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CHAIR KENNEDY: Good morning, California. Welcome to today's meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. I'm Ray Kennedy, the current rotating Chair of the Commission. Ravi, would you please call roll?

MR. SINGH: Yes, Chair. Thank you. Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here, good morning.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Aqui.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I am present.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Happy Friday, I'm here.

MR. SINGH: Happy Friday. 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?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Kennedy?

CHAIR KENNEDY: I am here.

MR. SINGH: Roll call is complete, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Ravi.

Are there any announcements from Commissioners or staff? The run of show today is going to be very similar to yesterdays. Unfortunately, that means there will be some back and forth and we will try to keep everyone up on exactly what it is that we are looking at, at any particular time.

We will start with finishing up some work on Congressional districts between now and 11 o'clock. We will take a break at 11 o'clock.

Then at 11:15 we will shift to Senate districts and have one, two, three - hopefully we can finish Senate in three ninety-minute blocks, which would take us to 4:45. My hope is that by the 5 o'clock mapping block, or at least at some point during the 5 o'clock mapping block, we will be finished with the Senate and able to turn our
attention to the Board of Equalization.

We would have a break from 6:30 to 6:45, at which time we would begin taking public comment. We did pass a new public comment policy yesterday, just updating the previous policy and recognizing the time that we have remaining in this process, but also wanting to continue to take public comment on the maps and the process, so public comment would consist of no more than two ninety-minute blocks. That would be 6:45 to 8:15 and 8:30 to no later than 10 p.m., depending on whether there are people in the queue.

So as last night, we did not -- we did not go all the way - we did not have to go all the way to 10 o'clock because we had exhausted the queue. We invited people to join the queue, a few more did, we took those calls and then that was the conclusion of the public comment period.

We should have a brief recap and review at the very end of the day and then as of tomorrow, I will be handing over to Commissioner Fernandez, who will be the new rotating Chair.

Are there any business items that are outstanding at this point?

Okay, no business items so we go to Congressional districts, and as I understand it, we have some work done
So Kennedy, I will turn it over to you and I believe that's -- who was that with? Commissioners --

MS. WILSON: Good morning.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- Fernandez and Turner.

MS. WILSON: Yes, good morning. I did have the pleasure of working with them last night and so we have two iterations to show you. A kind of overview of both of those is one -- is moving Modesto in with kind of some Gold Country area, down to Fresno, and the other one is moving in Tahoe and reuniting Tahoe and Truckee together.

So I will start with this one, here. Our previous iteration had -- it's similar to something that they had worked on before when I showed Modesto, so I'm going to move in here. Modesto is no longer with Mono, Inyo, Alpine. It is with parts of El Dorado, El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park, out to Diamond Springs, Amador, down to -- actually, Fresno. So we brought in the mountainside of Fresno and that extra 119,000 people that moved North of Fresno is brought into this iteration with Modesto.

Then moving into San Joaquin, we have Stockton with Manteca, Ripon, Escalon, Valley Home -- so just a portion of Stanislaus and Tracy, Mountain House, Byron, Discovery Bay -- and so keeping a majority of San Joaquin whole -- of course Lathrop is moving South into the VRA district,
so that's why it's not a part of it in here.

And then moving into Sacramento, there were not too many changes. Let me move closer in. We have Elk Grove with the bottom half of Sacramento County with Vineyard. We do have the dividing line at the river again, and took a tiny portion of Arden-Arcade at the bottom -- again with West Sac in here.

And then looking to the North we have Natomas, South Natomas going with Arden-Arcade, Carmichael out to Rancho Cordova up to Citrus Heights and Antelope, Elverta. There is no split in Citrus Heights, however there is a split in Fair Oaks.

And then moving up North we have Folsom and Orangevale going with the rest of Placer County, Nevada, Yuba, Sierra, up to Plumas with Alpine, Mono, and Inyo.

And that is this iteration.

I can throw up the other one as well, unless you would like to talk about this one now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fernandez --

MS. WILSON: And yes, you can --


MS. WILSON: No, I was just going to say, also of course, the Commissioners I worked with can have the time to --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.
MS. WILSON: -- say --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, okay. Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Kennedy. I just -- awesome, awesome. She's our magic person, right -- magic maker. And I just want to let everyone know that we did not touch STANISFRESNO, because that is our VRA district, so we worked with the other districts, trying to minimize, obviously, the number of districts that would be impacted by this.

And as Kennedy said, this one is similar to what we had presented -- it felt like five weeks ago, but I think it was just a few days ago. But we all -- it's a little bit different when you move up North, because it was less population than -- I think, Commissioner Turner and I, we were working with about 417,000 -- was the population we were trying to move around and this time it was close to like 300,000, something like that.

Commissioner Tuner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Yes, thank you so much, miracle-working Kennedy and Commissioner Fernandez. I just wanted to name -- we are fully aware -- we have reviewed over and over, the COIs, and we have notes as far as what the Commissioners desire, in what they've heard, what you all have heard. This area is very
difficult to attempt to map in that we do have Inyo and Monyo (sic) that we want to consider and Alpine -- and we do have our borders and we do have our VRA.

I'm wanting again, just to remind that we are required by our criteria, equal population, then into VRA, and then we do have to deal with the very shape of our state and the -- where we're situated on the map and so it does make things -- it does create some things that just kind of makes it very challenging.

So we tried to look at different things, we tried to disrupt as few COIs as possible and the people had to go somewhere based on what we -- decisions we've made based on our VRA districts, so I won't say less than ideal.

I'll say that I love everything that we've created, all the iterations because we've put our heart and time and resources and our attempts in it and we're believing that what we're creating, wherever it lands, will be something that you all as amazing California say you are, will be able to work through and get it figured out of how to work together. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner. I really appreciate the sentiments in that.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you so much. I know this was a lot of work. I saw you all when you came back
after you did -- literally, pour your heart and soul into it, so thank you all -- all of you.

I just wanted to ask, Kennedy, can you take off the labels, just so that we can see the big picture here? It's hard to see where the lines are with all the labels. Just so we can admire the work.

MS. WILSON: Yes, one moment while I take those off. I can also -- I don't know if it helps -- one thing that Commissioner Turner said last night, was putting a color fill on them helps, so I can also do that, and if not, I --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: That would be great -- just so we get a real feel of the whole thing. Thank you.

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

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Since we've got it on all of California, can we see our other work down below, just so that we get the prettiness of it all? Thank you. It's an amazing state.

MS. WILSON: And I didn't zoom in anywhere also, because I know it gets a little crowded down here and up there, so if you want me to zoom in, I can do that as well.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, I think this was really helpful. Thank you, I just -- it's great for all of us to see the whole state like this, because it reminds
us -- I mean, it's such a diverse, big state with
different areas and different densities, so this is
really helpful, thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I was going to say if
there's no more questions, but I see Commissioner
Sadhwani --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, can we just go in
and -- I apologize, I need to find the one on -- posted
to the website -- can we just go in -- back in one more
time and take a closer look at the COIs, what is and is
not being kept together and -- throughout that
Sacramento, Central Valley, sort of, area?

MS. WILSON: Yes, one moment.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you.

MS. WILSON: So -- and I don't have to speak to
this -- if you -- I can, if you want me to -- I don't
know. You tell me what to do.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think -- I'm just trying
to wrap my head on what the change is. So this new
district here is being populated by what was left from
the Modesto and the -- and Fresno; is that right, where
we cut the -- in to make that VRA district?
MS. WILSON: Yes, so Fresno, that portion there, Madera, and the kind of mountainous sides of Madera and Modesto going up with the -- Mariposa, all the way up to Amador being kept together and Modesto not going as far out at Mono and Inyo, but in this area.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it. And then Tracy, Stockdon --

MS. WILSON: And Tracy and Mountain House are kept in San Joaquin County and kept within -- with Stockdon. We also have in Sacramento, Elk Grove and Vineyard together, Fruitridge Pocket, Florin, Pocket, Little Pocket, going -- keeping all the downtown together, we do keep Arden-Arcade and Carmichael together, Foothill Farms, McClellan Park, Natomas, South Natomas.

Going North, we have Roseville -- I mean, all of Placer is actually kept together so it inherently is then Rocklin, Roseville, Lincoln, all of those together. You do keep Tahoe together, Nevada, Sierra together as well.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And then Folsom is in that district with Modesto?

MS. WILSON: No, Folsom --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

MS. WILSON: -- is actually going North, my apologies. So Folsom --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh --
MS. WILSON: -- a piece of Fair Oaks, and Orangevale are going up into Placer.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh, okay. My concern was that Folsom was being connected all the way down to Fresno. Okay, go it. So connected to those COIs, okay, got you.

MS. WILSON: Yes, going North.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you.

MS. WILSON: Not South.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Perfect, thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We've received mixed testimony, kind of, on the far North, coastal, and the far North, the Oregon border. And I just wanted to see -- when you all were looking at these options, did you look or try to see if there was ways -- we've done the coastal so it's always the coastal -- you know, like this in all the maps, though we have received some requests from the Oregon border groups and Trinity to be put together because of forest, and so I just wanted to see -- in our explorations, if we looked at that, and it just got too complicated, just because we've received a lot of -- we never -- yeah, we just left the coastal and you just thought that was perfect, and so I just want to make sure
that we did look at all opportunities in that.

MS. WILSON: So we kind of tried to keep the
population, and not going into Tamina's areas and messing
that up as well, but we do -- we've had iterations where
we did pull in Delmar and we did pull in Trinity, but --
so not in this particular iteration did we look at that,
just because we were trying to keep everything localized
and since this Northern district and the coastal district
weren't spoken about as far as direction goes, we didn't
look at those around, however in previous iterations, we
have had Trinity in -- and we've even tried Delmar in,
but for population and just the Commissions' wishes, they
were put out to the coast.

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

Commissioner Fernandez, did you have something
further at this point? All right.

MS. WILSON: Commissioner Yee has his hand -- I was
just going to kind of transition into the next one.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so what we're going to do --

MS. WILSON: Because we have two iterations, sorry.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We're not yet -- we're not yet ready
for that.

MS. WILSON: Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So thank you.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, before we transition, just want to say again, this is beautiful and amazing. And looking at it, all the choices, and it all seems kind of obvious now, but I mean, I'm remembering all the blood, sweat and tears that went into previous iterations and the further blood, sweat, and tears that got us to this amazing iteration, so just appreciation to everyone who's worked on this in all its different forms, and I'm so happy how this has now come out.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Kennedy, I'm wondering if it would be easy to display the populations by county in this -- in the -- let's call it the foothills district -- and I'm looking particularly for the population in every county that's in that district. So if we've got a piece of Fresno -- I just need the population of the piece of Fresno County that's in the district. I'm just looking to see how the voting strength balances out.

MS. WILSON: So I don't have a label for that, and I can really only put the label --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. WILSON: -- for the county itself, but I can tell you at least for Fresno, again, that was 117,000 people we had to move North. I can definitely highlight
the areas and let you know that way too, if you wanted a specific one.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, but I mean -- just off the top of my head, I'm looking at this and if we took -- I think it's Calaveras and Tuolumne and one more -- basically that would equal the amount of Fresno population, so it's not that Fresno is completely dominating that district, and I would guess the same for Modesto, so it looks to me like the district is fairly well-balanced, and so I'm very happy with that.

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I think Modesto -- if I took correct notes, was 169,594 into the ECA.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, and the foothill counties still have significant weight --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Significant, yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- in this district. I think that's certainly something to recommend this iteration.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, the numbers on that are from yesterday, it's like 310 in Salinas Valley in that chunk of Stanislaus and two -- 117 in Fresno, and so that's 427 out of 760, so it's like 427 -- 427,000 versus 333 in the foothills -- in the Sierra counties. So the
Central Valley is more dominant. It's not -- it's like 5/8ths, something like that, 5-3.

CHAIR KENNEDY: But it's very distinct portions of the Central Valley, it's not just one --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That's correct.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- block --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It's not one block --

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- in the Central Valley.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- in total.

CHAIR KENNEDY: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It's a small --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, and I --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It's a portion of Fresno -- the downtown portion of Fresno and the Modesto, Turlock -- or half of Turlock I think it is, something like that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, I'm looking at this as --

there's a Fresno chunk, there's a foothills chunk, there's a Modesto chunk, and those chunks look to me to be fairly well balanced.

Okay, Commissioner Fernandez, back to you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you, Chair.

And so we built this one -- it's like We Built The City, that song -- I'm almost going to start singing, but that's okay. And we weren't super excited about it, but
it was -- it's doable, correct.

So a couple of things that we felt we needed to bring up was just the length from Inyo to Plumas County, just the mileage -- it's six-hour drive.

And also, if you remember the Communities of Interest information, it was Inyo, Mono, and wanting to go up all the way to Tahoe and Roseville. But if you read the Communities of Interest from Tahoe and Roseville, Tahoe wants to go towards Sacramento because they are -- Tahoe and Truckee are both connected by Interstate 80 and Interstate 50 to Sacramento and then also to the Bay area, and when I refer to the Bay area, I'm referring to the one in only San Francisco Bay area.

And then the other piece of it was -- there is a piece of El Dorado that is being tied to that foothill district and I think that was it. So what -- in terms of Commissioner Yee, blood, sweat, and tears, I think the only tears might have been by Kennedy and that was justified also. Thank you, Kennedy.

And so what we did is we came up with kind of a small iteration, another iteration of what our currently -- our draft maps and what that did was move the lines a little bit around to try to bring in the Tahoe, Truckee area in one district together, and so that's mainly the difference between this iteration and
what our current draft maps are, so this also doesn't
have Inyo going all the way to Plumas, as our draft maps
have. So I believe that's the only difference, but I
will let Kennedy take it away. Thank you.
MS. WILSON: Yes, we pretty much localized the
switcheroo from ECA to PLACER-SAC and so this line here
covering Cameron Park and El Dorado was going out a bit
further into El Dorado County. However, when we took in
Meyers, South Lake Tahoe, and moved them North, we had to
move this line a bit further back, so it just has El
Dorado, Cameron Park, Folsom, Orangevale, up with the
rest of Placer going to Plumas.
And then South, you do have El Dorado, Alpine, Mono,
and Inyo are with Gold Country, but also with Modesto, so
that's -- yeah, it does have the opportunity to be with
Gold Country too, but with Modesto as well. And so yeah,
the main difference was just shifting the lines between
PLACER-SAC and ECA.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Andersen,
your hand was up.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, it was. And thank you,
everyone for this. Those little -- these few changes --
I just want to say, though, everyone seems to think that
it was -- and there's a couple that -- from Inyo, Mono,
Alpine, say -- they just want to go North. They actually
want to be with the Gold Country. It was those -- as a group, going North. Meaning, both sides of the hills. It wasn't -- let's divide one and put them up.

This sort of does that, but it also leaves all the Central Valley -- and what they wanted to be is not be led by the Central Valley. They wanted to be led by someone further North, you know, essentially take their area, and just move in the hills, North. And that isn't in either of them, so it's kind of -- you know, six of one, half a dozen of the other.

I was really also -- the one thing that I was really hoping, in the Congressional, is -- and I'd forgotten about this. Someone called in early -- the floodplain in Sacramento -- and that's a Congressional issue.

Sacramento, the city itself, is supposed to be whole because the floodplain issue, which, you know, that's -- that is a real -- something that the city will have to deal with as the -- as water comes, either nothing or a lot of it.

And I was hoping that we could actually keep Sacramento County in Sacramento and condense the -- so Folsom would not -- would stay in the county and the other areas would actually go up the suburbs, that would stay with their counties, and it would give us a little rearrangement that way.
But this is where we are, and -- you know -- so
anyway, that's -- I've said everything that I can say, so
thank you very much.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Fernandez, did you have anything
further at this point?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, I'm sorry. I forgot
to mention on the other iteration with Inyo, Mono -- you
know, they wanted to dip into Roseville. Roseville --
their Communities of Interest see themselves as going
North not South.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that, Commissioner
Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, same question I ask every
group that does multiple iterations. What -- which one
is -- makes you more proud? You're proud of both, but
which one do you feel -- looking at the big picture of
the whole State of California, would you recommend that
we gravitate towards?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Well --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And why?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I think we're presenting both
because I think either will serve some interest. And in
them, I think Commissioner Fernandez and I, we both
worked closely and held the desires and wishes of Californians in both maps. And I think either will serve.

We both have a personal preference. Personally, I prefer one. I think Commissioner Fernandez sees the value in the other and we're not in disagreement. We either -- can support either of them. At its core that we would be repeating, again, what we've said over and over, it's the COIs, it's the testimony and it's the constraints that we have based on the population, based on -- you know, the requirement to be equally populated and then driven by our VRA districts, and the shape and geography of the state.

So it doesn't make it too much of a mystery. It's where we are, and we do hear and know why everything from water, everything from living circumstances, everything from strength and power and electability; we've weighed all of that in and we have two options for us and nothing more to add. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, could we have a look -- so basically, Sacramento and San (indiscernible) are the same. So the differences are in the Northern
area, right up here and then, you know, as -- Inyo, Mono -- how the Sierra is grouped. 

Could we have a look, please, at the close in at El Dorado and how that breaks down? 

Yeah, so basically this is Folsom and -- what's the next town over? You know, as you're going up the 50, but it's -- 

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: El Dorado. 

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, El Dorado, thank you. 

So those go up with Tahoe, but the bulk of the county is South. 

And then -- could you turn the other one on, please, Kennedy? 

Okay, yeah, and there Folsom still goes with Tahoe, but El Dorado and -- through Placer, I guess it is, goes South and the rest of the county goes North and gets down to Inyo. So those are the differences. So what do we think? 

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen. 

In -- I'm not seeing other hands. I'll take the opportunity to say that -- you know, I would tend to favor number 1, but I could certainly -- I could support number 2. I continue to believe that pairing -- the issue is not so much that Inyo relates to Roseville as it is that Inyo relates to Tahoe and Tahoe relates to
Roseville and this is a very small population in Alpine, Mono, and Inyo and looking for the best way to get representation for them and their interests, in my mind, is to group them with Tahoe, and the fact that Tahoe wants to be grouped with Roseville -- you know, to me, I say put the two together.

So Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I tend to like number 1 better as well. And part of it because we're not carving out just South Lake Tahoe, but we're actually taking the bulk counties. I didn't -- I've said it from the beginning that when we just carve out part of an asset, it's difficult and in this case, you drive -- when you drive up there, you go back and forth between the counties and so I like one.

And I also agree, I think the way that you worded it is great, because people tend to look at the outliers, you know, the two that don't seem to make sense, but there's always those connecting dots that gets you from point A to point B, so thank you for sharing.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you, Chair. I think I would agree with Commissioner Sinay. I seem to favor number 1 and the connecting dots, and I know I've spoken
on the compactness of districts throughout this process.
I believe compactness speaks to access and our ability to
communicate with our seat of government.

However, that's criteria number 5, and I believe
that this more readily puts like communities together, so
I tend to favor number 1, but see the value in number 2.

Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, and I think these are
great maps and I'm torn between all of them. I think
it's actually three options, right? The option that we
had yesterday, that we approved, the Central Valley with
the improved maps. The one and two, and I'm not sure
which one I'm leaning towards, I mean, I'm weighing all
the options. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I -- I like, you know,
door number 3, but given this -- you know, Inyo, Mono,
Alpine, you know, in the winter, the only way they can
actually get North -- you know, all of them close, you
know, 108, 120, 4, and even 89 -- they close in the
winter. And Alpine has -- they have to go 395, into
Reno, and then in. But that is a way, and if -- in the
other area -- in the other one they are cut. So -- you know, which is why, it was the whole idea of getting all of them to go North.

So I think this is a bit better, option 1. What I think would be better -- if you go 50 from Sacramento, you go through, you know, multiple county -- multiple districts and El Dorado, I don't think is going to really like this. It's like, wait, what? And I -- but that's where the population is, so you'd have to take -- you have to really go differently to shape that. You have to -- and I'm sure they probably looked at, you know -- Commissioners looked at this. So this is probably the best. Thank you.

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

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, just to weigh in -- and again, thank you so much to Commissioner Fernandez and Turner for laying out these options for us. I think it's exciting to see, and to see the possibilities, and I think I would agree with Commissioner Taylor and with what else has been said. I mean, I can see the logic behind both options.

I think I'm leaning towards one, I think for all of the pieces, the compactness, and bringing together like communities -- recognizing that there's, of course,
trade-offs, and we've had to deal with the trade-offs all over the state, so I -- these aren't easy decisions, but I think I'm leaning towards one as well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah, thank you. I just want to note for the record that Turlock is split in both of these options, however, I understand the nature of the game, which is compromise and negotiation, so I think I am okay with either, particularly Commissioner Turner's statements really stuck with me, that each map does serve Californians, just might serve them in slightly different ways, so I am okay with either, given the constraints that we had to work with.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much, Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, so we're looking at one right now, correct? This is the one I like for all the reasons stated, but especially Commissioner Kennedy's reasoning about the Eastern Sierra is really in Tahoe, and Tahoe to Roseville. That just makes a lot of sense to me, thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Fernandez?
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And as Commissioner Turner stated, I prefer either our draft or number 2. And the reason for that is just the length from Inyo to Plumas, it is concerning to me. And also, I feel that Iteration 2 does fill other COIs in terms of keeping some of the Northern communities of interest intact.

And just to answer Commissioner Ahmad, in term of Turlock being split, part of it is in the VRA district, so we did not want to touch that, so yeah. We actually looked at it and were thinking about it, and we're like, oh no, wait, we can't touch it, so sorry about that.

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

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I'm just wondering -- is there -- I'm having an issue with this hook down into Fres -- into Folsom and I'm just wondering -- oh sorry, on the other version. And I'm just wondering -- this is -- wait, which one are we on? I'm sorry, yeah, you see both here.

Yeah, I'm just wondering if, you know, Folsom -- I don't know if it's something else in there, I can't tell, but I'm wondering if we could switch some of that, you know, put -- let's have it -- rather than from Tahoe, it
loops around and down -- it actually, you know, could we have a little bit more of El Dorado county with Tahoe and put Folsom in that district?

You know, can we do a little -- can we switch a little bit? Does that make sense? Like, put Folsom -- you know, take Folsom out and put Placer in. I don't know if they -- if you looked at that, it's just -- you know, that is an issue.

Also with Plumas, I know you take Plumas, put it back in the North, and put a little bit more of Yuba in. You could switch that, that's like 20,000 people. So you wouldn't have to be quite that far removed. But those are two separate issues. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Fernandez, on Commissioner Andresen's question?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, we -- I'm sorry, we're laughing because we're trying to figure out how to say con --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Contiguity.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Contiguity. English is my second language.

CHAIR KENNEDY: You wanted to make it congruent?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Contiguity.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I know, but it's -- let me tell you, it's a difficult word. That and entrepreneur, for whatever reasons, were very difficult words for me to say growing up. That has nothing -- so anyway, has nothing to do with this.

But it does, we could not bring Folsom in because of contiguity concerns and again, we wanted to minimize the number of districts that we were impacting, so we didn't look to move Plumas into another district, then that would impact another district.

So we were trying to minimize it to like the three or four districts.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I will agree that I like the inclusion of Tahoe. We heard a lot from the ECA district about tourism actually, and being one of the big kind of drivers for the area, but also just the federal stewardship of lands that are oftentimes managed by the federal government, or at least -- yeah, the federal government is involved, and I think that includes part of Tahoe as well, too.

I guess the one question I would have, and I apologize -- I was working with Jaime on another map, but is there a reason why we have to go all the way up to
Plumas? Is it to just minimize taking away the splits that you were talking about in Sacramento and trying not to break up so many more, I guess, parts?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. The reason we did not -- we kept Plumas because that was in that district that included Roseville and -- so what we did is we moved Inyo, Mono, and Alpine into that district, does that makes -- okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: All right, thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Anything further, Commissioner Akutagawa? Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, just dealing with Plumas, could we just put Plumas in the NORCA and take a little bit more of Yuba to put -- you know, the same amount of people, instead of 20,000, to put that into -- I guess that's now called ECA? That way it wouldn't be -- there's -- I know that Yuba, Sutter, and Butte actually all want to be together, but that would be a big switch.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So Plumas is 19,839. Kennedy, could you show us what taking --

MS. WILSON: So I do have a question. On which --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.
MS. WILSON: -- version would you like me --

CHAIR KENNEDY: On -- from number 1.

MS. WILSON: From this? Okay, so from --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. WILSON: -- Plumas down to -- okay, so I will try that now.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Kennedy, could you then jump over and just go Beale on the West side? I'm sorry, on the East side? Yeah --

MS. WILSON: Taking Beale -- and not this part here?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, you could take that if there's any -- little people in that.

MS. WILSON: There's only -- there's only 711 --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.

MS. WILSON: -- people selected right now. So I don't have to take that part in, if you do not --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, yeah, I -- yeah, that part I'd take, you know, but -- but then start -- then start over at the -- correct, at that side.

CHAIR KENNEDY: While she's doing that, I'll say that -- you know, one of the things that I always do when we're looking at these sorts of things is I pull up my topographical map and -- Plumas, on my topographical map, just looks so much like Sierra; and Yuba does not look like the others, and so when I do the -- which of these
does not look like the others, Yuba does not -- and
particularly Western Yuba does not look like the others
and so I have a hard time.

I mean, in theory I wouldn't have a hard time with
this, but as I say, once I go to my topographical map and
look, it just doesn't seem to make as much sense to me,
but please, Kennedy, continue --

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- exploring and seeing when we get
to the 19,839 to balance Plumas.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Chair, Chair, actually could I say,
the reason why I'm doing this is because people are
saying, you know, why go that far North? I agree. It
is -- Plumas is a Sierra county where Yuba really isn't,
but there's been discussion on this, and so I sort of
wanted the general people -- public to see why it goes
this far North. I actually would prefer just keeping
Plumas.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you for that
clarification.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I -- you know, I had
raised my hand actually to agree with you, Chair. There
had also been a COI that we've heard from about keep
Yuba, Sutter, Butte together. And while we -- this
iteration that we're looking at does generally cut into
some of Yuba, many of these cities right down here next
to Yuba City, which I believe isn't -- Yuba City is in
Sutter County; is that correct? You know, at a minimum,
it keeps them together so I would -- my preference would
be the Plumas one also if we move in this direction.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And I
wouldn't want to move Beale into that other district, I
think that's what we're considering, correct?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. It should stay
where --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- it's at. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that.

MS. WILSON: Also -- I'm sorry, in this exploration,
I think it would kind of require having to split up one
of these cities.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, right, and I -- you know,
again, I think that the relations between Sutter and Yuba
are not just between the counties with the cities closest
to the Sutter County line have the most interest, I would
think, in staying linked with Sutter County, so -- and having heard Commissioner Andersen, I think -- we appreciate the exploration, but I think we're probably good sticking with number 1.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Oh, yes. I was just going to say, this is painful to watch, let's undo it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, it's painful to watch, let's undo it. Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, thank you, Chair for -- this is for the public's view.

This is why Plumas, I think, should be in one -- not this area. And it's -- may seem like a very long district, but that is the way of our state, and this is what the people who live in these areas would like, so that is the reason why it goes this direction.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you. Just real quick, the Yuba testimony, Butte -- all that's fairly compelling, thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much,
Commissioner Taylor.

Okay, my sense is that we have a fair amount of willingness to live with either, but when it comes down to a preference, that the bulk of the preferences are for number 1. So unless there is opposition to going with number 1, I would propose that we go with number 1.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah, thank you, Chair. Just for clarity, can you state the title of the document that is in reference to number 1? Just so that we can all follow along? Is it the document titled "Modest_move" or is it "Tahoe_move"?

MS. WILSON: This one is the Modesto move.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: What we've been referring to as number 1, correct?

MS. WILSON: If number 1 is Modesto move, then yeah, number 2 is Tahoe move.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much for requesting that information, Commissioner Ahmad.

Okay, so we have resolved this matter and I want -- yay, yes, thank you.

Thank you, Kennedy, thank you to the -- Commissioner Turner --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Kennedy.
CHAIR KENNEDY: -- Commissioner Fernandez, good job, everyone.

Ms. Mac Donald, just want to check with you on any other remaining iterations -- outstanding iterations for Congressional maps?

MS. MAC DONALD: Hello, just switching seats here really quickly. We are done with Congress. There is nothing else outstanding. If you are done, we're done.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Did she say that?

CHAIR KENNEDY: All right, thank you so much.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, please don't say that. There's -- there was a couple of things that I noted in COI testimony that I just want to check on. Specifically, one is around Thai Town --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And it's in LA, so -- they want to move -- they are requesting not to be with the other Asian -- you know, like Little Tokyo, Chinatown, and Koreatown. They want to be with East Hollywood because they have a close working relationship. They asked to be swapped into GLEN2BA and out of NELA.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, then I guess we need -- is there anything else in the Central Valley --
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- since we have Kennedy --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No, no.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, so Kennedy, thank you very much. Job well done. And Karin, is Jaime available?

MS. MAC DONALD: Jaime is in transit right now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. MAC DONALD: She just wrapped up with Commissioner Akutagawa and is finalizing a file with your attorneys. So she will be on later on. I would suggest that perhaps we can take this up when Jaime is available and perhaps now move over to Senate, if that pleases the Commission and continue with Kennedy and Tamina.

CHAIR KENNEDY: If you can hold just a moment, I'm going to hear any other remaining items on Commissioner Akutagawa's list and then hear from Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, there was one other thing that I wanted to note. There was a comment about Eagle Rock being split and then with this Thai Town request, it may actually be an even swap to make between the two -- to make Eagle Rock whole and then bring Thai Town into the GLEN2BA, and then the rest of my notes around the COI testimony that I read through are related to the -- mostly Assembly district, and then there was
just a comment about Chapman University being split, but it didn't indicate whether it was Congressional or Assembly, and I haven't had a chance to check that one --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- but I wanted to just say it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And that's in orange, if I'm -- okay. So we'll look at those later, thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you. Just wanted to note that when Jaime is ready, I have some refinements in the Mount Washington area that we were working on. So my -- hopefully, very, very minor, but that's it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, very good. So we can, in fact, move to Senate maps. And as Ms. Mac Donald suggested, we will stay with Kennedy.

And so what do you have for us on the Senate level? Or Kennedy and --

MS. WILSON: And one moment --

MS. MAC DONALD: Hi, yes, should -- just one moment, we are switching computers out.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good, so we'll stand at ease for two minutes.

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: So sorry, with the Congressional maps there was a zero population move -- I forgot to mention, it's the Shell Refinery in Martinez, which apparently we've accidentally split, so moving one line zero population would make it whole.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, any objection to that switch?

Seeing none --

COMMISSIONER YEE: I can just follow up with Tamina.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, thank you. Sorry, I had a second page that I missed. Just a question, I noted in the most current COI testimonies, there was a question about the San Francisco boundaries. It looked like it was all whole but there was comments about using Van Ness as the dividing line and not the freeway.

And then also there was some -- a couple comments around the North coast and Humboldt and requesting that the Karuk and Yurok tribal lands be kept together, which I thought we had already achieved, but I just wanted to lift those up.

CHAIR KENNEDY: In relation to the Karuk and the Yurok, we had -- we've heard various things over the course of time and most recently we had heard that the
Karuk were okay with, and in fact would prefer to have a foot in both districts, and so that's why we went ahead and made that shift yesterday, was to give them that foot in both districts. Thank you for that.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: This is on the Assembly, but I keep putting it on my list and I just don't want to lose it and -- Santa Cruz has been grouped many times, has been split many times in our Assembly and I just was wondering if it would be possible for us to look at it and see if there -- if we can minimize that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: You're talking about Assembly maps?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I believe in the Assembly is when they're split the most, and I know that's -- that was in the past, but it's been -- it's come up several times and I've had it on my notes, and --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- I didn't want to lose it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Unless we finish Senate and BOE, we're not going to be talking about Assembly districts today. That can be discussed during the review over the weekend, but we must finish Senate today and I would very much like to finish Board of Equalization today as well.

So Tamina, you're with us?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, Chair. Kennedy and I are both
here, standing by.

   CHAIR KENNEDY:  Okay, and I understand that you are
   able to speak to and/or go ahead and make that change,
   zero population shift in relation to the Shell Refinery?
   
   MS. RAMOS ALON:  Happy to work with Commissioner Yee
   on that zero pop shift in Congress off-line.

   CHAIR KENNEDY:  Very good, thank you so much.

   Commissioner Andersen?

   COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN:  Tamina, I did give you the
   specifics of that, I sent that over in an email and
   that's exactly the outline that --

   CHAIR KENNEDY:  Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

   MS. RAMOS ALON:  Yes, I have that, Commissioner.

   Thank you.

   CHAIR KENNEDY:  Okay, perfect. So let's now shift
   to the Senate maps.

   Tamina, where would you like to direct our
   attention?

   MS. RAMOS ALON:  Okay, so we'll give you a little
   bit of a review of what we started yesterday and then the
   homework that you sent me home with. Kennedy is here
   because it greatly affects all of the North areas.

   Where we started yesterday is we deconstructed the
   Senate district that had San Benito in it, along with the
   Fresno area.
And so this was the new district which was created.
And that created a negative population in ECA and a positive population in MIDCOAST, which we moved around.
And so my job was to take it around to ECA in this way and Commissioners Yee and Ahmad were nice enough to help me do this and suffer through some of the moves with me.
So I'm going to show you a little bit of what we worked on and a little bit of where the pain points were and where we can use a little assistance in some refinements or some decisions.

So we are starting here in San Jose. One of the things that we did look at, because we did have Gilroy down South with the MIDCOAST was how to balance that 6.5 per Senate and so we looked at balancing it in the South and tried to figure out where it would be to move different pieces on different sides and the decision was made that it was not -- that it would be splitting Communities of Interest and cities and that for this iteration, I should return Gilroy to Santa Clara.

So the Santa Clara district that we have -- Santa Clara-based district is San Jose. This has the majority of San Jose City. As you can see, San Jose is split just in two in this visualization -- in this iteration, and the majority of San Jose South -- all of San Jose South is with the San Martin, Gilroy, and Morgan Hill COI.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Tamina, could you please put up the full statistics, the CVAPs on each district?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, absolutely. One moment, please. Uh-oh.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, I just wanted to mention. So Gilroy, of course has that connection to the South, but this keeps it in its own county, in Santa Clara County so that was one -- another reason for that move. As we look more closely at the San Jose area, what you'll see, to make this only one split in Santa Clara and a good split -- the price was separating Cupertino from Sunnyvale and Santa Clara. So that's probably the biggest cost, but no city splits to do that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: And can I add, Chair?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: This was our homework. We did do some extra credit, which you all will have the opportunity to either reject or revise or, you know, move forward with, with refinements, but we were pretty proud of the assigned homework, keeping together many COIs, recognizing there was some compromise that was needed, but we do see this area as an area that will serve the people of California.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER YEE: In fact -- I can add, in fact this keeps together more COIs than previous iterations.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Tamina, could you just remind the order of what we're seeing on those CVAPs? Is it Latino, Black, Asian, Indigenous, White?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, apologies. It is Latino, Black, Asian, Indigenous, and White.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, and can you go ahead and zoom in a bit on San Jose? Okay.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm still trying to wrap my head around separating Gilroy from -- you know, Salinas Valley and Watsonville and a lot of those communities, and so -- did I hear that the choice was really -- if we did Gilroy then we had to split up above the Sunnyvale and that COI, was that what --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: That was one of the costs? Is that what you said, Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I think the greater difficulty is at the bottom of MIDCOAST and you know, having to split small cities or split the whole Piru COI, you know, there were just no good splits that we could -- and then, you
know, depending on what we did, having to push into LA and reworking things there.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay, so it wasn't that you were trying to keep the COI of Sunnyvale -- sorry, I'm forgetting the term --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Cupertino? No, no.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER YEE: No, no.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay, I just wanted to make sure. Can we just -- can we just look at what the CVAP was with -- with Gilroy in with the MIDCOAST, and what it's -- I know MIDCOAST has changed a lot, and it might not make a difference. But I'm just trying to wrap my head around that and I know you all did a lot of good work and you already looked at it, but I just want to -- to see it one last time.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Just mention that with the -- with the split in San Jose, the airport is with the larger portion of San Jose.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Pair MIDCOAST without Gilroy in it, has an LCVAP of 27.54 percent. With Gilroy being added to MIDCOAST, the LCVAP is at 28.59 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Tamina. Okay, if she can enter the map again a bit on San Jose? Okay, thank you.
Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I think I would make -- I'm still trying to wrap my head around Gilroy, too and I think it would make more sense to go with the MIDCOAST district. Is it -- I mean, it is a part of the Salinas Valley; am I correct in thinking about it that way?

I'm also noticing with the SSACSTANIS, it looks like it's overpopulated at 6.8 percent, so that's going to need to come down. Could we look upwards a little bit? I'm just wondering if there's a small amount of population -- it looked like the possibility of moving Gilroy in would put us -- the deviations over slightly. I'm just wondering if there's a small amount of population anywhere that could be shifted?

Which might mean coming through EDENETECH, and I think that that would be reasonable in order to put Gilroy back together. But if someone can confirm that COI, of Gilroy being part of Salinas Valley and wanting to stay together would be helpful.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: The whole SSACSTANIS overpopulation, that's actually part of our larger -- that's part of our extra credit homework presentation. We certainly could look to that, to replace Gilroy
population in San Jose. I think -- you know, if we're going to contemplate Gilroy -- moving Gilroy, we should really look at the bottom of the MIDCOAST and decide what cut we can make there, because that's the challenge.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Let's --

COMMISSIONER YEE: If you can't make the cut there, you can't do it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, let's go ahead and move to the Southern part of MIDCOAST, and Commissioner Yee, Commissioner Ahmad, or Tamina, you can walk us through what was explored, what came closest, those sorts of things, what choices you were presented with.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah, so I can start and then Commissioner Yee or Tamina, please feel free to jump in. We did explore moving all of that unincorporated area -- I believe that we did that in open session at one point -- into -- out of MIDCOAST in exchange for Gilroy, and then we also took a closer look at Rio Grande area, Pismo Beach area in exchange for Gilroy moving into MIDCOAST. We would have to move some of that population down to SLO.

So it would most likely have required a cut into -- I believe it's Rio Grande, and then that population would then have to shift down South, beyond SCOAST into -- what is the next name here? This -- Salinas, Moorpark, Santa
Rosa Valley area, and that's where we kind of paused --
Camarillo area -- we kind of paused because we thought
that was above our pay grade, to go further down and make
those ripple effects down into the South in SoCal area.
So we paused there, we weren't sure if, you know,
making a cut in the Pismo Beach area was going to be
acceptable by the Commission. There is COI testimony to
keep that area together and there's COI testimony
speaking to that whole area from Los Osos down being
closer to Santa Barbara area and -- but, at the same time
we just weren't sure where that split would occur --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: -- in that area.
Commissioner Yee, am I missing anything else that we
explored?
COMMISSIONER YEE: No, that was it.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I guess my question in this
is, in relation to Santa Paula, Piru, Fillmore, et
cetera, my recollection is that they were wanting to not
be grouped with Camarillo.
So in my mind, moving Camarillo into that Eastern
Ventura County district was something that I was
certainly willing to consider. You know, realizing that
we would need to bring Jaime in on this and understand
the broader implications of moving Camarillo into that
district. But that was certainly something that I was willing to consider if it got us Gilroy in the MIDCOAST district.

Commissioner Turner, and then Commissioner Akutagawa, Commissioner Fernandez, Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. Very helpful conversation, thank you Commissioner Ahmad and Yee.

What I raised my hand, basically -- for the work that they've done. I understand Gilroy and us needing to get that piece figure out, but it does cause ripple and I just really wanted to see the whole of the work that they did as it currently stands and understand their reasoning and rationale so that as we're making decision in one area, we know why it cost us in -- well, where the trade-offs were in other areas, and be able to understand it going in. So I just wanted to see the whole of their work.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. And yes -- and that's part of why we wanted to come down and see the Southern end as well and hear what went into this, as far as exploration and considerations that came in when looking at the Southern part of MIDCOAST, but we can certainly pull back out some and look at the bigger picture as well.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair.
Particularly before we start making changes to it.

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

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I'm just curious. I
guess I didn't quite hear this, but why do we have to
look down below, why isn't it -- as I think you was --
someone had mentioned, you know, looking more towards
pulling from the North -- or pushing out into the North?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: It's theoretically possible. I
mean, it would just be a much longer reach, I think. And
you know -- I don't know -- it just didn't -- at the time
we were working through it, it did not seem like there
were any obvious ways of doing that and --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.
Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah, and I had that initial
thought too, Commissioner Akutagawa, 'cause it makes
sense there's a dense population in that area, so let's
just move up. But before -- the iteration that you're
seeing right now on the screen, it shows EDENTECH in the
positive whereas when we started working with this area,
it was in the negative. So we started pushing population
up already.
And so then this is when it gets kind of interesting that SSACSTANIS district shape and the population that was over there being pulled into ECA and then us having to try to rebalance that area on the inside, just -- it just seemed like it was going to be a lot more population that would have to move all the way up and around to rebalance that area up North. But if there's another solution, we're all ears.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Akutagawa, correct me if I'm wrong. My sense is that your question really centers on a potential split in Santa Cruz County and moving some of that population North to PENINSULA in order to accommodate moving Gilroy.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, or even -- I guess swapping out -- well not so much swapping out, but yeah --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Or --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- moving up that way and then moving across through EDENTECH if needed, or -- I guess maybe even if it's a little bit here, a little there we minimize the splits down South or something like that? I just -- you know, I'm sure you explored all different kinds of things. I was just curious as to -- it just sounded like the North was never an option, so I
was just curious. But thank you for that explanation.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Commissioners Ahmad and Yee. This is great. And so if I understand it correctly, so the SSACSTANIS, we would only need to move out about 1.5 percent, right, into ECA, am I reading that correct? Or into SACRAMENTO, I guess?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So it doesn't seem as daunting as I -- I mean, I thought it was going to be a lot worse, but -- so that's not -- that's doable, definitely.

And then the Gilroy -- yes, it would be nice to keep them in. Also, I would probably lean more towards what Commissioner Akutagawa is saying, because once you get down to San Luis Obispo and to those communities down there -- they -- there are small communities, but they are attached to each other. Does that make sense?

And to some of the major -- and I would really not want to split that up, because we're already splitting up San Luis Obispo, so I would prefer to look to the North if needed.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.
My sense, as I expressed yesterday, was that there was some potential moves in the Pismo Beach area because of the five cities, we have three on one side and two on the other and so there is some scope, potentially, for moving there. But we would need to bring Jaime into the discussion to really have a good understanding of what our options are in the South.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, Chair. I don't believe this is posted on our website. I'm just wondering if we can get it posted.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that. Ms. Mac Donald, I don't know whether you can liaise with staff and make sure that we have the latest on the website?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes, will do. We're looking into this right now. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much. We've got about fifteen minutes, fourteen minutes before break. I'm thinking that at this point, we are probably best as far as the Gilroy question, asking Tamina and perhaps Commissioners Yee and Ahmad if they could go back and perhaps take another look at this, bringing Jaime in and exploring options beyond the bounds that they were exploring within last night.

Let me -- Commissioner Sadhwani, do you have
something further? Thank you. Let me go ahead and ask Commissioners Ahmad and Yee to walk us through their extra credit work.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Fine, I would be happy to do that with Gilroy, take another look.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Chair, did we get a full explanation of what is here in this one, what the -- like Commissioner Turner said, could we look at the whole picture before we -- I think we sort of stopped at Gilroy and didn't quite really go through everything.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, Commissioner Yee, if you could cover --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, let's take a look --

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- any remaining points as well.

COMMISSIONER YEE: No, that was all for the San Jose area. Well, I mean, we can take a closer look. You can see that, you know, Cupertino is separated from Sunnyvale, Santa Clara. And then we have that split in San Jose, taking in the airport.

So for the extra credit -- Tamina, maybe you're actually better to describe. I think we -- maybe even starting at ECA is where we started and our logic for where we moved on from there.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Sure, Commissioner. So this was tricky, I'll warn everybody in advance that we -- so the
goal was, we had an overpopulation coming out of San Jose that was ending in EDENTECH. An underpopulation in ECA, and the question was how to get population from this side over to this side without interfering with the VRA district.

So we looked at a couple of options. One option would be to go up this corridor and then come down, back this way. As you'll see the Eastern part of Contra Costa is in the NAPABYRON district, so we did not go all the way up to NAPABYRON, but we tried to localize it within the Contra Costa, Alameda area. So the EDENTECH now has Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Milpitas, the Berryessa area and North area of San Jose. Freemont is whole, there's Newark, Union City, and Hayward that are whole.

And then we run into the 91,000 people in San Leandro and the accompanying Eden areas over here and wanting to keep them together. However, we could either push them up into SD80 Corridor, which would then require us splitting the Pinole, Hercules, Richmond area. Or they could come in with the rest of mid Contra Costa in the 680 corridor. So that's where they are in this visualization.

So Eden joins the tri cities and the tri valley in COCO. Coming from ECA -- let me zoom out a little bit -- we balance this side and so came into this part of
Stanislaus County and took Modesto and -- up to Ripon and then down South to Cressey, Ballico, Delhi, Hilmar. Which created an interesting district kind of in the middle between these two, which is SSACSTANIS.

So SSACSTANIS has San Joaquin County up to the border and then comes down into Alameda County and has these areas of the tri -- sorry, the tri city in Alameda County -- not the tri valley, just the tri city that is over here. So coming through Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore, Sunol.

We did explore areas of Sacramento and moving some things around up here in order to get here, so ECA really when we were balancing, kind of came up around through NORCA, PLACER-ED and SACRAMENTO. So we have Elk Grove, Vineyard, and Sacramento proper in SACRAMENTO and then to the East, Elverta, Arden-Arcade to the East going with PLACER-ED -- again, ending at that county line.

And that's what brought us down to SSACSTANIS. So SSACSTANIS currently has those two areas and it also has Western Stanislaus County, Patterson, Diablo Grande, Crows Landing and Newman.

As you can see, it is not completely balanced. We have -- 6.18 percent is our deviation for SSACSTANIS and that can be resolved in any number of ways, but there was no easy way to resolve it that we saw and wanted to kind
of get some feedback on this new architecture, because it
is very different than what we looked at before and other
ideas that the Commission had. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Tamina. Very good work.

Thoughts on where this excess population should go?

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I believe we're about eight
minutes before break. Could we have a look -- you know,
back, sort of out and see the whole North area?

And I know Commissioner Fornaciari is not here. He
has a lot to say about the tri valley and what has
happened now. Well, not quite that far -- okay, will
this get -- so we can have a look at this, is there a way
to have a look at this over our fifteen-minute break, to
really kind of have a --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sure, we can do that. Thank you,

Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Sinay, your hand was up a moment ago?

Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, excuse me. Tamina,
could you go into the border of -- what is it, Sacramento
and San Joaquin please? Thank you.

And just for clarity, Tamina, I think, just for
Sacramento, I think this is the first time Sacramento's
actually whole, right? The city of Sacramento, I believe, is whole.

MS. ALON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, okay.

MS. ALON: The city of Sacramento is whole.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. And if you can go back down, I was just going to make recommendations on how to move population --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Please

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- if that's okay. If you can take Thornton and you can -- oh, wait. Oh, it's a PLACER-ED. Oh, that's fine. That could go into the PLACER-ED, I believe. It's not very big; I think it's maybe two people bigger than my town. So it's about 1,000, I think, right? So that's not going to get us very far. But we could also look at Collierville. I think Dogtown would be too much.

MS. ALON: So --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Can you get -- can you get the space in between the -- from there to Thornton? I -- You'll probably get like three more people maybe. All the way to the -- okay. How many is that?

CHAIR KENNEDY: 3,386.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: All right. Might have to get Dogtown then, because there's no way. Yeah, there
you go. Take it all the way to the county. Thank you, Tamina. And that other side too. Thank you. I appreciate that. Getting close. Okay.

Another option if you move down -- oops. And if you zoom in into where that San Joaquin -- yeah, San Joaquin and Stanislaus corner, another option could potentially be maybe Escalon. I'm not sure. Escalon to go into ECA.

I'm looking at Commissioner Turner because she knows that area. It's right there. How much is that one? Oh, that would do it. Okay.

MS. ALON: That would do it. I assigned it to PLACER-ED for this second so we can see the population, but I'm happy to move them separately as requested.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you for exploring that.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. Well, actually, maybe making -- if you make Stanislaus whole -- you might be able to make Stanislaus whole. That might do it.

Okay. That's another option too, is making Stanislaus whole.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, that was my first reaction, if we start by making Stanislaus whole and then go from there. But I just got back. I need a little
more time to kind of stew on this. So it's going to be
posted so we can take a look?

MS. ALON: It should be in the (indiscernible) right
now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I understand that it is posted.
There aren't PDFs, but the shape files are posted. Okay.
So yeah. As colleagues have said, making Stanislaus
whole would also resolve the overpopulation. Okay.

And Commissioner Fornaciari, did you -- okay, thank
you.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Could we possibly get a PNG
posted so we can actually go in and look at the whole
thing? A shape file -- unless we can download it. I
guess we can --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: It's --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- we can download that into
the viewer; is that correct (indiscernible)?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Can I share that this iteration
is actually posted on the map viewer --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: -- so you can zoom in there
now.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you. And we will leave
things here and go ahead and go on break until 11:15.

Colleagues can peruse the map viewer, public can peruse
the map viewer, and we will resume our discussion on this
at the end of break. So we are on break until 11:15.

Thank you, everyone.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 10:58 a.m.
until 11:14 a.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you everyone for your patience
during our break. Welcome back to today's meeting of the
California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We have
been working for the last hour maybe, looking at an
iteration where we were looking at how to move some
excess population from the MIDCOAST district to ECA. And
we are now looking at the excess population in South
SSAC-STANIS and the best move or moves to resolve that
population imbalance.

So Kennedy, please take it away.

MS. WILSON: So me and Tamina, we're both here, can
go back and forth, but since we started moving into
Central Valley, I thought I would just take over some of
that as well, if that is okay with everyone.

A recommendation that we had over break was just
moving the entirety of Stanislaus into ECA, which would
bring the deviation of ECA to a 4.39 and SSAC-STANIS to a
1.65. So it puts both at an acceptable deviation range.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thoughts on that from colleagues?

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I like that in that it keeps the entire county together. That would probably be my preference over trying to dig into different corners of the SSAC-STANIS district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Could we zoom in a bit, Kennedy, into that area? Are we -- did you say that we were -- so we are taking a small slice of San Joaquin County? Do we need that small slice of San Joaquin County? Does that make sense to have that small slice of San Joaquin County, or do we just want this to be along the Stanislaus-San Joaquin line?

MS. WILSON: I think --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead.

MS. WILSON: I was just going to say previously, I wasn't there with Commissioner Yee and Ahmad, so obviously I don't know exactly what they were thinking, but I think these were similar to the lines we had before, and the thought of putting Stanislaus, all of Stanislaus, in wasn't really on the table. So if we move that in, then we can possibly even that out if that's the wish of the Commission.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Kennedy.
Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I think Commissioner Yee might be talking about the reasons why he was doing this, in which case, I'll have him go first.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Actually no, I think putting that piece back in San Joaquin would be fine. Actually there was a pre-step to all of this when we were -- started working on this last night. The state of things at that point had several of these counties split, and we made several of them whole. So making another one whole would continue that good work.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, okay. There are a couple of things which are certainly not whole. And I understand we've had a huge amount of work to do on this. Moving, what, 300,000 people? But the public really will have no time to look at this essentially, and I want us to make changes as little as possible and as palpable as possible.

And what I'm specifically talking about -- I kind of like the idea of putting Stanislaus County whole. I do not like it with ECA. I mean, that's just, like, why even call it ECA? It's Stanislaus County, so Central
Valley County area.

And also, Tri-Valley has been -- it doesn't exist anymore. It's completely split. There are a lot of things which are -- it was all together, and now it isn't. Are you kidding me? That's what I'm thinking the public is going to say.

And I'm just wondering if there's any way of doing a few different things in trying to keep -- trying to keep the map as sort of close to what it was. And still -- I kind of -- I like the idea of putting Stanislaus with San Joaquin, that sort of thing and trying to go -- going a few little things, areas up North to rearrange this.

But I know Commissioner Yee has been working on this, and I'd like him to talk a bit more how when the San Leandro into COCO and then COCO became all cut in half. I'd like to kind of walk through that a little bit and what was going on in that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, thank you for that, Commissioner Andersen. Actually last night, we did not move San Leandro in. That was the state of things that we inherited, and that -- actually, that was the last problem we did not get to try to fix.

So the three main problems that we are not able to
fix: San Leandro with COCO -- San Leandro, Castro Valley, that whole area with COCO, the Tri-Valley split, and just this kind of T-district (ph.) -- ugly T-district we kept calling it last night, including the part that's shaded right now that just has so many different things going on that don't really seem to make sense. Those were the three problems we did not get to fix last night.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Fernandez?

Kennedy?

MS. WILSON: I just also wanted to do -- as we do this exploration, just like -- I know everyone knows, but just a quick reminder that a lot of big changes are happening to a lot of these districts too, because 300,000 people had to be moved back into San -- into this MIDCOAST district. So as we are just moving, a lot of big changes are happening because we had to make a really big change in the Central Valley for that district, so moving in for Merced. So just wanted to put that out there as well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Kennedy.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you, Chair. And I -- that's what I was going to say, Kennedy.

Commissioner Turner and I just got through trying to
move 300,000. Regardless if you go North or if you go East, the communities are going to be split up from what we currently have because that's a huge pot of population to move around. And we've talked about this in the past, the Tri-Valley, is it kept whole in some of the other districts? And I believe it is.

Commissioner, you could probably correct me on this. So we've done share the pain, and if you don't get it in this map, you might get it in the -- hopefully will get it in the next map. So it's huge, huge population. It's going to -- it's a huge -- it's not even -- it's not a ripple, it's a -- I don't even know what you call it, tsunami or something? It's huge.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez. Kennedy, did you have anything further? Okay.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right, just to note, I mean, today's -- this morning's what I consider miracle map on the Congressional districts, to move Modesto out and all that. We'd love to do that here. But yeah, when we're talking about Senate districts, which is our -- which are our largest districts. So if we had Stanislaus with San Joaquin, then ECA would eat up, more than the entire North of the state, I think. So I would like to think that that's possible, but I don't envision that that
would be an exploration that would lead us to anything
we'd be happy with.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay. Thank you,
Commissioner, Yee.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, thank you so much for
the work that was done on this. I would like to see
Stanislaus whole. I thought that was brilliant,
including San Joaquin, that portion.

But Kennedy, remind me. San Joaquin, that goes down
how far? That line straight down that we currently have,
that's not the county line, is it?

MS. WILSON: This one here following Valley Home,
that is the county line.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: That's the -- oh. So we
took -- Oh, I have in my mind, the map where we went out
of the county line (indiscernible).

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay, great. So yeah, so
those are whole. I think if there was a way to go back
and address the San Leandro portion, I love what you all
did in Sacramento. I love these counties whole. That
ECA is just going to be bizarre for everyone always, but
again, same difference from the Congressional, we know
the why's.
And it would be interesting to see how much of North if we keep those -- what that looks like exactly, to be able to keep these counties in the Central Valley in the Central Valley. Again numbers, population is going to, I think, dominate anything that we would desire. So we're going to either be real comfortable with a real long, large block for population, or it will look like you've designed. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, the -- if we do this, the Senate was the only map where the Tri-Valley were going to be kept together, and now they're not. And the ECA has never had what it wanted, so -- in any of the maps, and I think there is a possibility here.

And I really, really would like to keep Stanislaus in the Central Valley. It being whole is a great idea. It's clearly a Central Valley county, and I'm just wondering if there's a way -- and it might do some rearranging, but there is population in those, if we look further North, in the suburbs of Sacramento, which are El Dorado County and Placer County, which could help balance this, wouldn't have to take the entire North.

There would be some rearranging required, absolutely, but I'd still like to figure out how we could
do an attempt to get the Tri-Valley back together.

Because as I said, it really is an engine-driver of the entire -- that huge amount of anything over in the East Bay, and it's never been put together. So it's always been the pain. It's never been shared. So I'd like to --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'd like us to work on that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Yee, can you speak to efforts made or any explorations related to that?

COMMISSIONER YEE: To ECA going further North?

CHAIR KENNEDY: No, to keeping the Tri-Valley whole.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Oh, we did not work on that last night. That was clearly desirable. We wanted to work on it, but we just never got that far.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER YEE: By the time, it was too late.

For the ECA, I mean, this morning's Congressional district, you have to -- you would have to have that plus another 300,000 people, right? So it just seems extraordinarily large number of people to add further into ECA. Where would you even go? The suburbs of Sacramento? Sure, but I mean it has to be that much bigger than even the Congressional district that some
thought was too big already this morning.

    CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, I mean, Kennedy, can you just
    give us a population figure for the portion of Stanislaus
    that is already in ECA, as well as that portion of Merced
    that's in ECA? If we were to draw a line there at the
    Stanislaus-Calaveras-Tuolumne line and the Merced-
    Mariposa line, how many people are we talking about?
    
    MS. WILSON: Yes, one moment.
    
    CHAIR KENNEDY: In the meantime, Commissioner
    Fernandez?
    
    COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, we just got finished
    tearing up the Northern part of Sacramento and the
    Roseville area in Congressional. I'd like to be able to
    keep them whole, for once, in this map. Thanks.
    
    CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, and it might even be possible
    to more closely approximate our Congressional lines in
    some new iteration of this. So over half a million
    people -- that seems rather herculean at this point.
    
    Okay. Then Commissioner Andersen, let me come back
    to you. And let's focus the map on -- or let's center
    the map on the Tri-Valley. And Commissioner Andersen, if
    you could talk us through any ideas that you have for
    resolving the issue that you've pointed out.
    
    COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, the Tri-Valley was all
    together. And so it would be a sort of a switch for a
switch, essentially. We've added, what, 90,000 I think it is now from -- or more, from the San Leandro over.

So actually, a fix that I think might work would be taking part of -- you know how we -- in all of the other attempts, we've tried to take part of the Northern portion of Contra Costa County and add it to -- with Vallejo. And that would require then though -- a portion of that which would just probably be Yolo coming out of the NAPABYRON. And that's never been -- a thought that's sort of never been allowed.

But something like that to make the room to handle the San Leandro having to come over to keep that county -- to keep that whole, essentially. And that would require then a -- that would -- population would go up into the North which would give you a bit more, but you'd have to add the Stanislaus to San Joaquin. Part of San Joaquin would have to be -- essentially, the Sacramento would have to come down, which it would if it gave up the El Dorado County.

And right now, that PLACER-ED, it just have -- that would be divided at the county line up there to gain more of San Joaquin to allow San Joaquin and Stanislaus to join together. And then that -- in some fashion, that might work out.

Because if you trade -- essentially, the lines would
be coming -- on the West side of this, around Sacramento, would come down a little bit. And like, essentially, we'd grab part of the Northern Contra Costa, and then that would require the Yolo line to come down. The NAPABYRON and the Stanislaus would go into the San Joaquin. You'd draw the line at Alameda County. And part of the San Joaquin would go over to PLACER-ED, and that Placer line would then come down to accommodate that. And then up North, you see where it naturally would break to create that district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Karin, do you have any reaction to this as far as feasibility and time required to do something like this?

MS. WILSON: It will definitely take time to do it. I think that the question is -- I understand the basic rotation, which is to take San Leandro up along the corridor, up through NAPABYRON --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No. No. No, no, no. It's to take --

MS. WILSON: Okay. Maybe I don't.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. It would be to drop the line at the Alameda, San Joaquin and create -- COCO would be that entire district. And then you'd take --

MS. WILSON: And (indiscernible) go where?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Leave that where it is.
Leave that where it is.

MS. WILSON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And then you'd take part of the Contra Costa -- oh, I see, I see. Yeah, you could take enough of San Leandro to allow -- actually, you can probably put San Leandro -- almost, most of San Leandro back in, and that would give you everything in Contra Costa to play with. You could take all of the -- between the Albany and El Cerrito line and go across, essentially grabbing, that Martinez to Antioch. Have that go North.

Well, sorry. The NAPABYRON line would come South to put that in however -- the people. And then you would be dropping the NAPABYRON line at Yolo down, again, South to accommodate that people going North. Essentially, we'd be shifting -- NAPABYRON would shift downward.

And then in over at San Joaquin, Stanislaus would be whole. That area would go with San Joaquin, so the PLACER-ED line would be coming South, and its Northern line would come down to the Sacramento County border. So then that whole area would be at the top, and you would be going to -- the ECA would now -- its line would be at the Mariposa-Tuolumne-Calaveras border, and it would be going up and probably grabbing -- as Yolo shifted, Yolo shifted in, that would be going up, so that rotation would go like that. Does that make sense? Is that clear.
in terms of the rotation?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. Hello, Chair Kennedy, if I may answer the question that you had earlier for me before the description from Commissioner Andersen. We think that this is a pretty major affair, and probably we should do this live if you want to explore it because, A, this is going to require both of the mappers being here. There's going to be a pretty significant ripple effect that would probably require the entire Commission to take a look at, unless you perhaps don't want to get done with Senate today.

We're just concerned that if we do this offline and then come back, it may just -- it may take quite some time to do it offline, and then it may not fit in the rest of the big picture. So we think it might make sense, if you wanted to explore that, to perhaps do some work here live and then see where it goes, if that makes sense. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Thank you. And that was the kind of answer that I was looking for on this, as an estimate of time and the best way forward.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, I'm trying to formulate an alternative approach which might be shifting the far-Eastern Contra Costa cities into San Joaquin,
moving the rest of Stanislaus -- putting Stanislaus whole. And I'm thinking about shifting the Tri-Valley up into COCO, but COCO would still need to shed some population somehow. And maybe it could shed San Leandro into the SD80 corridor. And maybe some of the Castro Valley either into the SD80 corridor or EDENTECH.

So that would, I think, be a kind of a simpler swap if that would work. I have a feeling the population of those East Contra Costa cities is 100-and-something thousand, and the Tri-Valley -- Livermore, Pleasanton, Dublin is about 250, 240.

I mean, that might be a simpler rotation. And based on just the numbers that we have in the East Bay there, we might be able to do it without going North into Solano, Yolo, and around that way.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Tamina, could you give us a total of the population in that East Contra Costa area that's currently in NAPABYRON?

MS. WILSON: Yes, Chair. And if I may ask clarification, it's to take this East County area out of NAPABRYON, so it would be a -- it would be a three-district swap; is that right?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari?
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I would -- yeah, I'd like to see what it -- first of all, if we took it out of NAPABYRON, NAPABYRON still be within --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Deviation?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- deviation? But obviously -- and I'm talking about putting it with Stockton.

MS. ALON: Chair, the population of this area is 130,985 people. NAPABRYON becomes underpopulated by 8.53 percent. COCO would be overpopulated by 14.87 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Tamina.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, it was actually -- I was talking about moving that into Stockton. And then moving --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, but NAPABYRON would still be underpopulated by eight and a half percent.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: No, it would be underpopulated by three and a half percent, but we could probably fix that. I mean, we'd have to swap some out of COCO North if there is an interest in doing that. I mean, no matter what we do to make the Tri-Valley whole, we're going to have to move North a bit -- some North a bit. But I was just trying to not move the whole, 250,000 people North. I was trying to minimize how much
we'd have to move North.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I was -- we sort of did some of this when we first put the Senate district together. I really feel trying to do this live is going to take a great deal of time, and I would propose that Commissioner Fornaciari and I, to try to work together, even if it's not necessarily with the line drawer, just try to come up with some ideas that might fly and try to present this. Because attempting this live, I just don't think we have the time to do it, quite frankly.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I guess, on the contrary -- I think, in agreement with Karin, I think we have to do this live if we're going to do it. It touches too many areas. And if Commissioner Andersen or Fornaciari or whoever, or me, it doesn't matter. If someone takes their time offline to go through this massive amount of change and bring it back, we're going to spend that same time asking a thousand questions and wanting to shift it, the work that was done. So I don't think -- I don't see it at all as a time-savings for this large of a shift to take it offline because we're still
going to debate it when it gets back here.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes, I agree with what Commissioner Turner just stated and Karin's recommendation if we are to move in this direction.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I think we should kind of have a discussion of (indiscernible) that we're going to hear, and it sort of doesn't really matter if we attempt this or not. I think we should sort of do a discussion rather than kind of spending time, spending time going into it if we know that we're really not going to pursue this. And that's why I was thinking we might come up with a couple of options, or we might find you just can't do it. And that's why I was saying that could be done offline without wasting everyone's time.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, I would like to see Commissioner Fornaciari play out his limited geography option live, I think, for all the reasons that have been stated.

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

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Can we restate the purpose? What are we trying to accomplish -- our goal one more time, please?

CHAIR KENNEDY: The goal that we're looking at right now is making the Tri-Valley whole.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Just so that the public knows, which cities encompass the Tri-Valley? Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: There are five cities in the Tri-Valley: Livermore, Pleasanton, Dublin, San Ramon, and Danville, and then some little bit of unincorporated areas around them.


Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, the goal here is -- this is Friday, and we were hoping to vote and have these final on Monday. And these are radical changes, and I'm concerned that the public will not have time to -- these sat for a long time like this, and the public's looked at it. And we're doing completely different changes with little time to make any -- to get any public input on it.
That's why I'm trying to minimize these -- the changes and keep as many of these areas together as the public has been used to seeing.

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

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, I'm agreeing with Commissioner Andersen, but I mean, once we had to redo San Benito, these changes are forced upon us. So not ideal in our short timeframe, but I don't think we really have a choice.

The goals, yeah, unite the Tri-City. We have to move population out of SSAC-STANIS, right? It's overpopulated right now. Also, trying to get San Leandro and surrounds into a better configuration.

Also, by the way, just to clarify. Tri-City refers to Fremont, Union City, Newark. Tri-Valley is the area that Commissioner Fornaciari mentioned.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee. Let's also pull the map back and recall that this all started with reconfiguring San Benito County, Monterey County, et cetera. And I just wanted to take a moment and ask Mr. Becker, are we right to be proceeding in this manner? Are we causing ourselves more problems than not by proceeding in this, or should we be going back to a different focus on this?
MR. BECKER: Just so I'm clear on the question, are we predominantly asking whether the VRA areas that we've identified are adequately covered and you can draw lines around those areas as you like, which is, I think, one set of questions. There's a broader set. I mean obviously, you have the right to consider all the criteria as they apply and change the maps until they're final, et cetera. That's a separate process question, so I just want to be clear on -- and given that the equal population deviations are within the safe harbor.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. No, it was more the first part.

MR. BECKER: Can I -- in that case, I'm not sure who's controlling the map, so my apologies, but can I see the complete CVAP? And zoom in on, I believe, SBFRESNO (sic) and the lower Central Valley districts, please.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I'd also like to see what the current map looks like, because it's my understanding that currently, San Benito is in a VRA district with Merced and parts of Fresno County. And I mean, I think the challenge has been that each one of our VRA districts has a million people and that we can't put all of that population into one area. But I would like to compare what's currently in existence to what we're
moving to, given that this is a VRA area, an area with VRA considerations.

MR. BECKER: Okay. Can you scroll South just a little bit so I can see the KINGS-KERN District? Yeah, so we've looked at this -- I don't know if this has changed from before, but it's pretty -- what's the number, the small number off to the side? The .553133, is that the previous --

MS. WILSON: Yes, that is the Latino CVAP of the previous, the ones with the blue lines.

MR. BECKER: So KINGS-KERN is a modest difference. It doesn't make a difference. I'm not quite sure that the -- I think there are some concerns with reducing SBENFRESNO over two percentage points. Something to consider. So I think that's on the lower edge that probably needs to be considered.

What we have seen in this area is that there are roughly four Assembly districts that include areas where Latinos are protected under the Voting Rights Act and where districts can be drawn that would protect those rights. The two Senate districts would seem to be appropriate, given that there are four Assembly districts.

I think it's extremely unlikely, if not absolutely impossible, to draw a third where Latinos would be able
to elect candidates of their choice. There's a relatively small population of San Benito that we've been able to include in districts that were over fifty percent, but I think it's unlikely. In fact, I'm about a hundred percent sure, given the percentages we've seen in the Congressional districts, which are smaller, that it's unlikely that we can draw a third fifty-percent district anywhere there.

So I think, with the caveat that I would probably caution against the reduction we've seen here, and would try to mitigate it in SBENFRESNO, the current architecture is close, if not there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Becker.

Any questions? Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I don't know what to do with that. I don't know that I walked away -- Chair, can you restate what we just heard?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Mr. Becker, can you restate what we just heard?

MR. BECKER: I think you have a previous architecture that had a fifty-five percent Latino CVAP in SBENFRESNO. You've reduced it by over two percent. VRA considerations predominate over everything except equal population, so I think there needs to be a really good justification there. And it's something I think is of --
increases risk to some degree.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner (sic).

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I just wanted to look at what the current district for this area is, because it's my understanding that San Benito is currently in a VRA district with -- and it looks like it's a portion, a little piece of --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Monterey.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- a little piece of Monterey and then into the Fresno area, potentially maybe even a little bit of Merced. But it's hard for me to tell on this map.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Sorry. I'm sorry. Do you mean the current today district?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No, I mean the --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Like, the district that's in place today, or --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- maps that are currently in existence today that are -- the districts that are currently in existence today, rather than the maps that we've been considering.

MR. BECKER: And Chair, if I --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And there we go.
MR. BECKER: Yeah, this is helpful.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Because when we look at where the map is right now today, like right now, San Benito is in a VRA district, and it's protected in a VRA district with Merced, Fresno, and portions of Stanislaus and Madera.

And I mean, my question to you, Mr. Becker, is by taking out of the VR-protected area, reducing potentially some CVAPs, because it's such a heavy Latino area, does that increase our risk?

MR. BECKER: Thank you. This is actually a very good illustration, and the answer is yes, it increases your risk. It's a relatively small population of San Benito, but that San Benito population has been a covered area and included in districts in other maps and in previous maps, meaning existing maps that were in existence before this redistricting cycle. The main concern was whether or not the Latino communities in Merced and even into Stanislaus which are also covered were included, but this map does that well. And it has a -- it protects it somewhat better, because it has a higher Latino CVAP.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, thank you, Chair. I'm
confused, because did we not have this discussion yesterday, and was not the choice that when we got to this end of the Valley in the VRA districts, that this Northern-most one had to choose whether to go into Merced or to go into San Benito, but could not do both, based on the districts that we had drawn up to that point in the Valley. And then we looked at population concentrations and numbers and so forth and opted to go the Merced route, which is how San Benito ended up in the MIDCOAST district. Was that not yesterday's discussion and choice?

MR. BECKER: And I'll tell you, I thought that was too, but I'm looking at a map right now. And I don't know if this is the right map, but I'm looking at a map that includes San Benito, Merced, and Fresno. Am I misreading that map?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: This is the current-day map. This is the map for the current election. Then we have our draft map, which also included San Benito, Monterey, and the Fresno area --

MR. BECKER: Because I remember this discussion --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- which is very similar.

MR. BECKER: -- Commissioner Yee, and the Merced, California -- I'm sorry -- Merced County Latino population was significantly larger than the San Benito
population. We had this conversation. That's absolutely right. Three and a half times larger.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. Right.

MR. BECKER: And we thought we were -- and I don't think I was there when the lines were actually being drawn, but the discussion was if we have to choose, the larger community would be appropriately included. But I'm looking at this, and I don't know if this is the first time I'm seeing this, but I'm looking at this and it appears that that's not the case.

Oh, sorry. I think we were thinking this is -- these are not the current map -- these are the current maps that are being used in California, not the current maps that are before the Commission.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: These are from 2010.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: These are 2010.

MR. BECKER: Got it.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And the population has now shifted and changed.

MR. BECKER: So back to the original point, if we have -- if there is a -- if there's a choice where it's only possible to draw a State Senate district with Merced or San Benito, I'd advise Merced.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Becker.
Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Could we see with this map, the 2010 map, and then the two different versions, our map of one that had Fresno, San Benito and one that has the -- yeah. And have those next to it to see what -- like, with black lines, our different ones, to see how populations have just gotten much denser. And now you cannot cover the same area in the same forty -- dividing this population forty times. Every single Senate district has to get smaller.

So this one is which -- yeah. Thank you.

And Kennedy, if you could walk us through these? Or whoever -- the differences.

MS. WILSON: Yes. So the dotted lines, of course, are the current-day districts drawn ten years ago. And the light blue lines are when we included San Benito-Salinas Valley with Fresno. So that was something -- I don't remember the exact percentage of deviation.

But then we also took a look at putting San Benito back in Monterey County, and so I'll turn on the district that we changed to. And just including -- sorry, there's a lot of lines going on here. And so now what we have redrawn when we took San Benito out was taking in not even the entirety of Merced, just up into the corner, and some more of Fresno.
So the difference is, yeah, that there is just a lot more people in this area. Because if I turn even these lines off, before this area covered some of Fresno, Madera, and Stanislaus, and San Benito, and the Salinas Valley. But those populations no longer fit all together.

MR. BECKER: Can you take the current maps off and put back the other -- the two maps that are reflective of current population?

MS. WILSON: Yes, one moment.

MR. BECKER: Thanks.

MS. WILSON: So turning those off. Turning on our version with San Benito in. And then turning on the version with Merced in.

MR. BECKER: Can I get all of the -- for what we're calling the version with San Benito in, can I get all of the CVAPs on that?

MS. WILSON: Yes, one moment.

MR. BECKER: Thank you.

MS. WILSON: So these are in decimals, so my apologies for that.

MR. BECKER: No, that's okay.

MS. WILSON: The San Benito before was -- it's Latino, black, Asian, indigenous, and white. Latino before, was 55.3. Black was before, 6.1. Asian before,
was 8.74. Indigenous before, was .98, and white before, was 28.02 percent. Versus now, Latino CVAP did drop to 53.03. Black CVAP raised to 6.28. Asian CVAP raised 9.05. Indigenous CVAP raised 1.11 percent, and so did white CVAP by 29.65 percent.

MR. BECKER: Okay. I think now that it's clearer to me what the two options are, I think there is a greater justification for the inclusion of Merced in this district. And while I would still say that 53 is probably on the lower end, and there might be a -- there might be a way to boost that somewhat, because it encompasses significant Voting Rights Act-protected communities. Given its much larger Latino population than San Benito, and given the construction of these districts and the population disparities, I think it's justifiable to go to the newer districts inclusive of Merced, particularly if some effort -- if it's possible to slightly boost that percentage somewhat.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Becker.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I think I might have door number three. In comparing the 2010 maps to our maps, they do not have nearly as much of Fresno in their map as we do. And Fresno has 550,000. San Benito County has, is it 64,000? Could we possibly put our area that
needs to be covered in San Benito with Monterey, see how much population that is, and put it into the entire area by just rearranging a little bit of Fresno and actually having our Merced -- it's the STANIS-FRES (sic) or whatever -- the one that's Merced and Fresno. Have it be with San Benito if we rearrange a little bit of the Fresno in our KINGS-KERN. I think that is an idea that would really deserve some looking at, because it would save, one, so much time and save so much of all of our other portions of the maps.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

MS. WILSON: And can --

CHAIR KENNEDY: And Kennedy?

MS. WILSON: I was just going to say, there's still only enough population in this concentrated area if you wanted a high enough CVAP for two districts. And if you -- if I zoom in on Fresno, just the county and the city, you can take a look at the heat map. But my concern with that would just be stranding other populations, if moving it around that way.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Kennedy.

Commissioner Fernandez, I thought your hand was up. Thank you. Okay. So we've heard from counsel that sticking with the current configuration is an acceptable option. Probably a better option than trying to expand
it to the West, given the larger Hispanic population in Merced County. And it seems to be, that is our choice.

So Commissioner Fornaciari and then Mr. Becker.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I will defer to Mr. Becker.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: Yeah, I just want to say briefly, I think you summarized it quite nicely, Chair. And I just want to note that if you want to look at an option that might include everything, including the areas in San Benito County that are covered, that does not require all of San Benito County to be covered.

There are areas of Latino concentrations, and if I'm recalling correctly, from what we looked at yesterday, the Latino CVAP raw number is roughly 17,000. So we're talking about 17,000 people in San Benito. Once we get closer to Santa Clara County, those were areas where we saw significant crossover and were probably not as significantly covered under the Voting Rights Act, if covered at all. So I think the areas, looking more in terms of the middle of San Benito County, were the areas that I think where there was some coverage.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner -- Thank you, Mr. Becker.

Commissioner Fornaciari?
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, to just touch on that point, nearly all of the population of San Benito County is in Hollister. And in order to go grab that Latino population would be splitting up Hollister and the county. So I just want to go back and kind of review the conversation from yesterday.

We talked about the trade-offs between including Merced or including San Benito County. We landed on Merced because of the higher population in Merced. We recognize that whatever the choice we make, some of the Latino population will not be in a Latino -- in a Latino-majority VRA district. We talked in depth about the reasons for having -- additional reasons for having the Valley-based districts, and one of those reasons was the in-place organizing capability that will enable that district to -- the San Benito-Fresno District to perform at that level. And then finally, we talked about the desires of the people of San Benito County to be with the Monterey County, and in the desire of those three-county region to be together, Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Monterey.

And so I mean, we spent an awful lot of time on this discussion, and that's where we came to. So I just wanted to kind of refresh us all on that conversation.

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

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Just for clarity -- again, English is my second language. And Chair, you did say per guidance, what we have is unacceptable. So it makes it sound like it's unacceptable. But --

CHAIR KENNEDY: No.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- I think what you're saying is that it is acceptable, correct?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, I did.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. Thank you. Okay, so I would say let's leave this as it is. Let's return to our question that we must resolve, which is we have an overpopulation currently in South SSAC-STANIS, and we have to figure out how to resolve this.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, just reiterate, if we make Stanislaus whole, we've solved that problem.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that. And there is support for that. Shall we proceed with that?

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, we shall. And there was a slice in, I think, San Joaquin we were going to look at as a next step.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.
Commissioner Yee? You're on mute.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, happy to proceed with that.

Recognizing that Stanislaus with ECA is not -- it makes some people unhappy. But after that, I'm still interested in having Commissioner Fornaciari walk us through live line drawing the swaps that he was envisioning for Alameda, Contra Costa, and Solano Counties.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Any further comment?

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I just wanted to lift -- I don't know if it was Commissioner Andersen or who earlier, certainly given the time that we have, willing to do that. But if trying to keep those areas, the Tri-Valley together -- and they may be in different counties. But if in trying to keep them together, we ultimately walk around and split SAC, San Joaquin, et cetera, I just want to say that that would not be something that seems like should be an equal trade. If we're going to push counties together for the sake of keeping them together to turn around and split out counties on the other end, I just want to lift that as a concern that I would have.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

So Kennedy, if we can go ahead and accept this change? Okay, thank you.
Commissioner Yee, is your hand up again? Okay, thank you.

So Ms. Mac Donald, am I -- oh, okay. Thank you, Kennedy, for reminding me yes, we wanted to take care of moving Ripon back into San Joaquin County. So we are at 3.34 percent above the target in South SSAC-STANIS, we are 2.69 percent above in ECA. Both are within acceptable deviations. I'm scanning the map. It looks like we are within acceptable deviations in all of the districts that I can see on the map.

So Ms. Mac Donald --

MS. MAC DONALD: Hello.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- are you aware of any outstanding issues on the Senate map at this point?

MS. MAC DONALD: Well, I think one of your -- and just for the court reporter, this is Karin on Kennedy's Zoom. I think you may need to -- you may want to take a look at your Assembly district and see if there is potential nesting, or whether you have nested, since that is your last criterion. And we want to do our due diligence. So with your permission, we could ask Kennedy to just turn those on, and you can take a look. And perhaps there are some very minor adjustments that you could make to this, or maybe not.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you. You can go ahead.
and do that. I'll call on Commissioner Fernandez and
Commissioner Ahmad in the meantime.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you. I'm just
going to respond to the nesting question. I think that's
probably not going to work, because we've made so many
changes to the maps. And then to try to overlay what the
Assembly looks like to what we have left, I'm just
cautionsing because I actually like the way the maps look
right now going North.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah, and just to add,
Commissioner Yee and I will work with Tamina on that
Gilroy piece to see if there's something that we can
still do there. So we're hoping to work over lunch --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: -- and bring back something.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that.


Kennedy, over to you.

MS. WILSON: So I have the labels on. And let me
make those a bit smaller. Oh, and the wrong ones.

So we have the Assembly lines in red. As you can
see, there's a little bit of difference. So starting
with the Bakersfield area and the Kings-Tulare-Kern area, the lines actually are pretty close. They divvy off a bit to go a little bit lower here and have a little bit wider out in Kern County going to the East. We also do have a split in Shafter, which was following a split from community groups that they took as well. We do have similar splits within Visalia as well. And Tulare was not split in the Assembly maps. However, we took the line that we took from Congressional maps and Congressional consideration as well.

Moving North, we have this Fresno and Merced-Fresno. Very similar and close to one another. And the San Benito was a separate one by itself over here -- San Benito, Salinas Valley, up into a little, like Gilroy, I think just underneath San Martin and into Santa Cruz County.

Then continuing to move North, we had a district that encompassed the rest of Merced that was not in a VRA district, and then moving North into taking Modesto. So this was one district. Above that, we had Stockton, Mountain House, and Tracy together. And then we had the rest of -- we had the rest of San Joaquin County up into Sacramento County as well and down into Stanislaus. And now this doesn't necessarily nest. It takes some of the same parts. Again, it is a bit different there.
We also had -- taking in some of -- splitting some of Amador and Calaveras in the Assembly -- whoops -- in the Assembly Districts that were also a part of this Stanislaus, Eastern San Joaquin, Sacramento, and then it splits there.

In the City of Sacramento, we had kind of a lower half -- a lower portion and the Northern portion. So we did have some splits within Carmichael, a split through -- I don't exactly remember what street we went across, but we had Fruitridge, Lemon Hill, Parkway, Florin, Elk Grove together. And then so in our districts now, you take in all of Sacramento City, Elk Grove, Vineyard -- all of those are together. Arden-Arcade and Carmichael are actually going out with West Placer, Sacramento, which kind of comes down to the rest of Sacramento and then we take Rancho Cordova, Folsom, out to Elverta. And then I'm going to turn these off.

We had a version with Roseville, El Dorado, out to Diamond Springs, Georgetown, Meadow Vista. We were excluding Sheridan from Placer. And then in this current version, it has Placer, the more populated cities of Roseville, Rocklin, Granite Bay, going down into Sacramento as well. And then we have some of El Dorado and Placer with Lake Tahoe being whole, going South now.

Continuing to move North, we have -- again, toggling
them on and off to see those differences. Moving North here, we had, again, a split in Amador, the rest of Amador County, the rest of El Dorado, the rest of Placer, Nevada, Sierra, Plumas, Lassen, Shasta, Siskiyou, and Modoc together.

Now looking at your Senate district, it contains Siskiyou, Modoc, Trinity, Shasta, Lassen, Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Sutter, Yuba, Colusa, Plumas, Sierra, Nevada, and then parts of Placer. So then there is kind of a cut here through Placer, and then the rest is going down.

Then we're moving to the coast. We did have Trinity pooled into the coast. And within this, you also had the Tehama, Glenn, Butte, Sutter, Yuba going into this Northern district as well.

Moving down the coast again, you had Trinity. You did not have Lake in there. And I'm going to zoom closer in. Yolo, Napa, Lake, Colusa were all together in Assembly District. And now you have Napa, Solano, Yolo, and parts of Contra Costa County.

I'm going to move in a bit closer to this area here. A lot of districts going on. Martinez down to Brentwood. Then you have, again, as you mentioned, Tri-Valley somewhat separated here. San Ramon, Danville, up to Walnut Creek. We had a split through Dublin and Pleasanton and out to Livermore. And then we did have
Hercules, Pinole, Richmond, down to Berkeley, parts of Oakland all together. And then we had the rest of Oakland and Emeryville down here. And then our current Senate districts somewhat follow that as well, down to the Oakland boundary up to Hercules. So those are kept together.

In the COCO Senate district, we do have a split from -- Martinez was going to Brentwood, and Brentwood and Byron are going North up to NAPABYRON. But we do have the district in Contra Costa with the rest of Contra Costa together, as well as, again, Castro Valley, San Leandro. So some of -- as you said, some are together, some are not, but a majority kind of fit in each other.

If you look in San Francisco, you see that those two districts that split San Francisco kind of down the middle are together with some of Daly City, Coloma going South. Then we have here --

MALE SPEAKER: Colma, not Coloma.

MS. WILSON: Colma. Yeah, not Coloma. My bad. I'm back to my area.

Then looking here in San Mateo County, we have two -- you had a district here from San Bruno down to the split you did in -- or Brisbane down to the split you created in Menlo Park. And you also had down past Pescadero. And you have a Senate district now that
follows that, also including some of this district here within Mountain View down to Saratoga. I believe the Senate district goes around and includes some of those, although it does take out Cupertino from that Sunnyvale area.

Continuing to move down, we have an Assembly again. Just remind you, San Jose going both East and West, and East to most of San Jose, there's Alum Rock there as well. And then we have out to Santa Cruz County on the other side. And you have a Senate district that just takes in all of the Santa Cruz -- not Santa Cruz, my bad -- my apologies -- San Jose down to the rest of the Santa Clara County.

And so, of course, Santa Cruz needs more population since it was using the rest of San Jose. So that now goes down to San Benito, Monterey, all the way down into San Luis Obispo. And that's including the San Benito district as well, but it did include some of Gilroy, so that's taken apart.

So there are some slight differences, but some things that are in both. And that was just a general overview. I can drill, zoom into any areas you would like to see closer. And yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Kennedy. As Ms. Mac Donald explained, this was to give us an overview in case
there were any minor adjustments that we wanted to make
to the Assembly districts in order for them to conform
more closely to the Senate lines.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. Yes,
there are two areas that -- I think the only two areas
that we could possibly nest would be San Francisco and
then the North Coast. And I did not catch that Trinity
has been -- yeah, in San Francisco, I would really like
to have those two Assembly districts nest into a Senate
district.

Kennedy, did you say that there was a difference?

MS. WILSON: These two do nest. The San Francisco
districts are in one Senate district.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Could we go up
and see the North Coast?

MS. WILSON: Yes, one moment.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And so this -- I missed the
Trinity. I did see the Lake, which -- I know Trinity
County did want to be with Humboldt, so I was hoping it
would be -- I would like to see that. I'm sorry. Oh, we
did correct our -- the AD North (ph.) did follow the
Assembly into keeping Humboldt whole; is that correct?
It has been adjusted? Sorry, we can't hear you, Kennedy.

MS. WILSON: I accidentally muted myself. We hadn't
gotten to the North part of the state in Senate yet, so
that definitely can be adjusted to the county line.

CHAIR KENNEDY: My recollection is that we did, no?

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah. (Indiscernible) North.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I thought you did,
Chair.

MALE SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) --

FEMALE SPEAKER: No.

MS. WILSON: We did --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So thank you for that,
Commissioner Andersen. I recalled us squaring that off,
but maybe that was -- I guess that was on one of the
other maps.

MS. WILSON: Yeah, we had this iteration in most of
the other maps, so we hadn't gotten this far North yet.
But we did fix it in the other ones.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well that's why we're here. So
unless there's any objection, let's go ahead and fix
that. Thank you.

MS. WILSON: So that is now rectified.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, Trinity only has
16,000. Could we also match the Assembly district on
that one? So put Trinity with AD North Coast (ph.)?

MS. WILSON: And now that is done as well. And deviations are still in acceptable range. North Coast moves to a 0.35 percent, and NORCA, North California, goes to a negative 3.23 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Before we move on, I didn't have a chance to ask if there was any objection to that. I just want to make sure before we move on. Okay.

Commissioner Andersen, you have more?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I do in that one Lake. Could we look further down to see -- thank you for having the numbers on both the assemblies and the -- it really helps. Okay, yeah. The NAPABYRON is already full.

Because Lake County said they really wanted to be with Napa, and they did not really want to be with Mendocino. And we did accommodate that in the Assembly. It looks like we did not in the Senate. There would have to be some changes, and I don't think anyone has the stomach for that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, that --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So I would prefer to match, but I'll defer.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And my recollection from Lake was that they wanted to be with both Napa and Sonoma. And so they are with most of Sonoma. We just couldn't fit Napa.
Commissioner Sinay and then Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'll bring up my same question from this morning. Can we go to the far North? We keep just accepting that we're going to go down the coast and separate the Oregon border, but we have heard from many, even from Del Norte and Trinity and Humboldt, Siskiyou. So I'm wondering, for the Senate, can we not nest that way so that there is some conversation? These are forced areas at the state level that do need to be looked at.

So in all the other plans, we have it going straight down the coast. But is there a possibility in this one, to do the far North and then go down?

CHAIR KENNEDY: And that would -- so just give us a little more detail on what you're asking.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, I'm not sure how these Senate districts were created, but if we're looking at the possibility of making any changes up here in the far North or in North -- it's just instead of nesting the -- I mean, I'm asking for, ideally, Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen, and Shasta go in with Del Norte, Trinity, Humboldt, maybe Mendocino. There might be others, but --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, but that's not -- as I understand it, that's not nesting. I mean --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, I --

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- that's regrouping.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: No. Well, I'm saying at the minimum. We do have two Assembly Districts that could be nested up in the far North, and I'm giving what my at minimum would be. So I've said both pieces.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So the nesting would be we nest -- how far down does that go? Amador, El Dorado, Placer, Nevada, Sierra, Plumas, Lassen, Modoc, Shasta, Siskiyou, which is one Assembly district, with the Assembly district that currently includes Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity, Mendocino, and most of Sonoma; am I correct? Okay. So could we see what that would look like?

MS. WILSON: Yes, one moment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. In the meantime, Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Well, I guess my question would be kind of moot. I was just going to ask, when I was looking at the Senate district, I guess, previous to this potential change, it looked like the ECA to the NORCA border was just above Lake Tahoe, and it was separated from Truckee, so I was just asking for clarification on that, but --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. We'll get clarification on that.

Commissioner Toledo?
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, so right now we're looking for possible nesting options; is that what we're doing? I'm just trying to get a little bit of clarification.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Again, as Ms. Mac Donald indicated before we started this --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Um-hum.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- this is so that we can see if there are potential areas, mostly related to our Assembly districts --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Um-hum.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- where we want to make minor adjustments to the Assembly lines in order to make them conform more closely to Senate district lines.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: That's very helpful.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Ms. Mac Donald, am I correct?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes, thank you. Either or. I know we're also going to be looking at Assembly tomorrow, and not that I would want to encourage you to reopen that whole conversation, but there may be some very minor moves that you could make that perhaps don't really upset the apple cart. And then you could fulfill that last criterion. And of course, I think we all knew, moving into this process, that nesting is the lowest-ranked criterion. It's probably not going to work in most
areas. You had to -- and I should defer to legal counsel here, you drew all of these Senate districts on their own merit and make sure that you adhere to all of the criteria. But now we're at the lowest one, so let's just take a peek.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Thank you very much.

MS. WILSON: And one moment while it selects. It is a very large portion of the state, so it does take a while to get all those census blocks and everything calculated.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. In the meantime, Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I'm a little frustrated that now that we're in the North, now we're all of a sudden worried about nesting when we have not even looked at nesting or considered it for any other part of the state. And we built these Senate districts based on communities of interest, which are higher criteria than nesting. And I'm just a little upset, because it's being treated differently than what we did with the rest of the state. And I realize that there were some VRA districts, but there was also flexibility there.

So I, again, will state that I just prefer to go with our Senate maps that we have now. Maybe there's a
couple, but I feel like I'm being forced to nest at this point, and that's not my direction nor my preference.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And I'm sorry if there's a misunderstanding. No one is being forced to nest. What we are doing right now is reviewing the two layers, the Senate layer and the Assembly layer, to see if there are any minor modifications that we want to make in either direction to get us closer to that.

And this is something that we're going to do for the entire state. This is not just for the North. This is something that we will do for the entire state, and this is not a process of nesting so much as it is to see if there are any minor modifications that we want to make to districts. That's all it is. Okay.

Kennedy, are you --

MS. WILSON: I'm sorry, one portion is now -- the first one has been chosen. We're now choosing the second one.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. WILSON: A preview of what it will look like is kind of -- it's kind of going to look like a U shape going -- U or V or whatever, from Amador, coming up and going around to Sonoma. And again, we will see when it all calculates all those blocks, but that's a preview of where it's going to go down to. And it'll be highlighted
in red for you to see what that looks like.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, I don't think that that makes sense. I just wanted us -- we've heard often from the very beginning, there are conflicting testimonies about the far North, and I just wanted us to explore this a little bit, because we hadn't talked about for Senate. We just made an assumption that we still wanted to keep the North Coast the North Coast, and the folks up by the Oregon border have asked us several times to please take a look at if there is a possibility for them to be with Del Norte, Trinity, Humboldt, Shasta, Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen. I don't think this makes sense, but I did want to explore it versus just us just go move forward without looking at the folks to the far North who haven't really had -- we haven't talked about them in this iteration.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, okay. Thank you. So this is not something that we will proceed with. Thank you very much, Kennedy.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Kennedy, for that very thorough overview of the Senate districts overlaying our Assembly districts. In the two iterations we have, I am comfortable supporting
them as you described. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So I'm going to go back to being upset. So I guess why I'm upset is when we went to the South, the Central, we didn't do the Assembly overlay. But now that we're North, that's our first -- that's our first go-to instead of looking at the Senate districts. I know --

CHAIR KENNEDY: That's because Kennedy is the mapper that's currently online.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Commissioner Fernandez, I hear your frustration. When we worked offline -- when I worked offline, that was the first thing we did was to see if there was nesting, what were the possibilities in Southern California, and then we came back. But I do hear your frustration.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I definitely hear the frustration too, and I totally get it, because I feel like any time I've raised nesting, I was like -- ah. We did look at it. I specifically recall, like, when we were in Riverside and San Bernardino, we would turn it on, largely because we were thinking about some of the COIs that we had worked out in the Assembly and whether
or not we can use some of the logic of the Assembly to inform the Senate. Not necessarily nesting, but simply, like, some of the good work that we've done. So I'm thinking about it from that way.

I'm hoping that that helps, because I hear you. But I think, to the extent that things -- if we worked things out in a positive sense in the Assembly, then perhaps it can help us. That being said, if we need to share the pain and shake things up, I think that's reasonable, too.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well again, as Ms. Mac Donald explained, this is not to make any major changes. This is to see if there are any minor adjustments that we want to make in either direction.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Now that we're in the South, though, I did think that the line cutting San Bernardino at the East, I thought we were trying to make that the same in every single map. And I am surprised to see that it is different in this one.

CHAIR KENNEDY: You are correct. And what we were -- what we were informed the other day by the mappers was that they wanted to wait until we were finished and then, given that the population is so negligible in that area, they would make that adjustment.

So yes, we do want to make sure that that is done.
I'm seeing head nods from the mappers that it will be done. So thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, well one, I'll just comment and just say I think some of these conversations -- I mean, it's neither here nor there, but I think this nesting conversation should have happened before we did the Senate district. And I think that's -- I'm suspecting that that's maybe part of Commissioner Fernandez's frustration.

I'm also a little concerned because I think there are additional adjustments, not changes, not big changes, but small adjustments that do need to be made. And I'm a little concerned about trying to have this nesting conversation without us having this other look at the Assembly districts because there are a number of small adjustments that I think were being requested to make.

And we spent time also on these Senate districts to get it to a place where we were all comfortable. And if it makes sense to nest and have that look after we just affirm or decide we want to do something different, then we do it then. But I don't know. I feel like we're losing a little time here just kind of arguing about whether we nest or not nest or which way we're going to
nest and other things like that. We built these Senate districts. Let's just keep moving forward.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. I don't know that we're being asked to make any adjustments. We're being given an opportunity to make any.

And I don't see this as a nesting discussion so much as a discussion of whether we want to make any minor adjustments in any direction as we review these.

We are coming up on our meal break at 12:45.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thanks for that share. Yes, I am seeing this as an opportunity to -- before we go back to the Assembly, is to see what we've done at the Senate because we have made changes and corrections in the Senate, to see is any of that, oh, right, we do want to make that change in the Assembly. That's how I'm viewing this. This is not a, oh, now we're going to try to nest. No. We had the discussion and we said we're not nesting unless it happens to work out that way.

And because it's the number 6 criteria, right? Isn't that -- or I should know exactly which one. So the other criteria comes first.

So this is just an opportunity to sort of review, and in my case, you know, I didn't realize that Trinity
was not in that. And you know, there are some areas that we might go, oh, oops. I totally forgot about that. That's how I'm seeing this.

Also, but I am thinking in terms of one possible that we might have nested. Did we do that in Santa Barbara or the Ventura? Could we see those ones?

MS. WILSON: So here we have Santa Barbara up to -- there's a looks like you take in Oceano and San Luis Obispo and then take the rest of Santa Barbara County. And then in Ventura, you do have a split in Camarillo, and then go as far out as Moorpark City boundary.

And then for your Senate districts, it does include the entirety of that, plus a bit more, and a little bit farther North into San Luis Obispo, you just also include Grover Beach as well. So those two Assembly districts are situated within a Senate district. Not exactly, but all the same cities are in there that are in your Assembly district as well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Kennedy.

Commissioner Andersen, anything else? That's it? Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I hate to pull us away from this exciting nesting conversation, but I just heard back from Jaime and Tina that they do have a
proposal that could work to bring Gilroy back into
midcoast for the Commission to review.

I will leave it up to you, Chair, whether we review
that now before our break or after lunch. It is 12:41
right now, so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: It is 12:41. We are coming up very
close on our lunchbreak.

Unless there's something further at this point, I
would propose that we go ahead and break for lunch and we
come back as scheduled at 1:30.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Sounds good.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. But we are on meal break
until 1:30.

Thank you, everyone.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much, Chair.

Enjoy your lunch, everybody.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Back at 1:30.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 12:42 p.m.
until 1:29 p.m.)

MR. MANOFF: We're standing by for the Chair,
everybody. Thanks for your patience.

We are standing by for the Chair. Thanks for your
patience.

Checking in with Vice Chair Fernandez. Hey, there.
The Chair is on a phone call. Would you like to bring us
back into session?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I should probably turn my video on first.

MR. MANOFF: Yes, please.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: And then I’m ready. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: All right. Stand by. You are live.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Welcome back, everyone. We will be continuing our journey in the Senate. And I believe at this point -- let me see. Sorry, I just got another message. We will be starting with Southern California.

Is that correct, Andrew?

Is Andrew there?

MR. DRESCHLER: That is correct, Vice Chair. We will --

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. What are we doing --

MR. DRESCHLER: -- Sivan --

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: -- in Southern California?

MR. DRESCHLER: Well, Sivan has some maps that she would like to show. She was let -- just a reminder, last night, we were working on trying to get SAA, the CVAP up. I think we started just over fifty percent, originally, and we were able to get it up to 51.18.

So we just wanted to show that and just see if there
was any feedback from the Commission.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Well, that is very exciting news.

So Sivan, work your magic.

MS. TRATT: Thank you, Vice Chair Fernandez. Yeah. So I, off-line, explored a lot of different things in SAA that were going off of the instructions given to me to try and raise the Latino CVAP of SAA without throwing off the surrounding districts or SAA itself into a deviation that would be outside of our legal range.

So I did try a lot of different things, and the exploration that I did live in the meeting yesterday ended up being the route that was least impactful to neighboring districts and also raised the Latino CVAP the highest.

So as a reminder, that was removing a Southern portion of Buena Park, just over here and down here next to Cypress. And as Andrew mentioned, the resulting Latino CVAP was 51.18 percent, and the current deviation of SAA is negative 4.97 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Sivan.

Any discussion on this?

Any objection to moving forward with this slight alteration to SAA?

Commissioner Fernandez?
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Not at all. And I just wanted to thank Sivan, and I feel like Andrew kind of took away your, you know, punchline at the end, but thank you for bringing up that CVAP.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent.

MS. TRATT: No, I appreciate that as well. And I did just want to mention, there was an email that was brought to my attention that was a submission from the People's Redistricting Alliance that had a suggestion for a slightly different iteration for OC that were based on how the districts looked before we did some of those swaps between the OC Coastal and the San Diego Coastal District.

I would love to show you what those would look like because I think it's potentially another route that we could explore. It would involve backtracking those swaps that we did that involved Costa Mesa, Mission Viejo, Dana Point, San Clemente, that we did yesterday. But I do think that there's still a way that we could potentially bring in at least Dana Point into the coastal district after these swaps are made.

So let me just put those lines on so you can see what that would look like.

The reason why I wanted to just bring this to the Commission's attention is because their swaps were able
to raise the Latino CVAP of SAA to fifty-two percent. So this swap is also -- helps 60 by 605 and would raise -- I believe this the deviation that it's rounding up slightly. I believe it's closer to fifty-six-ish percent and some change. It's not quite fifty-seven. But it would raise both Latino CVAPs for both of those VRA districts.

So just -- yeah. Chair, would you like me to just kind of give an overview of what those swaps would entail?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Let me get Commissioner Fernandez's input at this point.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you. Sivan, were you able to have our VRA consultants review this information?

MS. TRATT: I have not spoken to Counsel. So yeah. I don't know if Mr. Becker is on currently, but I'd be happy to discuss this live if possible.

CHAIR KENNEDY: He is here.

MR. BECKER: We're mainly talking about the boost SAA right now?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct.

MS. TRATT: Yes.

MR. BECKER: Yeah. And the previous percentage was what again?
MS. TRATT: So in the drafts, it was forty-five percent. Yesterday, it was a little over 50 and I was able to get it to 51.18.

The proposed swaps that were submitted by the People's Redistricting Alliance would raise it to fifty-two percent, and it would raise the SD 60 by 605 from 55.31 to around 56 percent.

MR. BECKER: All right. Yeah, I'm not going to render any advice on any maps that have been submitted that aren't currently under consideration by the Commission.

But with regard to this map, obviously, you're at the -- you're at the lower end of the range of deviation for this. It's still within the safe harbor, but barely. So that needs to be kept in mind. But the Latino CVAP is significantly better and I think this likely protects Latino voting rights in this area.

MS. TRATT: Excuse me. Just to clarify, I didn't have the exact numbers in front of me. The districts, if the changes were made to represent the red lines, SAA would become 51.55 percent Latino CVAP and the 60 by 605 would be 56.64 percent.

MR. BECKER: So which lines are currently before the Commission? Are the red lines a proposal externally or are these the lines -- so these are the lines that --
that are -- that you constructed in response to the Commission's direction, correct?

MS. TRATT:  Yes, that is correct.

MR. BECKER:  Okay.

MS. TRATT:  And the red lines --

MR. BECKER:  Those are the only --

MS. TRATT:  -- are -- okay.

MR. BECKER:  Yeah.  Those are the only -- these are the only lines and demographics that I'm commenting on that I'm reviewing.  And what I said previously stands.

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Okay.  But we do -- we are interested in looking at reviewing the suggestions that have been made by local groups, yes.

MR. BECKER:  I can give you --

MS. TRATT:  Absolutely --

MR. BECKER:  Yeah.  If you have options that you want to consider that are not at the direction of the Commission yet, probably best to consider those in closed session.

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Okay.  Then I would ask our videographers to send out an invitation for closed session.

MR. MANOFF:  Done, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Okay.

MS. TRATT:  Thank you, Kristian.
CHAIR KENNEDY: It is 1:39. We're just coming back. I'm going to -- I'm going to estimate a 2:15 return. And Kristian, we will update you if there is any change to that.

Thank you, everyone.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 1:39 p.m. until 2:51 p.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your patience. We did have a closed session under the pending litigation exception. We did not take any action in that closed session, so we are now back into open session and resuming our discussion of, first of all, the changes that the Commission had made before adjourning last night in Orange County, and hearing from our mappers the additional exploration that was done overnight at our direction.

So Sivan, if you can -- or Andrew, either one -- if you can reorient us and anyone in the public as to where we are in our discussion on this.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Thank you, Chair. Let me just zoom in on SAA. As I mentioned previously, the changes that we explored live in removing a portion of Southern Buena Park ended up being the most efficient way to stay within deviation and raise the Latino CVAP above fifty-one percent.
And as you can see, the resulting deviation is negative 4.97, and the Latino CVAP is 51.18 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you very much. Any comments on this?

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Sivan.

We received some input saying that there might be a possibility to increase the CVAP if we went into Santa Ana, if we took out parts of West Santana. And I just want to know if you had already explored that because I definitely don't want to do anything we've explored.

MS. TRATT: I'm not sure what portion of Santa Ana they tried removing. I did try removing various parts of Santa Ana and was not able to get the Latino CVAP higher than it currently is with the current configuration.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: They states West of Harbor Boulevard, but I'm not sure.

MS. TRATT: I'm not sure where that is. I was looking mostly in this area. I think I also tried removing a little bit from the South as well, but again, I think Buena Park was the best place.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And again, we're so close to the five percent maximum deviation that we needed to be as efficient as possible in this exploration. Thank you.
Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Thank you, Sivan, so much for your work on this. I really appreciate that. And I think just -- I just wanted to lift up and kind of provide us that recap that you know, we were taking a closer look at this yesterday and trying to improve the CVAP here, as this is a VRA district.

I think the testimony that we had received in this area did suggest the possibility of making some swaps. I think it was in particular -- I think it was Artesia, Cerritos -- and making some swaps between SD 60 by 605, SAA, North Coast, and I just want to feel the Commission out on that because we did go through a number of changes yesterday, largely to solidify sort of the coastal district. I think Commissioner Akutagawa had led us through that.

So I just wanted to, you know, get a sense of the room on how people would be thinking about that. You know, I think we've done a good job of keeping together as many points as possible. I think the testimony is suggesting there might be some slight increase to the SAA district if we were to move in that direction.

So I just wanted to kind of get a temperature check of my colleagues on that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think we've all said that if it improves the VRA, we're open to exploring.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I'd say -- I mean, I think as long as the goals are maintained, right, that improves the CRA, maintains the historical districts, and also the majority/minority districts. If we can do all those things -- but I think that's just difficult to do right now. I think we -- we're in a space now where we fix one thing and then something -- and break other things. And so that's where it becomes hard.

But if there's some -- I'm always for exploration, as long we can maintain those goals, right? Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And within a reasonable amount of time.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Within a reasonable amount of time, and you know, every hour that ticks by is an hour less that we have to do this. I would remind colleagues that, you know, there are some ancillary tasks that also have to be done before maps can be submitted to the Secretary of State.

So we can't think in terms of the 27th. We have to think in terms of Monday. We have to think in terms of a comprehensive review before we get there. But just want
everyone to keep that in mind.

Let me first call on Mr. Becker and then I'll get to the raised hands.

MR. BECKER: Yeah, thanks. If I'm understanding this correctly, this has potential direction to swap some population between SAA and SD 60. If it's straight swap, I will just say I think that's certainly available to you. I don't think that raises significant VRA concerns that SD 60 has some -- is at a comfortable level and especially if that -- if population -- if there is a lowering of LCVAP, and I'm not -- there might be other swaps around there.

A slight lowering of LCVAP should not significantly affect the ability of Latino voters to be protected under the Voting Rights Act. It could boost SAA a little bit, which would be positive.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Becker.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So I just -- to dig a little deeper in the trade off space, do we have an idea of how much of an improvement in SAA we could expect if we made these changes and how significant of changes -- of mapping changes we would need to make?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I think, you know,
Sivan had taken a look at the testimony that had come in from the community.

Sivan, would you want to just walk us through what the -- what would those swaps need to entail, if you can recall.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We'll need to --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- go to break.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Go to break.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And do this immediately after break.

So for our staff, we have a mandatory fifteen-minute break now at 3 o'clock, and we will be back at 3:15 to take this up.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 2:59 p.m. until 3:14 p.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your patience during our break. Break is for the rest of our staff, and we really appreciate them and the work they do but we do recognize that they need occasional breaks.

So we are back in Orange County on the Senate map. Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, thanks. And I agree with you. Everyone needs a break every now and then.
I think where we left off, we were talking about community testimony that we had received, possibilities of making some swaps. I think my sense from having read the testimony and having shared it with the line drawers that we had received was that it was -- it would swap out Artesia, Cerritos from SD 60 by 605 and slowly push population around Orange County, allowing us to boost SAA, which is also, you know -- it's at negative 4.97. So I think even if we boost that deviation slightly, that might be a positive thing, as well as boosting the Latino CVAP in the 60 by 605.

But again, you know, I was hoping perhaps Sivan might walk us through this. I know that she had looked at that testimony and was also, you know, aware of our goals as a Commission for that coastal district.

Sivan, would you want to kind of walk us through what that might look like?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. So I think they would be two separate swaps. The first swap would be with SAA and 60 by 605, and then we could go to the South part of Orange County and look at moving things around between IOC, the coastal district and Orange County, and the coastal district in San Diego. So those would be two different conversations, I think.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: But the idea would be
Artesia, Cerritos go into the North OC coast; is that correct?

MS. TRATT: Yes. These come --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

MS. TRATT: -- into the North OC coast and Brea would go in, and then the line in Buena Park would also shift slightly.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right. Okay. Okay. And then what would happen further down? I'm just trying to understand so that we can better understand the options before the Commission for the (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

MS. TRATT: Yeah. The other part of this swap is the line in Orange will move to Glassell Street.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: All right.

MS. TRATT: So it'll shift this line over slightly, and that'll compensate for removing the population in Buena Park.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

MS. TRATT: And then the swap also involves moving Costa Mesa, which had previously been in this OC coast district into IOC. The Commission already gave direction to make those changes. So we would just have to walk this back to previous version, or add this back into the district. I'm not sure how the swap would balance
without walking back some of the other swaps that we made in this area in the South.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I see. So it would break up the COI of Costa Mesa and Irving?

MS. TRATT: No, it would bring -- so it would bring Costa Mesa in with Irvine. The whole proposed swap took place before we had gotten direction to move Costa Mesa in. So we will have to walk back before we did that three-district swap with Costa Mesa to move Costa Mesa in with Irvine and to add Dana Point and San Clemente in with the coastal district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: This sounds to me like a significant --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- investment of time.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. You're absolutely --

CHAIR KENNEDY: You know, before you mentioned Costa Mesa, you know, I could see this happening, but once you starting mentioning Costa Mesa and the possibility of having to walk back so much of what we've done, I get more uncomfortable with this.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Me too. I'm not sure why we would have to walk that back since it's already with Irvine. Anyway, yeah.

MS. TRATT: So yeah. Yeah. So I haven't received
direction from the Commission, so I haven't made any of these changes myself. Looking at some of the maps submitted by community members, the way that they had envisioned the swap was -- or the starting place that they had gone from was the map that the Commission also started with yesterday.

Because we moved Costa Mesa in isolation and then did a swap to get Dana Point and San Clemente into this district, we did not involve 60 by 605. So you're bringing in another factor that isn't going to balance necessarily in the way that if we had started from the same starting point.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right. So --

MS. TRATT: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So if we wanted to move in this direction, again, the goal and the priority being the VRA districts, and secondarily some of these COIs, like the coastal COI, it would be Artesia, Cerritos into North OC, some changing of SAA in Orange and Buena Park. Further down, because we would move Artesia, Cerritos into the North OC, something would have to come out. So that could potentially be something like Laguna Niguel or is that Aliso Viejo in the blue?

MS. TRATT: Yes.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That could go back into IEOC, I think, so that Brea up above would go with SD 60 by 605; is that correct? So it's --

MS. TRATT: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- shifting of population largely around Orange County; is that correct?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. That's a different way that you could approach it definitely. We could try that as well.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it. Okay. And that would improve the VRA districts and maintain a coastal district though without Aliso Viejo and Laguna Niguel? Presumably. I mean, we would have to play around with those numbers.

MS. TRATT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it.

MS. TRATT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

MS. TRATT: If my mental math is working, I believe that that would be correct. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it. Okay. So it's an opportunity then to improve CVAP and maintain some of these COIs. I think there's also an unset COI up above that it put together.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sivan, if you could move the map back to North OC. Yeah. I mean, we've also been getting
a lot of feedback that we're already breaking up Northern Orange County quite a bit, and if we shift Brea into 60 by 605, I think we're going farther down that route.

You know, if we need to for VRA purposes, then I guess we need to, but you know, just want us to be aware of that.

Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Yes. VRA is number 2 criteria, so yes, trying to boost the SAA would be great.

Just a couple of questions. How much of an increase do we expect? And then also if we could have Mr. Becker weigh in on this conversation, that'd be great. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: So I can't really comment on hypothetical districts that haven't been drawn yet, but in general, I think if there's a way to boost SAA's Latino CVAP, given the voting rights, that consideration's there, that could be a positive thing.

As I mentioned, I think the districts to the North are likely very strong from a legal perspective. And just as a reminder, and this has been said many times, the VRA considerations are second criteria, the COIs
political boundaries, et cetera are fourth criteria.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Becker.

Commissioner Akutagawa and then Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Actually, I guess my question's been asked. I mean, yeah. I'm just kind of curious how much we're actually going to see it. I also just saw some additional COI testimony about suggesting moving half of woody area in to balance out the population deviations between SAA and 60 by 605.

But actually, I don't think that that's going to really make that much of a difference. If anything, the Latino CVAP will probably go down. We'll see. Because yeah. I tried playing with this last night and it was much more difficult to seek out than I think we might realize. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I'm open to exploring this. I am not as concerned about the breaking up of North Orange County as I am about ensuring our obligations are met as strong as possible in SAA.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I -- I don't think
Commissioner Fernandez's question got answered. What is the expected increase?

MS. TRATT: Chair, I can answer that question.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Please go ahead, Sivan.

MS. TRATT: So again, I have not personally made these swaps, but the expected increase in Latino CVAP for SAA would be again -- and this is from yesterday's starting point. SAA was at 50.56 percent Latino CVAP. It is now currently at 51.18 percent Latino CVAP, would be raised to 51.55 percent.

SD 60 by 605 would be expected to increase to 56.64 percent Latino CVAP.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, I guess the question is, is that going to make a substantive difference in the ability to elect, that little bit of increase?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: I don't know if that question was directed to me, but I'm happy --

CHAIR KENNEDY: I'm directing it --

MR. BECKER: Yeah. Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- towards you.

MR. BECKER: I'm happy to try to answer. Those are fairly minimal in increases. I think it's really hard to draw a fine line to say that those increases will have a
substantial impact. You know, I think -- so I think there's flexibility there and that's what I want to -- I want to suggest, which is it's up to you. I don't think either one is going to make a significant legal difference.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Becker.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry, Sivan, could you repeat what SD 60 would be with the anticipated changes, or the discussed changes?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Absolutely. It would go from 55.31 to 56.64 percent.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Got it. And so for me, while I was sort of looking at SAA, the increase in SD 60 is over a percent, which to me seems, at least from a policy perspective, from the Commission's perspective, seems to be potentially, at least for me, a worthwhile increase. A percentage plus is often what we're talking about when we're talking about deviations, when we're talking about, you know, improving CVAPs and other protected areas.

So it seems like these proposed changes would actually do some not negligible benefit, in my opinion, in my nonlegal opinion, to SD 60.

And so I'd be I favor of making those changes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Is there any objection to
proceeding with this, what I'm told is a brief
exploration?

No objection.

Sivan, please proceed.

I just want to remind us all that before the end of
the day, we have some work to do around the Gilroy area,
which I'm told would be done live. We have some work to
be done or that we would want to consider doing around
San Benito, which again, would be done live. We have
potentially some minor adjustments in Southeast San
Diego.

We want to do the same sort of side by side, if you
will of Senate districts and Assembly districts just to
see if there are any minor modifications that we would
want to make, such as we found earlier today when we
looked at them side by side. So that needs to be done in
Southern California, as well.

That's quite a bit that we still need to do today.
And that's not mentioning the Board of Equalization
districts. Mappers informed that they will need
something on the order of fifteen to twenty minutes after
we finish the Senate districts in order to be prepared
for the Board of Equalization discussions.

So please keep all of that in mind. Please keep
interventions short and to the point.
Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I think hearing that, if others are comfortable with it, I'm happy to work with Sivan on this off-line if it makes sense to do so.

I think we've discussed what the swaps would be. It sounds like there's no opposition to it. So just offering that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I am happy with that.

Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: And we still have not done Northern yet. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was just going to add on the list what we had talked about Carson -- looking at Carson. That was split. And I was just going to see in which of the maps it was in Assembly.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I do have a question. Since Commissioner Sadhwani has raised the question about this Santa Ana district, I know we have a similar district in the San Fernando Valley. Do we need to try to do a similar effort to raise the CVAP in that area as well too? Because it's at 50.2 right now.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Mr. Becker can maybe weigh in on this, but my understanding was San Fernando Valley didn't meet all of three Gingles preconditions.

MR. BECKER: That's correct. San Fernando Valley is not a VRA covered area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Okay. So if we could have Sivan work with Commissioner Sadhwani on going through this exploration in Orange County, we would want to make sure there's a snapshot of where we are currently that we could easily revert to.

If you could go off, make these proposed changes, come back, and show us what that would look like, then we can consider that. And meanwhile, we would need, I believe Tamina to work through with us any changes around Gilroy and San Benita.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

MS. TRATT: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I'll take this all off-line.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa?

Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay, anything?

Okay. So Jaime, hi.

MS. CLARK: Hello. How are you?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Good. How are you?

MS. CLARK: Fine. Thank you. Are we going to
Gilroy now, or are we going to -- where are we going?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Gilroy.

MS. CLARK: Okay. One moment, please. And Tamina is right here and can do this with you. One moment. I'll start sharing my screen though.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Good afternoon, Tamina.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Well, I'd love to walk you through what we came up with for Gilroy and get your thoughts on it. Gilroy is currently in the San Jose district, and it was requested by the Commission that it be moved to midcoast.

We were able to make almost a clean swap with that and Arroyo Grande. So Arroyo Grande would move South into SCOAST, whole.

And then I was able to work out with Jaime that we can duplicate the line in Camarillo that we have in Assembly that's relatively here. And in fact, I can turn it on right here. We can duplicate this split in Camarillo, and in being able to split Camarillo in this way and give this section to Jaime's area, we'll be able to balance.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And can you tell us how close East Ventura, San Fernando Valley would be to population deviation at that point? Because I was noticing that
Pismo Beach is remaining behind in the midcoast?

MS. CLARK: I will select that -- hello.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Hi.

MS. CLARK: I will select that area now just so that we can look at it all together as Tamina noted, adding in all of Camarillo would overpopulate the East Ventura, San Fernando Valley based district.

Hang on one second here. Let me just grab this line one more time.

(Pause)

MS. CLARK: So adding in this area to the East Ventura, San Fernando Valley district would make the percent deviation of that district 3.89 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So my question is Pismo Beach looks to be 8,000 people. 8,000 people would be less than one percentage point. So does it make sense to try to keep Pismo Beach with its other neighboring communities, bring that into East Ventura, San Fernando Valley -- sorry -- into S Coast, and then move another 8,000 people or so from S Coast into East Ventura SFV?

Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Tamina, can you go back to the border at San Luis Obispo, please? And zoom in.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, absolutely. Let me just --
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Right where Arroyo Grande is and Pismo Beach.

Can you zoom in more, please? Okay. That would be the beach. Okay.

Not a popular comment that I'm going to make, but my preference right now would be to keep Arroyo Grande and Pismo Beach in the San Luis Obispo and to not make the Gilroy move. In the Assembly and the Congressional, we have made the Gilroy move.

So I'm just trying to keep a little bit more of San Luis Obispo in the upper part because those two communities are also close with San Luis Obispo and some of the other larger communities. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I was wondering if it was possible to bring them all in together.

I noticed also that Oceano is -- I think what I read is that I think if that's the five cities that they all have a really tightly coordinated work together and they are split, and you know, at this point, you know, is it better to bring them back in as well too if we're not going to move Gilroy.

The other option I was thinking about is if you were
to -- if it was possible to move everything from Avila Beach down, I -- I also noticed -- I know that this is the ripple effect, but I noticed that Westlake Village is split, maybe moving that down a little further so that it's hole might make some of the room, since this is still a fairly small community and you know, would that be possible to do, too.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay. But back to Commissioner Fernandez's point, Commissioner Fernandez, you think that it's just best to leave this line as it is?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Right. And if possible, I would bring Oceano in as well, and I think what's right next to it -- Grover Beach. Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Grover Beach.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Because it's like driving from -- you can't tell where one ends and the other one starts, other than a sign saying you're in Grover Beach.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Now, I say that as I read the numbers, because Avila Beach is only 1,000 and some people, we should be able to have all five of them together in either district.

So in that case, which way do you think is best?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: My preference would be to keep it with the North part.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I think. Yes. I'm sorry.

Midcoast, yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Akutagawa, did you have further comment on that?

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I do agree with Commissioner Fernandez and I do feel it's important to keep Gilroy with Salinas Valley. And if I had to choose between one or the other, I think I would have this COI of five go South, even though I know that they're very close to San Luis Obispo. But I would move them South and Gilroy in with Salinas Valley. Gilroy would still be my priority.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thoughts from other colleagues?

Okay. I'll let you think about that a little bit more. So let's put this on the shelf for now. Let's look at San Benito.

Are there proposed changes to San Benito?

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I would propose adding a portion of San Benito, the portion that is closest to Monterey, the Northern parts. Potentially some of the Monterey area right there with the Northern portion of San Benito, which is the portion of the county that is
covered under section 2. And as much of that as possible within the deviation, and of course without reducing the CVAP into the North side Fresno area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So Tamina, you're at the map controls for this. Could you show us what it would look like to take that Northern portion of San Benito County as well as --

Commissioner Toledo, we're talking about Salinas itself and what else in Monterey County?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think as we can while still being in the appropriate deviation and --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- without reducing the CVAP because we want the CVAP to be about where it is now, if not higher.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. But can we start --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Preferably higher.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Can we start in Salinas and move South in the Salinas Valley?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: That's fine, but I think the covered entity is actually in San Benito, so --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So first, if you could guide, Tamina, for selecting the area in San Benito County.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So I think it's -- if memory serves me, it's mostly in the Hollister area. So if you
go to the Hollister area of there and highlight that
Northern portion. San Benito County as a whole, I
believe only has 17,000 people. And then of course,
going West.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: San Benito County is 64,000.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Oh, okay. 64,000. So as much
as we can without going over deviation.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. If Hollister is
(indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Can you show the LCVAP
again, please?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. We need to see all the
CVAPs.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. So it --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: We may not be able to get to
Monterey. So as much of the San Benito area as we can
get.

And I think Commissioner Fornaciari may have more.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Can we start over because
the LCVAP's already lower.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Well, I think first of all,
we need to get us in that portion in Monterey County
because we're way beyond the number of people that we can
move to SBFRESNO.
Okay. Yes. And even now, we need to be removing some of San Benito County and -- okay.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I know. Can we get the heat map, please?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. Tamina, could you turn the heat map on, please?

(Pause)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Tamina, I think we were better going all the way out West, but I see that we have two small portions of San Jose County that we don't need to be moving.

Okay. The CVAP was up to 53.11 or something, I think.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Chair, I have a question for Mr. Becker.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: So I mean, this move is in order to include covered populations in San Benito County. Do we know exactly where they are? I mean, how does that work? By county, by city, by neighborhood, by census block?

MR. BECKER: Looking at the change box on this map looks like this area, including Hollister is the primary concentration of Latinos, and I'm very open to -- and I'm sorry, I don't know if it's controlling the map right
now.

Jaime, is that you --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Tamina.

MR. BECKER: -- or is that someone else?

CHAIR KENNEDY: It's Tamina.

MR. BECKER: Thank you, Tamina.

I think I'm interpreting that correctly. So I think, you know, this is -- I think I'd feel comfortable saying this is in the range of including Latinos who are otherwise covered under the Voting Rights Act and maintaining ability to elect consistent with the Voting Rights Act.

You know, I think this exploration is constructive if that helps at all because I think where this is going on right now is where the covered communities live.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay. If I could, Tamina, just looking at the heat map, it seems like the Northeastern portion of this is probably less what we're interested in and going between Hollister and -- from Hollister towards Salinas was a good place to be looking.

Okay. So this is going well. And we're at 4.73 deviation in SBENFRESNO. So it looks like we've got a little more room that we could move up from Hollister towards Salinas, as well as that area, the Southwestern portion around Hollister. I think it was -- no. We're
at 53.17.

MS. RAMOS ALON: This is at 4.94 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Okay. We've boosted it slightly. We've kept SBENFRESNO within acceptable deviations.

Does anyone see any further changes they'd like to explore?

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Maybe just for the sake of keeping it a little bit more tighter and compact, and also maybe grabbing more of the concentrated population in Hollister. Do you see that -- it looks like a little shark fin up at the top. I don't know what else to call it. Yeah. Right up there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And that helped as well.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And then perhaps down at the bottom, it looks like -- I don't know. It looks like a little pointy foot or something like that. And besides that, the one next to it too. Yeah. Well, you could get rid of that one too if that helps, but yeah. It just looks like it's just -- yeah. Oh, that's one big census block.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, we're at 53.19 now. But our deviation is at the max. Okay. Okay.

Is this something that we would like to ask Tamina
to explore off-line at some point for any further improvement possible, or are we happy with this?

Commissioner Akutagawa?

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, I would like some more exploration because I mean, we're making a, you know, completely uninformed cut through Hollister. I just don't want to do that, you know what I mean? I understand the logic of making this move, but to make this a cut through Hollister that we have no idea what streets or neighborhoods, or whatever we're dealing with there, it's -- I don't know how to do that in the time we have to work.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: I just would suggest -- I think this is worth further exploration off-line, and I think there might be a way to solidify compactness if while maintaining basically what's being done here because there are a lot of underpopulated areas in this area that can be included.

And so I would trust Tamina to keep working on this.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I'd like to work with
Tamina on this and see if there's any way to create something that's a little more compact and also more logical, as Commissioner Yee says, in the next couple of hours that we have.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So I'll work with her on it.

Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for volunteering, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I believe if we do this move, then we can move Gilroy in without there being ripple effects, because midcoast would be negative, and I believe Gilroy's population of 60,000 would allow that. It'll be close.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: So I'm just saying there's another win/win.


Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: It's funny you should bring up Gilroy because I thought about that when we first started all this and I wanted to see if I could work with Commissioner Toledo on this.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, both.

Okay. So that means that we will have Gilroy and San Benito to come back to at some point.

Looking at my list, I believe we finished what we were -- or most of what we were planning in Orange County, but we have Southeastern San Diego to look at.

Sivan, are you available to look at Southeast San Diego with us?

MS. TRATT: Yeah. Absolutely, Chair. Before we go to Southeast San Diego, I do have what I worked with off-line, completing those changes or that exploration to show everyone.

So would you like to start there or in San Diego?

CHAIR KENNEDY: If you can hold on just a moment, I have a hand from Commissioner Andersen and then Ms. Mac Donald had her hand up as well.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. I was hoping we might be able to make a -- since we made the change in taking all of Stanislaus and putting them in ECA, I was hoping we might be able to try to do a little cleanup in COCO versus whatever Alameda County is now called, which it goes into status laws.

CHAIR KENNEDY: The 80 Corridor?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, not so much the 80
Corridor, but yeah. It's San Leandro. You know, that whole area has been put into --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- the North area and you can't --

CHAIR KENNEDY: All right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- get there without going through the other one.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay.

Ms. Mac Donald?

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you so much, Chair Kennedy. We just have a question about the timing of the exploration or the fine tuning that you just gave to Tamina.

When were you anticipating getting that back, please?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Let me look at my runoff show. Is it possible to have that back by 6 p.m.? It's currently going on 4.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. We'll do what we can.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Okay. So Sivan?

MS. TRATT: Yes, thank you, Chair.
So just summarizing the changes that were made and what the result of those changes were. We moved Cerritos and Artesia into N-OC-COAST from SD 60 by 605. We also moved Buena Park South of the 5 into N-OC-COAST from SAA. Brea was moved in from IOC into the 60 by 605 district.

The resulting deviation from those changes is 0.33 percent, and the Latino CVAP resulting from those changes is 56.57 percent.

Changes to SAA included, as I mentioned, removing the portion of Buena Park, South of the five, also includes a portion of Anaheim and Orange out to Glassell Street. And the resulting deviation is negative 3.99 percent, and the resulting Latino CVAP is 51.56 percent.

Because we moved population into N-OC-COAST, the final step to balance between N-OC-COAST and IOC was moving in Aliso Viejo and Laguna Niguel into IOC from N-OC-COAST. This still preserves the coast intact, as well as raising the Latino CVAPs for both SAA and 60 by 605.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. Let's go down to SOC NSD and just take another look at that. I wanted to make sure that we're comfortable with the swaps that were made.

Any comments, questions on where we ended up?

Okay. Then I guess this -- any objection to
proceeding with this visualization?

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Certainly no objections. I just wanted to highlight, you know, Sivan's great work here. You know, I think this does accomplish a lot of our goals. Certainly we boosted those two VRA districts. We've kept a lot of communities together. Certainly, the little Saigon community is here and with Huntington Beach, as I know we've received so many calls about, I think we're also preserving the API (indiscernible) COI and some areas. We have Costa Mesa with Irvine.

So I think this accomplishes many goals. Of course, not everyone, and not everyone will always be happy, but I think this does a good job at getting as many as possible. And of course, a coastal district.

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

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Just some questions just in terms of kind of the shape, but first basic question. I believe Laguna Hills is split, and given the moves that were just done, was there any effort to try to reunite them so that they would be together and not split? That would be one question.
Second question would be if Fullerton were to be added along with Brea to the 60 by 605 district -- I think that's what it's called -- it's already a big, long, kind of U-shaped district, would that adversely affect the Latino CVAP? And I'm asking this because then just for the sake of, you know, creating a little bit more compactness and also keeping some communities of interest together, moving Placentia and Anaheim Hills in together with Yorba Linda into the district that has Chino Hills.

But at least Yorba Linda, Placentia, and Anaheim Hills would be together, and then that would make the IOC district a little bit more compact.

MS. TRATT: We did not explore trying to reunite Laguna Hills because that was with a different district that we were not involving in this population swap. If you would like to give me direction, I can definitely explore making those changes that you mentioned.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sivan, I think it's just a question of -- well, I guess there's -- before that happens, I guess I wanted to just ask, if Fullerton were to be just joined together with Brea, just to make the district a little bit more compact, would it adversely affect the CVAP there?

MS. TRATT: One moment, please, and I will put up
the pending changes box so we can see what that will do.

So it looks like that would lower the Latino CVAP from 56.57 to 54.46 percent in the 60 by 605 district.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. That's okay. Then that's -- I just wanted to see that. So let's forget about that then.

Just going down to Laguna Hills, just trying to keep a city whole, if it's possible, it looks like IOC is over deviation, and SOCNC is under deviation. So could the rest of Laguna Hills be moved into the SOCNSD so that Laguna Hills is at least completely whole together?

MS. TRATT: I think the thinking here was that it was noncontiguous. So we would have to make a city split in either Lake Forest or Laguna Woods to avoid splitting this separate area of Laguna Hills, but I can definitely --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It's contiguous. There's just a small, very narrow piece of it that connects both parts together.

MS. TRATT: One moment, please. So it looks like you could make that swap, and the deviation -- or that move of population, and you would not have to swap anything back because both districts would remain within legal deviation.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. That way then, at
least we keep the entire city together. And if you want
to just double-check to make sure, but when I looked at
it before, there's a very -- there is a road that
connects them, but if you want to just doublecheck and
just -- you can see that. Yeah.

MS. TRATT: This might be the neck of all necks, but
it does appear to be contiguous by, like, a single census
block. But --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. That is the way the
city is crafted. It's interesting, but yes. It's a very
narrow road there, but it does connect them.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And Mr. Becker, that's fine
as far as respecting a criterion for element respecting
the city boundaries over criterion 5 compactness?

MR. BECKER: And just so I'm clear, we're taking
Laguna Hills here? Is that right?

CHAIR KENNEDY: We're reuniting Laguna Hills.

Laguna Hills has two main parts, and there's a -- there's
a road connection that is part of Laguna Hills running
between the two parts of it.

So we're inquiring whether reuniting the city, a
criterion 4 priority is sufficient to --

MR. BECKER: Yes. I think that's fair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- justify this --

MR. BECKER: Can you zoom -- yeah. Can you zoom out
just a little bit, please? Yeah, I don't think this raises significant concerns.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. BECKER: You're welcome.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Any objections?

Okay. Let's go ahead with this, Sivan.

MS. TRATT: All right. That change is committed.

Should I move to San Diego next, Chair?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please. We're looking at Southeastern San Diego.

MS. TRATT: Southeastern San Diego?


MS. TRATT: Oh, City of San Diego.

CHAIR KENNEDY: San Diego City, not county.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Thank you for the clarification.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we need to take a look.

COR-CAJON is at 4.28 percent. The idea was to look at that bit above Benita that is currently in SECA, bringing that in. We explored that last night and it brought us over deviation in COR-CAJON. Just want to confirm that.

And I guess the other question is, is there a possibility of shifting some population out of COR-CAJON to I guess the coastal district or another adjoining
district so that we could make that swap.

And was there mention of Mira Mesa? I don't recall.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, there was a request to ensure that Paradise Hills and Bay Terraces would remain together, and in exchange then a portion of National City would go into SECA, and then additionally and separately, they asked about having Mira Mesa brought in to the remainder of the City of San Diego instead of being drawn into the more rural East San Diego areas.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. I believe National City's already in SECA.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yeah. National City has been very adamant about staying whole, and they are in SECA. So I would -- and this is what I was mentioning yesterday. I would even say, you know, all of Southeast San Diego, if we could. And so what I would say is let's start first in creating more space for Southeast San Diego to be in --

CHAIR KENNEDY: COR-CAJON?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yeah. And then move as much of Southeast, if not all of Southeast because there's -- Lincoln Park is right there as well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So then if you pull out, Sivan --
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: So maybe we should know what those two are in population.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Chair?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. So I have a different set of instruction that might help with this and then we can see where it shakes out.

But the desire, and there was a request from the hub yesterday to bring in -- thank you, Commissioners and Sivan, in Canto and Paradise Hills, and to the COR-CAJON. But we received update that we didn't grab all of the required areas.

So the request I'm -- the testimony that I'm looking at is that we're moving part of the El Canto neighborhood and skyline Paradise Hills in, and of course trying to still maintain the VRA seat in SECA. So that's the goal.

And so from SECA, we're adding in areas East of the 805, North of National City from SECA, into COR-CAJON. And that will unify the El Canto in. And then from SECA, adding in areas of South Woodman Street, South of Paradise Valley Road, North of the 54 to unify skyline Paradise Hills in COR-CAJON, and move into SECA Crest and Rancho San Diego for population balance, and to preserve the LCVAP in SECA.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And then move into the SOCNSD from COR-CAJON move Coronado, Ocean Beach, downtown areas West of the 5 into SOCSD from COR-CAJON, move University East of 805 North of 52 into SOCSD from COR-CAJON, move Torrey Pines, Carmel Valley into SOCSD.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. This is getting a little complicated. I thought all we were doing was moving Bay Terraces, reuniting Bay Terraces with Paradise Hills. And certainly, the -- what was it, Lincoln Park area, I think we can handle those two fairly easily.

Sivan, if you can give us a read on what population we would be bringing into COR-CAJON by bringing in Bay Terraces, and that Lincoln Park area that is within the City of San Diego, East of the 805.

MS. TRATT: Yes, Chair. One moment while I bring up that population on the pending changes blocks. Sorry, I have the -- okay. So that's the population to the East of the 805. And then let me grab Bay Terraces. So the population highlighted in red represents 26,763 people. Moving these people from SECA into COR-CAJON would make the deviation of COR-CAJON 6.99 while SECA would be under deviation at 5.27 percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I had hoped that we weren't going to get to the -- we weren't going to exceed the
deviation in SECA. We didn't last night when all we were looking at was Bay Terraces.

So I would say let's make the Bay Terraces change first, and then we can spend a little bit of time exploring what I had --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Pardon me?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I said the Lincoln Park side.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Yeah. Commissioner Turner, do you have --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No, I was waiting to see how it played out.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: If wanted, I can work on -- because what we're going to need to do -- let me just double-check here. We're going to want to create space in COR-CAJON, and then we're going to need just a little bit into SECA.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. And --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just get all the deviations. And I can -- and that's easy to do. I know this community really well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Okay. Commissioner Turner?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. And that would be fine, Commissioner Sinay. Do you have the testimony from the hub that we all received? Okay. That's great. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And I have all the other testimonies from other parts of San Diego.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much. Okay. So is there objection to going ahead with this Bay Terraces change?

MS. TRATT: So Chair, just to be clear, this would push SECA beyond the legal deviation limitation. Is the instruction to accept this change and then move exploration off-line with Commissioner Sinay to remedy that deviation?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Could you bring the pending changes --

MS. TRATT: Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- box back, please?

MS. TRATT: So if this selected area of Bay Terraces neighborhood was moved from SECA back into COR-CAJON, the resulting deviation of COR-CAJON would be 5.36 percent. I'd also just like to point out that the Latino CVAP has changed from 59.55 to 60.01 percent in SECA.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Mr. Becker, we need your opinion on that CVAP figure.
MR. BECKER: The previous figure was adequate to protect Latino populations as required under the Voting Rights Act. There's no need to increase it. In fact, there's probably some flexibility that it could go a slight bit down if it needs to. I don't see any problem with it being increased though, by less than half a percentage point.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So making this change would be acceptable?

MR. BECKER: Correct.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Then without objection, please go ahead and make that. SECA is still within deviation and Commissioner Sinay will work with Sivan to identify where to shed the slight excess population from COR-CAJON.

Okay. That is done. We need to review just our side by side review of Assembly districts and Senate districts throughout Southern California.

Ms. Mac Donald, I don't remember whether Jaime's the best person to do that or who you would like to have do that.

MS. MAC DONALD: Hello. Thank you so much. Jaime can do the overview for everything but Sivan's areas because if there were some changes, then we don't have those yet merged together. So if that could perhaps be
split, that would be great.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

MS. MAC DONALD: Would you like to start with Jaime?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Andrew?

MR. DRESCHLER: And Chair, thank you. And I was just going to suggest we could work off-line and then with those changes in San Diego County, and then when we come back, we can show that. So I think that would work perfectly. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct. That's the intent. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Hello.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Hi, Jaime.

MS. CLARK: So just -- hi. So just starting with L.A. County, these are your current iteration percentage and those are the lines that are in black, and I am going to add the Assembly lines in blue. Just to review what would and would not be possible in terms of nesting. Is that what your preference is, just kind of to do a general overview of --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.
MS. CLARK: Okay. Sounds good.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

MS. CLARK: So here in the San Gabriel Valley, of course nesting is not going to be possible between West San Gabriel Valley and East San Gabriel Valley based districts, and based on big changes that have happened since the draft, also just -- yeah. Generally a difficult situation to try and nest, given that these are areas with VRA considerations.

And I know, or it looked like maybe there also were changes to these districts that you did with Sivan. So I actually don't have that layer, or I don't have a CDF of that.

But to me, it looks like Artesia, Cerritos were removed from SD10WE, and so -- I'm sorry -- this is -- you know what? When I was working with Commissioner Akutagawa on an iteration, I accidentally changed the label so I could do that offline shortly. So this is 60X605 and with Artesia and Cerritos being removed from that, with the current iteration, actually, it's already kind of mostly nested, although because this is also a VRA area, it might not be possible to do a full nest.

Moving on, I'm going to turn off the layers here off the current Senate layers. So the 710 to water district is generally in this area. It doesn't include
Bellflower. And it does include Lakewood. It does also include Maywood and Bell Gardens, so this area, too is almost mostly nested, although in your Assembly districts you do have a split in Northern Long Beach that wouldn't be reflected and also a split in Carson that would not be reflected -- or that are not reflected in the Senate maps. And then I'm just going to turn on the districts again.

Compared to your Assembly districts, it's kind of like the South Bay plus the 105 corridor are kind of almost nested. Again, there's a lot of like close but not quite here. This going actually further North and taking in parts of sort of the West side, but much further North. So this line follows here and just kind of, yeah, comes out here and takes, of course, you know, Malibu, et cetera, all the way down to Palos Verdes, including areas of the West Side and Hollywood. So definitely not like a nest there.

And then looking more kind of inside city of Los Angeles and Southern LA. So here, the Assembly districts 105 core and West of 110 and the 110 LA district, there's kind of a lot of overlap between these in -- and the STHLA. There's kind of a lot of overlap in these between the Senate districts and the Assembly districts. Yeah. So there's -- yeah. There's, like, overlap there, I
would say, where in your current Senate district, SPCC, there's parts of 105 corridor and 110 LA and the South LA, and actually because of the split in Carson, same with the Long Beach based district as well.

Looking at your Senate district called West of 110, it includes parts of the N10 Assembly District, actually even a little bit of the West Side District, the and the 110 LA, but mostly parts of the N10 Assembly District and 110 LA Assembly District are included in your current iteration for the West of 110 in your Senate map.

And looking at the SD NELA, that does include much of the AD NELA, and AD Glenn North LA. You did not replicate the split in Glendale in this map.

Additionally, included in the NELA district, for example, the neighborhood council area of Greater Wilshire, which is not included in the NELA -- that's now called the NELA District in your Assembly map.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Jamie, could I stop you for a moment?

MS. CLARK: Absolutely.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa has a question and then I have a question.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Actually, can you just come back to me?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I just like realized -- is like, okay, I kind of got -- forgot what I was going to say listening to everything.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. That's fine. Thank you.

Jamie, I'm looking at the -- at a square just West of Pico-Union where Pico-Union and Arlington Heights come together. I'm trying to figure out, you know, was there a particular reason we ended up with that square, with the Assembly lines on one side of it and the Senate lines on the other.

MS. CLARK: I am going to guess that that is either for -- either the Assembly or the Senate map for population or maybe for STVAP (ph.) purposes. Would you like me to look into making that change for Senate? So that would be moving the Senate line to follow this.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. If you can look into that.

MS. CLARK: Sure. One second. I'll just take a moment to visualize that for you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: In the meantime, Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Was this and -- now I'm having trouble reorienting myself to these maps, but was that maybe because of a concern Commissioner Akutagawa brought up about Pico-Union and the surrounding areas, being districted maybe with less like communities or
1 communities that -- is this the place, Commissioner
2 Akutagawa? Do you remember?
3 
4 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No. Sorry. I can't
5 remember.
6 
7 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Okay. Yeah. I'm not
8 remembering the particular logic for that line either,
9 then.
10 
11 CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. I'm not concerned necessarily
12 with which way it goes. I'm just wanting to make sure we
13 understand. And, you know, I think that we'd be better
14 off if the lines were -- if the lines coincided.
15 
16 Commissioner Akutagawa?
17 
18 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think part of it was
19 maybe because of the lines for Korea Town up above and
20 maybe when we just did the Senate lines versus the
21 Assembly lines, that -- we just didn't realize that they
22 were different.
23 
24 CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Well, I'll flag this as
25 something to be looked into. I don't know that we have
26 to resolve it immediately.
27 
28 Commissioner Taylor?
29 
30 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. Looking at that box, we
31 have a similar box on both sides of that district.
32 There's another line that looks like it's a block or two
33 away as well. Do we want to mesh both of those?
And I do remember the conversation, not verbatim, that Commissioner Vazquez is referring to. I think it -- we were concerned again about like communities, the Skid Row --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: -- community line. Right. But I can't pick it up verbatim. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: So making this change, which includes both that sort of square West of Pico-Union and also moving this line in downtown Los Angeles, both districts would be within the appropriate percent deviation. The Latino CVAP for SDNELA --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. CLARK: -- would become 49.98 percent. I did see, however, without this change in downtown then the CVAP stayed above fifty percent with the change, just with the area West of Pico-Union.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And if the changes went the other way? Do we have -- can we --

MS. CLARK: Well, so I can only work on one district layer at a time to --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

MS. CLARK: To look at the Assembly district, I would need to switch maps.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I would not object to that.
Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. In thinking through this, especially because we're not immediately able to recall conversations that we likely had and reasoning we likely had to deviate from our norm, which is keeping, you know, community -- following neighborhood council lines, et cetera. My preference is that we would -- if we're going to sort of clean up some of these lines, that we would actually favor the areas where we have made a deviation from the neighborhood lines because we likely had either COI testimony or other considerations to make that sort of deviation. That would be my recommendation.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I don't want to spend too much time on this. I'm just kind of flagging these as something that we might want to look into resolving. I don't want to spend the time right now actually resolving them, but just flagging them as things we might want to resolve.

So Jamie, let's just note this as something to be looked into. And not -- but not put you through resolving it right now. And you can pull back and continue the tour.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So a couple of things. One is I know that there's been some requested
changes about trying to bring in Maywood, which does include -- and then also combining Walnut Park into the 110 District that, based on the community input, is asking for some roundabout swaps. So before maybe we do all of this other clean up, maybe we can look at it when we come back to the Assembly districts to see if those swaps are ones that are viable and that we want to do.

I also remember now why I wanted to just say something now. I wanted to report back on my exploration with Jamie about that West San Gabriel Valley, just so that the whole Commission is also aware and then also for anyone in the public who's also listening so that there's awareness of what the results of that exploration is.

So Jamie briefly mentioned that we did do the exploration of trying to bring -- I focused on the core San Gabriel -- working class San Gabriel Valley cities of Monterey Park, Alhambra, San Gabriel, both the East and South San Gabriel, as well as Temple City, trying to bring it into a district that would be somewhat like in its profiles, both for the Latino and Asian communities. We tried some different variations.

However, at the end of all of the exploration, we are also talking about VRA districts, and in doing some of the kind of swapping and trying to reconstruct the districts. Unfortunately, we were not able to get to a
close enough level to the current VRA district Latino CVAP levels, and given where they are right now, we felt that as much as we would like to make the change, it's not viable given the first or the higher criteria of VRA districts over the communities of interest.

So I did want to just let everybody know. And, you know, for all who also wrote in and advocated for this change, unfortunately, the VRA criteria is a much higher criteria. And so that is why I'm not, unfortunately, going to be able to present anything. But I did want to report out to everybody about the exploration.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for doing the exploration. Thank you for explaining the exploration. It is, you know, unfortunate that we are not able to make everyone happy on all three levels all the time. But we do appreciate the work that went into this and we hope that the public will understand.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I also just wanted to thank Commissioner Akutagawa for taking on that exploration. This area was also an area of importance for me. And so just in the spirit of, you know, community and trying to keep like communities together, I was appreciative that we explored this. And, you know, it is unfortunate that we weren't able to sort of meet both our VRA obligations
and address the community needs of the West San Gabriel Valley, as expressed by most recent public comments. So thanks, Commissioner Akutagawa.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez. Jamie, we're back to you.

MS. CLARK: Thank you. Now, I'll just kind of go to the San Fernando Valley area. And, again, turning on the Assembly districts, which are in blue. So again, in Senate, this Malibu area goes kind of down the coast, whereas in your Assembly districts, and this is kind of just based on all of the VRA considerations, et cetera. And LA County in Assembly, these areas are together, the East Ventura County areas with Malibu.

So in which case, nesting here with this sort of West San Gabriel Valley oriented Assembly district would not really be possible without a big reconfiguration. And similar, we -- in Senate, you got rid of, again, this split in Glendale and also the split in Burbank. And nesting here, I think, would be a challenge at this point, given that there's just different sort of, like, boundaries or cut-offs for the different levels of district, for the San Fernando Valley oriented districts.

Zooming out, again here, West San Gabriel Valley is a VRA district with Asians as the protected group. So -- and in our current iteration, this area is here with the
210. So again, not really a possible nest there, just based on those VRA considerations. And zooming out, the -- I'll just kind of turn off the layers for a second.

So again, in Assembly, Santa Clarita Valley is here with some of the San Fernando Valley areas. That is not so in your current Senate iteration, where Santa Clarita Valley is paired with Antelope Valley and much of Victor Valley. Additionally, here you have a boundary -- the district boundary at the Kern County-LA County border, whereas with Assembly, the border goes further North to contain much of this California's, like, very Southeastern Kern County area, California City, Edwards Air Force Base.

So that kind of concludes our little tour with the Assembly's.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Any other questions, queries, things to note from colleagues at this point? Okay.

Jamie, thank you for this. Are there any further issues with the Senate maps in the LA area?

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I was trying to see where you had mentioned earlier about Carson -- or someone did about Carson being whole. And I didn't know that was the Senate or where. I was trying
to turn around and see your -- I was trying to turn
around to your board. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So that's at the Assembly level, and
presumably that is something that we would take a look at
over the weekend.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So I -- so nothing's able
to nest? I just wanted to confirm that part of it.

Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Okay.

Jamie, go ahead.

MS. CLARK: I'm sorry. Yeah. Just to quickly
respond to that, I think that in LA County as, you know,
it's so densely populated and there are -- you know, on
all levels of district, there's VRA considerations, and
just based on there being different very considerations
in Senate and Assembly, I haven't found two districts
that are able to nest into a Senate district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you so much. At this
point, we've got seven minutes left before break.

Are there areas that colleagues want to go to?

Shall I call for another mapper?

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I would like to try to do
something in the East Bay to try to fix some of that also.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Still have not gone to the North --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- to do any of the initial.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. MacDonald?

MS. MACDONALD: Hello. We would be happy to go North with you and Tamina and Kennedy are both working right now offline, but they could be back after the break if you perhaps would like to go to break a little earlier.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I will -- without objection, I will take Ms. MacDonald's suggestion and go to break now.

We are back at -- hold on.

Andrew?

MR. DRESCHLER: I'm sorry. We were just working with Commissioner Sinay. If we have five minutes to just show the changes in San Diego, we can quickly -- Sivan
can --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect.

MR. DRESCHLER: -- quickly --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect.

MR. DRESCHLER: -- show that. Okay. Great.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Let's go ahead and do that. Thank you.

MR. DRESCHLER: Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Jamie, as soon as you stop sharing --

Oh, thank you so much. Okay. Let me just get my screen up.

So the changes made were removing Bay Terrace neighborhood and putting it back into Cor Cajon (ph.).

While offline with Commissioner Sinay, we also looked at removing Lincoln Park. So we placed this population also back with Cor Cajon to make up for that population and stay within deviation. As you can see, we're just in legal deviation at 4.9 percent with these changes. We added in the Golden Hills neighborhood -- or Golden Hill, as well as South Park and a small portion of Altadena. And these were guided by Commissioner Sinay's direction and her understanding of COIs in the neighborhood city of San Diego.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that, Sivan.

Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. It was also guided by let's keep it simple, the two districts. And so this is the way we look at all the different COIs. We are -- you know, certain neighborhoods, different people -- it -- they're diverse neighborhoods, right? And so Golden Hill, South Park also overlaps with Latino, African-American as well as LGBT and low-income working class that want to live near the downtown.

So this allowed us to do everything we wanted, which was make sure we kept within the deviations and make sure that we kept our eyes on the Latinos CVAP and pack it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Commissioner Sinay. Thank you, Sivan, for your work on this.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I was also just curious because there was that other testimony about Mira Mesa. Were you able to look at that?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We did, and it was just -- yeah. We were trying to keep everything very simple. The Mira Mesa testimony was really to use Paradise Creek, and what it did was it was reduce the numbers in the central part of the district by a lot, because it was increasing it in Carmel Valley.

So Mira Mesa, isn't -- the idea was it -- Mira Mesa's not necessarily split. It's Carmel Valley that's...
split right now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. But the proposed change would have --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Would have changed the deviations. We were being called in, but we were trying to keep everything very, very simple,

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay.

MS. TRATT: Yeah. It would have pushed SOCNSD over five percent, so it would have just involved in additional swaps.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. TRATT: With the --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead, Sivan.

MS. TRATT: Oh, I was just going to ask if the Chair would like to see Assembly lines over the current district boundaries or if there were any other changes, just so that I can get everything exported and merged, so that we can show the most updated version?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. We can go ahead and take a quick look at those lines side by side.

MS. TRATT: Okay. One moment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Or superimposed.

MS. TRATT: I'm just going to turn the city colors back on.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Commissioner Sinay, did you add in other areas? Or you just moved within those?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We just moved within. We kept it very simple. We made sure to take all of Southeast San Diego and put it into Cor Cajon, and just kept -- looked where to find that. We had thought about taking Crest --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- and making the swap there, but it would have kind of left Crest on its own without other communities and neighborhoods. And so that's why we went through -- we did Golden Hill and that area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

MS. TRATT: Thank you so much for your patience. I was just adding the CVAPs for the Assembly districts to the labels. Is this color coming through on Zoom, or should I change this to red or something that'll stand out a little bit more?

CHAIR KENNEDY: No. I think that's fine.

MS. TRATT: Okay. So what you're currently seeing in this teal color are the latest iterations of the Assembly districts. And then, of course, in the black lines are the current iterations of the Senate districts that the Commission has been working on.

So I can just do kind of a slow pan around the
Southern part of the state and bring us into break, unless there's a part that the Commissioners would like to start with. I can start North or South.

CHAIR KENNEDY: If you can just pan around. We are up on our break time, so this doesn't need to take long.

(Pause)

MS. TRATT: And again, these lines will match in the final iteration, just waiting for final Congressional.

(Pause)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you very much, Sivan. It is four 4:45. We have a fifteen-minute break now. We will come back at 5 o'clock.

Looks like we will continue for a little bit longer with Senate. And then once we are finished with Senate, we will need to give the mappers fifteen to twenty minutes to, I guess, close that file and bring up what they need to bring up so that we can review the Board of Equalization districts. So --

MS. TRATT: Chair, could I -- just so that I'm using my time most efficiently, are there are other changes for Senate in this region, or can I use the break to export and start that merging process for the other line drawers?

CHAIR KENNEDY: My understanding would be that we are -- we have concluded our work on the Senate in your
area, Sivan.

MS. TRATT: Okay. Thank you so much for the clarification. I will go ahead and get that exported. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. So we are on break until 5 o'clock. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 4:46 p.m. until 5:00 p.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your patience. Welcome back to today's meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are on the course to complete our work on our Senate districts today and hopefully get to our Board of Equalization districts.

So I wanted to, at this point, shift our attention to the Northern part of the state and ask Kennedy to review for us where we stand with Senate districts in the Northern part of the state.

MS. WILSON: Okay. Very well, Chair. So I'll start at the very tip top. We have Siskiyou, Modoc, Shasta, Lassen, Tehama, Butte, Plumas, Sierra Nevada, parts of Placer, Colusa, and Glenn, all within one Senate district in the North. And then continuing to move South, we have, and I'm going to zoom in so we can see the cities within Placer and Sacramento County. And Placer ED,
which no longer has ED in it. We have the cities of Auburn -- actually, the city of Auburn was split, and then we have New Castle, Penryn, Granite Bay, Roseville, Rocklin, Lincoln, and Sheridan with some of the cities down in Sacramento, such as Elverta, Antelope, Arden-Arcade, and Carmichael are together. Rancho Cordova, Gold River, Fair Oaks, to Folsom, Rancho Murieta, down to the Sacramento border. We have Galt, Herald, and Clay.

And then moving into Sacramento -- the city of Sacramento, we have Rio Linda out to North Highlands and McClellan Park, and then we have the entire city of Sacramento whole, including Elk Grove and Vineyard, La Riviera as well, Rosemont, Mather, Parkway, Lemon Hill, Fruitridge Pocket, all the downtown, everything within Sacramento is together.

And then continuing to move into San Joaquin County. We do have reaching into Alameda County, Dublin, Livermore, Pleasanton, Sunol, with the entire San Joaquin County kept whole. And then continuing to move down, right above the VRA consideration district, we have Stanislaus with Delhi, Livingston, Snelling, and Merced County out with Mariposa, Amador, Madera, Mono, Inyo, Alpine, up to El Dorado, and Placer, and South Lake Tahoe, and North Lake Tahoe, all of Tahoe kept together. And that is an overview of the North, Senate North.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm sorry. I went to the bathroom. So did you do Norco also and NORTHCOAST, Kennedy or no?

CHAIR KENNEDY: NORCA was done. NORCOAST or --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- yeah, NCOAST is Terminous area.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- but Norco would give --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

MS. WILSON: But I can read it.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, that's okay. I'm good. I know what I want to look at, so thank you so much, Kennedy.

Can you zoom in right between ECA, Placer County, and Nevada? What I would like to do is, I'd like to combine Truckee with Tahoe. But I also want to see how much is left is Placer County that could potentially make that whole as well. And each -- oh, wait a minute. ECA is 2.17. Oh, we changed it. Okay.

I think the only option at this point would be to bring Truckee in, so at least it is combined in the same district with Lake Tahoe. Because that is --

MS. WILSON: And I will select --
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Truckee is 16,000. Thank you. Kingvale and Truckee would -- yeah. Thank you. Chair, if that's okay?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay, could you look up and see if Nevada County has completed its redistricting, and if there is a Board of Supervisors boundary that we might look at as far as the Eastern part of the county? Thank you.

So we've got Truckee and the -- in the pending changes box.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: My comments are for a different portion of the map, so I'll wait.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you. We'll wait on that to see if there is a Board of Supervisors district boundary that we might, look at.

MS. WILSON: So taking in Kingvale to Truckee would put NORCA at negative 5.5 percent flat. And would ECA at 4.47 percent?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Can we get the pending changes data box and bigger type face, please?

MS. WILSON: You most definitely can get that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

MS. WILSON: So let me put up. There we go.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Oh, at 5 percent even.
Okay. Got it.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Chair, what is it -- oh, you're looking to see how far South -- I mean, how far East to move that boundary?

CHAIR KENNEDY: How far -- yeah. If there is -- I mean, if the supervisorial district goes much farther West, then there's no need for us to try to respect it. I was just --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. It goes -- it looks like. It's kind of -- it doesn't have a road or any -- I don't know if it's the 174 and the 20, but it goes past the heel and kind of down to the foot.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Okay. Then that's not really a relevant consideration.

Commissioner Fernandez, did you have more?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think that's good for now. I may have some more, but -- oh --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Should we --


CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I should have something later.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Should we try to bring that -- the
Northwestern line in a bit so that we are under the deviation? Did that change the population? That didn't change the population. Okay. Okay. Yeah. Let's explore eliminating some North of Truckee. This is stubborn.

Okay. So we can clean up some of those -- yeah. so while Kennedy is doing this, I just want to ask, is there any objection to bringing Truckee into ECA with Lake Tahoe? I'm not seeing any objection. Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I have one more thing. Do you mind?


COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I -- there's been mixed testimony in terms of Del Norte wanting to be with the counties inland, and in all of the other maps we've left Del Norte with the coastal. And I would recommend moving Del Norte into Norco. And right now, Norco is at a negative and it could easily bring that in. And Del Norte is only 25,000. That's my second recommendation. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner Sinay has endorsed that change. Is there any objection to that change?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I have to say it's --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Pardon me?
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think the -- there's Native American communities up there. And so I'd like to take a look at that area a little bit more --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- before we make that change.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. And I would like to see that area up there, because I was trying to compare. The ratio looks different than what I thought it would look so --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I see.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- I'd like to see a comparison.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Kennedy, you can go ahead and proceed with this change. Thank you.

MS. WILSON: I got it down to a negative 4.98.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Great. Thank you. And then can we go to Del Norte County?

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Chair, just before we leave Truckee --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- did you want to look -- are
there communities of -- you know, how you were talking about the sphere of influence in big cities --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- and rural areas? Do we need to think about that here?

CHAIR KENNEDY: At this moment, no. This may be something that we clean up over the weekend, but thank you for raising that.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: So we did hear mixed testimony about Del Norte, some feeling like it was a better match for income levels and such with counties to the East. On the other hand, Yurok Tribe, in particular, their tribal lands, the largest tribal reservation in California and the only one on its own ancestral lands, does go from down to Humboldt. So that was one reason we never did that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Yee. Okay. So here we are. Oops, we lost the map. Leave it be.

MS. WILSON: I am back. Sorry for that technical issues. We are back and ready to go.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we're discussing whether or not in the Senate map to shift Del Norte East. It is in the coastal district at both the Assembly level and
Congressional level.

So Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So I think if we look at the terrain level. So let's go deep and let's look at the terrain, because the terrain here is really important. And if we look at the roads, if you can look, there is no road connecting the Del Norte to the Siskiyou area. There -- the only way that you can go into Siskiyou is through going up to the Oregon border, then around.

And then when you think about the industry -- I'm in health care, obviously, and when you think about the health care systems, the health care systems, the largest primary care health system is based out of Humboldt and it's Open Door Health Centers based out of -- that operates the Del Norte community health clinics. The tribal lands are as the Yurok Tribe. And I am not pronouncing it correct, but it goes from Del Norte all the way to Humboldt. The transportation, right, it's up and down. It's not really sideways. In terms of income level, there -- I can see an argument for income. But if we look at this holistically and the terrain just doesn't -- I mean, it would be more about keeping peoples up -- I mean, I just -- from a transportation, from a -- even from a philosophical standpoint, in terms of we created a coastal district taking a piece of the coast
out does kind of seem a little bit odd to me. So
that's -- those are some of the arguments against it.
And I would have to have a really strong argument to
support moving Del Norte out of the coastal region.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Here's my argument. We've
had many communities of interest that have said they
prefer to be with those communities or those counties to
the East, no commonality at all with Marin, which is
where this is going to. They would probably prefer to go
up to Oregon and around versus going all the way down to
Marin. And what we base the information on is our
communities of interest. And yes, the train information
is very important. So I'm trying to honor communities of
interest, because in the other two, we've left them in
the coastal. So I'm just trying to give it to them one
time. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I was going to say, you
need a strong argument, the community itself has asked
for it. And, you know, living on -- in a border area and
the foreign country border area. You use it as -- you --
people live, going back and forth as we shared before in
Modoc. We had talked to a woman who they did all their shopping and everything in Oregon.

It's -- I think the best argument is just that they have asked for it. And the second one is that it is part of the same forest and we've heard that over and over again, and we haven't looked at it that way.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you. I hear that, but on the other portion over here it was the forest. Crescent City is a major fishing area and the fishing industry, we had a bit of a break --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen, I'm sorry to interrupt.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We're having real problems with your audio.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Can you hear me now?

CHAIR KENNEDY: No, it's distorted.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Static.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Do you have headphones plugged in or anything?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No. No, I do not.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Kristian, are you able to --
MR. MANOFF: You may want to log out and reboot. The machine might be overheating.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry about that.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I should add that having said what I said about the Yurok. The Karuk, you know, on the other hand, go from Siskiyou to Del Norte, and there has been some testimony about their presence there in Western Siskiyou and interest in the Klamath River, which does flow from Siskiyou through del Norte. So that's a plus in that direction.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I wanted to ask Commissioner Toledo if you would restate again -- you said you're in health care and health care in this area, I imagine. Can you just say some more about what you were sharing?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Well, just in terms of where people get their health care. Because, I mean, certainly there's low-income populations throughout this area and throughout the North coast. And so we have the Sutter Hospital, which, of course, has affiliates in the -- going up and down and oftentimes sending to Sutter affiliates in either Santa Rosa, when there's trauma.
There's also specialty care that's available in the Arcadia-Eureka area through that system. But then there's Open Doors Health Centers, based out of -- which operates the Del Norte Community Health Center, which provides care to many people in the Del Norte area, based out of Humboldt. And so that's one. Certainly, one connection, but it's the transportation system, the economic system, the environmental issues, and the coastal.

I mean, it seems like the community of interest is really connected there. And the feedback that we got -- the public input testimony. We got a lot of public input that also supported going up and down. So it wasn't -- certainly, we got -- and I did see the public input from supervisors and other community members supporting Del Norte going Eastward, and I certainly understand that as well, especially from a political standpoint.

But I try to stay out of the political and think more of the economic, the transportation, the housing, the environmental issues, the issues that the communities stated -- and then if we put on the reservation for the -- I believe it's in this area, the tribal map. The tribe goes from Klamath down all the way to Humboldt, so we'd be splitting a tribe, which we -- I mean, I guess it's more important on the federal level, but even on the
state level, it's important. And we try not to split communities of interest where possible.

So if we need to do it for population. If we need to do it for community of interest or for -- I mean, certainly it wouldn't be VRA. I don't think it's for deviation population, but if it's for a reason that it is above this, then certainly, I'd consider.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I was -- I've been trying to just quickly go through the COI testimony again for Del Norte. I think we've heard different testimonies about staying coastal, and then others saying that they want to go, you know, from East to West -- or West to East in this case. I guess, you know, I definitely hear what Commissioner Toledo is saying. I'm reading some of the earlier testimonies.

I will also just remind everybody what struck me when we first started the early COI testimonies, hearing from individuals from this region talking about the Emerald Triangle and the -- you know, the kind of the weed area. I thought that that -- I will admit that that was kind of that was kind of interesting. I didn't know
anything about that, in terms of their industry. I also
read things about forests.

The last thing I want to just say is, I think, as
maybe as we all go through the COI testimony again about
this area, we should know who is giving the testimony.
Are these people from the actual county or is it someone
from outside? Because I feel like there's certainly lots
of people who are willing to tell other people in other
areas who they should be with. But I think we should
also look at that, the people who are living there, what
do they want? Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you. Thank
you, Commissioner Akutagawa. That's exactly what I was
going to say. There was quite a bit of testimony, but it
was coming from Marin. And they -- and I don't know if
part of the fear is they didn't want to cross the bridge.
So they were saying, keep us coast and go all the way
North. A compromise could be to -- I don't want to split
Humboldt, but you could also split Humboldt up to the
tribal lands. I don't know what that population is, but
it's something that can be done.

I just -- again, I'm basing it on the communities of
interest. And I've driven all the way up to Crescent
City. So I know how remote it is. And the reason I was up there, is there's a prison up there and many of the employees actually live in Oregon. They just cross -- it's that close to Oregon. So that's just my comments.

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

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Hopefully you can hear me now?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Much better.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Great. The fishing industry -- you know, Crescent City is a large harbor, and they need to be with the coast. And I don't -- you know, I was hoping to hear from the fishing industry. I haven't heard much at all. But I assume, you know, they don't really pay much attention to any of this kind of thing. But that is a major reason.

I don't know what percentage of their industry involves fishing versus logging. But, you know, that's one reason why I really hope we keep it on the coast. So that's another reason why I'd still like to keep on the coast.

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

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I'm currently split as to where I think Del Norte should go, either East or South.
I will just say, like, I hear Commissioner Toledo, what you're saying about sort of trying to separate the political from some of the more socioeconomic interests at play. And I just, for me personally, that doesn't always work because what I feel like what our charge is, is explicitly political.

We're talking about where community power is going to lie in terms of elections. And so that doesn't mean that partisan or sort of individuals with a specific political agenda should unduly influence our decisions. But I did just want to sort of, at least for myself, make it clear to the rest of the Commission and the public that I do think broad political power considerations are sort of inherent to the work that we're doing. And that is something -- that is a lens I'm bringing to the decisions around not just this area, but others.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you. We continually get lessons in this process. It's not over yet. I agree, Commissioner Akutagawa, we have to be mindful of the quality of the information that we get, something we learned throughout the process.

I, myself, am learning to be mindful of the COI testimony over my own thoughts. Put what is being told
to me ahead. And with that also, I'm also seeing much to
the leading of Commissioner Kennedy, that I am connecting
the dots to the neighbor across the street, as opposed to
the extremes of a district. Is the Del Norte closer to
Orick as opposed to Del Norte closer to Marin?

So those are some of the considerations. I'm trying
to figure it out along with you guys. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

My own sense, and I've, you know, certainly been
open to listening to, you know, all of the arguments on
this since the very beginning. I've tried to keep an
open mind on the public input. I do recall hearing from
people from Crescent City, from Smith River. It's not
all people from Marin. And, you know, to me, I've always
said throughout this process that respecting the wishes
of native populations is a high priority for me. I also,
you know, hear and certainly respect what Commissioner
Toledo is saying as far as health care delivery,
transportation and so forth.

So, I mean, at this point, my -- I'm leaning towards
leaving things as they are. I think if we were looking
at needing population in NORCA, I would probably be more
favorable to shifting Trinity. I think earlier today we
actually had Trinity in NORCA. I'd be probably more
amenable to moving Trinity back into NORCA.
I don't know a whole lot about Trinity County, but certainly listening to public input, you know, I know it's just kind of difficult to go in any direction from large portions of Trinity County. And, you know, if we're looking at the distance from Del Norte to the bottom of the district, you know, I think as one of our colleagues said, I also have to look at the distance from Del Norte to the opposite corner of NORCA and look at the differences.

And that brings me back to what Commissioner Andersen was saying about the fishing industry. And so you know, at this point, I'm leaning towards leaving Del Norte as it is. Thank you.

And Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I'm also reading the COIs. I came across a good number of them that actually explain -- that speak about the tribes and what have you and the -- and what I wish. And I know we talked about as an upgrade, that we will have comments to know if they meant for which district, what are we talking about, which map type.

But this one, Chair, says that one of the -- they were making reference to our discussions. One of the -- and this is from earlier, not a brand new submission. One of the Commissioners just said before public comment
that we -- when we move to the North, they wanted to
revisit the idea of splitting the Siskiyou County to keep
the tribal lands together. They print in all caps. The
tribes are whole now. Splitting Siskiyou County at I-5
will cut the Shasta tribe in two. The Karuk Tribe is
whole now because -- we undid this -- because the
Northwest corner of Humboldt County has been added to the
district with Siskiyou County. If what the Commissioner
meant was a desire to keep Klamath River tribes together,
this can be done by removing the Del Norte and Humboldt
Counties from the coastal district and including them in
a district that reaches to the East. The Klamath River
begins in Modoc County.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that, Commissioner
Turner.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I would really rather
not see Trinity removed. Actually, it's the little --
it's -- the Klamath River actually begins in Lake Modoc,
which is up in Oregon somewhere. It's not actually over
in Modoc County. I think that was a -- it's -- that was
a printed from like a mistake in an article, and it
actually goes up there to Klamath Falls. It actually
goes in that area and then comes down South. And it does
run, I believe, through parts of Trinity, and then
Humboldt and Del Norte. And I'd like to keep all that
together, which is watersheds from -- I know there are
other watersheds as well, from Trinity into Humboldt.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
Andersen.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you to everybody who's
watching us out there. Sometimes -- yeah. We always get
reminded by your quick responses to our conversations
that we are in a fishbowl. We have received a couple of
quick comments already. And one saying, please keep us
on the coast. When I travel to visit my family, I go
down the coast. And another one saying, please
reconsider keeping Del Norte, Humboldt, and Trinity
counties in the coastal zone. Keep in mind these
communities of interest. Keeping these counties in the
coastal zone and keeping Yurok and Karuk Tribes together.
So both of them are saying keeping them in the coastal.

So in keeping them -- so we are getting real-time
input. And I just wanted to acknowledge them, because I
know that the far North have said we hadn't looked at
this area at all and that we haven't listened to them.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Akutagawa?
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. I'm -- as I keep reading through some of the COI testimony, I do want to just point out some other interesting comments. One speaks about the Redwood Curtain and specifically Del Norte, Humboldt and Trinity, I believe it was. But another one -- others talk about different areas. I think in terms of the transportation, the US-101 and specifically Last Chance Grade was noted for Del Norte County and about the hopes to have, you know, the roads fixed there.

Another mention that the jobs center around either government or tourism in the area. There's a number of mentions about rivers, oceans, redwoods. Someone mentioned creatures. Also, environmental and conservation has come up a lot, along with fishing and forest.

And then the one that I'm currently on right now does speak to some very perceived differences by this person. This person is in Trinity County, but speaks to a very rural nature where their focus is more on, I guess, connection to the land because they're more rural. They're also concerned about their watersheds. They kind of like the mountains versus the Central Valley debate. They feel like other areas take. They're the ones that produce or are the sources of water. But natural
resources is a big thing that seems to be there, which
they see is different from -- as one person -- as this
person wrote, they do not want to be districted with
counties to the East. They feel their landscape is
disconnected, but also their economics as well, too. And
culturally, they feel that they are different from those
to the East as well, too. So I'll just keep reading
through and see what other things come up.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. And I am very
grateful for people that are able to watch and able to
provide feedback. Many are not. And I mean, it's
something we're going to move forward with and that's
fine. But I also don't want us to forget all of the
other input that we started receiving back in March,
April, May, June. So I tried, but it is what it is. At
the end of the day, it's still a fair map. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I think for me, it's
more about when I look at the communities of interest,
its really -- the community of interest that we've
received, it's less about Marin. And I don't think --
it's not about Marin. It's about Del Norte and Humboldt.
So -- and potentially Trinity, Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity. But most of the testimony that I've seen has -- have been those communities want to be kept together.

So even some of these regions actually said we don't want to be with Sonoma and Marin, but it's really about keeping these communities whole. So I mean, I would -- I mean, I wouldn't be as opposed if we wanted to shift all three to the Eastern portion. But if we want to just shift Del Norte, I don't think that's -- we'd be breaking up that COI and that community that wished to be kept together. And I think that would be an architectural change, which I would much rather keep it as is. Thank you. Given our -- how we said we wanted to build a coastal district. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Just one more, Chair, if you will, because I think it provides a different lens from the area. This particular one says -- speaks about Siskiyou and the coast not being different. They actually said someone said it was and they say that's a lie. But they say they're super alike in everything except for how they vote, and I'm going to skip some of that. But it says down here, it says also talking about the forest, this is what I want to get to. The forests
are different. That's just wrong. Siskiyou's Cal Forest Industry is one of the largest single employers in the county. It moved from Siskiyou to Humboldt and it still supplies most of the reforesting seedlings to the coastal redwoods. Similarly, the Sierra Pacific Industry, largest lumber forestry company in the North, it's based in Shasta now, but started in Humboldt. Heck, talking about the owner, et cetera. I don't know what the commenter was trying to say, but Shasta, Siskiyou, and the coastal counties are much more similar than Sutter and Yolo and the Central Valley. So that's all.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I'm wondering about Trinity, and I'm wondering if Commissioner Andersen could tell us -- give more reasons for why she's committed to keeping it on the coast. And as I recall, the limited testimony that we received was ambivalent about coast versus inland. It was certainly improve the deviation for NORCA if we could move it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Commissioner Toledo actually sort of said a lot -- most of the -- there's a lot of testimony at the original -- originally Humboldt, Trinity, Del Norte, so we want to stay together. But it
is the Klamath River that there's -- there is a little portion of Trinity. Yes, they are sort of flatter and they want to go down to Highway 5 and with Shasta. And at one point we even kind of talked -- which we split Trinity County, because the -- and that's sort of that East -- there's an Eastern portion.

But if you look at the Klamath River and this is a tribal thing, actually, there are some tribal interests in the Bay Area here who have been fighting to take rivers, take dams down along the Klamath River for quite some time. Some of that's happened and it runs through Trinity and then through Humboldt and Del Norte. So it's sort of a tribal thing.

The other reason that, in terms of, if we just take all three of those move them East, you know, the -- what's it? The Emerald Triangle, that's Humboldt, Mendocino, parts of Trinity. So they -- that whole and it's a huge business. It's a huge business being taxed. It's going to make our state a lot of money. And that's in those three counties.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I am -- based on COI testimony and in agreement with Commissioner Toledo, I am -- I would be in support of the
Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity type of move. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

I looked at the population. So Del Norte, Humboldt and Trinity would be about 175,000 people, most of that in Humboldt County. That's quite a significant shift and as was said earlier, would involve architectural changes, which, you know, had we been at this point several weeks ago, I think we would be willing to explore that. But at this point in time, I don't see that that is the best way forward.

Any further discussion on this?

My -- thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. I'm trying to decide if I if I would be in support of that, I would. And I think my frustration is because we left the North to the end, we're not willing to do anything. So that's very frustrating to me, because I've been respectful of all of the other areas and open to venturing. And I know that we're late but -- or behind, but just because we're behind doesn't mean that we shouldn't potentially look at a iteration.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I -- as I continue to read this, I mean, I see the mention of Del Norte
Mendocino, Humboldt, and Trinity, it depends on who's talking, whether they're from Trinity or Del Norte, but I would support an exploration that would look at, is it possible to look at some of these other moves that I think Commissioner Fernandez is advocating for?

Because there is mixed testimony. And as we've talked about, you know, mixed testimony in other areas, we've done some of the exploration. We're talking about also big areas. So it's not like the kind of complicated ripple effects that we would see in Southern California.

So if this is what we need to do to ensure that we're building the fairest maps for the people of California in this region, then I think we do owe it to them to take a little bit more time to just, you know, do this exploration. Maybe come back tomorrow morning or something like that with the results, and then we can make a more informed decision. Because I think there is different testimonies.

And it -- as we've learned, I think everything is always seen through the eyes of the person who's giving you the testimony. And sometimes it could be very, very different. So I guess, that would be my recommendation.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Not doing it because
we ran out of time is one thing. Not doing it because we
don't believe it's the right thing to do is something
different. And it felt to me like we were split. So
Chair, if we could get a sense, we should -- I would
support trying to make it happen, if indeed, that is what
we want to do.

And I don't just want to say we're not doing it
because we ran out of time. It seems like we are split
based on the COI testimony that's split. So I wanted to
just lift that so that we can make a decision based on
the desire of the Commission.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you for that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I completely respect
Commissioner Turner, what she said on that, because I
believe that's kind of why -- that we aren't doing it,
not for time. But on the aspect of time, I do appreciate
what Commissioner Fernandez said. And, yes, I am
sensitive to that.

But again, it's 5:30, 5:45 on a Friday afternoon,
and we'd like to vote on Monday. I'm very concerned
about the public not seeing the changes. And if we -- in
terms of areas that need work because it's been
completely reworked, I would really like to spend a
little bit of time on the East Bay.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I wasn't saying I was supporting looking at an iteration. What I was saying, it's my frustration that because we left this to the end, we don't have any choices. I -- if we're not going to move Del Norte in, I would leave it the way it is. So I didn't want you to think I was leaning towards it. I was just stating my frustration of we're going to get five minutes for North.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. And I understand the frustration, but Commissioner Sinay has been frustrated in the past as well about San Diego and the far South not getting attention.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But we still -- even when we got there, we still did iterations in Southern California.

CHAIR KENNEDY: You know, if the Commission wishes to go on this exploration, I'm willing to go on the exploration. But we have to understand the implications of that for the rest of our schedule. It could mean that instead of having maps approved on Monday, they're approved on Tuesday. But, you know, I'm willing to entertain that that discussion.

Commissioner Sadhwani?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Thank you, Chair, for that. And timeline issues aside, I just wanted to weigh in. I mean, I think going back and reviewing a lot of the testimony we've received, I mean, I'm still in support of keeping these counties together in a coastal district.

And I think there's a lot of testimony from the Karuk and Yurok tribes. And I may be saying those wrong, and I apologize in advance. You know, as Commissioner Toledo and others have laid out, a lot of economic and transportation issues, so I would be in support of just of keeping this where it is. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. I've said each time, I'm -- I have to be consistent. I would be in favor of a targeted exploration. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I would be, too. Building upon what Commissioner Turner said, I think we would do a disservice to the people in the Northern part of the Californias -- of California. And I think we will still have time to do at least a visualization. I think if it means that we delay to Tuesday, you know, we built in that time for the just in case.
And I would not want to do this disservice. And so
I think -- I would be in wholehearted support of at least
doing the exploration so that at least we all know. And
I would -- yeah. I would definitely be in support.
Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Any objection to exploring
this? And let's also be clear what it is we're
exploring. At this point, we're exploring the
possibility of shifting Humboldt, Trinity, and Del Norte
from a coastal district to a North state district.
Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: The amount of COI
testimony -- the greatest amount of COI testimony from
this area, excluding Marin has been Mendocino and
Humboldt. And this would split Mendocino and Humboldt.
So I do not like this idea. We can explore it.
It's going to be large -- a lot of architectural changes.
But I'd really like to see Mendocino and Humboldt on the
coast, not inland.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I am not in support of
this. I was making a different point. So just to be on
record. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I just want to keep what we have at this point. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

My sense of the will of the Commission is that, in general, we believe that it is best to leave the Senate district as it is for a variety of reasons. We have said that we are willing to undertake an exploration, but it would involve significant architectural changes.

We do have the flexibility in the schedule. But in the end, it seems that the determination that the best end result is to leave us where we are, would indicate that we are best our best path forward is to leave things as they are.

Commissioner Akutagawa, Commissioner Taylor, I believe your hands are just still up.

Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez, are there other areas in the North that you had wanted to take a look at?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I believe that was it.

Just one last time, Kennedy, right? Kennedy is with us.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Can you just go into the Yolo, Solano? Yeah. I think I was okay with all of
that. I don't remember receiving any testimony that
would be opposite. Yep. I'm good. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Kennedy, if you would, just walk us one more time
around your entire region, and then we will ask Tamina to
start at the Northern state line and take us all the way
down her region.

MS. WILSON: Okay. So let's do a quick -- well, if
we're going to start with her at the North, let's start
at the bottom of my district. We have our two VRA
consideration districts taking in parts of Bakersfield,
parts of Shafter, Kern County North -- the Western part
of Kern County North, into parts of Tulare, Porterville,
parts of Visalia, all of Kings County, Kingsburg in
Fresno County, moving up to the San Benito-Fresno
district, which is no longer Benito at all. It's Fresno,
Merced, and parts of Madera. We have Fresno-Kern, which
has -- there was the remainder of the Northern parts of
Fresno and Clovis going down with the rest of Kern
County.

Then we have our ESA, which is Mono, Inyo, Alpine,
keeping Lake Tahoe together. We did bring in Kingvale
and Truckee to be down in there, Amador to Madera
together, Stanislaus whole in this county, and parts of
Merced that were not in the VRA district, and South SSAC-
STANIS, we have no more of South SSAC at all. Just STANIS. It does not represent this at all. It's all of San Joaquin and parts of Alameda County out to Sunol, up to Dublin.

Then moving North into Sacramento, we have Oak Grove, Vineyard, Florin, the City of Sacramento all together, as well as McClellan Park, and Rio Linda, North Highlands. And then on the -- and Sacramento is kind of split in an East-West version. And so on the East side, we have the Southern part of Sacramento County, Golt to Clay, up to Folsom, out to Antelope, up into Placer County, Rocklin, Roseville, together, and Newcastle.

And then we have the rest of -- well -- so then we have the Auburn area up to Alta going North into the North district where we just were looking at, which does have Nevada and Sierra together. There's Plumas, Butte, Sutter -- Butte, Sutter. Oh my goodness.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sutter.

MS. WILSON: Sutter, Uber (sic) -- I cannot talk.

Oh my gosh.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yuba.

MS. WILSON: I just give up. Sorry, Yuba. Colusa, Glenn, Tehama, Lassen, Modoc, Siskiyou, and Shasta, all together. And that's all.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much,
Kennedy.

Is Tamina available?

MS. WILSON: Tamina is available, and I can go over North Coast also, since it's right there. We have Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity, Mendocino Lake, most of Sonoma together. Of course, we -- you took out the Rohnert Park. And then you also have parts of Marin as well. And Tamina can take over the rest, but that's North coast.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you so much, Kennedy.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: With Kennedy still in place, can we go back to Sacramento?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry.

MS. WILSON: Yes. Oh, sorry.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well done.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Well, I just wanted to ask Commissioner Fernandez or anyone else knows this area well, to comment on Mather, which in our late night extra credit work, we ended up separating from Cordova, but wondering if that should go North instead?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think either way is fine. Mather is actually connected both sides, and it's nice that the communities aren't split. So I -- if you try to connect it with Rancho -- actually, I'm not sure what
that would -- well, you're -- Sacramento's already low.
So you'd probably have to bring in Arden-Arcade. You'd
have to split out Mather and bring in Arden-Arcade, I'm
thinking, which is a possibility, actually.

COMMISSIONER YEE: We tried it. It's still barely.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And Rosemont. If you
brought in Rosemont as well. And then brought in Arden-
Arcade to the Sacramento side. Does that make sense,
Kennedy?

MS. WILSON: I'm sorry. I did lose you there.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: That's okay. Commissioner
Yee was asking about Mather, and I was thinking a
different swap could potentially be taking Mather and
Rosemont and moving that to the Placer. And then
moving -- offsetting -- bringing Arden-Arcade into
Sacramento. I'm not sure -- unfortunately, I don't know
what the numbers are. So what I do like about this is
this is the only time I believe that Sacramento City is
actually in one district.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Mather is less than 5,000
people. But if it's less than 5,000 people, it seems to
me, can we try and see if it really is going to push the
under population above five percent?

MR. WILSON: It will not.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I think we tried it last night
and it was just below five. So you could just do that.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

MS. WILSON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Before you make that change, I also want to just lift up that there is a Syrian Afghan refugee COI between Arden-Arcade and Carmichael. So if we move Arden-Arcade out, then that COI will be split. So I mean, it sounds like from what you've said, Commission Fernandez, it could go either way in terms of Mather. So just wanted to lift that part up, in terms of the --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. And there's --

CHAIR KENNEDY: But we don't need to make any further changes. The Mather shift is possible without going over deviation in Sacramento. So we don't need to make any further changes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I was just going to respond to the -- there's actually quite a bit of testimony of Carmichael and Arden-Arcade wanting to be split. They don't see each other as a -- right, except for the one COI. And if you do look in there, it's -- it actually -- it just causes me to chuckle because to drop off my son,
I had to go through both neighborhoods and they seem to be fine.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Yee, were you finished?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I'm in line for when we get to the East state.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Same area?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Commissioner Fernandez, this move splits Rosemont and Mather, and I thought they were -- had commonality as well. Are you -- do you see that?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I believe it was more of Rosemont with the Oak Park section. I can look really quick, though.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. This could also be one of those switches that's made over the weekend since it doesn't involve any other changes.

Thank you for that, Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It's moving -- it's Commissioner Yee -- the East Bay, not this.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez, can we move -- okay. Thank you.

Then I guess, Kennedy, thank you. And we would need Tamina. Okay.

So Tamina, just talk us through the East Bay area, and then we will have Commissioner Yee and others chime in.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Certainly, Chair. So we have the NAPABYRON District, which I believe was already discussed, but has a little of the East Bay, so we'll put that in there as well. So just the East Bay sections that are in NAPABYRON, are the Eastern -- East Contra Costa cities of Bethel Island, Oakley, Knightsen, Brentwood, Byron, and Discovery Bay to complete the -- this delta COI.

We have SD80COR, which takes Crockett -- sorry, right before Crockett, so Rodeo, down the 80 Corridor through West Contra Costa into Alameda County, keeping Oakland whole and stopping right before San Leandro. We have Cocoa, which has San Leandro, and the Eden unincorporated areas, comes up into Contra Costa, has the 680 Corridor up to the 4, including La Marinda and the 4 over to Antioch.

We have SSAC-STANIS, which you may have gone over
already, but the Dublin, Livermore, Pleasanton COI with Sunol, to Mountain House and Tracy. We have Eden Tech, which has Hayward, Union City, Newark, Fremont, all intact, along with Milpitas, the Northern area and various areas of San Jose, Santa Clara, and Sunnyvale.

And stretching the definition of East Bay, we have the San Jose District, which has the balance of San Jose with Gilroy, San Martin, and Morgan Hill, and Lexington Hills.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And then peninsula?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Going into peninsula, we have San Francisco. The district keeps San Francisco whole with Daly City, Colma, and two neighborhoods' COIs of South San Francisco.

Peninsula takes the balance of San Mateo County going down the 101 Corridor and down the coast. It also includes areas of Santa Clara County from Palo Alto and Stanford down to Cupertino and Saratoga. Also including Campbell, Los Gatos, and Monte Sereno.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Tamina.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. Thank you, Chair. And I believe we were still going to move Gilroy, correct, from this morning's discussion? So that's a pending change.
But yeah -- but this morning when we were here, so I think I mentioned the three things that we didn't get to in our late night extra credit session. One was basically Tri-City -- Tri-Valley area, doing something on San Leandro and then overall improving the SSAC-STANIS architecture and what's included.

So I believe, Commissioner Fornaciari had talked us through an idea, and I had requested that we try working through that idea this morning, but we didn't get to it. So I'm hoping we could do that now? And if Commissioner Fornaciari is willing and available, whether we could that now?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes. So -- and Tamina, please feel free to tell me if I'm going off the rails here. So just roughly, the idea is to keep the Tri-Valley together. I was thinking with the deviations were a little bit different in the East, but maybe we'd try to bring Danville and San Ramon down. I don't -- just in my -- thinking of that, I don't think that would work, so you know, if we think about moving Pleasanton, Livermore and Dublin up, it's about 240,000 people. So in order to make that work, we could move the Bethel Island, Oakley, Knightsen, Discovery Bay into SSAC-STANIS, but we'd probably also have to move Antioch into SSAC-STANIS.
That move would also overpopulate -- probably overpopulate Cocoa. So I would guess and I'm just guessing that that would -- and under populate NAPABYRON. So I'm just guessing that we would need to move, like Martinez to Pittsburgh up to NAPABYRON to balance that. And then that -- Cocoa is probably still a little bit over, I would guess. And then we could move much of San Leandro into the SD80 Corridor.

But if there's not -- you know, if there's not support for those steps -- I mean, that's kind of roughly, I think. Does that sound about right, Tamina? I've lost you there. Does that sound like it would balance out there about-ish?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Almost. In putting the San Leandro and that area into SD80 Corridor, what are you taking out?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, I think -- I mean, we're putting 250,000 people in to Cocoa. And then we're taking about 250,000 people out, right? But I mean, I think we can still move some of San Leandro and make that work. Make that balance.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Right. And you wanted to move -- but you wanted to move that part into SD80COR, right?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah.

MS. RAMOS ALON: So what are you taking out of
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Nothing. They're negative. Yeah. They're negative. not all of San Leandro, just some of it.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Is that not going to add up?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Happy to try.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: No. But I don't want to down this road. I mean, I think Commissioner Andersen had some ideas, too, but I wouldn't go down this road if there's no support for moving for moving Martinez to Pittsburgh into NAPABYRON and/or moving, you know, the Delta Contra Costa cities into Antioch into SSAC-STANIS.

So if we don't have that support, you know, we can still do the San Leandro thing either way. But if we don't have that support, then I don't see it, unless you see a different way to do this.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. We did mess with San Leandro into this area, again, trying to keep the Western Contra Costa school system all together. The only ones you could kind of pull out of there, is Rodeo would have no population, so it's kind of insignificant.
And I believe Commissioner Yee might know about this. I think we might be able to put the portion of San Leandro that's North of Davis in and still keep it okay. It's not that much. What I was thinking -- I didn't think anyone would have the stomach for any of that, and I didn't think the numbers would work.

I was thinking actually of trying to if we just moves just so we can see all of Eden Tech, as well, please. My idea was to -- since, and now it's called San Jose, Gilroy comes out. So I was hoping to gather as much as -- of the portion of San Jose that is an Eden Tech to balance the San Jose around, you know, still like that 4.5 or something like that. Which would allow a little bit more room in the Eden Tech, and taking that portion of San Leandro into the 80 Corridor enough to make that to, you know, balance.

The idea is, I'm taking -- and then the space that's in Eden Tech, grab from the portion that used to be in Eden Tech, which is San Leandro and the whole unincorporated area that got put into Cocoa. Take the portion of that back that we can, which would allow more room into Cocoa and notice Cocoa is also unbalanced. I know Dublin will at least fit. I don't know if parts of Pleasanton or Livermore would fit. That was going to be my idea. Without going SSAC-STANIS -- without going
Cocoa over or SSAC-STANIS under. That was just my --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- simple, in that little area, idea.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Right. Thank you. Thank you for that, Commissioner Andersen.

Let's hear from a couple other colleagues first, and then we'll ask Tamina some questions about Commissioner Andersen's concept.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I mean, the portion of this district that I'm having the most difficulty with is San Leandro, San Lorenzo and Castro Valley, which are very different than the San Ramon, Danville areas. And but, you know, I'm also looking at the areas around it.

And it would -- the rotations to get there would be difficult because of the amount of population there. If there was a way to do it without having to impact the Northern portions of the Cocoa area, then I'd be open to some exploration. But, you know, keeping the Tri-Valley area whole and making this other change seems like it would be difficult to do. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Turner?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I have very little energy around making this swap and this change. But I raised my hand to talk about Gilroy and the move supportive of Gilroy. But to me, it seems like if we're going to move Gilroy, we should be moving to get it some kind of way connected with Watsonville and those other areas, as opposed to San Jose.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So I guess, from my perspective, if we're not going to put the Tri-Valley together, then I would honor the county line. I wouldn't try to move Dublin. I'd just leave -- I'd leave Cocoa and SSAC-STANIS the way they are, and then work on San Leandro. I don't think it -- I don't think moving Dublin to Cocoa puts the Tri-Valley in any better state than if -- than the split that it has now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner -- I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And with regard to Gilroy --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I can see both sides of that question. If we left it in Santa Clara County, it'd be the first time it's in in Santa Clara County, I think,
in all our maps. If we moved it, it would be with Watsonville, Salinas and Hollister.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Hollister.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And so there's definitely a community of interest there. So I mean, I can go either way.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I would like to do -- I respect what Commissioner Fornaciari said, and without a great deal of work, I don't see how we can probably get all of Tri-Valley together. But I was hoping a little bit. But I agree with, you know, if he doesn't want to do that, I still, however, would like to put at least Davis North because that helps access to the Oakland Airport in San Leandro.

And I would like to, you know, if at all possible, move parts of the Eden -- I don't know if Eden, but you know, the Cherry Hill, Ashland, that area with Hayward. They would like to do that, I mean, go back into Eden Tech as much as possible. I also like I also like the Gilroy, Hollister, Watsonville connection.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Yeah. I mean, I'm looking at the numbers, it seems that we could get maybe two-thirds of San Leandro back
into SD80 Corridor. So I'm certainly happy to move in that direction.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I'm also -- back to the San Leandro, Castro Valley. If we can honor the Alameda County line, I think that would be ideal. I just don't -- I'm not sure if the population is too great to rotate. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. I mean, San Leandro is 91,000 people. I don't know what -- off the top of my head what Castro Valley is, but it, you know, and San Lorenzo, Fairview, we're looking at quite a bit of population there, I think.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. Castro Valley is about 60,000, so -- but yeah. I'm supportive of Commissioner Andersen's idea of moving Gilroy South, adjusting the line in San Jose. Maybe bringing Castro Valley and the rest of Eden down Eden Tech. And then sending as much of San Leandro into SD80 Corridor again.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Yee. So the first step in this would be to move Gilroy, as I understand it. But we were exploring that earlier, so where do we stand on shifting Gilroy South?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We have an iteration for
you with that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We have a couple of iterations.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Then let’s -- we’ve got about twenty minutes. Let’s see the iterations for moving Gilroy South

MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay. So our first iteration for moving Gilroy South actually redraws the Mid Coast District to take in part of -- it looks very similar to what we did in Congress. So Gilroy comes South along with the rest of San Benito and Monterey, and then comes North to take in the Alum Rock neighborhoods and Latino areas of San Jose.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So maybe I should introduce some of these so we have a couple of iterations, and one of these is very -- we’re just kind of exploring and kind of thinking like just big picture. And then and some of these are more conservative, and we’ll get to the conservative ones next. But this was just thinking, what if the maps look closer to our Congressional and -- but then we had other iterations as well, so don’t worry. We just wanted to show you what we were -- what we worked through.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Okay. So the second is -- oh, that
just, sorry this one does not address Gilroy. The second
iteration is merely taking Gilroy itself, and I'm going
to put on the pending changes, so you can see what
happens when we move Gilroy into Mid Coast.

(Pause)

MS. RAMOS ALON: So Gilroy into Mid Coast was the
second option that we looked at, in taking into Gilroy
and then cutting at the top here of Santa Cruz County.
We don't actually have a snapshot for that, but that's
what we -- it's really only because this is only a 60,000
population change, we'd only need about 15,000 people to
move. And I believe that's the end of our Gilroy
iterations.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think with this one we would
keep San Benito within the Mid Coast District, so San
Benito would not be connected. And then we did have one
where San Benito is -- where Hollister is carved out as
well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Any thoughts on those iterations
from the Commission?

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: We did look at this, and the
issue was how -- what do we take out of Mid Coast if we
put 60,000 in, and that's what we ran into trouble with
this, because we couldn't work out something at the
Southern end. So I'm sort of wondering, did we work that out?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Tamina?

MS. RAMOS ALON: We took it out -- so we took out part of the top of Santa Cruz and just did the swamp in between San Jose and Mid Coast.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So can we see that?

MS. RAMOS ALON: I don't actually have an iteration for that, but I can select some cities.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. We can do that live.

MS. RAMOS ALON: That number 2 is like the Congressional one.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, if we're going to look at moving some of Hollister into the Senate district, then do we have to take Santa Cruz apart? And I mean -- so I guess at this point, we've carved up Santa Cruz pretty viciously in all of our other maps and I mean, I don't -- I said I was on the fence for moving Gilroy, but if we have to carve up Santa Cruz again to move Gilroy, I would just assume leave Gilroy in its own county.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So we have -- we did go
through and you can see in this iteration and selected as much as we could from -- as much as we could while keeping the deviation and maintaining our CVAP in our VRA district. I cut into Hollister. And then -- and with that, we were able to take in Gilroy. So that is a possibility.

What we didn't like about it is that we couldn't bring in all of Hollister. So that was -- and we tried. We tried to bring in all of Hollister, there's just too much population. And I mean, we tried to find -- and both Tamina and Kennedy were helping us try to identify places where we could, on the edges, you know, shave off some population and then bring in more of Hollister. And we just weren't able to. I mean, they've done such an amazing job of just trying to get every single -- get the VRA district to be as optimal as possible.

So our choices are we dip into San Benito, we get some of -- or most of Hollister, but not all of it. That would allow us to bring down Gilroy. But we would leave out a portion of Hollister and Hollister is where the majority of those San Benito population lives. So that's, I think, some of the challenges that we're -- that's complicating all of this.

Certainly, we can do that. And it would protect some more people, get them into the VRA district
protected groups and allow us to go into Gilroy. And that may be a possibility. We just wanted to bring to the group what we were able to achieve within about an hour's worth of time, and we did explore many options.

So that is a possibility, bringing in some of San Benito and if we zoom out, you can see what the district looks like. So it's Merced, the Fresno area, and a little piece of San Benito in the corner, which I don't know what I feel about -- how I feel about taking so much of San Benito -- so much of the San Benito population out of the County of San Benito and Monterey County.

So that's -- yeah. That's why we started looking at a more extreme option, which would be to create something more like what we have in the Congress, but that also would be very challenging and would require some architectural changes, Tamina has presented earlier.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

And I have to say that, you know, looking at this and considering it more carefully, you know, I was one of the ones who was wholeheartedly in favor of finding a way to get Gilroy into Mid Coast. But to me, it seems to lose a lot if we're then going to turn around and get rid of Hollister. Because I thought part of what I would like to try to do was unite Gilroy, Hollister, and Watsonville and we end up not being able to do that if
we're then taking most of Hollister away.

So other colleagues' thoughts on any of the iterations that have been presented?

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'm with Commissioner Fornaciari. This is -- you know, the idea was the Gilroy, Hollister, you know, Watsonville and --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Salinas.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, Salinas. Yeah. This -- so this this doesn't work for me to leave Gilroy.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. The exact same way Commissioner Kennedy, I wanted Hollister with Gilroy.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Could we just -- Tamina, could we see the other option one more time?

MS. RAMOS ALON: And so this includes all of Monterey.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So this includes all of Monterey, all of San Benito, and dips into Gilroy, San Martin, and then into the Alum Rock neighborhood of San Jose. This
connects the working class neighborhoods or district areas in this area, both agricultural and some of the processing workers as well as others.

You know, so we were just looking at potentially, could we architect this close -- could we create an architecture that's closer to our Congressional map? Not quite, because, of course, we wanted to keep all of San Benito and Monterey. This could potentially allow us to do more in the East Bay.

So if we moved over and we did this for population purposes, potentially it may not. It may not. And I might be thinking of the rotations differently. But potentially, if we draw down population down, could it potentially help us in the -- up North?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Because when I was going back and just looking at some of my notes, what I had seen is that Gilroy, San Martin, and Morgan Hill had a community of interest testimony linking them together.

Certainly, we've heard a lot from the folks in the Salinas Valley and the agricultural workers and essential workers, so you know, I could certainly see the value in, you know, bringing together these communities of interest in this way. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Andersen?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: The one thing I want to bring out in this area, I see what Commissioner Sadhwani is saying and that looks great, until you realize that all of -- the bulk of Santa Cruz is now with San Jose. And Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito are the three counties that have essentially so many different trade arrangements, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. And so that -- you know, I do see there's still there is still -- there is a little bit of space -- grab a little bit more of San Jose and put it in this area, which might help the East Bay. But, you know, I think -- I just want to make sure that everyone sees that's the big change in this.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner YEE: I see some of the pluses here, but, you know, in the Congressional district, we reached up to San Jose for VRA reconsiderations. And this district would not have the same considerations. So it'd be hard for me to get behind it, even though it does do some nice things as well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. And we didn't get -- we started this and we ran out of time, so we were just starting with the Congressional architecture. I
personally because we don't have VRA considerations.

I -- and I did -- and I do hear Commissioner Andersen, and I agree the connection here is really Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito.

But we started with this architecture and we actually wanted -- the plan was to go down to Morgan Hill, San Martin, Gilroy, just to limit it to that and then go into Santa Cruz. But we didn't know how much we'd be able to do it. And to create more of a Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito district that brought in population and potentially could help us up North, but also kept San Benito in a district that -- and Monterey in a district that is more coastal and central coast.

Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Yeah. I have to say that when I was first looking at this and focusing on different parts of it, I almost got very enthusiastic about it until Commissioner Andersen pointed out the issue with Santa Cruz. And that did kind of kill it for me.

So yeah, I think, you know, there was some really good work done here. I think, you know, it certainly has merit as far as a way for further exploration. I would have to consult with the mappers and with the incoming chair to see if there's stomach for that sort of
exploration.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ:  How did you know I've been having stomach issues?  Ever since about a month ago?

Let us see.  This is iteration two.  Yeah, the first one I did not really care for.  This one I kind of don't care for either.  I kind of prefer what our drafts looked like -- or with having the Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Monterey.  Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Toledo?

And we've got about three minutes before break.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO:  I think, I just left my hand up.  Sorry.

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Oh, okay.  Thank you.

Any further discussion of this?  I mean, we've made some valiant efforts.  I certainly appreciate the mappers' willingness to work on this.  I think, you know, we had some really good ideas.  But in the bigger picture, we just weren't able to carry them all the way through to where we needed to get to in order to implement them.

I don't know if other Commissioners have further thoughts, but, again, certainly want to thank the mappers for going with us on these multiple journeys.
MS. RAMOS ALON: Always a pleasure, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Tamina.

Okay. Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I appreciate that, and I'm so sorry that we didn't come up with something on that. Are we going to venture further into the idea, you know, we can't -- it doesn't have the 60,000, but it might be able to do something with San Leandro in that area or are we going to -- I don't know if that would move it until tomorrow, I guess. So I -- that's my question.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. I mean, you know, you had a very specific suggestion of where to move the line to. And we do have two minutes to go. So if Tamina, you want to move the line to that point that Commissioner Andersen had indicated, let's go for it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And Tamina, I think that -- does that possibly match up? We did certainly try that one time before. I don't know if we did it in Assembly or something or other. But it's -- it would be take it down to Davis, which is essentially the 112, see that up there? Right.

And once you hit Washington when it borders San Leandro, I would go up to that. And Commissioner Yee sort of walked through this before, and so I don't know
if you want to --

MS. RAMOS ALON: Sure. Let me try that. Hold on a second.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

And meanwhile, we'll hear from Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. That was an idea when we needed just a little bit of San Leandro for one of the iterations. But if we're going to do this, I think I would try to move as much of San Leandro as possible, if we can get a majority of it into SD80. I think that would be preferable.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. I think from the population numbers, we'd be able to take about two thirds of it, so 60,000 of the 91. So to me now, let's see if we can pull together, approximately, 60,000.

MS. MAC DONALD: (Audio interference)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Ms. Mac Donald.

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to alert you to the fact that San Leandro is whole right now, and this move is going to split it. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We -- yes. We're -- we're very much and painfully aware of that.

Okay. Tamina, can we leave you to work on this. We need to take a fifteen-minute break. When we come back,
it is time for public comment. We will take about five
minutes to finish this up and then turn to public
comment.

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Tamina.

So Katy, could you go ahead and read the
instructions?

And Kristian, we are on break now until 6:45.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you, Chair.

In order to maximize transparency and public
participation in our process, the Commissioners will be
taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the
telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is
877-853-5247. When prompted to enter the meeting ID
number provided on the livestream feed, it is 85932989398
for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant
ID, simply press the pound key.

Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a
queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press
star nine. This will raise your hand for the moderator.
When it is your turn to speak, you will hear a message
that says the host would like you to talk and to press
star 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 we will be back at 6:45.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you, everyone. We are on break until 6:45.

We also would like to welcome those who have called in to give public input. If you can hear the sound of my --

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 6:32 p.m. until 6:44 p.m.)

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

If you could please enable video there, Chair.

Stand by to go live. You are live.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone for your patience during our fifteen-minute break. We are back with you. We are about to begin public comment. We just wanted to take a moment and get a report back from our mapper, Tamina, as to the results of the mapping in accordance with our instructions, moving approximately 60,000 people from -- in San Leandro from the COCO district into the 80 corridor district.

So Tamina, could you let us know how that came out?
MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, Chair. I actually was working on the middle of a second iteration here. I just ran out of time, but. So this would be one iteration, would be to come up. You can see we don't really get two thirds. It's a little bit more than -- a little bit more like half. But we are at 3-6-9 right here, so probably could be taking a little bit more to get us to the two thirds mark, into this area or into the South -- Southeast corner over here. So that is one option.

And then a second option would be -- I'll turn on that layer again, so we can see where we are. This was beginning with Commissioner Andersen's instructions and taking that area back. And so we are now at -- what screen are we on here. So we are coming down Marine (sic) and then coming down Merced, to Wicks, and then over across the canal.

CHAIR KENNEDY: But in this one, we have left COCO underpopulated?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, and this one -- this is getting as much of San Leandro as possible into SD80CORR, so this would make COCO underpopulated.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Whereas, the -- the other one did not bring as much population into 80 corridor and left COCO within permissible deviations, if I recall correctly?
MS. RAMOS ALON: Yes, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Did you have anything else to share with us?

MS. RAMOS ALON: Not this time, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Tamina.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I was just going to say the same thing that you just mentioned, Chair. Unless there's some other portion of SSACTANIS (sic) that we can add, we have to stop before COCO goes negative five percent.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Thank you very much, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I didn't see the full map. I was just hoping -- that was I was going to ask. Is there something we can add into COCO, not from SSACTANIS, but from some other area that we wanted to make whole? Did we have something left out that -- a wish list?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, this -- this would be where we would be able to come South of the -- yeah, South of the Alameda County line in the Tri-Valley. But I'm not clear how much we would be able to do there. Did you have a further question, Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: It went the wrong way. No.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I was just going to say that some of the Contra Costa County in NAPABYRON, they're in the East Contra Costa County. So there could be an opportunity to bring some of those cities back into Contra Costa County to bring that deviation to NAPABYRON is -- is almost at five.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I don't -- I really don't want to eat into the public comment time. But that does sound like a potential exploration that would be useful.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I'm sorry. If others have an appetite for continuing this, that's great. But I have to say, it's not growing on me. Actually, it's splitting San Leandro (indiscernible) is actually looking worse, so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Could you repeat that, Commissioner Yee; I didn't hear it.

Commissioner Yee, could you repeat, please?

Okay. Then Commissioner Fernandez.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: No. I was just going to say that I believe Commissioner Yee said that splitting San Leandro, he wasn't -- he wasn't in favor of that, correct?
COMMISSIONER YEE: That's right. I'm sorry. I had to switch computers. Yeah, I'm saying this is not growing on me. I think splitting San Leandro thusly is actually just going to make things worse. So I would probably revert. But if others have an appetite for other explorations, that's fine, too.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I just want to check Mr. Yee. How about Davis or does -- do you want San Leandro whole, or can we at least put Davis in? The reason is, you know, I know that helps with the airport.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I think I would have to check some COI testimony to actually back that up. I mean, I understand the idea. You know, I certainly have been in that area a lot. But I would need to hear from San Leandro that they -- that that interests them.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. I -- I thought that that was that particular COI. So yes, if you would check on that. You know, I'm -- I'm just trying to make, you know, things better in that area, so. But I'll go with your COI information.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I'll double-check.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, both. Thank you for
checking on that, Commissioner Yee. We'll look forward to hearing back later.

With that, we will abandon those changes in San Leandro, and we will go to public comment.

So Katy, would you please read the instructions again and get us started with public comment.

In accordance with the policy that was approved yesterday, we will be taking a maximum of three hours of public comment. The lines will not close until the end of that three hours. Breaks do not count in the calculation of the three hours.

If we do get to the end of our callers before the end of the maximum three-hour public comment period, I will invite public comment. I will ask Katy to read the instructions again. We will take any additional callers that come in, as we did last night. But once those callers are heard, we will close the public comment period. So thank you, all. Looking forward to public comment.

Katy.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much, Chair.

The Commission will now be taking public comment by phone. To give comment, please call 877-853-5247. Enter the meeting ID number, 85932989398, for this meeting. Once you have dialed in, please press star nine to enter
the comment queue.

The full comment instructions were read previously and are provided in full on the livestream landing page. And one more time, for those that have not done so already, please press star nine to raise your hand indicating you wish to give comment.

Our public comment period is one minute and thirty seconds. Please -- we will be giving 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 for when it is your turn to speak. And let's get started.

Right now, we have caller 0983. And up next after that will be caller 2714.

Caller 0983, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioner. While I want to thank Commissioners Andersen, Kennedy, and Sadhwani for hearing us, I also want to express my deep appreciation to you three for acknowledgement for having Little Saigon back. I watched the meeting last night, and it was really upsetting to me. That's why, regardless what we have sent for a month, Commissioner Akutagawa is still trying to put area that we are asking not to put into the refuse here, our place.
You have done it for the Senator and Congressional district, including Huntington Beach with Little Saigon. We know you can do it for the Assembly as well give us population limit just on up North Garfield Street, stop at Seapoint Street in Huntington Beach to Little Saigon. You can do this to remove center and East --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- of Garden Grove. This could give enough population to add North Huntington Beach to Gothard Street. Please, please, help us, Commission, to give Little Saigon Congress members, Senator and Assembly members to fight for our families and our chyrdren -- children for the next ten years. Thank you and have a good night, Commissioner.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 2714. And up next after that will be caller 2931.

Caller 2714, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, do you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you. Hello, Commissioner. I just want to thank you, Commissioner Kennedy and Andersen for wanting to revisit the Little Saigon map. Thank you for listening to us and
for standing by our side. The current map is perfect, please don't make any change. We appreciate the Commission for allow us to have a voice for the Senate district.

The Assembly district, GGW, is not complete for our Little Saigon community of interest, please do. We are asking the Commission to at least make some change to the Assembly district GGW map. Leave all of the North Garfield stop at Seapoint Street in Huntington Beach. You can remove it up that road in Stanton because we have nothing in common with these two cities. They belong to Latino community of interest.

It would not be fair for them not to take part of their community to our Little Saigon community. And it will not be fair for us as well. Again, thank you Commissioner --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- Kennedy and Andersen for hearing us and make sure Little Saigon has a true representation for Assembly in the next decade.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have caller 2931. And up next after that, have caller 3530.

Caller 2931, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

CALLER 2931: Hello Commissioners. Commissioner Kennedy, thank you for listening to us and suggestion to remove East Garden Grove last night. We are grateful to have you on this Commission.

Commissioner Akutagawa, you want to push Santa Ana to Little Saigon yesterday. Why? For a month, we have been since sending thousand of emails and COIs and hundreds of calls waiting for hours to speak to let the Commissioner know that the island (sic) part Huntington Beach belong to Little Saigon, not one (indiscernible) up in Santa Ana. So instead of hearing our request, you're having completely ignore us and have not give us any reason why our requests are unreasonable. The only reason we can think of is you would rather listen to the one percent who called in last night, one person to a hundred of us. Commission -- Commissioner Kennedy and Andersen, yes, we have -- we have heard you're willing to help us. You have heard -- you help -- help us. Please help us by adding on the North Garfield Street stop, Seapoint Street --

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- to the Huntington Beach because there are areas where Vietnamese-American living
and where our school district cross over with Westminster and Fountain Valley. Keep our family and children --

MR. MANOFF: Ten.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- together. Don't separate them. Commissioner, Little Saigon needs your help. Please help us, hear us, and make sure Little Saigon have a true presentation in the State Assembly. Put --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 3530. And up next after that is caller is 4201.

Caller 3530, please follow the prompts. And one more time, caller -- oh, there you are. The floor is yours.

Caller 3530, if you'll please double-check your phone, make sure you are not on muted. You are unmuted --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I hope --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- in the hearing.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I hope I can -- I hope you -- can you hear me now? Commissioners --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- first I want to thank you for your hard work. And I'm calling tonight because I hope that you've abandoned the ill-advised plan to carve up Hollister and put it in Merced County. That's
really -- for a small county like San Benito, we only have -- there's only 64,000 of us. And if you -- and most of the population is -- is actually in Hollister. If you take the majority of population out of Hollister, you've left us, really, with not much left in terms of population. Hollister is not just our county seat; it's also our economic seat. It's also the -- our social and cultural center. San Benito County, you're right in -- in your deliberations in making Gilroy, Hollister, and Watsonville together. They should be included with Salinas and Salinas Valley. It's really important that you keep us together with Latino and farm worker community in Salinas and Salinas Valley.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Once again, thank you for your hard work. And thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 4201. And up next after that is caller 6880.

Caller 4201, please follow the prompts. And one more time, caller with the last four digits 4201, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

I do apologize, caller 4201. You appear to have some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I do have
you down for a retry. I will come back around.

Right now, we have caller 6880. And up next after that will be caller 8224.

Caller 6880, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. COHEN: Hello, Commissioner. My name is Jean Cohen, J-E-A-N C-O-H-E-N. And I'm the executive officer of the South Bay Labor Council. I want to thank you for the time you've spend carefully considering the impact that redistricting has on our region. As someone who was born and raised in San Jose, I can tell you that our city and our region has grown for the better. We are not a monolithic city, and I believe the C2 (phonetic) included as part of the December 11th versions of the Congressional maps barely reflected that by acknowledging the significant Asian-Pacific Islander and Latino communities here.

And I want to be clear. It's fine for the City of San Jose to be included in multiple seats if it helps you comply with the Voting Rights Act. What is not okay is for Mayor Sam Liccardo to try to draw himself a seat for Congress. This is out of his own self-interest and his concern that San Jose is going to be overshadowed by one of the smaller cities in his district is nonsense. San Jose is the big city in this region. And it will be
taken care of --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. COHEN: -- similar to San Diego, which is currently split into four house districts but still managed to have three of those represented by a San Diego city resident.

San Jose is going to be fine without the Sam Liccardo gerrymandering. It's totally unfair for him to use his local office as a shield against the state law --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

MS. COHEN: -- prohibiting candidates for office to be taken into consideration of your work. The version you have adopted yesterday was a seat drawn to benefit Sam Liccardo at the urging of Sam Liccardo. Please --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 8224. And up next after that is caller 9517.

Caller 8224, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. I'm calling regarding the Little Saigon in Orange County. I have been calling every day on behalf of my community because I can speak a little English. There are thousands of Vietnamese-American who pay a lot of attention to this district and unable to call in because they cannot speak English. All
we are asking now is to have a true representation in the Assembly district, GGW. You have Senate and Congressional district right from day one.

We have been making public demands, sending email and calling in to make sure you add all the North Garfield stop, by Seapoint Street in Huntington Beach. Remove East Garden Grove and Stanton. We did everything we could to help so you can hear us. It's not hard to put the inland part of Huntington Beach with Little Saigon. Huntington Beach is current with Little Saigon in all seats. And we are asking it to continue this way.

I just want to thank you, Commissioners Sadhwani, Andersen, and Kennedy --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- for hearing us. Have a great holiday and thank you for listening before the (indiscernible). Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9517. And up next after that is caller 0240.

Caller 9517, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, good evening, Commissioner. When you look at the Assembly map tomorrow, please add Huntington Beach to the Assembly GGW
map. All we are asking if we cannot have the whole Huntington Beach, we just ask all of the North of Garfield. You can use Garfield Street in Huntington Beach at the dividing line. Little Saigon doesn't belong with Stanton or East Garden Grove. Please take Stanton and East Garden Grove out of our area.

Commissioner Kennedy, Andersen, and Sadhwani, thank you for hearing us and we are proud for -- to have you both on the Commissioner (sic). Thank you very much and goodnight.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 0240. And up next after that will be caller 9277.

Caller 0240, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. MUNSON: Thank you very much. This is John Munson from Nature for All. And we're asking you to maintain the integrity of CD 210 and create a more logical Northern boundary for CDC 05 just North of West and -- West Fork and the East Fork. We really appreciate what you've done for all of the districts involving the Angeles National Forest. But you took our suggestion of an addition above Azusa and is now morphed from our original modest suggestion all the way to two thirds of the way toward the Northern national forest boundary and
almost to Angeles Crest Highway, dividing the CD 210 in half.

It makes sense to go back to what we last proposed, which was extending the boundary North to the major recreation area, North of East Fork and West Fork along the San Gabriel River. The only facility North of this area is higher altitude developed campground which has very different problems and very different setting from East Fork and West Fork --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. MUNSON: -- (indiscernible). And so we just ask you to take back the very last adjustment you made and reduce it back to East Fork and West Fork which means that the 210 -- CD 210 will --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. MUNSON: -- not be -- look like it's divided in half. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 922 -- 9277. And up next after will be caller 8640.

Caller 9277, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

DR. BERGMAN: Good evening, Commissioner. I'm Dr. Sheila Bergman, the executive director of UCR ART, which is the California Museum of Photography and Culver Center
of the Arts located Downtown Riverside. I'm writing to urge you to adjust the State Assembly district boundaries that encompass the University California, Riverside, located at 900 University Avenue, Riverside. In the current SWRIV map, iteration dated 12/08/2021, UCR as a community of interest is split from the Greater Riverside area.

Tomorrow when you review the Assembly district maps, I encourage you to consider maps submitted by campus architect Jacqueline Norman, under comment 40611, as a part of the official record that includes Shapefiles and maps for your reference.

The City of Riverside and UCR actively partner on various initiatives, including a significant arch innovation and economic development corridor, UCR in downtown Riverside and Americourse University East side, collaborative, to name a few.

Students living off campus typically live in the City of Riverside throughout the University Avenue corridor, and they also work and do research there. I can't imagine bifurcating the main campus from its other centers, business, clinics, where students and faculty conduct critical work.

I appreciate the Commissioners' attention to this request. Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 8640, and up next after that will be caller 5944.

Caller 8640, please follow the prompts.

And one more time, caller with the last four digits 8640, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MS. REIMANN: Hello?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, hello.

MS. REIMANN: Yes, hello. Thank you, Commissioners.

My name is Linda Reimann. And it's spelled L-I-N-D-A, R-E-I-M-A-N-N. I'm assistant deal at the School of Medicine at the University of California, Riverside, and live in the downtown Riverside area.

I also urge you to adjust the State Assembly district boundaries that encompass the university because in the current Southwest Riverside map iteration dated December 8th, UCR is split from the greater Riverside area.

There are three reasons I ask you to consider. The inland Southern California region has a historic and dire shortage of physicians. The UCR School of Medicine was created to help remedy this shortage in direct response to community need. Gaining the long-term support and sustainability for the school has been a heavy lift, and
it has only been through the partnership and alignment between the city and state that the school is now supported and will be able to sustain and grow, continuing to benefit residents throughout the region.

In addition, UCR Health, the School of Medicine, and the City of Riverside partner on many initiatives. An example is a clinic for the unhoused --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. REIMANN: -- (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) in place that will open in the spring in downtown Riverside. Again, this was only made possible through strong alignment.

When you review the Assembly district maps, I encourage you to consider those maps submitted by our campus architect, Jacqueline --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, caller 5944, and up next after that is caller 7068.

Caller 5944, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commission. As some of you may know, former Obama Attorney General Eric Holder has devoted his post Justice Department career to ensuring voting rights and fighting laws and redistricting efforts aimed at disenfranchising minority
voters. Tonight, he called some of your work absurd and
unnecessary, and called into question whether the
California Commission would be a model for the country
going forward.

One of the more absurd and unnecessary districts
that this Commission has produced is the FRESNO-KERN
Congressional District, that connects Fresno and
Bakersfield. Forty percent of this district are minority
communities who can no longer meaningfully participate in
federal elections for the next ten years. This district
extends more than 200 miles across desert, mountains,
foothills, and valley, while splitting six cities in the
central valley. It's basically just leftovers from two
neighboring VRA districts.

Bakersfield and Fresno make up more than 900,000
people, yet the largest impact community in this district
is Clovis, at about 100,000 people, which is 200 miles
from the Eastern border, and the second largest is
Lemoore at 26,000 people. You have robbed those
voters --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- any chance at fair
representation for the next ten years. This Commission
has not given anywhere near the amount of consideration
to the hundreds of COI testimony from Fresno, Clovis, and
Bakersfield, as it has from other parts of the State.

It is frustrating to see Commissioners use individual and more recently COIs to confirm their biases and avoid exploring sensible, architectural changes. Stop ignoring the FRESNO-KERN District, and fix it before your deadline. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 7068, and up next after that is Caller 9238.

Caller 7068, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. NGUYEN: Hi, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. NGUYEN: Hi, my name is Young Nguyen (ph.) I am calling to ask that the Commission and ask Commission Kennedy's proposal for a small split in Huntington Beach. I understand why the Commission is hesitant to split Huntington Beach and in a perfect world, it would not be split. But if we wanted to maximize Vietnamese voting powers, your proposed split would actually do exactly that. Thank you for spending time on this, and I hope you can finalize this change. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have Caller 9238, and up next after that is Caller 3640.
Caller 9238, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. DUGGER: Feels like I'm playing bingo here. Hello, everybody. I am Thomas Dugger, T-H-O-M-A-S, D-U-G-G-E-R, with the Science to Policy student group at UC Riverside, asking you once again, like my UCR colleagues, to group UCR and the City of Riverside in the same district. Specifically, it's putting UCR, located at 900 University Avenue, Riverside, California, 92521, and the surrounding area in about a mile radius, in Assembly district 58-JRC, instead of where the December 8th map had it, which was in Assembly district 63-SWRIV.

Universities are a core part of their surrounding communities. Most of the people living on campus and nearby are UCR graduates and undergraduate students. We are more of a COI, as you all call it, with the City of Riverside, than the communities in the Southwest, and should be represented accordingly. We spend more recreational time in downtown Riverside and participate in more events with that city community than we do in the areas to the Southwest --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. DUGGER: -- in District 63. Fortunately, UCR's proposed revisions have been submitted by campus architect, Jacqueline Norman under comment 40611 as part
of the official record, and includes Shapefiles and maps
for your reference. So I encourage you all --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. DUGGER: -- to take a look at that and the
changes that UCR has suggested, and I thank you all very
much for listening, and the work you've put in for
redrawing the districts.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now we have Caller 3640, and up next after
that will be Caller 3480.

Caller 3640, please follow the prompts.
And one more time, caller with the last four digits
3640, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing
star six. I do apologize. Oh, there you are. The floor
is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, Commissioners.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Caller 3640, if you could
please get a little closer to your microphone. Or double
check and make sure -- hello?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you hear me?

MR. MANOFF: Caller 3640, we are having trouble
hearing you; can you please get closer to your
microphone?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, can you hear me?

MR. MANOFF: That's much better, thank you. Go
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. Good evening, Commissioners. I'd like to talk about iteration STCD-2, 3, and 4 of KINGTULAKERN Congressional visualization.

As a resident of Kings County, I don't appreciate our cities being split into two Congressional districts. Maps that connect random areas from all over around the central valley are not honoring the community. By splitting Kings County, you're only ensuring that our communities of interest will be overshadowed by these bigger cities such as Fresno and Bakersfield. All VRA districts should be treated equally. We deserve to have the adequate resources and representation as residents of the central valley. Please keep Kings County whole.

Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will have Caller 3480, and up next after that is Caller 3726.

Caller 3480, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. LEE: Hello, can you hear me all right?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. LEE: Hi, my name is Richard Lee (ph.). You know, when you revisit the Congressional maps tomorrow morning, I hope the Commissioner -- I hope that
Commissioner Kennedy's Huntington Beach plan can be considered immediately before you move on to more complicated areas.

I think it's the perfect adjustment to finally finalize the Orange County area, and I know it won't make everybody happy, but it is a fair offer, and I speak on, you know, behalf of my family as well, and you know, after all the testimony that you guys have been hearing, I know it's hard to balance, but I really do appreciate all of you guys doing hard work and you know, staying at these late nights and having these talks.

So yeah, just again, I think you guys should be considering -- and I hope that Commissioner Kennedy's Huntington Beach plans can be considered before you move on to anything else. Thank you guys very much. Have a good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have Caller 3726, and up next after that is Caller 9685.

Caller 3726, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. NGUYEN: Hi, my name is Daniel Nguyen from Orange County. So I just want to say that there are many organized groups participating in the redistricting process, but like the Vietnamese community is the one
grouping that's missed for having a lot of callers.

I would say that we have the opportunity to call in and doing -- and keep doing this to make sure our community is protected, just like more -- for more organizations. We are so close to getting our full community in one Congressional district, and the proposal to split Huntington Beach is a compromise that accomplishes that.

Please actually enact a compromise. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, I have Caller 9685, and up next after that will be Caller 9370.

Caller 9685, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. DE LA RIVA: Good evening. My name is Eddie De La Riva, council member from the City of Maywood, calling regarding AD-54 NELA.

Thank you, Commissioner, for your hard work. I support your current map, but I do believe Maywood and Bell Gardens should not be connected to Korea Town in Northeast Los Angeles. Maywood should be connected to communities West of the 710 freeway. Bell Gardens should be connected to communities East of the 710 freeway. Downtown LA should stay together.
Maywood is a Southeast community, as well as part of the I-710 corridor, and part of the gateway cod (ph.), which is why I believe that Maywood should stay in AV Gateway. I implore the Commission to adjust the map in AV Gateway to include Maywood. Please keep us with similar communities of interest in Southeast Los Angeles. Drawing us into NELA will place us at a big disadvantage by placing us with large City of LA communities, where our voice will be diminished, and not to mention, it will disenfranchise our voters.

We should not be a throw in to make the numbers make sense for ADNELA. Do not sacrifice Maywood for the benefit of the Northeast. Maywood belongs in AV Gateway. Please, I encourage --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. DE LA RIVA: -- I implore you guys (audio interference). Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have Caller 9370, and up next after that will be Caller 5038.

Caller 9370, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, hello.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello. My name is
Josue. First, I would like to thank you guys for the work you've done. We support the Franklin High School map. I ask that you guys please keep Eagle Rock and Mount Washington in our district. We share the boundaries for local community schools. Our local businesses thrive together through the Eagle Rock Chamber of Commerce. Our roads, trails, and parks, railroads, and the roads are part of what makes our community whole, and what brings us together.

Once again, please keep our Northeast Los Angeles communities together. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have Caller 5038, and up next after that is Caller 6579.

Caller 5038, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm glad to see you all changed the Santa Clarita Valley Senate map, but I'm wondering why you all haven't moved Sylmar to the Eastern San Fernando Valley, despite you all agreeing you would. And it's crystal clear that the Latino community of the Eastern San Fernando Valley wants Sylmar to be a part of it for the Congressional District.

And I urge you all to move the Santa Clarita Congressional District East into the Angeles National
Forest and San Gabriel Mountains. This change is crucial for the Latino community, and for us in Santa Clarita, since our rural area is hit very disproportionately by huge, disruptive wildfires. So this new Congressional map helps address the wildfire risk management that we so desperately need.

Now, for State Assembly, please keep the San Fernando Valley separate and whole, just like others have asked. In fact, you also listened to the Latino community there, and create two supermajority Latino Assembly districts. There's absolutely no reason as to why you can't do that.

For the SCV Assembly District, Commissioners, please bring back Acton and Agua Dulce into the Santa Clarita Valley; they are literally part of our community in every single way, so they can't be split off. And in fact, I urge you all to please move the Assembly district into the Northwest, part of LA County, like Frazier Park, and add unincorporated cities, like Quartz Hill and Eastern Lancaster, can make up for the population difference.

This solves everyone's issues about the Los Angeles area Commissioners, and ensures that not only our communities of interest have the representation we deserve, but that you are listening to us and acting on --
MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- these changes so we can be well off for the next decade.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have Caller 6579, and up next after that is Caller 9852.

Caller 6579, please follow the prompts.
And one more time, caller with the last four digits -- there you are. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, can you hear me?
Hello?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. Yes, hello.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you hear me?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, can you hear me?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, hello.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. The Eastern San Fernando Valley still does not have Sylmar in it. As you know, all haven't move it from Santa Clarita (indiscernible), move Sylmar as soon as possible to the Eastern San Fernando Valley for the Congressional maps and then create two supermajority Latino VRA Assembly districts in the San Fernando Valley, as many others have
requested.

Now, so that Santa Clarita is represented fairly, please move the Congressional map Eastward into the Angeles National Forest, past the 14 freeway, as a lot of us go there for recreation and it will help our next representative push for wildfire prevention legislations --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- since we are affected by this constantly.

Lastly, please keep Acton, Agua Dulce, with Santa Clarita Valley, and move the Assembly map Northwards to Frazier Park and add part of Lancaster so that it mirrors the new Senate map.

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The San Fernando Valley and Santa Clarita Valley should not be together in any map, as other callers have mentioned.

So please add on these requests, Commissioners.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have Caller 9852, and then up next after that will be Caller 1535.

Caller 9852, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. DAVILA: Hi, there. My name is Laurel Davila,
L-A-U-R-E-L D-A-V-I-L-A. And I have lived and worked in Irvine for over twenty-seven years.

Irvine is the fastest growing city in California. We have over 300,000 residents. And our city is very cohesive. We have the same school district, and just one police force. So a number of corporations, particularly in the technology and semiconductor sectors, have their national or international headquarters in Irvine. It's home to several higher education institutions:

University of California, UCI, Concordia University, Irvine Valley College, Orange County Center of the University of Southern California, and campuses of California State University, Fullerton, University of La Verne, and Pepperdine University.

Irvine residents share common --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. DAVILA: -- concerns. All our traffic issues are closely connected. Irvine does not have common interests with Fullerton or Yorba Linda. It's important not to splinter our --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. DAVILA: -- Irvine geographic area. Irvine should not be split up into two different Senate districts. This would fracture our Senate representation and dilute our voices.
Also, Irvine should be --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have Caller 1535, and up next after that is Caller 1041.

Caller 1535, please follow the prompts.

And one more time, Caller 15 -- oh, there you are.

The floor is yours.

MR. MALDONADO: Hi, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. MALDONADO: Commissioners, this is Tony Maldonado from Santa Clarita again.

You know what? I don't get it. For three days we've been asking you to fix the serious mistake on Santa Clarita's Congressional Senate maps. When Commissioner Kennedy pushed the Northern boundary of CDFSSS (sic), CD GLEN2BA and CD210, all the way through the Angeles National Forest to the 14 freeway in Santa Clarita and to the Southern Antelope Valley, and still nothing.

This is a major wildfire area, and you have given jurisdiction to sections of our side of the Angeles National Forest to these other areas. That's four Congressmen and three Senators, when you include our home. So when another large wildfire breaks out, and it shall, we'll be watching our homes burn as the Keystone Cops will be fighting over jurisdiction.
They need to fix this quickly, so please instruct her to do so. Then, why is Sylmar still attached to the Congressional -- our Congressional maps, when the Commissioners agreed to move it to the San Fernando Valley East? Where's the new iteration? And our Assembly maps --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. MALDONADO: -- still has us with the San Fernando Valley rather than the Antelope Valley and Northwest LA County, like our Congressional Senate and BLE maps.

Look, I know you're short on time, but let's get this right. Kristin, Katy, and all the interpreters, thanks for the great job. Commissioners, keep at it, but let's just get this right. Everyone, have a good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have Caller 1041, and up next after that we have Caller 4273.

Caller 1041, please follow the prompts.

And one more time, Caller 1040 -- 1041, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

I do apologize, Caller 1041, you appear to have some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I do have you down for a retry, and I will come back around.

Right now we have Caller 4273, and up next after
that is Caller 9819.

Caller 4273, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. PARISH: Hello, Commissioners. My name is Brandon Parish, and I'm a lifelong resident of Sacramento County, and I wanted to leave a few comments about redistricting of our county.

On the Assembly map, I would like to ask for Carmichael to be kept in one Assembly district; it's vital for my community not to be split. Additionally, I think it's important that the City of Sacramento get its own Congressional district.

Recently we received shocking news that the power substation caught fire in Sacramento, plunging downtown into darkness, and that's because the infrastructure had -- was six years overdue being fixed. Sacramento is also one of the highest flood risk cities in the nation, along with New Orleans, and I think we know what happened to that city, unfortunately.

It is vital that we get federal funding for infrastructure for Sacramento County, and it's important that the integrity of Sacramento remains whole.

Splitting North Sacramento so neighborhoods like North Sac, Del Paso Heights, and Natomas, out of the City of Sacramento, is incredibly harmful to the city and will
ultimately reduce representation --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. PARISH: -- and will reduce the ability of Sacramento to get critical funding. I ask you to please keep the city whole. It's easy to rearrange the North Sac and the Sacramento districts so you can keep Sacramento whole, without substantially messing up other parts of the map. Please keep --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. PARISH: -- Sacramento whole. Thank you for your time and I hope that these comments can make a difference. Have a great night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have Caller 9819, and up next after that is Caller 7051.

Caller 9819, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I'd like to ask that you remove Upland and Rancho Cucamonga from the LA County Senate District we are currently in, and group us with San Bernardino District where we live. We do not share the values or interest of those in the foothill communities of Los Angeles County or LA County community. We find ourselves best represented and grouped with San Bernardino County
residents because that is where we live. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have Caller 7051, and up next after that is Caller 0805.

Caller 7051, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Hi, thank you so much for your service, Commissioners. I really appreciate all the work you have done so far.

My name is Jessica Rodriguez, and I'm calling from North Hollywood to support VICA proposed Map A. VICA Map A keeps Glendale and Burbank unified in the Eastern San Fernando Valley with Santa Clarita. These are similarly sized communities that are all independently incorporated and work together on brush fire prevention.

The map also keeps communities along the Mulholland Drive unified in a single Assembly district. Map A is the only acceptable map submitted by VICA. The other maps break down too many communities of interest to be considered.

Please support VICA's proposed Map A; do not support Map B or C. Thank you so much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have Caller 0805, and up next after
that is Caller 7175.

Caller 0805, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Oh, thank you. Thank you so much, Commissioners, for your service. You guys are in the home stretch.

My name is Cristina Hernandez, born and raised in Van Nuys. I am calling tonight to support the San Fernando Valley firefighters Assembly map. The proposed firefighter Assembly map plan is the one I support because it unifies the working class communities and the similar economic corridors of the East valley, where I live. But it also manages to respect the Burbank/LA city limit. It also keeps the communities of the Verdugo Foothills and the rim of the valley trail with Santa Clarita.

Therefore, unifying communities most directly supports impacted by the brush fires in the region. We've heard a lot tonight about brush fires directly impacting this area, which we know is a huge issue.

And also finally, and really most critically to me and my family --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.
MS. HERNANDEZ: -- this map creates a Latino
majority district and a strong Latino influenced
district, while unifying the fast growing Filipino
population in my area of the --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. HERNANDEZ: -- valley. I really want you to
take this into account. Thank you very much. Have a
good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have Caller 7175, and up next
after that will be Caller 8689.

Caller 7175, please follow the prompts. The floor
is yours.

MR. PAYNE: Thank you, good evening, Commissioners.

This is Jeremy Payne on behalf of Equality California. I
would like to call in to say thank you for keeping much
of our LGBTQ+ community together in your Senate mapping
this week; we greatly appreciate your careful attention.

As you move back to the Assembly, I want to bring
attention back to the San Fernando Valley. I understand
there are many competing interests in the area that make
it difficult to balance competing interests while also
empowering the many diverse COIs in the San Fernando
Valley, including our LGBTQ+ community of interest in
Valley Village, Valley Glen, North Hollywood, and Toluca
Lake.

To help with your efforts for equitable and fair redistricting, I would like to express our support of the San Fernando Valley map submitted by the Los Angeles County Firefighters on December 13th, which keeps our San Fernando Valley LGBTQ+ community united. It allows communities impacted by fires to be unified and empowered to address fire risk concerns in their neighborhood, and it also allows the Commission to draw a second Latino VRA seat that was lost in previous drafts.

This mapping of the San Fernando Valley may not be perfect, but it is --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. PAYNE: -- one of the stronger considerations we have seen so far for the LGBTQ+ community in the San Fernando Valley.

We hope the Commission will consider that and move forward with this recommendation to help empower our LGBTQ+ community in the San Fernando Valley, and the diverse communities which we belong.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. PAYNE: Thank you so much and have a great evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have Caller 8689, and up next after that is
Caller 7840.

Caller 8689, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. WHEELER: Hi, Commissioners. My name is Tom Wheeler, and I'm a resident of Humboldt County and the executive director of EPIC, an environmental advocacy group based out of Arcadia, California.

I'm here to speak with for the North coast, which is drawn together by our coastline, our shared economies in Weed, Wood, and Wine, and Highway 101.

While I'm glad that the Commission appears to have moved on from the idea of splitting off Del Norte, Humboldt, and Trinity Counties from the rest of the North coast, I do want to highlight that the Karuk tribe has advocated for their tribe's ancestral territory to be drawn to the maximum extent possible towards the coast, away from inland districts.

Currently, Karuk tribal members are split between legislative districts. While I'm not advocating for a large reopening of line drawing for the North coast, I am advocating for a minor adjustment to draw parts of Western Siskiyou County towards the coast.

As Western Siskiyou County is lightly populated, I expect that the necessary balancing is not going to be very significant, and will likely be an easy fix that
disrupts no major VRA concerns.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. WHEELER: Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

All right. Now, we have Caller 7840, and up next after that will be Caller 6625.

Caller 7840, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. GUTIERREZ: Hello, good evening, Commissioners.

Thank you so much for the painstaking work you're doing for all of us.

My name is Eduardo Gutierrez, and I'm a lifelong resident of Valley Village in the San Fernando Valley of Los Angeles. So I'm calling in tonight because I want to tell you that I support VICA's proposed Map A for the San Fernando Valley, and I wanted to let you know why you should, too.

VICA's Map A, it'll do three things. First, Map A will ensure that the communities along Mulholland Drive remain unified and united in one single Assembly district.

Second, it guarantees that North Hollywood and Toluca Lake stay together, along with the working class communities of the central San Fernando Valley. Finally, Map A would keep Glendale and Burbank unified in the East
San Fernando Valley, along with Santa Clarita. These communities are similarly sized, and they are independently incorporated. They all together work together on brush fire --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. GUTIERREZ: -- prevention, which is a huge concern in this area. In short, Map A is the only acceptable VICA map submitted by VICA. The other VICA maps break down too many communities of interest to be considered. I urge you all to support Map A; do not support B or C. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have Caller 7175, and up next after that is Caller 9048.

Caller 7175, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, can everyone hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hey there, Commissioners. I'd like to share my strong opposition to iteration STCV 2, 3, and 4 of Kings, Tulare, and Kern Congressional visualization. As a Latino, we have communities of interest outside of other Latinos and I live and work in Hanford, and I don't appreciate that the city's being split into two Congressional districts. Our community is
not based upon the color of my skin, but rather, the
resources and representation we deserve as residents of
Hanford and for the Central Valley.

Our community is made up of farmers, business
owners, and hardworking individuals that hold the same
values towards water rights and preservation of our
farming communities, so please keep Kings County whole
and focus on the values of our community and not the
color of our skin. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have Caller 9048. And up next
after that will be Caller 3083.

Caller 9048, please follow the prompts. The floor
is yours.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you very much, Commissioners.

My name is Steve Ferguson, and I live and serve as a
member of the Board of Education of the Burbank Unified
School District in Burbank, California. Really just
calling today to support the San Fernando Valley
Firefighters' Assembly Map, as it serves my community
well. I will say we are a smaller suburban school
district, and so drawing us in with other smaller
suburban school districts allow us to advocate for
funding priorities that are aligned with our needs, and
not those of big districts, which again, have big needs
like Los Angeles.

   So please, again, adopt the San Fernando Valley
Fires -- Assembly map and it also creates a Latino
majority district, a strong Latino influenced district,
while also unifying a very fast growing Filipino
population throughout the valley.

   So again, urging you and hoping you will hear the
voices of our local leaders in Burbank, and support the
San Fernando Valley Firefighters' Assembly Map. Thank
you.

   PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
   And right now, we have Caller 3083, and up next
   after that is Caller 6758.
   Caller 3083, please follow the prompts.
   And one more time, caller with the last four digits
   3083, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing
   star six.
   I do apologize, Caller 3083. You appear to have
   some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I do have
   you down for a retry and I will come back around.
   Right now, we have Caller 6758, and up next after
   that is Caller 9954.
   Caller 6758, please follow the prompts. The floor
   is yours.

   UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Good evening. I'm
Jackie, and I'm a resident of Westminster. The Vietnamese community has fully engaged in this redistricting progress -- 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 a community can live with. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have Caller 9954, and up next after that, will be Caller 3995.

Caller 9954, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, thank you. I'm calling from Rancho Cucamonga, and would like to ask that you keep Rancho Cucamonga and Upland in the San Bernardino County based district. We are currently kept whole and together with other San Bernardino County cities in our Assembly, State Senate, and Congressional Districts. We feel represented.

Your new maps split and tear our two communities to pieces, fully undermining the voice of our residents. Please reverse this decision and group Rancho Cucamonga and Upland with San Bernardino County, not Los Angeles County. Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have Caller 3995, and up next after that is Caller 4967.
Caller 3995, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.
I just want to say that I hope you all end up grouping all of the high desert together. It's important to uphold the value of community. Please try to get Adelanto, Apple Valley, Hesperia, and Victorville back to where they belong, with the high desert.
There's no doubt in my mind that you all can do this; let's get it done. Thanks again, and hope you all have a great evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have Caller 4967, and up next after that is Caller 4458.
Caller 4967, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (In Spanish, not translated).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have Caller 4458, and up next after that is Caller 4328.
Caller 4458, please follow the prompts.
And one more time, caller with the last four digits
4458, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

I do apologize, Caller 4458. I do have you down for a retry. There appears to be some type of connectivity issue for the moment, but I will come back around.

Right now we have Caller 4328, and up next after that is Caller 7832.

Caller 4328, please follow the prompts.

And one more time, caller with the last four digits 4328, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

I do apologize, Caller 4328. There appears to be some type of connectivity issue for you at the moment; I will come back around.

Caller 7832 will be right now, and up next after that will be Caller 7517.

Caller 7832, please follow the prompts to unmute.

Caller with the last four digits 7832, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

Caller 7832, I will come back around for a retry.

I'd like to remind all those in the queue, I know some of that may be frustrating with the star six and connectivity issues. And I'd also like to remind all of those to please be near their phones as well.

Right now, we have Caller 7517, and up next after
that is Caller 3783.

Caller 7517, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I wanted to first thank you for your time and hard work on this Commission. I'm in Huntington Beach, and I wanted to say that adding Huntington Beach in with Little Saigon for the Congressional and Senate district was the right thing to do, so please keep these maps and don't make any changes; you got it right, so thank you.

However, I question why you didn't do that for the Assembly district. I know that the population constraints are there, but you could simply adjust by removing Stanton and East Garden Grove to add portions of Huntington Beach.

I know -- excuse me. It is known that Stanton, East Garden Grove, Anaheim, and Santa Ana are very similar and have a large Latino population, while Huntington Beach is known to be part of greater Little Saigon. If you simply add all of either North of Garfield Street or Ellis Street in Huntington Beach, you'll give Little Saigon the true representation the Assembly and also the Latino communities, as well, in the other Assembly districts.

These are just minor changes to the Assembly and it will give Little Saigon the representation --
MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- the representation they deserve. So I please hope that you consider these changes before you finalize the maps. Thank you for all that you do, and have a great night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

All right, now we have Caller 3783, and up next after that will be Caller 8802.

Caller 3783, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. My name is Lily, and I'm calling regarding Commissioner Kennedy's proposal regarding the Vietnamese community in Huntington Beach and Little Saigon.

Tomorrow, when the Commissioner visits the Congressional maps, I would like to request that you all consider this proposal. I know you won't be making substantial changes to the OC map, 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 this evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

All right, now we have Caller 8802, and up next
after that will be Caller 9835.

Caller 8802, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hi, my name is Alan (ph.). And I want 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 there's one final easy change we could make to the Orange County map before we finalize.

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 9835, and up next after that is Caller 0566.

Caller 9835, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

Caller 9835, will you please double check your phone, make sure you are not on mute. You are unmuted.

Oh, there you are. The phone is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, sorry about that. Wanted to thank you for taking my call. Thanks to the firefighters for recognizing that we have redistricting at the last minute.

Unfortunately, any San Fernando Valley maps that do
not include two majority Latino districts is not recognizing the will of Los Angeles North County voters. You guys recognize, the Commissioners, that it's so important that you drew a Senate seat, the CVAP -- Latino CVAP, above fifty percent. You've also shown that you can do two Assembly seats doing the same thing.

This is a community that needs representation and I implore you to redraw your maps to make sure in the Assembly you have two majority Latino CVAP districts to make sure that these voices are heard. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

All right, now we have Caller 0566, and up next after that will be Caller 6586.

Caller 0566, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, I am -- I'm calling in support of the November 10th map that keeps the mountain cities together and not combine them with the big cities. There's nothing in common with big cities and the mountains, Coarsegold, Oakhurst, areas. Don't make those small mountain communities the ugly stepsister of these big cities; they will have no representation. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have Caller 6586, and up next after that is Caller 8951.
Caller 6586, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi there, Commissioners. I'm a resident of Orange County, and I'm just calling about the line that you guys ended up putting up on December 8th. They were able to keep North Orange County together, so the cities like Yorba Linda, Placentia, Cities of Brea and Fullerton, those were all able to be united, and in one piece, and that is a cohesive community with definitely a lot of communities of interest. And it was good lines that were -- I feel like were able to be pretty balanced with its neighbors as well, and so I'm just asking the Commission to reconsider those lines from December 8th that kept North Orange County whole.

Having gone and broken up everything again has, I feel like caused a lot of problems, so revisiting those lines, I feel like will be very beneficial. Thank you very much for your time and hope you have a good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have Caller 8951, and up next after that is Caller 6059.

Caller 8951, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners.
My name is Anna, and I'm here to discuss about the Commission's position to divide the Vietnamese community in Orange County.

I think the Commission has prioritized the voting power of nearly every other major community of interest. While I appreciate the hard decisions this group has to make, I think that we must restore the voting power of Asian-Americans and Vietnamese people in Orange County.

Please keep Huntington Beach residents together, along with the strong Vietnamese communities of Little Saigon, Westminster, Garden Grove, and Stanton valley. Without combining these communities, the Asian-Americans in Orange County will never be able to have the power to elect representatives they feel are best for them.

Thank you for all of your hard work, and I hope you will consider making these changes.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have Caller 6059, and up next after that is Caller 2648.

Caller 6059, please follow the prompts. And one more time, caller with the last four digits 6059, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

Caller 6059, I do have you down for a retry. I'll come back around after the break.
Right now, we have Caller 2648, and up next after that is Caller 1564.

Caller 2648, please follow the prompts.

Caller with the last four digits 2648, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

And as I said before, I will come back around after the break for these retries.

Caller 1564, and up next after that will be Caller 9045.

Caller 1564, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.

First of all, I want to thank you for your time and effort in getting these districts correct.

I just -- I'm a resident of Rancho Cucamonga and would like to ask that you keep Rancho Cucamonga and San Bernardino County as a base district. We are currently split and grouped with Los Angeles County, who we share nothing in common with.

Our concerns are best addressed when we are kept with the representative from the Inland Empire. At the moment, we are kept whole, and our elected officials from San Bernardino County represent us. Please keep Rancho Cucamonga with San Bernardino County and do not group us with Los Angeles County. Thank you for your time.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now, we have Caller 9045, and up next after that will be Caller 3675.
Caller 9045, please follow the prompts to unmute.
The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, good evening, everyone. I'm calling from the Coachella Valley. So the Coachella Valley should always be kept together, whether it's new districts or as it is. Not only is there an exceptional strong community of Spanish-speaking Latinos, communities in the Eastern Coachella Valley face a lack of investment in the areas of housing and infrastructure, from roads to sidewalks, to street linings to community parks.

Similar to other rural pockets in the Inland Empire, the sense of community here is incredibly strong and the activism and community organizing in the region is a testament to that.

From housing to education to environmental justice, that Coachella Valley must be kept whole, not split into two different districts, so that the residents can properly advocate for their needs and property -- and priority as a community. Folks from East Coachella Valley travel to the Western section of the Coachella Valley for work purposes. The I-10 and Highway 111 are the main roads that connect these cities, and people use
to travel to get to their workplace.

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We also get farm workers that live in the West part of the Coachella Valley and need to travel to the East Coachella Valley for work purposes.

MR. MANOFF: Ten.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All in all, the Coachella Valley should be kept together and not try to split it apart. Thank you. Have a good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have Caller 3675 and up next after that is Caller 7750.

Caller 3675, please follow the prompts to unmute.

The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners.

Many people have previously called asking for Sylmar to be removed from the Santa Clarita Valley map and be reconnected with the Eastern San Fernando Valley. We're still waiting for you all to make that change for both communities. And I ask that you please push the Santa Clarita Valley Congressional map East into the Angeles National Forest since we all share the same wildfire prevention concerns. That way, the Santa Clarita Valley and Antelope Valley communities, along with the Angeles National Forest, all have a representative that can fight
to stop wildfires.

Additionally, the Assembly map merges the Santa Clarita Valley with the San Fernando Valley and you all need to keep these valleys separate Commissioners.

Please add Acton and Agua Dulce --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- into the Santa Clarita Valley and not the Antelope Valley. Then push it Northwest into the rest of LA County so that it looks like the Senate and Congressional maps.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Please do this now, Commissioners. We have been waiting too long. Thank you very much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have Caller 7750, and up next after that is Caller 6056.

Caller 7750, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, everyone. It's Julie again, from the Central Valley.

So I was talking to my neighbors, and you know, we all work in different industries, have families, you know, all that. It's a good group of good people with different perspectives.
In looking at the maps, I think iteration STCV-2 from December 15th works the best for all of us here. It keeps the communities of interest together and overall seems like it would be a good fit for the area for the years to come.

So please use iteration STCV-2 from Wednesday, when you finalize maps in this region. Thank you. I'm calling from the Central Valley. Thanks.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have Caller 6056, and up next after that is Caller 6692.

Caller 6056, please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

And one more time, caller with the last four digits 6056, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

DR. WEISSBERG: Thank you. My name is Dr. Emily Weissberg; I'm a member of the Burbank Unified School District School Board. I'm calling to speak in regards to the San Fernando Valley/Santa Clarita Valley.

I want to respectfully urge the Commissioners to amend the map, focus on San Fernando Valley Assembly districts, and please adopt the map proposed by the LA County Firefighters, which connects Glendale, Burbank, Sunland-Tujunga, and Santa Clarita, uniting communities of
interest and addressing problems with recent iterations.

Among the many concerns I have about the state Assembly maps is that it places Burbank in a district which is completely surrounded by LAUSD communities. Burbank and LAUSD are not funded in the same way, under the local control funding formula. Leaving Burbank and LAUSD with super different needs from the state budget. It's much more equitable to tie Burbank with Glendale and other suburban school districts to share funding priorities. As a school board member for Burbank Unified, I am deeply concerned about the implications for our public schools --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- if the map is not amended. Our struggle for funding will only be made worse if we shift into an Assembly district where we'll be forced to compete with LAUSD. Burbank Unified has struggled so much. To have these maps create a situation where our small, but important, district is overshadowed rather than supported, would irreparably damage our ability to meet the needs of our students --

MR. MANOFF: Ten.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- staff, and families. I urge you to adopt the map submitted by the California Professional Firefighters. Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 6692, and up next after that will be caller 2992. Caller 6692, please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Commissioners, I'd like to discuss Iterations STCV 2, 3 and 4, KINGS-TULARE-KERN Congressional Visualizations. I'm concerned about all these iterations. All these visualizations dramatically change the way in which our community and overall region are represented at the federal level. The Commission is not supposed to be looking at politicized maps, yet they're looking at using MALDEF maps. Even their activists are calling it MALDEF maps only proves the point that these maps are politicized.

Don't take the words from these activists reading from a script. Take the words from someone like me who lives in the community. Even former attorney general for President Obama, Eric Holder, said this Commission is failing to draw the lines that respect communities, and I'd have to agree. Please keep this -- please keep Kings County whole. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 2992, and up next after that will be caller 0526. Caller 2992, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.
MS. CHICOURRAT: Good afternoon. Thank you for --
Commissioners, for all your hard work, or I should say
good evening. I'm calling on behalf of Monterey County
Hospitality Association. My name's Janine Chicourrat,
and I'm chair. And I'm calling regarding the
Congressional District of Monterey County and Santa Cruz
County, and San Benito County. You know, I listened to
your testimony earlier about the Senate and talking about
the importance of keeping Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San
Benito to together. And I firmly believe, on the
Congressional side, you need to do that as well. You
need to, if at all possible, you can revisit the
Congressional map, going West towards the East, and
keeping those three counties together. That really is in
all of our best interests.

We have -- agriculture is our number one industry,
hospitality is our number two industry, and we all work
together and have for many years. By splitting it up the
way that you have it, going and taking the Salinas Valley
and tie them into Silicon Valley, where they have no
common interests, really doesn't make sense for our
community. And when you look at the way our community
has worked together, by dividing it up the way you
currently have it laid out, you are splitting up our
hospitals --
MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. CHICOURRAT: -- school districts, and so much more. So I urge you to revisit the Congressional map, and really take a hard look at going from East to West and keeping Santa Cruz, Monterey County, and San Benito County together. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 0526. Please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MR. SCHULTZ: Thank you very much. Good evening, Commissioners and staff. My name is Nick Schultz, and I'm calling tonight from Burbank, California, where I serve as a city council member. In reviewing the proposed San Fernando Valley Assembly districts, I would urge the Commission to adopt the map submitted by the Los Angeles County Firefighters as part of public comment number 38778. The map would include a proposed Assembly district identified as AD45-South SF, which would connect Glendale, Burbank, Sunland-Tujunga, and Santa Clarita.

These communities share common interests, including the recognition of the growing risk of wildfire, increasing ties to the entertainment industry, unique equestrian neighborhoods and infrastructure, and a common struggle to ensure that the needs of our medium-sized,
independent cities are not lost under the shadow of the City of Los Angeles.

Last, but certainly not least, Southern California is home to the largest Armenian community outside of Armenia. However, Glendale is split in half under the current map proposals, and Little Armenia is in an entirely different district. I understand that it may --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. SCHULTZ: -- not be possible to keep the Armenian community united as part of the same district, but I would strongly encourage the Commission to keep North Glendale paired with Burbank and Sunland-Tujunga at a minimum. In conclusion, I urge the Commission to support the Los Angeles County Firefighters map.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. SCHULTZ: You can read my entire comment letter by referring to Public Comment number 41937. Thank you for your time, consideration, and your service.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for your input so far. We are at 8:15. It is time for a 15-minute break for our staff and for the Commissioners. So those of you who are in the queue, please hold on, we will be getting to your calls after 8:30. Thank you so much, everyone. We're on break until 8:30.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 8:15 p.m.)
CHAIR KENNEDY: Welcome back to today's meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We are in the midst of taking public comment. And so, I will turn it back over to our comment moderator, Katy, who will lead us through the next public comment blog. Take it away, Katy. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much, Chair.

All right. Right now, we have caller 3527, and caller 9898 will be after that, as mentioned earlier. And then after that, I will be heading down to these retries. Go ahead and give people a second opportunity, because we had quite a collection earlier. So after that, we'll be coming to caller 4201 is a retry, and I'll go down the line after that. But right now we have caller 3527, and up next after that will be caller 9898.

Caller 3527, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (In Spanish, not transcribed).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9898, and then up next after that will be caller 4201. Caller 9898, please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

MR. WORSKILL: Thank you so very much. And I just
want to appreciate our Commissioners and also you, Katy, for the -- lasting as long as you have.

My name is Grant Worskill (phonetic). I'm a Del Norte County resident, and I want to be speaking to the matter of keeping our North Coast communities part of the North Coast. And that would be Marin, Sonoma, Mendocino, Humboldt, and Del Norte. And in my case, I have been an active chamber member for about twenty years, both as a business member and as a nonprofit manager. So I'm just going to speak to kind of the business side of things first.

First, timber is a very important part of our economy. Our largest private timber company, Green Diamond, that would be 90,000 plus acres just in Del Norte County, and all of their land is thirty miles within the coast. So it's very coastal. It makes sense. Our forests are the same in these coastal counties.

Secondly, travel and tourism. Chamber is really big on that. They do so much. And a couple of things that resonate -- will resonate for you -- is where the Redwoods meet the sea. And that is so thematic and so important. Travel and tourism, about the single largest part of our economy --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. WORSKILL: -- and also America's Wild Rivers
Coast. That really says it. So thank you so much for keeping Del Norte and Humboldt part of our coastal communities. And thank you, again, for your work. Good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, I'll be going down to caller 4201 as a retry, and then after that, I will be retrying caller 1041.

Caller 4201, please follow the prompts to unmute.

The floor is yours.

MR. WALDMAN: Good evening, Commissioners. Stuart Waldman from VICA calling about the Senate maps. And first thing, appreciate the efforts that you made on the maps trying to get Glendale and Burbank back together. I tried it myself. Could not come up with the solution while keeping Latino CVAP seat. So we appreciate the efforts on that as well. So maps are fine right now. Let's not change. Let's not make any drastic changes.

And then we did submit three Assembly maps; maps A, B, and C. You've heard callers say Map B is bad. I'd say my favorite map would be Map A. I think if you look at the two districts that -- in the middle of my Map A, they're very similar to the Senate seat that you just draw -- drew. So it was a 57 percent Hispanic CVAP seat and a 40.7 percent Hispanic CVAP seat.
MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. WALDMAN: We work to keep most neighborhood councils whole. We kept Burbank whole. We put Burbank and Glendale in the same district. We united working class communities. We put NoHo, Van Nuys, and Valley Village in one district, North Hollywood with Toluca Lake in one district, as well as the Hispanic CVAP seat --

MR. MANOFF: Ten.

MR. WALDMAN: -- majority seat and the Hispanic Opportunity seat. So thank you. I hope you take a look at them.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we will be retrying caller 1041, and up next after that will be the retry of caller 2648. Caller 1041, please follow the prompts to unmute.

Caller 1041, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. Caller 1041, you did have your hand up earlier, and I am giving the second retry. There appears to still be some type of connectivity issue for you. I would suggest hanging up and calling back. Thank you so much.

And right now, we will go back down here and retry caller 2648, and up next after that we will retry caller 4328. Caller 2648, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I'm calling regarding the State Assembly 110A Draft -- Draft Map. I'm here to ask for your help with a minor cleanup modification. We ask for you to also place our next door neighbors from unincorporated Walnut Park into the same 110 LA map as us, and make the one -- the 10 Freeway the Northern border of the map. It is imperative to have Warner 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.

We have a united community between Walnut Park, Huntington Park, and Florence-Graham, as we would like to keep it as such, in order to continue our advocacy and priorities for our community, as we have the same political and social challenges. I understand that Huntington Park cannot be in the same map, due to --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- population; however, with a minor change of moving Walnut Park into the 110 LA map, it would help our unincorporated communities of Walnut Park and of Florence-Graham to have a fighting chance in having a voice in Sacramento.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, I'll go down -- right down my list here. And we'll retry caller 4328, and then up next after that, we will retry caller 6059. Caller 4328, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

MR. ICHINOSE: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Dan Ichinose. I'm research director at the Orange County Civic Engagement Table. I also work to support the People's Redistricting Alliance, as you know, a multiracial coalition of sixteen community-based organizations working to center low-income communities of color and working families in redistricting processes in Orange County.

As always, we appreciate all of the hard work, recognizing the diverse interest, the Commission and line drawers are working to balance. It's been a long journey, and it certainly hasn't been easy, but we believe you've drawn the best possible maps of Orange County. So thank you for listening to us.

Our sixteen community-based organizations and their Orange County constituencies would like to express their support for the current versions of the State Assembly, State Senate, and Congressional map. In addition to drawing effective Federal Voting Rights Act compliance -- compliant districts around Santa Ana, all three maps
respect numerous committees of interest, including
Korean-American communities in North Buena Park and
Northwest Fullerton, low-income immigrant communities in
South Fullerton and West Anaheim, Little Arabia in West
Anaheim --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. ICHINOSE: -- (indiscernible) communities in
South Buena Park, La Palma, and Cypress in Orange County
and (indiscernible) in Los Angeles County, LatinX
communities Santa Ana, Vietnamese-American communities in
Garden Grove, Westminster, and Fountain Valley, Pacific
Islander Community Garden Grove, immigrant communities --

MR. NANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. ICHINOSE: -- in Irvine and Costa Mesa, and
finally, coastal communities from Seal Beach to Laguna
Beach in the Assembly map, and even in the Senate map, a
fully coastal district. So achieving these -- this
delicate balance between numerous communities of interest
is no small --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we will retry caller 6059. And then
up next after that will be our last retry for right now
will be caller 7832. Caller 6059 will be right now, and
up next after that will be caller 7832. Caller 6059,
please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.
The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I'm calling regarding the State Assembly 110 LA Draft Map. I'm here to ask for your help with a minor cleanup, modification. We ask for you to also place our next door neighbor -- neighbors from unincorporated Warner Park into the same 110 LA map as us, and also make the 10 freeway the Northern border of the map. It is imperative to have Warner 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.

We have a united community between Warner Park, Huntington Park, and Florence-Graham, as we would like to keep it as such in order to continue our advocacy and priorities for our communities, as we have the same political and the social challenges. I understand that Huntington Park cannot be in the same map due to population. However, with the minor change of moving Warner Park into the 110 LA map, it would help our unincorporated communities of Warner Park and Florence-Graham to have a fighting chance in having a voice in Sacramento. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And we have one more retry down here. Caller 7832,
if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. And one more time, caller 7832, if you please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. Caller 7832, I did have you down as a retry. You did have your hand up. You do not now. And if you're still having some type of connectivity issue, I do suggest hanging up and calling back. Thank you so much.

Right now, we have caller 5253, and up next after that will be caller 8544. Caller 5253, please follow the prompts to unmute. And one more time, caller 5253, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. Thank you very much for your service. We can all see what a tough job this is. My name is Sandra. I'm from Del Norte County. Can you not hear me?

MR. MANOFF: We can hear you. Go ahead.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Caller 5253, if you'll please, press star six again. We did hear you just fine. There you are.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. I'm back.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: All right.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. Thank you. So my name is Sandra. I've lived in Del Norte County for decades. I thank you for deciding again earlier today to
keep all the North Coast counties together. We like the last maps that you did from keeping Del Norte County down to Marin County together. Our community of interest is unified by Highway 101. That is our lifeline that runs through all of our counties; and as an earlier speaker said, it keeps our commerce and our tourism flowing. We don't have as much in common, if much at all, with the inland counties, the counties to the East.

Please don't split off any of these coastal counties to be with the counties to the East. In fact, there are no roads directly connecting our counties to the counties -- excuse me -- directly connecting --

MR. MANOFF: Twenty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- my county with the counties to the East. The counties to the East are united by Highway 5, but 101 --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- along the coast is our lifeline. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

I'd like to remind all those in the queue to please remain alert. I apologize for the wait, but we are coming around to all of you.

Right now, we have caller 8544, and up next after that is caller 9352. Caller 8544, please follow the
prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is
yours.

MS. TATTERFIELD: Hello, Commissioners. My name is
Catherine Tatterfield (phonetic). I have been
participating in this process for a while. I appreciate
all the work that you guys have put into it, but I'm
really surprised at what I am hearing tonight. I am
hearing a lot of advocacy for a fire map and a VICA map
submitted for California State Assembly, and this is just
coming out of nowhere. You guys have been listening to
public comments for weeks, even months, and none of it
reflected what these people are saying.

I think you should consider the source of these
comments, you know, and see it as the astroturfing that
it is. It just purely benefits incumbents and special
interests. It's political opportunism, and that is not
what this Commission is about. It's about representing
the people. And the people of San Fernando Valley prefer
the San Fernando Valley Assembly Community maps. They're
a reasonable alternative to get us closer to the original
draft maps where we had consensus.

There was consensus before. This eleventh hour push
to suddenly separate Santa Clarita and Stevenson Ranch in
the fire map. Come on. Who -- who thinks that's a good
idea? No one. Nobody, okay. So let's get back to where
we were, where the people agreed --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. SATTERFIELD: -- and it did not reflect a bunch of incumbents. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 9352, and up next after that will be caller 7618. Caller 9352, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. MCLEARY: Good evening, Commissioners, and Katy. Hello from Del Norte County. My name is Patty McLeary. And yes, that's where I live, Del Norte County. Please keep North Coast counties together. Your redistricting draft number 1 map is great, and no changes are needed.

Just to recap for you, the community of interest key elements from Marin to Del Norte include salmon, redwoods, coastal policies, coastal agriculture, Highway 101, harbor issues, dredging, and then there's the Dungeness crab, issues relating to the Pacific Ocean and sea level rise. These issues are common from the Golden Gate Bridge to the Oregon border.

Finally, state and federal agencies service areas are organized to serve the North Coast as a unit, and some of the examples are the Department of Fish and Wildlife, NOAA, State Water Board, Coastal Commission.

So thank you, again, for your time. Thanks for
supporting democracy, and I really appreciate your work, and keep the North Coast writ large from Marin County to Del Norte together. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 7618, and up next after that will be caller 6659. Caller 7618, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. NGUYEN: Hi. My name is Jessica Nguyen, and I'm calling in support of now splitting Huntington Beach. At first, I did not want it split, but this late in the process, it seems that this is the only way to get the Vietnamese population full together in the Santa Ana District. Please make this split you proposed to truly creating an Asian influenced district in Orange County. Thank you so much for your time. Have a great weekend.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 6659, and up next after that will be caller 6329. Caller 6659, please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

MR. TRAN: Hi. Can you guys hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. TRAN: Hi. Good evening. My name is Kevin Tran, and please approve Commissioner Kennedy's idea to include part of Huntington Beach 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 it 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 6329, and up next after
that is caller 8366. Caller 6329, please follow the
prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. CHIN: Dear Commissioners. My name is Chris
Chin, and I'm calling in as the Voting Rights Community
Advocate at the Asian Law Caucus, as well as a
representative of the API and a member of State
Redistricting Collaborative. Thank you for considering
our collaborative suggestions and for continuing to
refine the maps to keep our communities whole. As we
enter into the final days of the line drawing process, I
wanted to uplift some priority areas identified by our
collaborative.

First, for the Assembly map in Los Angeles, we urge
the Commission to keep the City of Carson whole. We're
couraged that many Commissioners have mentioned the
need to unify Carson at the Assembly level. Carson is
home to the largest concentration of Filipino-Americans
in the U.S. We understand that the Commission has
expressed interest in keeping the two ports in the region in separate districts. I would like to remind the Commission that our collaborative proposed a map that keeps these ports in separate districts, while also keeping Carson whole. We hope you find our proposed fix useful.

Second, for the Congressional map in the Bay Area, we would like to urge the Commission to move the Vietnamese business district, Little Saigon, with a greater Vietnamese residential community.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. CHIN: We appreciate the Commission's plan, YA-San Jose Iterations 1 and 3, for keeping most of the Vietnamese community whole across the East San Jose and Evergreen neighborhoods. We ask to please keep the Little Saigon area, which is a prominent commercial corridor for these Vietnamese businesses.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. CHIN: While we understand this business district is currently a VRA -- VARC, we believe moving the small commercial area will have little impact on the Latino CVAP percentage. It's important that Little Saigon is connected to the residential Vietnamese community in East San Jose. Thank you so much for listen --
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 8366, and up next after that will be caller 1595. Caller 8366, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. BAUMAN: My name is Cole Bauman. I'm calling from the Tolowah Dee-Ni' Nation Office of the Tribal Attorney. The Tolowah Dee-Ni' Nation is a federally-recognized sovereign Indian nation with its government headquarters located within Del Norte County; specifically, Smith River. Nation supports the Congressional Districts map Iteration 12-15-21, as it pertains to Del Norte County. The map iteration, inappropriately keeps Del Norte County and by extension, the Nation, within the same district as its coastal neighbors. Del Norte County is a coastal community, and its interests most often align with the interests of its neighboring coastal communities. Economic activity in the area follows the North to the South path, not East to West as the coastal range mountains separate coastal communities of Del Norte county from commerce to the East, and the U.S. 101 connects Del Norte County to its coastal communities to the South.

Nation maintains the Rowdy Creek Fish Hatchery in Smith River. The Nation's concern with the health of the North California rivers is shared by other residents of
Del Norte County, as well as the residents of Humboldt County, where the Eagle River and Mad River Fish hatcheries are operated.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. BAUMAN: In sharp contrast to this, are the priorities of farm-based communities in Northeastern California who utilize the same rivers for irrigation. This is just one example, and I know I'm short on time. The great majority of public comments originating in --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. BAUMAN: -- these communities have confirmed the same distinct differences between these coastal and noncoastal communities. Any proposal to redistrict Del Norte County to a Congressional District shared with the Northeastern California communities should be rejected. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 1595, and up next after that will be caller 8987. Caller 1595, please follow the prompts to unmute. Hold on one moment. Caller 1595? And no, you did not hang up. Did you mean to lower your hand? Caller 1595, please, press star nine, or did you intentionally lower your hand? I highly doubt it. Caller 1595, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right. Thank you.

Apologies. Thank you for this opportunity to speak. My name is Ramsey. I'm one of the community leaders for the Florence Firestone District. I'm calling in regarding Assembly 110 LA Draft. I am here to ask for a minor change. We are asking for a one-on-one swap. Move the small community of Walnut Park area into the 110 LA map, then give the small parts of downtown L.A. that have absolutely nothing in common fiscally or economically in common with us that you currently have in the L.A. 110 map, and move the small downtown area to the AD54 Northeast L.A. Map.

And lastly, you can move the small city of Maywood from AD54 in the L.A. to the Gateway map. This is a close and even swap that will put these small community areas in with similar communities, which is crucial as far as voting and resources are concerned --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- areas in common.

Commissioners, we are asking for the small clean up to ultimately have Walnut Park in the same 110 LA map as the Florence-Graham community, in order to truly have a representation of what the community is.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 8987, and up next after that will be caller 7374. Caller 8987, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. GAIDO: Good evening. I'm Mary Ann Gaido, a City of Irvine Planning Commissioner and a former Irvine City councilwoman, and I'm calling regarding the proposed split Senate district for our city. I'm convinced that the City of Irvine is really a community of interest.

After all, it is a Master Plan city, which just celebrated fifty years since incorporation. And my concern is that this Senate district will be detrimental to our city and its cohesiveness.

The city is really proud of its school district, of its city council, of its Irvine Ranch Water District, and all of the public safety programs we have in -- with our urban police. I'm really concerned that the Commission's Draft Plan calls for splitting Irvine into two separate Senate districts. And yes, we've depended on the close relationship --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. GAIDO: -- with our state legislators and have historically worked on local issues together, such as transportation, housing, public safety and open space.

So keep Irvine whole. I really encourage you to consider
redistricting --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. GAIDO: -- the Senate district in this area.

Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 7374, and up next after
that will be caller 7064. Right now we have caller 7374.
Please follow the prompts.

MR. PACK: Good evening, Commissioner. Can you hear
me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. PACK: Okay. Very good. Good evening. My name
is G.W. Devon Pack. I am on the Planning Commission for
the San Benito County. However, I'm speaking as a
private citizen this evening, and my views do not
necessarily reflect that of the county government. That
being said, I'm also a historian. I am seeking to urge
the Redistricting Commission to go with the plan that
keeps Benito County in a district with Monterey County.
We have historically had deep ties with Monterey County
and with Santa Clara County. We do not have any
comparable ties with Fresno County.

The majority of the community of Hollister is
Latino; 67 percent Latino. And our traditional ties have
been with farmers and agricultural interests in the
Salinas Valley. Seventy percent of our employed citizens in our county --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. PACK: -- work either in Santa Clara County or in Monterey County. And so once again, I strongly urge the Commission to keep San Benito with its cultural and minority, and economic and --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. PACK: -- geographic ties, which are with Monterey County and with Santa Clara County. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have 7064, and up next after that will be caller 6051. Caller 7064, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. I'm calling in from -- tonight from Brea. It's a twelve square mile city, and I want to ask the Commission to place North Orange County and Brea back together. There was a compromise on December 8th that kept the community together. And again, Brea, Yorba Linda, Placentia, we are a community. We have many things in common, and that will still accommodate a number of the testimony from other parts of your county.

Based on your population deviations right now, these maps can all happen within the three Non-Voting Rights
Act Orange County districts. And it would be very important for the city of Brea and for myself to be part of Placentia and Yorba Linda. So I'd ask that you would put it back together, that you would shift the map counterclockwise.

In 2008, the freeway fire demonstrated the critical need for mutual aid in which it did Fullerton and Brea and Placentia. And I mean, we depend on each other for both fire and police safety. And for you to split Brea like you're doing --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- I mean it would, basically, make me an orphan, because this part of Brea would have nothing in common with Rossmoor and the other --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 6051, and up next after that will be caller 7251. Right now will be caller 6051. Please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. GILBERT: Hi. Thank you. My name is Janet Gilbert. I live in Del Norte County, and I'm calling to thank you that Del Norte County is in the North Coast district of Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma and Marin Counties. The North Coast shares a coastal climate, seafood industries, and goals of achieving sustainable
forests and timber production. We even share a subduction zone fault off the coast with a significant risk of an earthquake impacting the entire Northern California coastline.

The reason I say that is that we have similar concerns, similar economies and needs, and grouping us together is a more efficient and results in more -- a more expedient solutions to our problems. I ask that you continue to keep Del Norte County in the North Coast with Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma, and Marin Counties. I thank you so much for that, and I hope that that turns out for us all. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 7251, and up next after that is caller 2009. Right now, we have caller 7251. Please follow the prompts to unmute. Caller 7251, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. Caller 7251, you appear to have some type of connectivity issue at the moment. I will come back around.

Caller 2009 would be right now, and up next after that will be caller 0347. Caller 2009, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

MR. ALDINGER: Hi. This is Rick Aldinger. I'm the chair of the Monterey County Hospitality Association
Government Affairs Committee. I'm calling regarding the Midcoast and Cupertino Drafts in relation to the Central Coast Fixed Map of Midcoast, as it pertains to the Congressional Districts. In Monterey County, agriculture is our number one industry with hospitality number two. There's a large overlap in our workforces with individual communities and even families who have members working for both industries.

Our industries have worked together for years on common goals for the health, safety and well-being of our workers. As an example, during the pandemic, our industries came together to help those most vulnerable. While the AG industry remained open, hospitality was shut down due to the high COVID-19 positivity rate, mostly located in the Salinas Valley. When the vaccine first became available, we lobbied our local --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. ALDINGER: -- elected officials to prioritize our farm workers and the communities with the highest infection rates to give them the vaccines first. We knew that the health of our community depended upon taking care of those who were being impacted the hardest by the pandemic --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. ALDINGER: -- even when our employees were out
of work, and many of our businesses were forced to close. While the new political boundaries may be well intentioned, the ramifications are far greater. The new boundaries would move this entire Salinas Valley and tie it into Silicon Valley. Our Congressional District --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, will be caller 0347, and up next after that will be caller 6907. Caller 0347, please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

MS. GONZALEZ: Hello. My name is Edith Gonzalez. Thank you for allowing me to speak today. I support South Los Angeles staying together as a whole, as well as keeping the current map with Boyle Heights and East Los Angeles into two separate districts. Koreatown, on the other hand, should not be connected to Maywood and Bell Gardens. And I appreciate everybody's time and support on all these matters. And thank you for your time. Have a good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 6907, and up next after that will be caller 8136. Caller 6907, please follow the prompts to unmute.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. Thank you, Commission,
for the incredible work. I am fully supporting the map that has the neighborhoods of Boyle Heights and East Los Angeles split into different districts. I believe Maywood should be connected to communities on the West of the 710 Freeway, and Bell Gardens should be connected to communities on the East of the 710 Freeway. Bell Gardens and Maywood should not be connected to Koreatown. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 8136, and up next after that would be caller 4863. Caller 8136, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. HERRON: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Kaya Herron, Deputy Director of Fresno Metro Black Chamber of Commerce and a resident of the City of Fresno. Please stop splitting Black COIs in Fresno. On the Congressional level, the visualizations 2 and 3 are absolutely abysmal for our communities across the Valley, and they split every COI we have listed. Iteration 4 puts most of our COIs in the CORE Fresno District except for the State Garden, which has one of the highest concentrations of Black residents in the City of Fresno due to historical context, including racial housing covenants that have prevented Black folks from moving to specific parts of the city and different counties.
The COIs that are being kept together in visualization 4, are the COIs West of 99, West Park and areas around CSC-FRESNO. As they're currently paired, the Fig Garden Loop is with Clovis, and that is not what we'd like. However, we recognize that it would be favorable for us to stay in that district instead of being in ECA district.

Additionally, most of the people in these districts are Black residents that migrated in the '70s or '80s. And that was one of the benefits extension to the physical boundary that prevented Black people from moving past the Van Nuys extension.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty Seconds.

MS. HERRON: We are united by shared priorities of affordable housing, clean water and air and access to homeownership, quality jobs and education. The Central Valley is one of the last affordable places in the state and increasingly being priced out in --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

MS. HERRON: -- terms of opportunity. I appreciate your clear concern and efforts to maintain a VRA seat, but please do not do this at the expense of Black communities. In closing, please keep Black COIs in Fresno whole --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now we have caller 4862, and up next after that will be caller 4286. Caller 4862, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours. Caller 4862, if you'll please double-check your phone, make sure you are not on mute. You are unmuted in the meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. My name is Kris (phonetic). I thank you, Commission, for your time and dedication. I am here today asking for Maywood and Bell Gardens to not be connected to Koreatown. We need to keep these communities separated by the 710 Freeway. I also want to show my support to keep the current map that has East LA and Boyle Heights separated into two separate districts. Downtown Los Angeles should also need to stay together. So thank you very much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 4286, and up next after that is caller 7312. Caller 4286, please follow the prompts.

MS. GARCIA: Hello?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes. Hello. The floor is yours.

MS. GARCIA: Hi. Hello. My name's Jacqueline Garcia. I would like to show my support for the current map that keeps East LA and Boyle Heights two separate districts. I also think Bell Gardens should be connected
to communities on the West of the 710 Freeway, while Maywood should be connected to the Eastside communities. They should not connect to Koreatown. As well as that, I will join over 350 city leaders and residents that signed the letter posted in Public Comment 41011 to keep Maywood and Southeast communities. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 7312, and up next after that will be caller 8797. Caller 7312, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. SALINAS: Good evening. My name is Elia, E-L-I-I-A, Salinas, S-A-L-I-N-A-S. I'm a resident of San Benito County. I'm calling in support -- that actually is not in support. I misspoke there. I believe that your map people need to, and it was quoted -- it was stated earlier, that they need to do some hard work, and it's true. They need to go back, and they need to redo a lot of these district maps that I've been listening to here. Let me remind you of both hacking and cracking, and that's what I've been hearing.

Hollister. City of Hollister does not belong in Merced and Fresno. We have nothing in common other than a mountain range between us. It's twenty miles to get through the mountain range. We belong with Monterey County. We have a history with Monterey County, and
that's where we need to stay. Moving us to -- with Gilroy, San Martin and Alum Rock, as one of the Commissioners --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. SALINAS: -- stated earlier, is that basically that we have the same basic economic interests, the social economics. It's not true. We are not -- we are not part of Silicon Valley. We do business in Santa Clara County --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. SALINAS: -- and which would be in Gilroy, the closest to us, but we are more in common -- we are an agricultural community and we have more -- we are associated more with the Salinas Valley farmers and agricultural industry --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 8797, and up next after that will be caller 7644. Caller 8797, please follow the prompts. Caller with the last four digits, 8797, please follow the prompts to unmute by -- there you are. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Dear Commissioner, please look at Little Saigon in San Benito District again. You are very close to completing the map of our community. So please don't split us. Please make the change before
it's too late. The community will have to suffer for the changes with Huntington Beach or the Santa Ana district, and we thank you for that. We asking the Commission to put the Inland Park community which is our part up to Garfield and down up at Beach Boulevard. I live in Huntington Beach, and want to be represented by the family member in Little Saigon, and we'll get lost if we ignore, if we split apart in Little Saigon. Thank you, Commissioner, and have a pleasant day. Good night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 7644, and up next after that will be caller 3636. Caller 7644, please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

MR. PAYNE: Good evening, Commissioners. Eric Payne with the Central Valley Urban Institute. We represent low-income families from across the region. We like Iteration 4 that you created for the Central Valley Congressional Districts, because it captures most Black Fresno COIs in the CORE Fresno district. And we would like to see something similar on the Senate and Assembly, because they're breaking up communities.

Specifically because Bullard High School is in Fresno Unified School District, they have the largest population of African-American students that feed into the school from this neighborhood. That puts most of our
COIs in the core Fresno district except for Old Fig. But on all other levels, we still have splits West of 99, West Park, the college COI by Fresno State, and Old Fig Garden, and these other areas that we have lifted up around the Fig Garden Loop.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. PAYNE: Again, I'd like to thank the Commissioners for taking the time to take a deep look at this and take corrective fixes, because this is something that we've lifted up over the last year and a half.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. PAYNE: Again, thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 3636, and up next after that will be caller 8987.

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: Hi. My name is Saul, and I want to say that I appreciate the work you guys have done with the Franklin High School map and support it, but I ask you to please keep Eagle Rock whole and North Washington in our district. We share the boundaries with local community schools, and local businesses thrive
together through the Eagle Rock Chamber of Commerce. Our roads, trails and parks, rivers and our (indiscernible) are part of what makes our community whole. So I please ask for you guys to keep our Northeast Los Angeles community together. Thank you so much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 8987, and up next after that is caller 2223. Caller 8987, please follow the prompts.

MR. ENGLAND: All right.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

MR. ENGLAND: All right. All right. Thank you for the time, Commissioners. I'm Bruce England in Mountain View. That's England, like the country. I manage the community group, Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning, and I serve as the interim team leader for the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition Mountainview team. However, I'm speaking for myself this evening. I know you're thinking about how clusters of cities work best together. I understand this, and I'm concerned that Mountain View would be separated from Sunnyvale and Cupertino per current plans.

For transportation, land use, and other purposes, there's a tremendous amount of synergy across these cities that would be lost or compromised. From a larger
perspective, Mountain View collaborates regularly with these cities, along with Palo Alto and Los Altos. Multiple examples of this exist as active transportation and transit options are considered or developed across our region and how jobs and housing development are best coordinated. Accordingly, having single points of representation for us is the ideal.

And then lastly, I'll just say that districting in the interest of wildlife protection does make sense to me. I heard --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. ENGLAND: -- those comments today. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 2223, and up next after that is caller 7842. Caller 2223, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I am a resident of Brea, and I want to thank the Commission for your hard work. I'm calling in regarding the Congressional lines around Orange County. And I appreciated the maps you created on December 8th for the Congressional Districts that kept North Orange County cities, like North Fullerton, Brea, Yorba Linda, Placentia, and Anaheim Hills together. North Orange County is an important community of interest that shares the same issues and concerns. And in the
drafts of these maps, you're not only able to put North Orange County together in one strong district, but created a VRA district and the Savannah Ana District that elevated the voices of the Asian-American community.

But -- however, the current iteration of the Orange County Congressional lines split up North Orange County, and my City of Brea is currently split, which is a disservice to such a small city like ours. And Yorba Linda and Placentia, two cities that even share a school district also --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- placed in a Congressional districts. So the maps that you had on December 8th were fair for Orange County communities, and there -- I feel like there are changes that can be made with little ripples and without affecting surrounding areas. So --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- I hope you'll consider reinstating that map. Thank you so much for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 7842, and up next after that is caller 8338. Caller 7842, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. LE: Hello there. Hi. Oh, hi. Okay. So my name is Anthony Le. I'm a resident Mountain View,
California, and I'm also calling as a representative for the Vietnamese-American Roundtable, which is a 501(c)(3) org that promotes and advocates for Vietnamese interests. I just want to say thank you to the Commissioners for the great work we've been doing. I also want to encourage and hope the Commission will make one more change to the map that you're working on, and that's to include Little Saigon into the District Santa Clara, compared to where it's right now. It's in District Cupertino.

This split will actually connect -- disconnect the Vietnamese community from the business side with the residential side. The Little Saigon area is actually a business district, and it would not affect too much of the population density. Also, it's the largest concentration of Vietnamese population outside of Vietnam, and many residents in Evergreen and East San Jose conduct business in Little Saigon. So keeping it together will continue to push and uplift the Vietnamese community and continue to bring a better community building from there. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we have caller 8338, and up next after that will be caller 9951. Caller 8338, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. MA: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is
Kevin Ma. I'm from Mountain View, California and the South Bay, and I'm calling to speak against the Midcoast Congressional Map. Inherently, Palo Alto and Mountain View are very different compared to the rest of the district. They're one of the highest real estate prices. They're, you know, part of Silicon Valley, whereas the -- most of the rest of the district is agricultural or rural land, which would -- basically, given the economic constraints of canvassing and campaigning for the district, basically means that Palo and Mountain View would represent the entire district for years on end, given the amount of money you need to do for this.

As such, I recommend that the district change to remove those districts out of -- inherently Mountain View does have a growing Asian population, which I believe would make sense for the grid that you didn't see that district, the VRA districts are as well as -- perhaps shifting the MIDCOAST District to go further East of the San Mateo County. 280 is not exactly the most rural -- is not the rural boundary. It's more like (indiscernible) --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- so inherently, I do want to make sure that we don't cause any economic damage against the rest of the district. Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now we'll go to caller 9951. And up next
after that we be caller 1701. Caller 9951, please follow
the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. TAGOBIAN: Good evening, Commissioners, my name
is Lacete Tagobian (ph.) and I'm speaking on behalf of
the Santa Clarita City Council. The City of Santa
Clarita is the third largest city in Los Angeles County
and is uniquely located in the North County, essentially
surrounded on all sides by unincorporated communities,
including Castaic, Stevenson Ranch, Acton and Agua Dulce.
The city and aper mentioned adjacent communities
make up the Santa Clarita Valley, sharing unifying
conditions and commonalities, including transportation,
planning, public safety, emergency preparedness, water
quality and supply and homelessness services. The city
and adjacent unincorporated communities collaborate
regularly on regional issues and share many public
services, including public safety services, through the
Santa Clarita sheriff's station and water services
through the Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency.

For these reasons, and reasons expressed in previous
correspondence, originally dating back to July of this
year, we urge the Commission to keep the City of Santa
Clarita and unincorporated communities of Castaic,
Stevenson Ranch, Acton, and Agua Dulce in one Assembly —

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. TAGOBIAN: -- one Senate, and one Congressional
district.

Thank you for your service and diligent work this
year. I hope you guys are finally seeing the light at
the end of the tunnel, and that you all have a great
holiday. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 1701. And up next
after that will be caller 2252. Caller 1701, please,
follow the prompts. And one more time caller with the
last four digits 1701, please follow the prompts to
unmute. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. You can hear me,
right?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we can.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Hello, Commissioners.

Thank you for all the hard work you guys done. And I
understand that you will revisit the Senate and the
Assembly map tomorrow and make some change. The Senate
district is done correctly for the Little Saigon. And we
want to thank the Commission for considering our
commands. Please do make minor changes to the Assembly
GGW map. This district is very important for our
From my personal experience during the pandemic, I lost my job and I didn't know what to do. I was able to contact my Assembly member who can speak Vietnamese and have staff who can speak Vietnamese to help me. This why is very important for the Vietnamese community to have a true representative who understand --

MR. MANOFF: thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- our needs, our culture, and our history. (Indiscernible) in Huntington Beach, stop our Seapoint Street is the right move to make sure Little Saigon has a true representation. Remove --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- Stanton and Garden Grove because we don't have anything in common with them. We need to remember who can help our community, especially our youth culture. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 2252. And up next after that will be caller 1610. Caller 2252, please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (In Spanish, not transcribed).

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (In Spanish, not
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 1610. And up next after that is caller 9858. Caller 1610, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. FRIEDBERG: Hello. My name is Natalie Friedberg (ph.). I'm a resident of the community of Eagle Rock and the City of Los Angeles. Good evening, Commissioners and staff. Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak. And thank you so much for your service. I was recently one of the Los Angeles city redistricting Commissioners. I'm well aware of your efforts.

I'm calling in tonight to share that at one point, the Commission I served on also looked at the options of splitting Eagle Rock up, which is what this map is suggesting. There was so much concerted pushback from individual Eagle Rock residents, from the Eagle Rock Association, and from the Neighborhood Council, that we clearly understood this to be a community of interest and made sure that it was kept whole.

I'm speaking for myself as a thirty-year resident of Eagle Rock. But I wanted to remind you that many in my community spoke in a very compelling way about the desire and the need to stay together, to stay unified in one district. I urge you to please reconsider splitting us
up and to please keep us together with the rest of
Northeast Los Angeles, as we have been for nearly a
hundred years.

We are a part of Northeast Los Angeles. We even
have an Eagle Rock-based nonprofit named
(indiscernible) --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. FRIEDBERG: -- Eagle Rock, Highland Park and
other neighboring communities. Please use existing
municipal boundaries or as a less preferable alternative
use the 134 and 6 Freeways, not Colorado Boulevard as a
split.

Again, thank you so much for your many hours of
service. You are greatly appreciated. And have a
wonderful holiday.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 9858. And up next
after that and we be caller 8058. Caller 9858, please
follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. Thank you for having
us tonight. This is Malcolm (ph.) from San Diego,
California. This has been a frustrating process because
we've seen many situations of the Black community
basically being on the chopping block. We did a lot of
organizing and a lot of hard work to move our people in,
only to see -- only to see our community being fractured
and split again.

The latest -- latest move with Encanto has been
split up and separated from Skyline and Paradise Hills,
which is something we advocated a lot for. We're looking
for to -- to correct the issue. We're asking that the
area East of the 805 North, National City, would be
joined into -- into the Cojon area to unify -- excuse me,
sorry about that. We want -- we want to ask the area
South of Woodman Street and South of Paradise Valley
Road, and North of the 54, we want to add that --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- and unify
(indiscernible) Hills. So we want to see Crest and
Rancho San Diego -- population balance, Latino CVAP
(indiscernible) -- Ocean Beach and downtown area --

MR. MANOFF: Ten seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- West of the 5 be moved
into move into the (indiscernible). Especially, just
want to see Encanto --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now we have caller 8058. And up next
after that is caller 1430. Caller 8058, please follow
the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you. Hello, Commissioners.
My name is Paul Alexander (ph.) and I'm a big fan of Bell Hooks, but today I'm only representing myself as a resident of Southeast San Diego. I recently learned that this historically Black community may unintentionally be split. I'm calling today to ask you to please make Southeast San Diego whole by including Encanto, Skyline, and Paradise Hills together in the COR-CAJON Senate district. And please follow -- continue to follow the Black hub's most recent proposed fixes. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 1430. And up next after that will be caller 4607. Caller 1430, please follow the prompts. And one more time caller with the last four digits 1430, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. I do apologize, Caller 1430, for the -- you appear to have type of connectivity issue at the moment.

Right now, we have caller 4607. And up next after that will be caller 4125. Caller 4607, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. I was waiting on the call yesterday to try and make public comments and I was able to hear bits of the comments made when you were discussing the Little Saigon area. I am
confused when one of the Commissioners wanted to add a portion of Santa Ana in with Little Saigon district, while we have been asking to make sure the Latino community and Little Saigon community both deserve to have our own representation.

The same reasons why we've been asking you to relook at the GGW map for the Assembly. And this map, Benson and East of Garden Grove have a majority Latino community. They belong with Santa Ana and Anaheim, while all of North of Garfield Street in Huntington Beach, where Vietnamese American belongs with Little Saigon. Thank you for putting all of Huntington Beach with Little Saigon for the Senate and Congressional District. Don't change these two maps. Now, please help us finish the Assembly district and North of Garfield Street into Little Saigon Assembly district --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- and remove Stanton and East of Garden Grove. This will make the GGW map exactly what is best for our greater Little Saigon, like the Congress and Senate districts.

If the goal is to keep Little Saigon together and allow areas that have seen a --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- significant growth of
Vietnamese American in the last five years, then this is the right thing to do. Don't keep trying to add areas supposedly to Saigon to a lose our Assembly member. Commissioner Andersen and Kennedy, Little Saigon is rooting and grateful that you are on the Commission. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have a caller 4125. And up next after that will be caller 3889. Caller 4125, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners and staff. Thank you for your continued hard work throughout this process, particularly Katy, the stenographer, and ASL interpreters who are all doing a great job. Several days ago, you put Sylmar with the San Fernando Valley Congressional district and this was the right move. Unfortunately, at the same time, you cut Porter Ranch and Granada Hills out of the Valley, which doesn't make much sense.

VICA has submitted a revised map that keeps North Hollywood and Toluca Lake together and put Sunland-Tujunga in the Santa Clarita Antelope Valley District. Sunland Tujunga is a better fit for the ABSCV (ph.) District.

As I've said before, it is crucial that the areas
affected by the Porter Ranch gas leak, the biggest methane leak in history, are represented by a member of Congress who will bring in the EPA. I'm asking that you make it a priority to keep Porter Ranch together with Chatsworth and West Hills. Thanks again. Have a great rest of your night.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 3889. And up next after that will be caller 7575. Caller 3889, please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commission. I'm calling because I believe that Burbank and Glendale should be kept whole. I don't see that they have anything in common with Santa Clarita. Santa Clarita Valley, Burbank, and Glendale district would not really be contiguous, wouldn't be compact. And honestly, it would break up the Santa Clarita Valley, which, as many of you know, is home to 300,000 people. And it's the third largest city in Los Angeles County.

We have seen maps trying to connect Santa Clarita to the West San Fernando Valley. We've also seen maps to try and connect it to the central San Fernando Valley, and also the Northeast San Fernando Valley. And now the East San Fernando Valley. It seems to me that the Santa Clarita, the San Fernando Valley, it's just too much.
And Santa Clarita Valley should not be an afterthought. We should instead be listening to what Santa Clarita --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- belongs to and what they want. And what they want is to be an Assembly district that is in Acton, Agua Dulce, or Simi Valley. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 7575. And up next after that will be caller 0133. Caller 7575, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. Thank you. My name is Michelle (ph.). I'm calling from Northridge, and I'm really concerned and kind of weirded out by the L.A. fire union and VICA, like, presenting maps. It seems to me that it's political opportunism. I don't know if you guys know what's going on with the L.A. Fire Department as a whole, but they've made national news for their extremely toxic, racist, sexist culture. So to me, weird. And it's, like, it's the last minute, so I don't really understand that, you know. And it's a push, in my view, anyway, for the San Fernando Valley Assembly community.

I don't know, it's just -- it seems weird, like, I'm very specific. It seems like it favors the incumbent or something. I -- I don't like it.
I strongly oppose the 12-8 San Fernando Valley map for 80, 40, 43, 45, and 46. And I'm really asking you to --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- please adopt the -- okay, the SFV Assembly communUNITY (ph.) -- all caps -- unity is all caps -- now, to keep our diverse communities together. For the maps --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- that you do for the San Fernando Valley, don't make any sense. I could talk about -- okay -- don't make any sense for the region. So we would like to stay together. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 0133. And up next after that is caller 4585. Caller 0133, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, my name is Sarah (ph.). I'm calling from the Santa Clarita Valley. And I wanted to thank all the Commissioners for their hard work. I can't imagine how tired you all are because I am so tired. But I wanted to call in and say that I oppose the firefighters map and the VICA map A that connects Santa Clarita with Glendale. They don't have any natural connection and they shouldn't be in a district together.
The -- those two maps are clearly drawn for political reasons and they carve out the districts for current incumbents. And that's not your job. Your job is to listen to the communities.

So the San Fernando Valley Assembly community map is the only one that gets the closest to the draft maps that were widely agreed upon back in November. About all -- and those are widely agreed upon by the communities of interest that connect Jewish, Armenian, Latino and like communities throughout the Fernando Valley.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you again for all your work. And I'm calling in favor of the SFV Assembly community map. Thanks so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 4585. And up next after that will be caller 6483. Caller 4585, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. MCLEAN: Hello.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, hello.

MS. MCLEAN: Yes, hi. This is Councilwoman Marsha McLean (ph.) for the City of Santa Clarita. And I have to tell you, I cannot believe some of the stuff I'm hearing here. It makes absolutely no sense to follow the L.A. counter -- County firefighters. We cherish our
firefighters, but what they're proposing makes absolutely no sense.

We have a very diverse ethnically and economically community of interest right now. And to take us out -- or take Castaic, Stevenson Ranch and Acton and Agua Dulce out of the Assembly district makes absolutely no sense. It would be absolutely detrimental to the -- to what we've been able to achieve with our diversity. And I hope that you will look at what they're proposing for what it is and keep Santa Carita --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. MCLEAN: -- with Castaic, Stevenson Ranch, Acton and Agua Dulce. We share a water district. We share our school districts and law enforcement. Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 6483. And up next after that is caller 1986. Caller 6483, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm calling about the new ECA district. And I wanted to request that you keep the mountain regions together because putting us with any big cities like Modesto or Stockton or Fresno would just disenfranchise all of the people up here in the Sierra Nevada's.

And you have already created three maps that
accomplish this. You did a map on November 10th. You did a map on December 15th. And even your new Iteration number 2, Tahoe, would accomplish this and keep all of these mountain communities with similar interests together.

And so I'm just encouraging you to please keep the communities that have similar interests together and not combine them with large communities, large cities that would completely disenfranchise all of the communities in the mountain regions. Thank you so much and have a good evening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 1986. And up next after that will be caller 5462. Caller 1986, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello, Commissioners. I'd like to comment on Iterations STCV (ph.) 2, 3 and 4 of the Kings, Tulare, Kern Congressional visualizations. I'm concerned about these iterations. They're not in the best interest for our communities. It's important that the Commission takes our testimonies into consideration. We are asking for our communities to be together, not split up.

The Commission shouldn't allow one organization to dictate the entire Central Valley. We are the Central
Valley. We are hardworking individuals. We care deeply about our communities of interest. As a Latina and resident of Kings County, we should be taken seriously because we know what's best for our community. Please keep Kings County whole. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 5462. And up next after that will be caller 8170. Caller 5462, please follow the prompts. And one more time. Caller with the last four digits 5462, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. I do apologize, caller 5462, you appear to have some type of connectivity issue at the moment.

Right now we have caller 8170. And up next after that will be caller 6043. Caller 8170, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. ROCHA: Hello. My name's Anthony Rocha (ph.). Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. ROCHA: Thank you. My name is Anthony Rocha, I am a member of the Salina City Council, a former member of the Salina city's Unified School District School Board. I am here talking in my capacity as an individual and not as a representative of either capacity.

I really want to advocate to the Commission to keep
the Salinas Valley whole. One map in particular is a concern to me is the Senate map. I want to be very clear in saying that lumping the Salinas Valley with the Monterey Peninsula or with the Silicon Valley has serious detrimental impacts. And that doesn't only apply to the Senate map, but any map, for that matter.

The Salinas Valley challenges are very unique to our area, but also are many of them shared at the Central Valley. And so while some may comment that the Monterey County should be as a whole, I would also just submit that to the -- the peninsula -- Monterey Peninsula incomes tend to be a lot higher than Salinas Valley incomes, and the challenges facing residents in Carmel are significantly different --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. ROCHA: -- than those of the residents Salinas or Gonzalez or Greenfield. So it's really important for our Latino community that the Salinas Valley be kept whole and that we be with agricultural communities. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 6043. And up next after that will be caller 6982. Caller 6043, please follow the prompts. Please press --

AUTOMATED VOICE SYSTEM: You are unmuted for --
MS. RAMOS: Hello. Oh, hi. Hi, my name is Emily Ramos (ph.). I'm with the city -- well, I'm not with the city, but I live in the city of Mountain View. And I'm calling about the -- that -- that long red coastal district that Mountain View has found itself a part of. Ideally, I would like to not have a district where it would take four hours to travel to another one, like, without traffic. Like, I mean, we probably have, like, a four-hour drive with traffic with some of the traffic in Silicon Valley, but we are much more urban district than some of the other coastal cities.

So if -- if you could either change us back to not having us in the same district as places like Paso Robles, that feels really far and really different. You -- that -- that's one way you could fix that. Or you could just carve out Mountain View and Palo Alto and -- and get us back with the rest of the Santa Clara County. Or -- or even -- you could even, like, go to, like, the -- that -- that more urban part of San Mateo County if we fit somewhere there.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 6982. And up next after that will be caller 3678. Caller 6982, please follow the prompts. And one more time, caller with the last four digits 6982, please follow the prompts to
unmute by pressing star six. I do apologize, caller 
6982, you have some type of connectivity issue at the 
moment.

Right now we have caller 3678. And up next after 
that will be caller 9999. Caller 3678, please follow the 
prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. CARLTON: Good evening, members of the 
redistricting Commission. Thank you so much for staying 
up late on a Friday night to listen to the public. My 
name is Jennifer Carlton (ph.). I'm the director of 
Humboldt Baykeeper, an environmental advocacy group 
located in Humboldt County. I'm calling to thank you for 
maintaining our coastal communities and a coastal -- I 
mean in a cohesive district from Marin to Del Norte 
Counties. But I strongly support the Karuk and Yurok 
Tribes' request that they made back in November to keep 
their ancestral territories within the same district with 
the coast as much as possible. Currently, the -- the 
draft maps divide these two tribes' ancestral territories 
and dilute their interests of their members.

I'm asking you to please listen and respect the 
sovereign nations of the Karuk and Yurok Tribes, which 
are California's largest indigenous tribes. And the 
Commission should honor their request to stay with the 
North coast, keep their members --
MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. CARLTON: -- in a single district. And specifically, I'm asking that Western Siskiyou County and the Orleans area of Humboldt County, which are currently in the Northeastern California districts, be united with the North coast districts.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. CARLTON: Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 9999. And then up next after that will be caller 5462. Caller 9999, please follow the prompts. Caller with the last four 9999, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

MR. JOHNSON: Hello, Commissioners. And I want to thank the Commissioners and the interpreters and all who have stayed on the line this long. This is Hans Johnson. I'm president of the East Area Progressive Democrats, the largest Democratic club in Los Angeles County and in the State of California. And I'm calling in on behalf of our more than 1,000 members to urge the Commission to respect the voices from Eagle Rock and the surrounding communities to keep our neighborhood intact and not to crack it into two Congressional districts.

The Congressional boundaries in the latest December
15th revision need to be changed to make our cohesive community of interests into one community. It currently is intact in the Congressional district, and its municipal boundaries on the East needs to be matched by respect for the municipal boundary with Glendale on the West. This is the only way to keep our Northeast Los Angeles communities --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. JOHNSON: -- together and to maintain cohesion in this thriving community of diversity and more than 36,000 residents. On behalf of the EAPD and a wave of community supporters, including our supervisor, Hilda Solis (ph.) --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. JOHNSON: -- professors from Occidental College, I urge you to keep us intact.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And Right now, we will have caller 5462. And then up next after that will be caller 0542. Caller 56 -- I'm sorry, 5462, please follow the prompts to unmute.

MS. TETTER: Hi.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

MS. TETTER: Hello. My name is Pauline Tetter (ph.). I'm a native of San Leandro in the Bay Area with about 90,000 residents. And I just have to say, you give
listening to public comments a new meaning for me. I'm really inspired.

I want to thank you for your work today. And -- but I would like to urge you to redraw the map to keep San Leandro whole. Especially looking to our coastal area, the frontage area. We've got many projects that are coming up, including housing, and the library, and also keeping our wetlands together and doing some new nature based solutions for the community. And to keep it whole would be in our favor and also help us with grants and so forth.

I know that it's -- you have to make some adjustments somewhere. The problem with the way you have it drawn is you're taking a lower income area of San Leandro and putting it with more of lower income in the unincorporated areas.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. TETTER: And I'm just afraid they're not going to have a voice speaking for them and -- which is very important to me.

So I'm hoping that you'll be able to keep us whole by running East to West down Grand Avenue or following the creek, if not, maybe --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. TETTER: -- taking the top part of San Leandro
around 580 off, would get you the same numbers. But I really appreciate the work you're doing. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 0542. And up next after that is caller 6242. Caller 0542, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

MS. GUARDADO: Hello, my name is Monica Guardado (ph.), and I'm a community leader in the City of Maywood. And I'm calling to request the Commission to please keep the City of Maywood in the AD GATEWAY (ph.) district. Combining our city with cities in L.A. does not make any sense. Downtown L.A. should stay together. We should keep Maywood connected with the communities on the West of 710. And we should keep our Bell Garden connected with the communities East of the 710.

I appreciate all the hard work you're doing. I know this is a difficult task, but please listen to the community members, the representatives of the cities that are calling because we know our areas. We work with our communities. We know what works for us. And so far, everything has been great in the City of Maywood. Things have been improving and we would love to stay with AD GATEWAY. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 6242. And up next
after that is caller 1675. Caller 6242, please follow
the prompts. The floor is yours.

MR. AUSTIN: Good evening, Commissioners. Thank
you. My name is Leslie Austin. That's L-E-S-L-I-E
A-U-S-T-I-N. I've been an active resident of San
Bernardino County for 35 years. While the Commission may
have moved off the idea of splitting up San Bernardino
County in the Senate map, I'm calling to urge you to move
off the idea and keep the county whole. But please do
not carve out Hollister. Given our shared and social
economic interests, I support continued alignment of San
Bernardino County with our traditional communities of
interests. Specifically the Latino and community --
farmworker communities of Salinas in the Salinas Valley.

I think it helps to consider that San Bernardino
County is 64,000 people. Simply to understand the scale,
the entire county is half the size of the city of
Salinas. We are much too small to be separated from our
county seat, the City of Hollister, and much too small to
be separated from our existing district communities and
communities of interest.

This is also true, I think, of the Congressional
district. I urge you to revisit the Congressional map
and keep our communities of interest in Monterey, Santa
Cruz and San Mateo counties together.
As you've heard from other --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MS. AUSTIN: -- small rural communities this evening, the only chance we have at having a political voice, frankly, is by sticking together. I want to thank you all for reconsidering the lines. And I -- I hope you know that your efforts --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MS. AUSTIN: -- are truly appreciated. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 1675. And up next after that will be caller 7215. Caller 1675, please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

MR. KELLY: Thank you, everyone, for giving up your evenings and being away from your loved ones to hear our public comments. My name is Dan Kelly (ph.). I am the president of the Board of trustees at College of the Redwoods. I'm an executive director of a physician group. I'm a father of four. Today, I'll be speaking to you as a citizen. And I wanted to talk to you about the importance of keeping down the work with the coastal communities. Thank you for doing that.

I want to speak in the context of the community of interest of College of the Redwoods and the students. Our college covers about one 10,000 square miles. We're
one of the largest districts in the state. We service approximately 6,000 students currently across three different campuses, of which Del Norte is one. And Del Norte in particular serves two very important programs that we are committing to financially and with -- with great effort. And any changes to the district boundaries here would hinder that.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. KELLY: One is our (audio interference) program, our LV to RN program, and the other is our Pelican Bay Prison Scholarship Program. So thank you for keeping Del Norte in the coastal district and we would encourage you to not --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. KELLY: -- make any changes there. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now, we have caller 7215. And up next after that will be caller 0304. Caller 7215, please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, my name is Samantha (ph.), and I am calling in to express my support for the MALDEF redistricting plan map. MALDEF plan was drawn with input from community leaders and organizers from across the state through workshops and talking to --

taking care to retain historic Black districts in Los
Angeles and API district and COI across the state. The MALDEF plan also draws more Latinos, CVAP majority districts than Commission benchmark plan. And then the Commissioners can also make history by empowering the Latino voters, which have been driven -- the -- with -- which have driven the growth in California for the last decade.

So with the MALDEF plan drawing stronger districts at all levels, that would empower historically underserved communities to have the opportunity to elect --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- a candidate of their choice. I really am expressing my support for the MALDEF plan and making sure that our communities are being taken into account since this will be for the next ten years. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And right now we have caller 0304. And up next after that will be caller 2625. Caller 0304, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Commissioners, for your work and for these many long hours and days and nights. I'm a Santa Clarita resident and I know you're receiving overwhelming public comment this week opposing
your 12/8 maps. A number of community members representing organizations around the Valley in Santa Clarita have come together to ask that you adopt the San Fernando Valley Assembly community map. The community map is the only map being proposed that reunites the Jewish Southwest Valley community, maintains seventy percent Latino CVAP seats, unite those impacted by that Aliso Canyon disaster, and unites the Armenian community in the Southwest -- Southeast valley.

The Firefighter and VICA maps are clearly drawn for political reasons, only to carve out districts where current incumbents live. You can check your Twitter to see the maps of their homes. This is not your job. There is a very strong connection in the North San Fernando Valley in Santa Clarita because of school, work, and housing established for decades.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: To separate Santa Clarita, North San Fernando Valley would be disastrous. There is no connection between Santa Clarita and Glendale, and our communities should not be connected. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now we have caller 2625. And up next after that will be caller 3910. Caller 2625, please follow the prompts. The floor is yours.
MR. ADEBARI: Yes. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we can.

MR. ADEBARI: Thank you, Commissioners, for all your hard work and time. This is Buster Adebari (ph.). I am the Karuk Chairman speaking on behalf of the Karuk Tribal Council. We need to keep the North coast together because we're one community of interest. As the overwhelming bulk of public comment has provided, we have similar interests in the economies that bind us together. We are distinct and separate from the rest of the inland Northern California. The Karuk Tribe has requested that you keep together its ancestral territory with the coast to the maximum extent possible. Currently draft maps divide the tribe into (audio interference) interest. Please listen and respect the sovereign government of the Karuk Tribe.

Also dividing the North coast also splits The Yurok Tribe, the large --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. ADEBARI: -- the California's (audio interference) government. The Commission should honor the wishes of the Yurok Tribe as they have -- as they have expressed. They would like to stay together with the North coast and would like to keep their enrolled tribal members together. Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And right now we will have caller 3910. Please
follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The
floor is yours.

MR. CETINA: Good evening. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. CETINA: Thank you. Well, good evening. My
name is Luis Cetina (ph.), I am vice president of the
board of the Cucamonga Valley Water District and chair of
the Chino Basin Water Bank Joint Depository -- we're
trying to realize here in Western San Bernardino County.
I am calling you today and asking you to revisit your
maps to ensure that the communities of Upland and San
Bernardino are represented by San Bernardino
Congressional, State Senate, and Assembly members. If
you were to look at the current maps, it looks like tic-
tac-toe in terms of our representation on all three
fronts.

Why is this critically important? We are making
efforts to create a groundwater basin bank so that we can
alleviate any demands on the delta, which is a benefit to
Northern Californians and all Californians. We need to
have sound representation from San Bernardino County.

For many years we have been represented --
representatives in Los Angeles County. And it looks as
if we're being used as an add-on --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. CETINA: -- to ensure that we meet population
requirements for L.A. County. The maps are being created
to benefit Los Angeles County and not necessarily San
Bernardino. I urge you to revisit your maps and ensure
that the communities of Upland and Rancho Cucamonga --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

MR. CETINA: -- are represented within San
Bernardino County, Inland Empire. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Chair, at this time, we
are at three hours.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Katy. As I believe we've
explained and have posted on our website, the new public
comment policy that was -- that replaced the previous
policy yesterday establishes a three-hour limit for
public comment. We have reached the end of those three
hours. I realize we started a few minutes late after
6:45, but we have compensated for that late start. So
unfortunately, the public comment period for today is
closed.

We encourage everyone to join us at 9:30 tomorrow
morning when we will continue our work. And there will,
of course, be opportunity for public comment at the end
of the day tomorrow.
So thank you, everyone, for calling in. We apologize to those we were not able to hear tonight, but we do look forward to hearing from you at some point over the weekend. And we also encourage you to use our online channels to communicate with the Commission. So thank you, everyone. And we now have -- we will now have a brief recap and preview before we close for the evening.

Oh, okay. So we had hoped to knock out the last of the remaining Congressional iterations. I believe we came close, but I'm -- I'm still thinking we have perhaps a little bit of outstanding work on the Congressional districts. We had hoped to finish off all of the iterations on the Senate districts. Unfortunately, we did not achieve that. And we were to get to the Board of Equalization today, but unfortunately, we did not manage to do that either.

I -- you know, I have tried to move things along as quickly as possible, but I don't want to be brutal in cutting Commissioners off. I, you know, hope that we can all recognize the importance of timeliness in our efforts. I know that we all feel very passionately about this process. I think we have been -- really been a model of working well together. And we know -- we -- we've known for months that, you know, on some issues we really want and need to talk it out among ourselves, to
feel comfortable with where we are.

So I do hope that we are in fact comfortable with where we are. Let's keep our noses to the grindstone to finish what we need to finish over the next few days.

And with that, let me turn it over to Alicia, our incoming chair, for a preview of tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And thank you for all your work this week to get us this far.

I guess I'm going to be the one that's going to cut everybody off. Oh yes, definitely cut us off because we are behind and we do need to get our maps approved. That's our main goal, our main mission.

So tomorrow we start bright and early at 9:30. Expect to stay late again. So excited to be spending all day with you again tomorrow. Sunday and Monday, we have start times of 11:00 and Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday is 10 o'clock.

So those -- the agenda should be posted on our website for everyone that's out there. So tomorrow our goal is to finish the Congressional. Finish the Senate before we have lunch. And also finish Board of Equalization.

After lunch, we will briefly go back to the Assembly. And when I say briefly, no more iterations, minor revisions, minor refinements. Unfortunately,
there's no time to look at any huge iterations and to work with our mappers. When we -- I believe it was Commissioner Toledo, he led us through the Assembly. And at that point we all agreed -- general consensus, we were fine.

So right now, looking at minor refinements that we can do in five minutes, hopefully, each one. So when you come tomorrow, please be prepared to -- we'll put together a list of what those refinements may be. We will prioritize them. But I also urge you to ensure that whatever refinements or iterate -- or reworks you want, you've already worked it out and you know it's going to work.

Other than that, thank you all. I know we're going to get there, but we're just going to have to really stick to it tomorrow and on Sunday. And I think that is it. I will hand it back to Chair -- I'm sorry, Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Real quick. Before you're official chair and start to crack that book, because that's exactly what we need to have happen. I just wanted to say, Chair, you did an outstanding job and you listed off a lot of things that we did not get to do. But what we did get to do is to hear a whole lot of public comment that we still valued and we still
researched or made fine tuning adjustments at the last minute. And so I'm really glad for that. We know that that was an option of either not hearing anyone else and moving or being able to do what we can do, and we chose California comment over just a tight, rigid schedule. So thank you for allowing that. And all of us should feel good about that. And yes, we're going to now have to go home and do some real serious work to come and get our changes within under five minutes because we got the right one that's going to drive us at this point. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, and I'll, I guess, reiterate what Commissioner Fernandez is saying. We are looking for refinements. Changes are bigger than refinements. So we need we need refinements. Things that are small in scope, easy to implement.

I anticipate that we will have a number of these to go through, as Commissioner Fernandez has indicated. I think our first step in the morning is, in fact, going to be listing those off so that we can first prioritize them, get the greatest good for the greatest number, before we move into the work so that once we do move into the work, we are moving as effectively and efficiently as possible.

So unless there are other comments, I will adjourn
the meeting at 10:16 -- sorry, Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry, just a quick -- so
the things we need to do in the morning are Congressional
and Senate, correct? Anything like that. And then our
lists are for, you know, any minor refinements,
Assembly, blah, blah?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Congressional, Senate and
Board of Equalization. We haven't touched Board of
Equalization. Obviously, we can't get there until we
refine the Senate.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right, yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And with that 10:17 p.m., we
are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the State of California, Citizens
Redistricting Commissions Public Meeting
adjourned at 10:17 p.m.)
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