the work you have done so far in Los Angeles County.

Tonight, we are simply -- simply asking if we can keep Burbank and Glendale together. These sister cities have historically worked together as gateway cities to San Fran -- San Fernando Valley, and splitting them up will diminish their unified voice for fair representation in Sacramento. We urge you to ensure these cities are kept in the same Senate district. Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 8025, and up next after that will be caller 5428.

Caller 8025, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

Caller 0825, if you will please double-check your phone. Make sure that you are not on mute. You are unmuted in the meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry about that. Hi, Commissioners. I ask, as a resident of San Jose -- sorry, I just got a little cough. Sorry about that. My throat was a little dry, but as the tenth largest city in America, I just don't think it makes sense that we would be split up into such small districts. I feel like that would really diminish the diverse voice that San Jose offers.

I do agree that Monterey and Santa Cruz counties should be in a different representation, just because they have different communities of interest. But I hope that you guys will rethink splitting up San Jose into separate districts so that we can continue to make progress with one voice that San Jose has, since we have similar interests. Thank you, Commissioners, and I appreciate you taking public input.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 5428. And up next after that will be caller 1535.

Caller 5428, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Commissioners, thank you very much for your incredible work in LA. I don't know how you did it. I'm not even sure you did it. I want to also thank Katie for setting the civil tone of these
hearings, which could have been contentious.
So many visualizations ago, you surprised us with the North Contra district. On first look, it seemed to be the perfect five refinery district, including the working class residents impacted by those refineries. You've gone through many versions to end up with an amazing majority-minority district reflecting the diversity of this state in which we live. Thank you, Commissioner Yee, for adjusting the Southern Solano shape to include the Suisun Bay, the best duck hunting and sturgeon fishing in California.

North Contra still needs a little more --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- adjustment. The hundred-year-old Shell Martinez Refinery has been split into two Congressional districts. It really does matter, if you know the area. Moving East to the Antioch split, did you intend to include single --

MR. MANOFF: Ten.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- family, Southeast Antioch commuters, the area that Commissioner Toledo called the swimming pool area --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 1535. And up next after that will be caller 6483.
Caller 1535, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MR. MALDONADO: Commissioners, it's Tony Maldonado from Santa Clarita. Thank you and the mappers for the recent changes to Santa Clarita Senate and Congressional maps, as you correctly paired us with the Antelope Valley and correctly placed Sylmar in its rightful place in San Fernando Valley East, which itself is now a VRA district.

However, we request that for Santa Clarita, please remove Porter Ranch and Granada Hills, include the rural Sunland-Tujunga and Foothill Trails, which we and our horses would prefer.

By the same token, please revisit Santa Clarita's Assembly map, which still has us connected to San Fernando Valley. As Santa Clarita is home to over 300,000, please remove the San Fernando Valley and instead add Agua Dulce, Acton, Lake Elizabeth, and the Northern unincorporated areas of LA County up to Frazier Park. This would match our Senate and Congressional maps.

Regarding our Senate and Congressional maps, please move the boundary on the Eastern side of Santa Clarita further into the Angeles National Forest. Currently, the boundary sitting off the 14 freeway, this area is home to Placerita Canyon State Park and Magic Mountain Wilderness.
that are wholly within the Santa Clarita Valley, which local Santa Clarita residents use for recreation --

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

MR. MALDONADO: -- and strengthens our wildfire risk management. These areas should not be in the San Fernando Valley maps but instead within all of the Santa Clarita maps.

On another note, a big thank you --

MR. MANOFF: Ten.

MR. MALDONADO: -- to Katie and all the comoderators (sic) and ASL interpreters. Have a good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

Right now, we have caller 6483. And up next after that, we have caller 0135.

Caller 6483, if you will please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening. I'm calling about the Congressional district called ECA. The ECA district includes the mountain areas of Yosemite, Bass Lake, Mariposa, Madera, and they are all very similar communities that have similar interests, especially on items such as water, trash, transportation, even economics.

Adding Clovis and North Fresno, as I heard you mentioned earlier this week, is like adding large cities
or metropolitan areas that are basically the opposite of these ECA areas -- mountain areas. So please take this into consideration when you're finalizing the ECA district, and keep counties whole and with their counterparts, such as Madera, Mariposa, Merced, and please leave Clovis and North Fresno out of the ECA district. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 0135, and up next after that will be caller 4599.

Caller 0135, please follow the prompts.

And one more time, caller 0135, if you wish to give comment this evening, please press star six.

Caller 0135, as you had not chose to raise your hand this evening, I will be going to the other few callers in the queue. If you choose to press star nine indicating you did wish to give -- do wish to give comment, I will retry again one more time. If you do wish to give comment, please press star nine, and I will come back around.

Right now, we have caller 4599, and up next after that will be caller 4615.

Caller 4599, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute.

The floor is yours.
MS. SYLVIA: Good evening, everyone. Commissioner Toledo, you have done an amazing job sharing the Assembly maps. My name is Mary Sylvia. I live in Walnut Park and have lived here for twenty-five years.

Today, we are calling to ask you and the Commission to do a small cleanup to our community. We know we cannot have everything, but we would settle on getting our small community of Walnut Park into the same 110 LA map as us and make the 10 freeway the Northern border of the map. It is imperative to have Walnut Park and Florence-Graham together in the same map, as splitting this unincorporated island will only diminish our voices and efforts that we have fought so hard together for over thirty years.

Commissioner Toledo, please look at the current Assembly map and strongly consider moving Walnut Park to the 110 LA map, where it has been together with Florence-Graham for over twenty years. Consider drawing the same boundary line and that we have now for Walnut Park.

Thank you so much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, I will be going to caller 4615. And then up next after that, we will have caller 6089.

Caller 4615, please follow the prompts. Wait.

Caller 4615, please follow the prompts.
And one more time, caller with the last four digits 4615, as you have not chosen to raise your hand this evening, if you wish to give comment, please press star six.

Caller 4615, if you wish to give comment, please press star nine indicating you do.

Right now, we will go to caller 6089. And up next after that would be caller 9747.

Caller 6089, if you will please follow the prompts.

All right. Right now, we will go to caller 9747.

If you wish to give comment, please follow the prompts.

The floor is yours.

MR. QUINONEZ: Commissioner Toledo and Sinay, communities of Walnut Park, Florence-Graham, and Huntington Park want to thank you and the rest of the Commissioners for helping communities like ours.

My name is Steve Quinonez. I am the CEO of the Florence-Firestone community organization. I am calling regarding the Assembly 110 LA draft map. We are here to ask for a minor small change. We are asking for a one-for-one swap.

Move the small community of Walnut Park area into the 110 LA map, then give the small parts of downtown LA that have nothing in common with us that you are currently have in the 110 LA map, and more that small
downtown area to the AD54 NELA map. And lastly, you can
move the small City of Maywood from the AD54 NELA map to
the Gateway map. This is an close and even swap that we
will put these small communities areas with other similar
communities where they are more in common.

Commissioners, we are asking for a small cleanup to
ultimately have Walnut Park in the same 110 LA map as the
Florence-Graham community in order to truly have an
opportunity for our hardworking families to elect a
candidate of our choice. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And Chair, that is all our callers for this evening.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much, Katie. Job
well done.

Okay. So on the run of show, I put a very short
discussion in the form of a recap and preview. So I just
wanted us to have an opportunity to reflect on the day.
I think we did some very good work today. I think we
worked well together. I think we made the best possible
use of our incredible team of mappers. We certainly
demand a lot of them, but they have come through for us.
I am hopeful that we can be as productive tomorrow as we
were today.

As I mentioned earlier, I intend to use the first
ninety-minute block tomorrow entirely devoted to
Congressional iterations. And if you could let me know now or send me a note and say, I have an iteration ready in the morning, I'm ready to go, that would help me organize myself and our time tomorrow to make the best use of it.

After that, we will go back to the Senate maps. Again, I think we did some good work today. We made better progress than I had hoped on the Senate today. So I am a bit more optimistic than I was yesterday as to where things stand and the literally hours remaining in this effort. We got so used to thinking in terms of how many months were left and then, maybe in San Diego, we had to start thinking in terms of weeks left. And then after that, we had to start thinking in terms of number of days left.

We literally are now at the point where we need to be thinking of this in terms of the number of hours left. The number of hours that we have left is limited. The number of hours that the mappers have left is limited. So there are inevitably changes that I would like to see. And I read them and say, I'd really like to make that. But looking at the bigger picture, we all have to prioritize what is going to get us to that finish line, hours from now, in the best possible shape. So please, please, think in terms of very scarce hours left, both
for us and for the mappers. Let's see how we can make the best possible use of those hours.

One of the things that I would like to put on the table and get your thoughts on. Sometimes, all of this is moving very quickly, and I want to make sure that we are not leaving good proposals behind because we're moving so quickly. And at the same time, are we accepting bad ones that endanger passage of these maps? That's why I've emphasized during the course of the day today, are these maps that we can support? Because in the end, at the end of the day, at the end of this process, we have to support a set of maps.

So just, if anyone has any thoughts on whether we are leaving behind good proposals or accepting bad proposals, what can we do to change that, to make sure that we get to next week with maps that we can support? So. Happy to hear your thoughts.

I know we're all tired. Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think I just am looking for a little clarification. Are you talking about, based on what we're hearing, are there changes that we would like to see or proposed to the current drafts that we have? Should we be coming back tomorrow ready to share either our requests to change or come with an iteration of some type that perhaps we've done on our own through
QGIS or with the mappers?

CHAIR KENNEDY: I mean, there have been concepts that have been put on the table that have been discussed and that have been dismissed. Were we correct in dismissing them?

Likewise, there have been proposals put on the table and accepted. Did we accept some that, deep down, we are not committed to supporting? Because as I say, at the end of the day, we have to support these maps.

So I want to make sure that we have done everything that we can to end this process with maps that each of us can support.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think one of the pieces I would like to see tomorrow is just have a conversation with legal counsel about the different options in the Central Valley for iterations we saw and just get legal counsels' take on each of them. I know that they've been approved, but it's always helpful just to hear from them.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, thank you, Chair. I appreciate your diplomatic language about being able to support final maps. More bluntly, we're going to take a vote, right. And so if any of us has a reservation that
would keep us from voting yes on a map, know it needs to be special vote, of course. It does not have to be unanimous. The 2010 vote was not unanimous.

But of course, every vote does count. So I guess the plea is, and I agree with it, show your cards. If there is something that would keep you from approving, let us all know early so we can see what we can do. And that'll all make it go better. I think (indiscernible).

CHAIR KENNEDY: Exactly. Let's not have any surprises.

Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, one proposal we did kind of ditch, I think, clearly, and said, hey, we really like it, is the one that you made, Chair -- parts of Huntington Beach. And I don't know if that's what we have right now or not. That's something I think that was a good idea, and we just kind of went, oh well, way too fast on that, I thought.

I still, still firmly believe that we could on one map have the Sierras. (Indiscernible) split the Sierras and not with Central Valley. I know a lot of people, oh, phah, phah, phah, that's dumb that -- they all -- look they're same, same, same. They're not, and we're it hearing over and over again.

People go, that's a good map because they want
someone else to be with the Sierras and not them. And I think we could do it. But I'm only one vote, folks, so don't worry about too much, but I really, really would like to see us try that. Thanks.

And oh, also, the little corner in Humboldt. We need to have that fixed. Have that be the same in all the maps.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And that really is, as I see it, the purpose of the work that we're going to be doing Saturday and Sunday, doing those sorts of very small cleanups to make sure that we've got our ducks in a row.

On the Sierras, I think I said this yesterday or the day before, to me, it's kind of a process of one plus one makes two. The Placer to Tahoe connection makes sense because of the roads and so forth and then a separate Tahoe to Mono and Inyo connection because of those issues. It's not that Inyo has the same issues as suburban Placer County, but it's that Mono and Inyo have the same issues as Tahoe, and Tahoe has the close relationship to suburban Placer County.

So that's my thinking on that. And that's out there for everyone to understand my thinking on it. So thank you for that.

Okay. Unless anyone else has further comment, thank you all very much for a very productive day. Let's have
another one like it tomorrow, and let's keep this train
on the tracks and rolling towards our destination.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Keep (indiscernible) Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thanks, everyone. Meeting
adjourned, 9:18 p.m.

(Whereupon, the Citizens Redistricting
Commission (CRC) meeting adjourned at 9:18
p.m.)
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