



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

Wednesday, June 22, 2011

2:00 PM

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Pedersen, Commissioner Reyes, Commissioner Ollague, Commissioner Choi, Commissioner Escandon, Commissioner Harris, Commissioner Acebo, Commissioner Hatanaka, Commissioner Napolitano, Commissioner Hernandez, Commissioner Hoffenblum, Commissioner Sun, Commissioner Mejia and Commissioner Tse

Excused: Vice Chair Holoman, Commissioner Andrade, Commissioner Martinez, Commissioner Friedman, Commissioner Flores and Commissioner Hollister

1. Call to Order and Introduction by Chair Pedersen. (11-2884)

The meeting was called to order by Chair Pedersen at 2:05 p.m.

I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER

2. Approval of Minutes of June 15, 2011. (11-2885)

On motion of Commissioner Reyes, seconded by Commissioner Hernandez, this item was approved.

Attachments: [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Minutes](#)

II. REPORTS

3. Report on redistricting website activity. (11-2921)

Susan Herman, of the CEO reported that there have been 18,588 total individual visits to the redistricting website. May 25, 2011 remains the busiest day with 778 hits since the launch of the redistricting website. The most popular pages visited are: (1) Submitted Plans; (2) Meeting Schedule - Agenda/Minutes; (3) Commissioner Bios; (4) Upcoming Dates; and (5) Comments. Martin Zimmerman of the CEO added that all plans that have

been submitted have now been posted as "Shared Plans", allowing any visitor to conduct more detailed review of each plan. A pop-up notice is included on the website with instructions on how to view a "Shared Plan." Commissioner Reyes thanked Frank Cheng of the CEO and other staff for making this possible.

4. Report on status of submitted plans. (11-2926)

Alan Clayton, a member of the public, addressed the Committee stating the Committee should look at the Brown vs. Delgadillo and the Ortiz vs. Bowen races as they are valuable in seeing how communities vote.

5. Consideration of additional redistricting data. (11-2923)

Mr. Zimmerman reported that staff is still researching the question posed by Commissioners at the June 15 meeting as to the population shift in the court-imposed Garza plan. He indicated staff hoped to provide the information at the June 27 meeting.

Alan Clayton commented that he was looking forward to reviewing the Garza information when it becomes available.

6. Staff report on population shift in Garza plan. (11-2940)

Mr. Zimmerman reported that staff is still researching on the request made by Commissioners at the meeting of June 15, to find out how much population has moved as part of the redistricting plan imposed by the Court under the Garza case. Staff will continue their research and report back at the meeting of June 27, 2011.

7. Consideration of redistricting plans submitted by the public, including discussion of potential revisions by Committee members:

Plan J1, submitted by Leo Estrada

Plan K1, submitted by Keith Privett

Plan L1, submitted by Seyou Oh

Plan M1, submitted by Alan Clayton and John Wong

Follow-up staff report on Plan H2, submitted by Leo Estrada

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. (11-2924)

Mr. Zimmerman reported on J1, K1, L1 and M1 submitted plans as follows:

Plan J1 submitted by Leo Estrada:

Justifications – This plan did not include an additional clarifying narrative in the submission.

1. Proposes reassignment of 1,175 redistricting units which make up 142 whole or partial communities (pages 5-7 of the staff report).
2. Total population deviation is 0.23% (page 27).
3. The total number of people moved from one district to another is 3,867,242 (page 11).
4. Deferred and Advanced Voting – County Counsel reports that, countywide 27.9% 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 J1 Benchmark

District 1	51.1 %	63.3 %
District 2	32.5 %	33.6 %
District 3	14.4 %	23.8 %
District 4	50.0 %	31.6 %
District 5	27.9 %	24.7 %

African American Plan J1 Benchmark

District 1	6.4 %	3.6 %
District 2	36.7 %	36.5 %
District 3	4.4 %	5.0 %
District 4	4.4 %	7.8 %
District 5	7.5 %	6.8 %

Asian Plan J1 Benchmark

District 1	17.1 %	18.2 %
District 2	11.6 %	10.5 %
District 3	11.6 %	10.3 %
District 4	19.0 %	16.9 %
District 5	13.9 %	16.5 %

Party Affiliation by District
(page 35 of the staff report on the plan and page 18 of Benchmark)

Democratic Plan J1		Benchmark
District 1	58.1 %	57.5 %
District 2	64.6 %	66.3 %
District 3	47.8 %	52.9 %
District 4	47.7 %	45.0 %
District 5	42.1 %	40.4 %

Republican Plan J1		Benchmark
District 1	14.8 %	16.9%
District 2	13.2 %	11.5%
District 3	25.4 %	19.7%
District 4	27.6 %	29.9%
District 5	32.7 %	34.2%

6. This plan does not displace any Supervisor from his/her district and districts are viewed as being 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
Burbank 1 / 5
Culver City 2 / 3
Glendale 1 / 5
Long Beach 2 / 3 / 4
Monrovia 4 / 5
Pasadena 1 / 5

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

- Bracket Field – from District 5 to 4
- Whiteman Airport – from District 3 to 5
- South Coast Botanic Garden – from District 4 to 3
- Downey/Rancho Complex – from District 4 to 1
- El Monte Civic Center – 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 (pages 5-8)

Professor Leo Estrada addressed the Committee by stating the following:

- **He was responsible for drawing the configuration of the Board of Supervisors plan that has largely been in place for the last 20 years. Since then, the north County has grown and there have been ethnic and racial changes. His goal this time in drawing plans was to avoid "lobster claws" as seen in his previous plan, and he focused on achieving equal population among the various districts;**
- **In District 2, he tried to enhance the African-American representation by moving away from the west side, from the Marina and Culver City area and to move deeper into the Northeast and Northwest side of Long Beach;**
- **In District 1, he extended it to the San Fernando Valley which required a pathway through Glendale and Burbank;**
- **In District 4, he tried to take territory that was there and create a "Section 2" District.**
- **Districts 2, 3, and 5 remain very similar with the exception of the edges. Districts 1 and 4 contain the major changes from the current base map;**
- **The first objective in the development of the plan was equal population, then contiguity, compactness, preservation of natural boundaries and conservation of communities of interest. The second objective was the creation of two "Section 2" Districts, Districts 1 and 4.**
- **In terms of communities reassigned, there are three ways in which these movements can occur and it is listed in the appendix (AW, PW and PS). This means he took a whole area that was already complete and moved it to a new district. This was done for 59 communities. He took 34 partial communities and made them whole and these should be considered improvements. The goal was to achieve as little deviation as possible resulting in some of the remaining splits.**
- **In terms of the information related to voter deferral and advancement, there are 1.3 million people that are advanced in elections and 1.4 million that get deferred netting 64,000 people; overall, the net is only 2%. The Citizen Age Voters' impact is around 15% and those are important impacts to consider.**
- **For the two "Section 2" Districts (Districts 1 and 4), the information provided on the Citizen Voting Age by the DOJ categories demonstrate how this was accomplished.**
- **Income level was one of the main factors examined. Districts 1 and 2 are low-income populations, District 5 and 3 are at the upper end of income range, and District 4 fits in between. This exemplifies the many factors examined in looking at socioeconomic status of these areas along with other factors.**

Commissioner Reyes asked Professor Estrada, to describe in detail how he drew lines in particular areas and why he decided to go one way versus another solely based on the communities of interest.

Professor Estrada looked at the socio-economics of the area. Once established, he utilized three views: (1) the reference layer data of poverty provided by the County; (2) how people voted in the Democratic and Republican registration; (3) income in terms of housing value (ownership/renting) which assisted in the drawing the upper and northern part of District 3 and part of District 2; and (4) ethnic/racial data with respect to establishing "Section 2" districts. A combination of all these things and others assisted in drawing the lines. However, he did not find the major facilities information to be helpful.

Commissioner Hoffenblum asked two questions regarding communities of Interest: (1) Should the City of Long Beach as a community of interest be in one District or should it be split; and (2) Why does District 2 extend into the San Fernando Valley splitting the Latino community into two separate Districts?

Prof. Estrada, stated the larger cities of Los Angeles and Long Beach were amongst the most populated areas and have been split in the past. The reasoning for splitting the San Fernando Valley was to maintain compactness.

Chair Pedersen stated, as a resident of the Long Beach, the community is pushing for one congressional seat. Commissioner Hernandez, also a resident of Long Beach asked Prof. Estrada why he also split the Latino community within Long Beach.

Prof. Estrada wanted to keep Long Beach together, but he wanted equal population amongst the various districts and as a result, he split Long Beach.

Commissioner Hoffenblum commented that in his experience, Long Beach votes for those who are from Long Beach.

Commissioner Reyes asked what the results would have been on total population deviation if Sylmar was kept with the First District.

Prof. Estrada responded that if Sylmar was kept within the First District to achieve low deviation and compactness, he would have had to drop other cities from the First District. And if Sylmar was kept within the First District, the population deviation could be as high as 5-6%. So when there was no more population to work with, he stopped. If he had gone further north, the deviation would have been higher.

Commissioner Ollague asked how the split was made with the community of Glendale.

Prof. Estrada explained that the southern part of Glendale is very different from the rest of the City. He knew that he could take population and try to avoid going around Glendale but it began to take on an odd shape, with a narrow neck. He chose to take a piece of Burbank and go into the Valley.

Commissioner Reyes asked for the reasoning on factors used to draw "Section 2" Districts.

Prof. Estrada explained, based on his understanding of the law, if you can show that there is a possibility of a "Section 2" district, it has to be taken in consideration. When drawing the districts, he tried to maximize the Latino CVAP in the districts. As he started the reconfiguration, he began to move citizens and in doing so, accomplished the goal of establishing "Section 2" districts in Districts 4 and 1.

In a follow-up question by Commissioner Acebo, Prof. Estrada agreed that the Latino CVAP was a factor in establishing a "Section 2" district for the 4th District configuration.

Commissioner Acebo also inquired as to the difference between the socio-economic data, income and voting patterns. Also, how should the Committee go about balancing community of interest vs. direct input provided?

Prof. Estrada stated it is important to meet the goals of redistricting and to balance several factors. Where you decide to put communities of interest is something the Committee needs to decide. In Prof. Estrada's opinion, the legal requirements supersede communities of interest, but do not ignore it completely. The reasoning on splitting the Glendale area below the 134 Freeway is mainly based on the 30% Latino poverty level.

Commissioner Acebo asked how Prof. Estrada accounted for the decreasing African American population and the increased Asian American population.

Prof. Estrada commented that he wanted to protect the African American voting core and therefore drew a district that maximized the African American CVAP. His proposed district is even higher in CVAP than the current benchmark district. As for Asian Americans, unfortunately, they are spread throughout the County and do not reside in just one area geographically.

Commissioner Hernandez asked why he created a coastal district. Prof. Estrada responded that the entire coast is under the purview of the Coastal Commission. He stated that, while he was not uncomfortable with the coastal district, since he had focused more on the ethnic communities, the coastal areas would have been kept together.

Commissioner Ollague asked Prof. Estrada what the Committee should look at as far as criteria.

Prof. Estrada stated the Committee should first establish the submittal as legal. Then they need to look at the districts to see if they are internally related to each other and take the communities of interest into consideration.

Proposed Plan M1 by Alan Clayton and John Wong:

There was no additional information provided in the justification section.

1. Proposes reassignment of 1,116 redistricting units that make up 125 whole or partial communities. (Pages 6-8 of the staff report).
2. Total population deviation is 0.50 % (Page 25).
3. The total number of people moved from one district to another is 3,705,510 (Page 12).
4. Deferred and Advanced Voting – the County Counsel report shows that, overall, 24.6 % of the constituents of LA County will be affected in terms of their voting ability being advanced or deferred.

5. Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) by District (Page 38 of staff report and 23 for Benchmark):

	Hispanic Plan M1	Benchmark
District 1	52.6 %	63.3 %
District 2	36.5 %	33.6 %
District 3	14.4 %	23.8 %
District 4	50.5 %	31.6 %
District 5	23.1 %	24.7 %

	African American Plan M1	Benchmark
District 1	4.8 %	3.6 %
District 2	37.1 %	36.5 %
District 3	6.8 %	5.0 %
District 4	4.6 %	7.8 %
District 5	7.1 %	6.8 %

	Asian Plan M1	Benchmark
District 1	11.6 %	18.2 %
District 2	10.0 %	10.5 %
District 3	12.2 %	10.3 %
District 4	17.3 %	16.9 %
District 5	19.9 %	16.5 %

6. Party Affiliation by District (Page 33 of Staff Report)

	Democrat	Republican
District 1	57.2 %	16.5 %
District 2	66.8 %	11.3 %
District 3	48.5 %	24.8 %
District 4	47.7 %	28.0 %
District 5	41.1 %	32.6 %

7. This plan does not displace any supervisor from his/her district. All five supervisory districts are viewed as contiguous and reasonably compact.

8. Major facilities moved – County Counsel report
There are two cities split: Culver City and Paramount. The plan unifies Azusa, Hawthorne, and Pico Rivera. The El Monte Airport, Downey/Rancho complex, Marina del Rey, Sheriff Headquarters, Museums and Catalina island would change districts.

Alan Clayton addressed the Committee and presented his reasoning behind his submittal. He said that when designing plans, you should look at poverty, compactness, packing and cracking, and try to keep communities together. One of the issues that came up regarding keeping the coast together is common environmental issues. He said coastal communities have various similar issues in seeking to environmentally improve the area and it would help to have a supervisor that would keep an eye on it. You should have poverty in the database when drawing districts. He did a poverty overlay on District 2. He reassigned and made minor changes in District 2. There were areas that were not compatible, and he moved some of those areas out to District 3. Also look at political data extensively. In terms of compactness it is very compact, and areas have socioeconomic similarities. This time, he didn't make determinations based on partisan data. When doing the LAFCO map years ago, he said he ended up getting political support and he used communities of interest. He added you don't want your plan to come up in court and violate Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. He also commented that he tried to create an Asian area of influence in the Fifth District that provides the Asian community an excellent opportunity to compete when Antonovich retires. There is a lot of commonality. He thought it was important to unite the Asian community, and he did look at the socio- economics. The area has increased in Asian influence, and these areas are reasonably compacted. He indicated the deviation in his plan is 0.5. He looked at the 405 freeway. Communities beneath the North Hills area and Canoga Park have similar characteristics as the San Fernando Valley, Arleta, Sun Valley. If you look at politics, you can disenfranchise some but he was trying to engage all five supervisors. In looking at other plans, he stressed that you should look at those where the African Americans are treated fairly. He said he is trying to enhance communities, similar to what the masters did, to ensure the rights of Latino and African Americans. He said he tried to be careful splitting cities.

Commissioner Hoffenblum addressed Mr. Clayton, stating that, in 1981, Latinos in the Valley indicated they did not want to be mixed in with the Latinos from downtown and East Los Angeles.

Mr. Clayton stated that he wasn't sure if this was still true, and as a matter of fact, Hispanics have similar transportation issues, and Hispanics in the valley have a similar interest of having their transportation issues addressed. That is one issue that connects them.

Proposed Plan K1 by Keith Privett

Prior to Mr. Zimmerman presenting his report, Commissioner Acebo made a motion to accept the staff report on the plan and hear only the CVAP information in the meeting. Commissioner Harris seconded this motion and it passed unanimously.

1. Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) by District (Page 35 of staff report and 23 for Benchmark):

	Hispanic Plan K1	Benchmark
District 1	54.9 %	63.3 %
District 2	29.9 %	33.6 %
District 3	19.5 %	23.8 %
District 4	39.5 %	31.6 %
District 5	29.5 %	24.7 %

	African American Plan K1	Benchmark
District 1	5.2 %	3.6 %
District 2	31.7 %	36.5 %
District 3	4.8 %	5.0 %
District 4	8.0 %	7.8 %
District 5	7.5 %	6.8 %

	Asian Plan K1	Benchmark
District 1	23.0 %	18.2 %
District 2	10.0 %	10.5 %
District 3	11.2 %	10.3 %
District 4	17.5 %	16.9 %
District 5	11.3 %	16.5 %

Proposed Plan L1 by Seyou Oh:

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

1. Proposes reassignment of 676 redistricting units that make up 96 whole or partial communities. (Pages 5-7)
2. Total population deviation is 0.28 % (Page 11).
3. The total number of people moved from one district to another is 2,216,138 (Page 16).
4. Deferred and Advanced Voting – the County Counsel report shows that, overall, 19.4 % of the constituents of LA County will be affected in terms of their voting ability being advanced or deferred.
5. Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) by District (Page 39 of Staff Report and 23 for Benchmark):

	Hispanic Plan L1	Benchmark
District 1	48.7 %	63.3 %
District 2	39.0 %	33.6 %
District 3	22.2 %	23.8 %
District 4	34.0 %	31.6 %
District 5	27.7 %	24.7 %

	African American Plan L1	Benchmark
District 1	3.9 %	3.6 %
District 2	33.2 %	36.5 %
District 3	5.3 %	5.0 %
District 4	9.5 %	7.8 %
District 5	7.6 %	6.8 %

	Asian Plan L1	Benchmark
District 1	27.0 %	18.2 %
District 2	5.7 %	10.5 %
District 3	11.9 %	10.3 %
District 4	15.1 %	16.9 %
District 5	12.7 %	16.5 %

6. **Party Affiliation by District**
Mr. Zimmerman briefly highlighted some of the registered voter information. The variations between the plan and the Benchmark were generally within a couple of percentage points. One of the more significant changes would put Republicans in the First District at 20.8% vs 16.9% in the Benchmark, while Democrats in the First District would be at 51.8% in the plan vs 57.5% in the Benchmark.

7. **This plan does not displace any supervisor from his/her district. All five supervisory districts are viewed as reasonably contiguous and compact.**
8. **Major facilities moved. The plan splits cities like Arcadia, Hawthorne, San Gabriel, Santa Monica and Whittier.**

Mr. Zimmerman also reported on the request from the Committee regarding H2. Specifically, he noted that reassigning the three RDUs assigned to District 1 (but surrounded by District 2) to the 2nd District would have very little impact on CVAP percentages.

Attachments: [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - PLAN J1](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - County Counsel Plan Summary J1](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - PLAN K1](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - County Counsel Plan Summary K1](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - PLAN L1](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - County Counsel Plan Summary L1](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - PLAN M1](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - County Counsel Plan Summary M1](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - A1 Benchmark Plan](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - County Counsel Plan Summary of A1](#)

III. FUTURE MEETINGS

8. **Future dates of Boundary Review Committee meetings. (11-2929) Mr. Zimmerman noted the submitted plans that will be scheduled on the upcoming BRC meetings for June 27, 2011 and June 29, 2011.**

June 27, 2011 - Plans for consideration:

- **Plan N1, submitted by Alan Clayton and Diana Velasquez**
- **Plan O1, submitted by James Reed**
- **Plan P1, submitted by Ron Hoffman**

June 29, 2011 – Plans for consideration:

- **Plan Q1, submitted by Steven Ochoa (Mexican American Legal Defense Fund).**
- **Plan R1, submitted by Steven Ochoa (Mexican American Legal Defense Fund).**
- **Plan S1, submitted by Jackie Dupont-Walker, Tunua Thrash, Marqueece Harris-Dawson (Community Coalition, West Los Angeles CDC, Ward AME EDC District 5).**

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

IV. MISCELLANEOUS

Matters Not Posted

9. 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. (11-2886)

No action was taken by the Committee.

Public Comment

10. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Committee on items of interest that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee. (11-2887)

No members of the public addressed the Committee.

Adjournment

11. Adjournment for the meeting of June 22, 2011. (11-2888)

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.