



**STATEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS  
FOR THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT BOUNDARY REVIEW  
COMMITTEE  
KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION  
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 381B  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012**

**Monday, June 27, 2011**

**2:00 PM**

**ROLL CALL**

Present: Chair Pedersen, Commissioner Reyes, Commissioner Ollague, Commissioner Choi, Commissioner Harris, Commissioner Acebo, Commissioner Hollister, Commissioner Napolitano, Commissioner Hoffenblum, Commissioner Sun and Commissioner Mejia

Excused: Vice Chair Holoman, Commissioner Andrade, Commissioner Martinez, Commissioner Escandon, Commissioner Friedman, Commissioner Flores, Commissioner Hatanaka, Commissioner Hernandez and Commissioner Tse

1. Call to Order and Introduction by Chair Pedersen. (11-2974)

**The meeting was called to order by Chair Pedersen at 2:13 p.m.**

**I. REPORTS**

2. Report on redistricting website activity. (11-2994)

**Susan Herman of the Chief Executive Office reported that there have been 21,883 individual hits to the redistricting website. The busiest day thus far has been June 23, 2011 with 2,165 hits. The rise in traffic and increase in correspondence received to the redistricting website indicates that people are interested and want to engage the Supervisorial District Boundary Review Committee (Committee). The most popular page continues to be “submitted plans”, followed by the “BRC meeting schedule” and “preparing a plan.”**

3. Consideration of additional redistricting data. (11-3009)

**No Staff Report was presented.**

**Alan Clayton, a member of the public, addressed the Committee regarding the issue of data. Mr. Clayton stressed the importance of two non-incumbent elections which occurred in 2006 that should be included. The first was a Democratic Primary election for California Attorney General that featured Jerry Brown versus Rocky Delgadillo. The second election was the Democratic Primary for California Secretary of State between Debra Ortiz versus Debra Bowen. Both elections were highly contested and the data revealed how Latino and non-Latino candidates fared in those areas. Mr. Clayton urged the Committee to consider including the relevant elections in the interests of the community and the Board of Supervisors who will ultimately approve the redistricting plan.**

4. Staff report on population shifts in Garza plan. (11-2995)

**This item was tabled for later in the meeting to allow for a presentation to be made by consultant David Ely.**

**Later in the meeting, David Ely presented a staff report regarding the population shifts in the Garza plan. Mr. Ely stated that he reviewed the 1990 Census population changes that occurred when the Garza plan was adopted. As a result of the Garza plan, approximately 36.6 percent of the County's population was moved from one district to another countywide.**

**Commissioner Harris inquired about the percentage of the population that had their Supervisory election deferred as a result of the change in district.**

**Mr. Ely stated that information could be gathered but he is not certain of the sequence of elections. He did recall that the First and Third District were up for election that particular year. The Garza plan occurred in the middle of an election cycle. The Third District had already completed its election during that cycle. The First District had a primary election, but it was discounted.**

**Commissioner Harris further indicated that this period was marked by an extraordinary period of electoral activity prompted by redistricting in an effort to protect the voting rights of historically disenfranchised segments of the population.**

**Mr. Ely agreed.**

**Commissioner Ollague inquired if the 1980 Supervisory district map Mr. Ely provided the Committee placed the City of Long Beach in the Second District.**

**Mr. Ely stated that the City of Long Beach was not in the Second District in the 1980 map nor did it include the City of Compton. The City of Long Beach was in the Fourth District.**

**Commissioner Acebo inquired about the possibility of adding maps and data that Mr. Ely provided the Committee not only for 1980 and 1990, but for 2000 and 2010.**

**Commissioner Harris inquired about the possibility of using the 2010 data to produce a map that resembles the 1980 map.**

**Mr. Ely indicated that it would not be a perfect representation, but yes, it could be done.**

**Attachments:**    [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Garza Plan](#)

- 5.**    Consideration of redistricting plans submitted by the public, including discussion of potential revisions by Committee members:  
Plan N1, submitted by Alan Clayton and Diana Velasquez  
Plan O1, submitted by James Reed  
Plan P1, submitted by Ron Hoffman

Plan A1 (Benchmark Plan) is also included for reference.

Note: Plans not discussed at scheduled meeting due to time constraints will be carried over to the next Boundary Review Committee meeting. (11-2996)

**Plan N1 submitted by Diane M. Velasquez and Alan Clayton:**

- 1. Proposes reassignment of 1,079 redistricting units which make up 129 whole or partial communities (pages 6-8).**
- 2. Total population deviation is 0.48% (page 24).**
- 3. The total number of people moved from one district to another is 3,709,676 (page 12).**
- 4. Deferred and Advanced Voting – The County Counsel report indicates that, countywide, 23.3% of constituents would have the frequency of their voting deferred or advanced under this proposed plan.**

**5. Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) by District (page 37 of Staff Report and page 23 of Benchmark):**

**Race/Ethnicity Categories**

**Hispanic Plan N1                      Benchmark**

District 1	53.9 %	63.3 %
District 2	37.5 %	33.6 %
District 3	13.8 %	23.8 %
District 4	50.0 %	31.6 %
District 5	23.1 %	24.7 %

**African American Plan N1      Benchmark**

District 1	5.3 %	3.6 %
District 2	38.5 %	36.5 %
District 3	5.8 %	5.0 %
District 4	4.7 %	7.8 %
District 5	7.1 %	6.8 %

**Asian Plan N1                      Benchmark**

District 1	11.3 %	18.2 %
District 2	10.5 %	10.5 %
District 3	11.9 %	10.3 %
District 4	17.4 %	16.9 %
District 5	19.9 %	16.5 %

**Party Affiliation by District  
(page 35 and page 18 of Benchmark)**

**Democratic Plan N1              Benchmark**

District 1	57.9 %	57.5 %
District 2	66.5 %	66.3 %
District 3	48.6 %	52.9 %
District 4	47.6 %	45.0 %
District 5	41.1 %	40.4 %

**Republican Plan N1              Benchmark**

District 1	15.9 %	16.9%
District 2	11.9 %	11.5%
District 3	24.5 %	19.7%
District 4	28.1 %	29.9%
District 5	32.6 %	34.2%

6. This plan does not displace any Supervisor from his/her district and is viewed as being contiguous and reasonably compact.

7. Proposed City/Community Splits, further detailed in the Staff Report and County Counsel report:

**City/Community Splits    District Splits**

Compton	2 / 4
Culver City	2 / 3
Lomita	2 / 3
Long Beach	2 / 3

8. Proposed City/Community Unified, further detailed in the Staff Report and County Counsel Report:

**City/Community    Joined in District**

Azusa	4
Hawthorne	2
Pico Rivera	4
West Covina	4

9. Examples of Major facilities moved out of their current districts are as follows:

- Bracket Field – from District 5 to 4
- El Monte Airport – from District 1 to 4
- South Coast Botanic Garden – from District 4 to 3
- Marina del Rey – from District 4 to 3
- Sheriff’s Headquarters Complex – from District 1 to 5
- Edmund Edelman Children’s Court – from District 1 to 5
- Fairplex in Pomona – from District 1 to 4
- Santa Catalina Island – from District 4 to 3
- Also included are various Courthouses, Golf Courses, and Parks, a complete list is detailed in the County Counsel Report (summarized on pages 4-7)

Alan Clayton addressed the Committee by stating the following:

- **Among my considerations I took into account in drawing the boundaries: contiguousness, compactness, keeping incumbents in their districts, and socio-economics. I also used poverty data extensively and looked at outcome in terms of final plan and how it impacts various minority communities.**
- **In District 2, I included a portion of North Long Beach. African-American CVAP in the Benchmark Plan is 36.5 and my plan is 38.5; 2% higher than the Benchmark. I was able to do that by doing a poverty overlay and looking at areas that were in the same socio-economic category. In doing poverty overlay it is very helpful to know where to keep areas together and take out areas. My District 2 allows the African-American community to continue to elect a candidate of their choice.**
- **In District 5, the Asian American CVAP of 19.9% is higher than any district at the present time. In State Redistricting, Assembly District No. 49 includes much of this area including Monterey Park, San Gabriel, Rosemead, Alhambra, Temple City, San Marino, South Pasadena, and Arcadia. These areas are upper middle class to fairly wealthy and there is commonality in those particular areas. My goal was to draw a district that met all the requirements that the Commission had set forth and State and Federal law but also look to see if it was possible under the relevant legal constraints to keep that community together. From a political standpoint, a candidate from the Asian community, be it Democrat or Republican, could emerge and be a competitive candidate for Supervisor Antonovich's seat if he chose not to run for reelection or retires. In terms of the Voting Rights seats, one of the seats lies predominantly in the San Gabriel Valley; it takes in over 1/3 of the current Supervisor's District (4th District) along with areas from District 1. It creates a district that is 50% Latino CVAP. It is very similar to Professor Estrada's map and the Latino CVAP is very similar and gives the Latino community an equal opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice.**
- **The goal for the Northeast San Fernando Valley was to draw a district that kept it together and also had a bridge through Burbank and Los Feliz into the Eagle Rock area, downtown into the Southeast area where there are many similarities. All LA City Council members that are Latino would reside in that district. Transportation is a major issue in this area in dealing with a lack of funds. Transportation dollars that have been voted on by the entire County are not committed in their area equally and it is an issue that should be brought up. This map would help ensure that it is brought up because both of the areas are transit-dependent and both have significant poverty areas.**

- **Voter deferral was 3.7 in the Velasquez-Clayton plan and the voter deferral in Garza was 36.6%. When you draw Voting Rights districts you have major voter deferral. If you read Garza it's all in the documents. I've attempted to draw districts that meet the criteria under the constraints of the Federal Voting Rights Act and try to treat people fairly that are current incumbents and not move any incumbents out of their area.**

**Commissioner Reyes asked what the distinction was between Plans M1 and N1; for example, in District 2, in determining the shape in one plan versus the other and whether the guiding principle resulted in the difference?**

**Mr. Clayton stated that in District 2 he did a poverty overlay in looking at North Long Beach. He said the area is a mixture of both African-American and Latino population, and when you do a poverty overlay, you try to keep areas together that have similar socio-economic interests. The district will have a strong African-American CVAP and the registration would be higher than the CVAP number; probably 44-45%. The Latino numbers on CVAP would be lower on registration; individuals may be citizens but not registered to vote at the same rate as other individuals.**

**Commissioner Reyes asked specifically was there anything distinguishing the overall goal in designing plan M1 versus N1, as they are shaped a little differently. Was that in response to any overarching principle or just another variation?**

**Mr. Clayton responded by stating that in District 2, he wanted to see what would happen if he included North Long Beach, and that the final impact was an African-American CVAP increase from 37.1% to 38.5%. In District 1, the numbers went from a Latino CVAP of 52.6% to 53.9%. In District 4, there was a city added that may have increased the Latino CVAP. This map is very similar to others submitted and are based on his political experience and partisan redistricting.**

**Commissioner Hoffenblum commented on the idea of putting Latinos from the San Fernando Valley in the same district as Latinos from downtown and asked if the Commission had received any letters from Latino leaders or the community in the Valley stating that they do or do not want to be in the same District as the Latinos in downtown?**

Mr. Zimmerman informed the Commission that no correspondence had been received specifically addressing this issue to his knowledge. Commissioner Hoffenblum stated that most of the comments they are getting from the Valley are the fact that they want a Valley district, and he recalled that when they were first trying to create a Latino District in 1980, they received strong comments from Latinos in the Valley that they did not want to be in the same District as downtown. Commissioner Hoffenblum then asked Mr. Clayton, how much did he split Culver City and why?

Mr. Clayton responded by stating that he had inadvertently split it while looking at poverty in the area and tried to keep the cities together; poverty was the only overlay. He also added that the process is early, and once it moves along and deliberations begin, people will come forward with suggested changes, and in the end, the Commission must comply with the law.

Commissioner Hoffenblum responded by stating that the law can be complied with while also complying with the wishes of the community.

Mr. Clayton replied that because he was able to draw reasonably compact 50% Latino CVAP districts, this meets the requirements of the first prong of the test under Section 2 and you need to pay attention.

Commissioner Acebo asked Mr. Clayton if Districts 1 and 2 were considered poor districts because poverty overlay was used as the dominant factor, and if so, is there an unintentional consequence of packing poor people in Districts 1 and 2 and was it drawn to make sure that they had the same sort of poverty index?

Mr. Clayton responded that if you look at the income levels, they vary by district. There are areas in District 2 that are affluent, that socio-economically fit and were kept together. It was drawn based on redistricting principles that met Federal and State laws to ensure that incumbents were kept in a district, to ensure that race was not used as a predominant factor, and also to consider previous economic data in those districts.

Commissioner Acebo asked why Burbank is a bridge and what is it a bridge for and what socio-economic data is prevalent amongst the Northeast Valley and the Southeast cities?



**Mr. Clayton responded that he tried to form Section 2 districts that were socio-economically compact and described various issues to assure legality.**

**Commissioner Acebo questioned if in District 2 in the North Long Beach area, was Mr. Clayton trying to add more African-American citizens to elect an African-American supervisor?**

**Mr. Clayton answered that he was trying to give the African-American community an opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice.**

**Commissioner Ollague questioned the difference between the Garza Plan vs. this plan relating to poverty.**

**Mr. Clayton responded that the indicators on his plan would be similar to the Garza Plan.**

**Commissioner Acebo asked Counsel if the 2001 Benchmark Plan was approved by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). Nancy Takade, County Counsel responded that the 2001 Benchmark was pre-cleared for purposes of Section 5 by the DOJ.**

**Chair Pedersen asked how did you rate the importance of the two 50% Latino CVAP in both plans and was it based on the Strickland vs. Bartlett case?**

**Mr. Clayton referenced a variety of factors including the avoidance of packing and cracking.**

**Commissioner Reyes stated he would need confirmation from special counsel regarding DOJ guidelines. He noted Section 5 does not preclude any legal action under Section 2 or show an automatic racial gerrymandering. He hopes to speak with special counsel to discuss clear guidelines on what is appropriate and what is not to minimize the consequences that can arise by not considering the appropriate standard.**

**Commissioner Acebo asked Ms. Takade if the 2001 plan meet all the traditional guidelines? Ms. Takade responded that there was an extensive plan submitted to the DOJ for purposes of preclearance; and that a letter received from the DOJ showed that the plan was pre-cleared.**

Commissioner Ollague asked if the 19.9% Asian Pacific Islander CVAP included in both maps included the four or five core cities?

Mr. Clayton responded yes and listed a variety of other cities and issues.

Commissioner Reyes added it is appropriate to look at communities of interest and income as a motivating factor.

Commissioner Acebo reiterated that it will be a challenge for the Committee to weigh issues equally.

Plan O1 submitted by James Reed:

Justifications C-G as set forth in the submitted plan were read in, then Mr. Zimmerman gave his report.

1. Proposes reassignment of 967 redistricting units which make up 123 whole or partial communities (pages 5-7 of the staff report).
2. Total population deviation is 0.42%. (Page 25)
3. The total number of people moved from one district to another is 3,359,943 (page 12).
4. Deferred and Advanced Voting – the County Counsel report indicates that,  
countywide 28.2%, of constituents would be affected in terms of the frequency of their voting being advanced or deferred.
5. Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) reported as follows:

**Race/Ethnicity Categories**

(page 38 of the staff report on the plan and page 23 of Benchmark)

**Hispanic Plan O1                      Benchmark**

District 1	54.3 %	63.3 %
District 2	47.3 %	33.6 %
District 3	24.8 %	23.8 %
District 4	19.5 %	31.6 %
District 5	28.8 %	24.7 %

**African American Plan O1      Benchmark**

District 1	3.8 %	3.6 %
District 2	36.4 %	36.5 %
District 3	5.6 %	5.0 %
District 4	9.1 %	7.8 %
District 5	7.5 %	6.8 %

<b>Asian Plan O1</b>		<b>Benchmark</b>
District 1	21.1 %	18.2 %
District 2	7.1 %	10.5 %
District 3	13.6 %	10.3 %
District 4	15.0 %	16.9 %
District 5	14.0 %	16.5 %

**Party Affiliation by District**

(page 33 of the staff report on the plan and page 18 of Benchmark)

Mr. Zimmerman stated some percentages for party affiliation were very similar between the Benchmark Plan and O1, and highlighted the following:

<b>Democratic Plan O1</b>		<b>Benchmark</b>
District 1	50.1 %	57.5 %
District 4	48.2 %	45.0 %

<b>Republican Plan O1</b>		<b>Benchmark</b>
District 1	24.7 %	16.9%
District 4	25.9 %	29.9%

6. This plan displaces Supervisor Gloria Molina from the First District and places her residency in the Third District, resulting in two supervisors in the Third District, and no supervisor in the First District. All five supervisorial districts are contiguous and reasonably compact.

7. Proposed City/Community Splits, further detailed in the staff report and County Counsel report:

**Cities Split Between Districts**

Alhambra	1 / 5	La Mirada	1 / 4
Bellflower	1 / 4	San Dimas	1 / 5
Compton	1 / 2 / 4	Torrance	2 / 4
Glendale	3 / 5	Westlake Village	3 / 4

This plan would unify three cities (Azusa, Pico Rivera, West Covina) as well as unify communities within the City of Los Angeles.

**8. Examples of Major facilities moved from their current districts are as follows:**

- **Whiteman Airport – from District 3 to 5**
- **Downey/Rancho Complex – from District 4 to 1**
- **Hall of Justice – from 1 to 2**
- **Bob Hope Patriotic Hall – from 1 to 2**
- **Twin Towers Correctional Facility – from 1 to 2**
- **Also included are various Libraries and Courthouses**

**James Reed, a freshman at George Washington University in Washington D.C. and a former Legislative intern for a State Senator, gave a brief explanation of his objectives in his plan, key among them keeping the population deviation among districts reasonably contained within 5,000 people of the ideal population. Mr. Reed looked at what geographical features make the distinctions between districts.**

**He used the freeways for each district as follows:**

**District 1 – North of the 405 and East of the 710 and South of the 10**

**District 2 – Box between the 91, 10, 405 and 710**

**District 4 – West of the 405 and South of the 91**

**District 3 and 5 – With respect to current boundaries, they were adjusted to equalize the population count.**

**Incumbency was not considered. He only considered population numbers to ensure that there was variation in population among the districts of no more than 5,000 people. Although Mr. Reed testified at the California Citizen’s Redistricting Committee to advocate for keeping the South Bay together, his submitted plan does not. Mr. Reed is aware that the Committee can choose to modify any plan, and suggested that if the Committee does modify the plan, they may wish to keep the South Bay together (South of the 105 / West of the 110) as environmental and coastal issues are important to the people who live there; and due to the impact of Measure “R.” In closing, Mr. Reed stated his plan passed the integrity test in the County software, and it should be good for consideration.**

**Commissioner Reyes thanked Mr. Reed for his submittal. He added that having the submitter testify on behalf of their plan provides a great deal of assistance to the Committee as a whole as opposed to those that just submit online.**

Various questions were posed by the Committee to Mr. Reed, as follows:

**Commissioner Reyes - Other than Measure "R," what other connections/interest would be beneficial in having the South Bay area not split.**

**Mr. Reed – In addition to his living in the South Bay area, there are other economic interests and organizations in addition to transportation benefits in keeping the South Bay together.**

**Commissioner Hoffenblum – As to the 3rd District, what was your thinking in splitting Sylmar and a small section of the San Fernando Valley from the rest of the Valley?**

**Mr. Reed – An attempt was made to square off the 91 FWY, but needed to achieve the population count.**

**Commissioner Ollague – Explain what you did with Lawndale. Did you split Lawndale in your map? Did you want Lawndale to be part of the coastal community?**

**Mr. Reed – The plan that is being considered would have a part of the South Bay (Lawndale) that is affected by Measure "R." be split. He reiterated, when the Committee considers plans, they look at how Measure "R" would affect the community as a whole, not just one area in particular. Mr. Reed did want Lawndale as part of the coastal community.**

**Commissioner Acebo –It appears that the economic interests of the South Bay were preserved. However, in the 3rd District and parts of the San Fernando Valley, the same economic interests are presented, but they are split. How would you suggest the Committee balance those interests, as you may be splitting those interests unintentionally?**

**Mr. Reed – The split was made unintentionally, as he was not familiar with the Valley. The Committee should look at the economic interests of those communities and ask or research what parts of those communities have vital economic interests in common.**

**Plan P1 submitted by Ron Hoffman:**

**Justifications C-G as set forth in the submitted plan were read in, then Mr. Zimmerman gave his report.**

1. Proposes reassignment of 1,015 redistricting units which make up 127 whole or partial communities (pages 8-10 of the staff report).
2. Total population deviation is 0.11%.
3. The total number of people moved from one district to another is 3,368,821 (page 14).
4. Deferred and Advanced Voting – The County Counsel report indicates that, countywide, 30.7% of constituents would be affected in terms of the frequency of their voting being advanced or deferred.
5. Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) reported as follows:

**Race/Ethnicity Categories**

(page 40 of the staff report on the plan and page 23 of Benchmark)

Hispanic Plan P1		Benchmark
District 1	50.8 %	63.3 %
District 2	38.7 %	33.6 %
District 3	13.6 %	23.8 %
District 4	39.7 %	31.6 %
District 5	30.9 %	24.7 %

African American Plan P1		Benchmark
District 1	3.6 %	3.6 %
District 2	37.0 %	36.5 %
District 3	5.4 %	5.0 %
District 4	8.0 %	7.8 %
District 5	7.0 %	6.8 %

Asian Plan P1		Benchmark
District 1	21.4 %	18.2 %
District 2	10.4 %	10.5 %
District 3	13.4 %	10.3 %
District 4	16.8 %	16.9 %
District 5	10.3 %	16.5 %

**Party Affiliation by District**

(Page 38 of the staff report on the plan and Page 18 of Benchmark)

Mr. Zimmerman stated some percentages for party affiliation were very similar between the Benchmark Plan and P1, and highlighted the following:

<b>Democratic Plan P1</b>		<b>Benchmark</b>
District 1	52.0 %	57.5 %
District 3	49.1 %	52.9 %
District 5	44.0 %	40.4 %

<b>Republican Plan P1</b>		<b>Benchmark</b>
District 1	22.1 %	16.9 %
District 3	23.6 %	19.7 %
District 5	30.5 %	34.2 %

6. This plan does not displace any supervisor from his/her district. All five supervisory districts are contiguous and reasonably compact.
7. Proposed City/Community Splits, further detailed in the staff report and County Counsel report:

**Cities Split Between Districts – The plan would split one city currently split in a new way (Pico Rivera - 1 / 4); would unify three cities (Azusa, Hawthorne, West Covina); as well as unify and split identified communities within the City of Los Angeles.**

8. Examples of Major facilities moved from their current districts are as follows:

- Brackett Field – from District 5 to 4
- Los Angeles County Arboretum – from 5 to 1
- South Coast Botanic Garden – from 4 to 3
- Downey/Rancho Complex – from District 4 to 1
- Los Angeles Civic Center – from 1 to 2
- Bob Hope Patriotic Hall – from 1 to 2
- Fairplex – from 1 to 4
- Men’s Central Jail – from 1 to 2
- Santa Catalina Island Interpretive Center – from 4 to 3

**A supplemental sheet was submitted at the meeting by Mr. Hoffman for the Committee.**

Ron Hoffman, retired Los Angeles County Regional Planning employee, gave a brief explanation of his goals when developing his plan. His goals were to use geography, topography and existing areas that people could identify with, such as the San Fernando Valley, Antelope Valley, Santa Monica Mountains and others as the basis in drawing new boundary lines. In addition, he utilized the existing district boundaries as a basis. One primary goal was to avoid splitting unincorporated County communities. Of the 89 unincorporated communities, totaling about 1 million in population, people in these communities have a County Supervisor as their only local representative. When a community is split between two districts, it creates problems within the community and how their needs will be addressed. This plan would unify all the unincorporated areas except for 1. The supplemental sheet submitted today, would include a way to unify the Covina Islands and the Pellissier area and the City of Pico Rivera. Mr. Hoffman's thought was to keep the cities intact, so when the City Councils deal with the supervisor in their district, they would be able to speak with a unified voice to one supervisor.

In closing, the proposed plan with the revisions would:

- Unify the 89 unincorporated communities within specific supervisorial districts;
- Place 87 of the 88 cities in a single district;
- Ensure that 68 of the 73 communities within the City of Los Angeles would be represented by a single supervisorial district.

The population deviation achieved within this plan is very minimal showing the population to be almost identical and the degree of compactness is greater than in the current Benchmark Plan.

Commissioner Hoffenblum stated that this plan was a very thoughtful one and was one of the most apolitical plans submitted in his 30 years of serving on redistricting committees.

Chair Pedersen added that uniting the unincorporated areas was a good objective because, as Mr. Hoffman stated, the Board of Supervisors is their city council.

Commissioner Reyes – Were there any thoughts on Section 2 of Voter rights compliance?

Mr. Hoffman – The review provided in this plan shows there is no group that is separated or unfairly advantaged or disadvantaged.



**Mr. Hoffman suggested the Committee keep in mind when reviewing these plans under the Voting Rights Act, to keep those unincorporated communities and cities together so that a Supervisor becomes the spokesperson for the geographic area.**

**Attachments:**    [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - PLAN N1](#)  
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - County Counsel Plan Summary N1](#)  
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - PLAN O1](#)  
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - County Counsel Plan Summary O1](#)  
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - PLAN P1](#)  
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - County Counsel Plan Summary P1](#)  
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Plan A1 Benchmark Plan](#)  
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - County Counsel Plan Summary A1](#)  
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - SUPPLEMENTAL TO P1](#)

## **II. FUTURE MEETINGS**

6. Future dates for Boundary Review Committee meetings. (11-3010)

**Mr. Zimmerman reported that the Committee's next meeting is Wednesday June 29, 2011 at which the remaining three plans will be reviewed. Also to be included on the June 29, 2011 Committee agenda is a summary comparison of all submitted plans and a discussion item regarding further review of submitted plans.**

**Chair Pedersen inquired if the outside counsel would be available for the June 29, 2011 Committee meeting.**

**Nancy Takade, Principal Deputy County Counsel, stated that outside counsel will not be available for the June 29, 2011 Committee meeting, however outside counsel has been confirmed for the July 13, 2011 and possibly July 6 and July 11.**

**Attachments:**    [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Revised Proposed Boundary Review](#)

### **III. MISCELLANEOUS**

#### **Matters Not Posted**

7. Matters not on the posted agenda, to be discussed and (if requested) placed on the agenda for action at a future meeting of the Committee, or matters requiring immediate action because of an emergency situation or where the need to take action arose subsequent to the posting of the agenda. (11-3011)

**No action was taken by the Committee.**

#### **Public Comment**

8. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Committee on items of interest that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee. (11-3012)

**Alan Clayton, a member of the public, stated his pleasure that the Committee is reviewing the implications that the Garza plan had on redistricting. Mr. Clayton recalled the testimony that took place regarding the Garza plan in terms of intentional discrimination and was reminded of the issue of “cracking;” specifically, that the boundaries between the First and Third Districts had a concentration of the Latino community. And according to a letter from the Department of Justice, there were two 23 percent Latino areas where there could have been one drawn with 44-46% Latino CVAP back in 1981. By 1987, it was shown that there was a 50 percent Latino CVAP seat. In addition, Mr. Clayton stated that, in reviewing the maps from that time, it would be apparent that the coastal community, as well as the San Gabriel Valley, were kept largely together. Mr. Clayton thanked the Committee for their time and consideration.**

#### **Adjournment**

9. Adjournment for the meeting of June 27, 2011. (11-3013)

**The meeting adjourned at 4:21 p.m.**