



**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, July 11, 2011

2:00 PM

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Pedersen, Vice Chair Holoman, Commissioner Reyes, Commissioner Martinez, Commissioner Ollague, Commissioner Choi, Commissioner Escandon, Commissioner Harris, Commissioner Acebo, Commissioner Hollister, Commissioner Hatanaka, Commissioner Napolitano, Commissioner Hoffenblum, Commissioner Sun and Commissioner Tse

Excused: Commissioner Andrade, Commissioner Friedman, Commissioner Flores, Commissioner Hernandez and Commissioner Mejia

1. Call to Order and Introduction by Chair Pedersen. (11-3145)

The meeting was called to order by Chair Pedersen at 2:12 p.m.

Chair Pedersen welcomed all in attendance and stated that the July 11, 2011 and July 13, 2011 meetings will be streamed live on the Internet. Access will be available by going to the Los Angeles County homepage at <http://www.lacounty.gov>, and clicking on "Board Meeting Webcast" on the right-hand side of the page, or at the following direct link: <http://bos.co.la.ca.us/Categories/MtgsBoard/LiveBroadcast.htm>

I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

2. Approval of Minutes of June 29, 2011.

Delegation to Chair to approve any minutes finalized after last Boundary Review Committee meeting and take other appropriate actions to communicate Boundary Review Committee recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. (11-3144)

On motion of Commissioner Hatanaka, seconded by Commissioner Hollister, the minutes from the meeting of June 29, 2011 were approved.

Martin Zimmerman of the Chief Executive Office, requested the Committee also delegate to the Chair the authority to approve any minutes finalized after the last Boundary Review Committee meeting and take other appropriate actions to communicate Boundary Review Committee recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Reyes made a motion that any draft Minutes also be forwarded to Committee members for review and any subsequent changes be submitted to County Counsel for review and final approval by the Chair.

Therefore, on motion of Commissioner Reyes, seconded by Commissioner Napolitano, the Committee delegated to the Chair the authority to approve any minutes finalized after the last Boundary Review Committee meeting and to take other appropriate actions to communicate Boundary Review Committee recommendations with to the Board of Supervisors, and that any draft Minutes also be forwarded to Committee members to review and then have any changes be submitted to County Counsel for review and final approval by the Chair.

Attachments: [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - June 29, 2011](#)

Public Comment

3. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Committee on items of interest that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee. (11-3271)

Members of the public were called up to address the Committee as follows:

1. **Louis Pelts, member of the La Mirada Kiwanis Club – The population of La Mirada is balanced. The City of La Mirada has had a very successful association especially with Don Knabe. We would like keep Don Knabe as the Supervisor and stay in the 4th District. It would not benefit the City or the Supervisors to change.**
2. **Owen Newcomer, Mayor Pro Temp for the City of Whittier – Asked that the City of Whittier stay within the 4th District. There is a long standing and productive relationship with Supervisor Knabe and his staff. There is also a good relationship with the surrounding cities like Downey, and Santa Fe Springs. Those cities have a community of interest that we would like to keep whole and within the 4th District.**
3. **David Lesser, Councilmember for the City of Manhattan Beach – The City of Manhattan Beach strongly supports the retention of the current boundaries for the 4th District that has been in place for over 20 years. Manhattan Beach has worked closely with the 4th District where governmental structure and staffing issues are critical.**
4. **Gary Toeppen, member of the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, President and CEO – Supports less movement, only as necessary in order to comply with the principle of “One Person – One Vote” and the Voting Rights Act. We discourage wholesale changes that could shift the representation of millions of people in the redrawing of District maps. The Districts we currently have represent communities of interest. Each Supervisor in that community of interest has gained and expertise and understanding of the citizens and businesses of their respective Districts.**
5. **Wayne Powell, Councilmember for the City of Manhattan Beach, a member of the South Bay Cities Council of Governments and a Los Angeles County Beach Commissioner – I serve on the sub-committee that is working with several members of the County on a new Library. Continuity with the County, Manhattan Beach and the South Bay Cities would be lost if Manhattan Beach was to leave the 4th District.**
6. **Mariann Hampton, a resident of and business owner in the City of La Mirada – Very pleased with La Mirada and the current boundary lines. La Mirada is very friendly with businesses. We have built communities and relationships through the years and recommend the boundaries remain the same.**

7. Hal Malkin, a recently retired Councilmember and resident of La Mirada. In 2009 CNN rated the City of La Mirada the 3rd best place to live in California and the 34th best place to live in the United States. These results are not just from good local government, but also from the great relationship we have with the County of Los Angeles and Supervisor Don Knabe. Through the efforts of Supervisor Don Knabe, we were able to build one of the premier water parks in Southern California, a resource center, an activity center and a gymnasium; all serve thousands of people, both within the City and County. On a personal level, I am a registered Democrat, who believes the quality of life issues cross over party lines. It is through people and relationships that governments work together, not whether you are a Republican or a Democrat. Since 1996, the City of La Mirada has developed a very strong relationship with Supervisor Knabe. I strongly support keeping the City of La Mirada as part of the 4th Supervisorial District as the final outcome of this redistricting process, and hope the Boundary Review Committee (BRC) will seriously take today's input, as any redistricting changes will have a huge impact on our community.
8. Carol Chen, Mayor for the City of Cerritos – Request to keep the City of Cerritos as part of the 4th District. Supervisor Knabe has been a very good representative for the City and the people of Cerritos. On a personal note, he has been a wonderful neighbor.
9. Bruce Barrows, Councilmember for the City of Cerritos – In support of Supervisor Knabe and keeping the 4th District as is. Supervisor Knabe knows the people. Making changes to the District will erase any progress that has been established.
10. Julie Turner Tisue, Executive Director of the San Pedro and Peninsula YMCA – Thanked Supervisor Don Knabe. We have worked with him on some very difficult neighborhood issues in San Pedro. We couldn't do what we do without Don Knabe. Therefore, we are very strongly in support of keeping Don Knabe as the Supervisor for the 4th District and are very much opposed to any changes to that. Don Knabe is very much in support of the non-profits and the City of San Pedro is home to a lot of non-profits that serve the Los Angeles area. With his efforts, we have learned to collaborate more and have become more efficient and we would like to keep it that way.
11. Steve Jones, Mayor of the City of La Mirada – Request the City of La Mirada remain in the 4th District. We have existing partnerships with other cities including Norwalk, Downey, Commerce, Whittier, Cerritos and others in the Gateway City region, which are mostly represented by the 4th District.

Having the same supervisory representation with our regional partners is extremely helpful in accomplishing shared efforts. Supervisor Don Knabe and 4th District staff understand our community needs and have been highly responsive to the City for many years. On behalf of the City of La Mirada, we request the Committee consider these regionally significant relationships when drawing the final boundaries and keep the City of La Mirada within the 4th District.

12. Richard Montgomery, Mayor of the City of Manhattan Beach and President of the Independent Cities Association. We want to keep the 4th District the way it is and keep our boundaries the way they are. It is well run, and efficient. Supervisor Knabe is very accessible. The South West cities and South East cities get along well. "If it's not broke, don't fix it." The 4th District is not "broke," so please don't fix it.
13. David O. Lavine, President of the Marina del Rey Lessees Association in the unincorporated Marina del Rey. Marina del Rey is a result of a unique public/private partnership serving Marina del Rey for over 40 years and has been represented by the 4th District. This continuity of relationship with the 4th District is essential to the smooth functioning of Marina del Rey. The County's interests and long-range planning needs are benefitted by the consistent and stable leadership that has been provided by the 4th District; I support keeping Marina del Rey in District 4.
14. Nate Holden, member of the Marina City Club/Club Management Council – Supervisor Don Knabe is a decent guy who knows the policies and is open to hear what your concerns are. To change our supervisor to someone else would present a large task to the new representative; Supervisor Knabe knows us. We want to keep Don Knabe on the job in the 4th District.
15. Jack Miranda, resident of La Mirada, a local Pastor and a member of the Kwanis Club – We are very fond of Don Knabe and La Mirada is very happy with where we are. He concurred with Richard Montgomery regarding "if it's not broke, why fix it?"
16. Myllie Taylor, resident of La Mirada for almost 56 years – Since 1960, I have served on several Committees. Our relationship with the Board of Supervisors has been superb as long as La Mirada has been with the 4th District, where we hope to stay. She stated: "Why are you doing this? We are happy where we are. Everything is copasetic. And if it isn't broke why fix it?"
17. Tom Robinson, City Manager of La Mirada – The 4th District includes a number of contract cities. As a former Mayor and Councilmember, Supervisor Knabe understands the special needs of contract cities and works to ensure that County services are provided appropriately to these cities.

The 4th District also includes many of the communities which make up the Gateway Cities Council of Government, an important sub-regional organization of community of interest; dealing with important issues such as transportation, jobs and the environment. We are making progress together and we need to stay together.

18. Steve De Ruse, Councilmember for the City of La Mirada – The City strongly supports La Mirada remaining in the 4th District due to the importance of the connection to the Gateway Cities, well established park issues, capital projects and other endeavors. Also super-regional issues with cities such as Long Beach, Lakewood, Cerritos, Norwalk, and others are some of the reasons why La Mirada requests to remain in the 4th District. Supervisor Knabe and his staff have been true professionals. Supervisor Knabe has repeatedly demonstrated that he understands our communities of interest and has been responsive and engaged in the community for many years.
19. Mariko Kahn, Executive Director of the Pacific Asian Counseling Services – Our agency is located in Districts 2, 3 and 4. We are here to ask that the District boundaries be maintained with only minor adjustments. As a representative of the Asian Pacific Islanders of those communities, we feel it is important that the Committee know that within Los Angeles County there are 15.5 % Asian Pacific Islanders (API). Any dilution of our community would be detrimental. There is a proposal that would divide the City of Long Beach. This would be very detrimental as there are two emerging communities that would be greatly affected if Long Beach was broken up: Pacific Islanders (Asians) and Cambodians. Within Signal Hill and North Long Beach, more and more Cambodians and Pacific Islanders are living there.
20. Sam Olivito, Executive Director of the California Contract Cities Association – We urge that the BRC continue to support the boundaries as they are, specifically the cities within the 4th District that house most of the contract cities within Los Angeles County. If changes must be done, they should not divide communities of any interest. We would like to keep the 4th District as it is and keep Don Knabe as Supervisor, as he has worked so well with the contract cities.
21. John Eckman, a resident of Hacienda Heights for 55 years, President and a representative of the Hacienda Heights Improvement Association (HHIA) and its associated constituencies – The Charter of HHIA is to represent the interests of all property owners, residents and businesses in the unincorporated area of Hacienda Heights. Approximately 25 years ago, the Hispanic community began migrating to Hacienda Heights, followed by the Asian and Asian Pacific community.

All these groups moved to Hacienda Heights not to be with their own, but to take advantage of the good schools, the residential atmosphere and the ethnic harmony that exists. Creating new districts to accomplish a group's or individual's goal to advantage one group over the other is not to the best interest of all citizens. Maintaining and reflecting the diversity and similar interests of various communities is much more important and meaningful to our citizens. Adopt a plan that does not significantly change the boundaries because that would cause severe negative impact to our community and constituents.

22. Karen Seeman, representing the Essex Marina City Club – We support keeping Marina del Rey and the Marina City Club in the 4th District. Marina del Rey was developed as a public/private partnership. Our community would be best served by continuing to remain in the 4th District. It would be a disservice to change the boundary lines so that Marina del Rey would no longer be in the 4th District. Please retain our long-term relationship with the 4th District.
23. Mark Masaoka, Policy Coordinator for the Asian Pacific Policy and Planning Council – Our member agencies provide services in all five supervisory districts. We are alarmed with the possible carving of the current 4th District. The 4th District includes many existing Asian American and Pacific Islander communities. They cumulatively enable Asian and Pacific Islanders to have a measure of influence. These communities include: Japanese-Americans in Torrance; Pacific Islanders throughout the South Bay; Filipinos in Wilmington and neighboring cities; Cambodians and Vietnamese in Long Beach; South Asians in Artesia; and Chinese and other Asian Pacific Islanders in Hacienda Heights, Diamond Bar and Rowland Heights. Many County programs provide specific funding for each supervisory district. We are concerned with the dilution and dispersion of Asian Pacific Islanders; that this will diminish the political influence within our communities. For these reasons, we ask you to keep the 4th District essentially intact.
24. Pete Meza, resident of Downey and a volunteer at Rancho Los Amigos – As a person with disability, we are a community of interest. Supervisor Knabe has fought to keep Rancho open and that Downey should remain in the 4th District.
25. Betsy Cheek, Wilmington YMCA – We urge you not to disrupt our District. Supervisor Knabe understands us and our unique situations in providing access to the underserved communities of Long Beach and Wilmington. It doesn't make sense to change the 4th District with Supervisor Knabe. He works with us. His staff is accessible. He represents us fairly. We urge you not to move us from the 4th District.

26. Carlos Benavides, patient of Rancho Los Amigos – Supervisor Knabe looks out for the people at Rancho and supports us in every aspect. We want to stay in the 4th District with Don Knabe.
27. Ann Ruth, patient of Rancho Los Amigos – Supervisor Knabe has made a difference at Rancho. He knows the staff. He knows the programs. He is active and real supporter for the people in Downey. We want to keep Don Knabe as our Supervisor in the 4th District.
28. Alexander Morales, patient and volunteer at Rancho Los Amigos – Supervisor Knabe is the only Supervisor that has fought to keep Rancho open. I would like to see Don Knabe stay in the 4th District. He is a good guy.
29. Catherine Gaughen, Executive Director for the Cerritos Regional Chamber of Commerce – Strongly supports keeping both Cerritos and Hawaiian Gardens in the 4th District in the final outcome of the redistricting process. Splitting the 4th District would result in changes to the quality and timeliness of services that we have come to expect. Any redistricting changes would have a huge impact in our community.
30. Alexander Brown, patient at Rancho Los Amigos – I am a Polio survivor. Supervisor Knabe meets our concerns and Rancho. Removing him from the 4th District would be detrimental to Rancho as he has constantly voted to keep Rancho open.
31. Allen Lay, Mayor of Rolling Hills – We strongly support keeping Rolling Hills, Palos Verdes Peninsula and the South Bay as part of the 4th District for Los Angeles County represented by Supervisor Knabe. We are very much opposed to having our South Bay neighborhoods separated. We are a contract city and several smaller cities that make up the 4th District receive our services from the County. The 4th District has provided great support by Supervisor Knabe and his staff. To make substantial changes to any of the Districts in this economic climate that we are currently in would cause unnecessary disruption and cost to the County and the cities and neighborhoods affected. Therefore, we urge you to retain Rolling Hills as part of the 4th District and allow us to have services of Supervisor Knabe and his staff.
32. Eileen Hupp, CEO of the Palos Verdes Peninsula Chamber of Commerce – I am speaking today on behalf of over 400 members, both businesses and local non profit. Our Chamber is in strong support of keeping our community as part of the 4th District represented by Supervisor Knabe. Don is both a member of our community and is a distinguished supporter of our businesses, schools and our non profits. All of which serves to strengthen our local economy and improve the quality of life for all of our citizens. Our Chamber strongly supports keeping the Peninsula within the 4th District.

33. Dr. Geneviève Clavreul, member of the public – Would like to see an expansion of the Board of Supervisors from a five-member Board to a nine-member Board. I'm not interested in the Supervisors, but I am interested in change and having nine supervisors would promote that.
34. Kanji Sahara, resident of Torrance – Because there is a high percentage of Asians in the 4th District, I think there is a high impact on the government. We would like to keep the District together as is with minor changes to accommodate the change in population. Don Knabe treats all the groups well. For the next Supervisor, we would like to have a high percentage of Asians so that we can have an impact on the government.
35. Jeffrey Gamble – member of the Patient Advisory Council at Rancho Los Amigos. Don Knabe is a man that has stood up for Rancho Los Amigos when many others voted to shut it down. If Rancho was to shut down, not only will people suffer more catastrophic events, but people will die. Going to a different hospital that doesn't know anything about paralysis, people will die. I have been to other hospitals where they didn't know anything about paralysis and they treat you like a piece of meat. At Rancho, they understand and are specialized in treating people with paralysis. To let the District be broken-up, people will really die. You will have other hospitals affected as well. People that are not properly treated will have to go to other hospitals, causing more suffering.
36. Bobbi Jean Tanberg, a 10 year resident of Downey, worked at Rancho Los Amigos National Rehabilitation Center for 20 years and serves as a Commissioner for the Los Angeles County Commission for Women – During this time, I have experienced the budget crisis in Los Angeles County and the risk of closure to Rancho Los Amigos on several occasions. Those of us providing direct patient care have seen the panic and fear in our patient's eyes at the potential closure. Supervisor Knabe has a unique understanding of the critical services we provide to the disabled population of Los Angeles County. Very few people, outside of rehabilitation and healthcare professionals, truly understand the services we provide. It is because of the substantial time that Don Knabe spends at Rancho, that he has this understanding. I am extremely concerned that the proposed redistricting will threaten this valuable relationship. Only through the support of Supervisor Knabe has Rancho been able to demonstrate the long-term financial savings and the quality of life impact for our patients and families. I am in full support of keeping Downey and Rancho Los Amigos National Rehabilitation Center in the 4th District and under the leadership of Supervisor Don Knabe.

37. **Adriana Figueroa – resident of the City of Norwalk – The City of Norwalk has submitted a letter to the Committee a few weeks ago. I want to express the City’s desire to remain in the 4th District. Supervisor Knabe has been a great advocate for the City of Norwalk. He understands the unique needs of our city and the regional issues that we face (water, economic development, transportation quality, etc.) The 4th District staff has always been committed to our community and represents us very well. The City of Norwalk would like to remain in the 4th District boundaries as is.**
38. **Rich Trujillo, 30 year resident of La Mirada, member of the Kiwanis Club, involved with the Chamber of Commerce, a business owner in La Mirada and the softball coach at La Mirada High School. In a period of uncertainty, stability is important for business owners, people and community members. We are concerned that the relationships that have been built with Supervisor Knabe and his staff will be broken. Please support keeping La Mirada in the 4th District.**
39. **Richard Cline, citizen of La Mirada – Our Community Emergency Response Team Program, hinges on the community involvement. It reaches out to, and coordinates with, the boundary cities and other members of the 4th District. We have trained a number of people from La Mirada and the neighboring cities. Likewise, Cerritos has offered us their facilities for hands-on training in our once a year National CERT training programs. Our emergency response center (911 call center) is practically manned by volunteers and they coordinate closely with the Norwalk Sheriff station that handles La Mirada service calls on the weekends. Moving us out of the 4th District would create discontinuous boundaries. Any interruption, added red tape, or inter-district bureaucracy, especially in public safety within the neighboring cities of the 4th District, would be detrimental to the citizens of the 4th District.**
40. **John Kelsall, CEO for the Greater Lakewood Chamber of Commerce – Want to support the continued relationship that we have been able to achieve with Supervisor Knabe and his outstanding staff. Because of that relationship, trust, and mutual respect, those achievements would not have been accomplished in any other way. Please keep Lakewood within the 4th District.**
41. **George E Franzen, resident of Bellflower and native of Los Angeles County. I was born in the 1st District, grew up in the 2nd, and with my wife Ann, we have lived in the 4th District for 45 years. My children have grown up and attended schools in the 4th District and a member of several organizations.**

I have seen how 4th District works together. I have worked with Supervisor Knabe with the Arch of South East Los Angeles. He has helped with our events and participated in the walk to raise funds for the Arch helping those with mental disabilities. Don has been active in every activity and I strongly support in keeping the 4th District together.

II. REPORTS

- 4. Report on redistricting website activity. (11-3273)**

Susan Herman of the Chief Executive Office gave a verbal report of the redistricting website activities. The website continues to grow strong with 28,619 individual viewers on the website. Today, includes the most popular day of the site. Which shows more and more people are gathering information about the process.

The most popular sections visited are as follows:

- 1. Summary of Comments and Letters Received**
- 2. Submitted Plans**
- 3. Meeting Schedule**
- 4. Committee Bios**

Ms. Herman stated there are fewer individuals are being referred from other sites. Over 42% of the people visiting the site go directly to the site and are first-time visitors.

- 5. Consideration of additional redistricting data. (11-3147)**

Mr. Zimmerman stated this item is a standard item on the agenda and there are no new items to report. The last information that was added was the two elections from 2006 and as stated last week, that data has been uploaded to the website.

- 6. Presentation of summary of plans submitted by the public, review criteria (as revised by Boundary Review Committee), and discussion of approach for further review. (11-3275)**

Mr. Zimmerman reported that the summary lists all viable plans submitted by the public in comparison to one another based on certain factors. The revised criteria provides review guidelines for the

Committee's consideration. Additionally, the Committee requested two revisions at the July 6, 2011 BRC meeting. In the document entitled Boundary Review Committee's Review and Consideration of Proposed Redistricting Plans, under Guidelines for Reviewing Proposals, the following revisions were made:

- **Keep total population deviation as nearly equal in population as may be.**
- **Avoid splitting cities/unincorporated areas whenever possible.**

Chair Pedersen indicated that each District will have an opportunity to make comments, suggestions or amendments on any of the submitted plans.

Alan Clayton, a member of the public, addressed the Committee regarding submitted plans. Mr. Clayton urged the Committee to consider the issue of packing. Furthermore, Mr. Clayton believes that packing currently exists within the 1st District and if this is not adjusted correctly, there may be possible litigation against the County due to violations of the Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. Mr. Clayton further warned the Committee of the costs involved with litigation.

Attachments: [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT_Summary of Plans Submitted by Public](#)
[SUPPORTING DOCUMENT_Revised Criteria](#)

7. Staff report on analysis of changes to Benchmark Plan (A-1) as requested by Boundary Review Committee. (11-3277)

Mr. Zimmerman reported that the supporting document entitled Boundary Review Committee Scenario 1 includes a motion by the Committee to use the A1 Benchmark as a baseline for certain changes. The

following changes to the A1 Benchmark were made:

- **Move the communities of Rowland Heights, South Whittier and the City of Santa Fe Springs from the 1st District to the 4th District.**
- **The motion was amended to move the City of Rosemead from the 1st District to the 5th District**
- **The motion was further amended to move the cities of Claremont, Covina, West Covina, Monrovia and Duarte, including adjoining unincorporated areas, from the 5th District to the 1st District.**

Mr. Zimmerman indicated the support document referenced above includes three maps. The first map displays the current supervisory boundary lines. The second map displays the supervisory boundaries based on the Committee motion referenced above. The third map displays the actual areas that changed districts.

The deviation under this plan would increase from the current 9.97 to 11.31.

Below are the percentages for the Voting Age Citizen by Race/Ethnicity:

	Hispanic (all races)	African American	Asian
1st District	59.8%	4.1%	16.7%
2nd District	33.6%	36.5%	10.5%
3rd District	23.8%	5.0%	10.3%
4th District	32.2%	7.7%	16.8%
5th District	22.6%	6.8%	17.6%

The total population reassigned for the A1 plan is 375,757.

Mr. Cheng of the Chief Executive Office reported that in order to make the revisions requested by the Committee and to maintain contiguous districts, staff moved Bradbury and some unincorporated areas to the 1st Districts to avoid islands within the 5th District.

Alan Clayton, a member of the public, inquired if the Committee's counsel had vetted the revised A1 Benchmark for compactness and contiguity and that it complied with federal law.

Nancy Takade, County Counsel, indicated that the revised A1 Benchmark is not a submitted plan but was developed at the request of the Committee as a scenario to evaluate changes and not as a full plan, and thus it did not receive a similar analysis as other submitted plans by the public

Attachments: [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT_Staff Report on Requested Changes A-1](#)

8. Consideration of redistricting plans submitted by the public, including discussion of potential revisions by Committee members. (11-3281)

Chair Pedersen indicated that each district will have an opportunity to comment on any of the submitted plans and make a recommendation.

Mr. Zimmerman also indicated that if a Committee member would like to begin with one of the submitted plans as their baseline plan, they have the ability to revise the actual plan in real time during this meeting and see the results.

Commissioner Hoffenblum stated that the laws relating to minority representation have changed based on Supreme Court rulings since the 1991 U.S. Supreme Court case "Garza."

Commissioner Hoffenblum indicated that he was very moved by the testimony heard today by 4th District constituents. The persuasive arguments they made were to not make significant changes to the existing boundary lines, unless it is absolutely necessary. Regardless of what plan is implemented, the 5th District has to concede several communities. Although Supervisor Antonovich does not want to lose any communities, he realizes that he must do so under the law.

Representing the 5th District, Commissioner Hoffenblum recommended the following revisions to the baseline plan.

- 1. Move the City of West Covina to the 1st District including unincorporated islands labeled Redistricting Data Unit (RDU) 1310 and RDU 1316.**
- 2. Move RDU 293, which is the West Hills area of the valley from the 5th District to the 3rd District.**

Representing the 4th District, Commissioner Hatanaka recommended the plan labeled Scenario 1 as their baseline map with the following revisions.

- 1. Add the communities of South Whittier, Santa Fe Springs and to bring in the remainder of Rowland Heights into the 4th District.**

Representing the 3rd District, Commissioner Acebo, had no comment.

Representing the 2nd District, Commissioner Choi stated that the priorities of the Committee should be to ensure that the map complies with the Voting Rights Act and to minimize the threat of litigation by protecting voting rights and empowering opportunities for historically disenfranchised communities. In addition, it is important to keep unincorporated communities consolidated in one supervisory district because those communities receive much of their services from Los Angeles County. Therefore, the 2nd District recommends the plan labeled S1 as their baseline map.

Representing the 1st District, Commissioner Martinez is in favor of creating a 2nd Latino voting age population majority district and was concerned with the present map with respect to Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act in particular the issue of "packing." Although the 1st District would welcome the addition of any community, the addition of West Covina, which has a Latino population of 48.6 percent, and Covina with a Latino population of 47 percent, does not reduce the packing number as the Latino percentages are too high. The 1st District is open to any suggestions that would decrease the existing 72.3 Latino population within the 1st District. Therefore the 1st District recommends the plan labeled S1 as their baseline map.

Chair Pedersen indicated that he is in favor of using the A1 Benchmark map with the recommendations set forth by the 5th and 4th Districts as the baseline map.

Commissioner Hoffenblum stated that he takes Commissioner Martinez's concerns about packing very seriously and indicated that the 5th District took several factors into consideration when determining their recommendation, such as socio-economic factors.

Commissioner Acebo stated that the Committee should take into consideration all public comments, testimony, e-mails and letters received before making a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. In addition, the criteria that the Committee voted on last week provided a good guidepost.

Commissioner Napolitano inquired about the timeline to submit a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Zimmerman indicated that according to the statutes for the BRC, a recommendation would need to be determined by the end of the last meeting which is scheduled for Wednesday, July 13, 2011.

Mr. Cheng reported that using the redistricting software, the requested changes for the A1 Benchmark mentioned above were made. The changes resulted in a total deviation of approximately 1.70 percent.

Commissioner Hoffenblum inquired about viewing additional data on the revised map, such as ethnicity.

Mr. Cheng reported the CVAP data on the revised map:

	Hispanic (all races)	African American	Asian
1st District	62.05%	3.72%	18.76%
2nd District	33.61%	36.51%	10.45%
3rd District	23.77%	4.98%	10.32%
4th District	32.22%	7.65%	16.79%
5th District	23.52%	6.88%	16.04%

Vice Chair Holoman requested the political affiliation data for the revised map.

	Democrats	Republicans	Declined to State
1st District	56.81%	17%	21%
2nd District	66%	11%	18%
3rd District	52%	19%	23%
4th District	45%	29%	20%
5th District	40%	34%	21%

Chair Pedersen requested the revisions for S1 be made using the redistricting software.

Commissioner Reyes stated that the submitted plan labeled R1 should be included. In addition, Commissioner Reyes stated that based on outside counsel Laura Brill's presentation at the July 6, 2011 BRC meeting, the two Section 2 majority minority CVAP Latino districts were not mandated, which is different than stating that they cannot be drawn. However there is nothing preventing the Committee from voting on those plans. Additionally, the testimony from the S1 and R1 plan authors was very helpful in determining the methodology used to draw their maps that reflect a willingness to comply with the traditional redistricting criteria even though the Committee adopted the guidelines. There was a reliance on socio-economic factors and data. In addition, the authors of S1 and R1 held town hall meetings where they solicited input from their constituents.

Additionally, both S1 and R1 have the ability to create two 50 percent CVAP Latino districts. The Committee also heard testimony from the author of J1, Professor Leo Estrada. Mr. Estrada's plan was created independently from R1 and S1, yet they used similar methodologies to draw the maps. These plans also respect many of the wishes and requests made by constituents at BRC meetings and other community outreach meetings. For example, much of the northern part of the 3rd District remains intact.

Commissioner Harris requested the following revisions to the S1 plan:

1. Move the remaining portion of Wilmington from the 2nd District into the 3rd District.
2. Move the East Hollywood portion currently within the 3rd District into the 2nd District.

Mr. Cheng reported that the total deviation after Commissioner Harris' revisions was 2.81 percent.

Mr. Zimmerman reported the CVAP data on the revised map after Commissioner Harris' revisions were made.

	Hispanic (all races)	African American	Asian
1st District	53%	5%	12%
2nd District	34%	37%	10%
3rd District	15%	6%	12%
4th District	52%	6%	18%
5th District	23%	7%	19%

Chair Pedersen ask what was the total population moved after Commissioner Harris' revisions were made.

Mr. Cheng reported that the software is not immediately capable of calculating the total population moved.

Chair Pedersen indicated that prior to Commissioner Harris' request; S1 relocated approximately 3.35 million residents.

Commissioner Hatanaka expressed his concerns regarding the large population move associated with S1. Specifically Commissioner Hatanaka is concerned with the impact this may have on local jurisdictions and how they are organized.

In addition, S1 separates many of the Asian/Pacific Islander (API) communities. Many of these communities have worked together for 20 years and with S1 they will be separated and divided especially in the 4th District.

Commissioner Harris responded by stating that if you compare the data from S1 to the Benchmark plan, the API community population only declines in the 1st District but increased in all of the other districts. One can make the argument that while communities of interest may be split, they are consolidated in new areas creating a new sphere of influence. Discussions related to ethnic communities of interest and voter empowerment are nothing new in United States history. The Voting Rights Act exists due to the centuries of discrimination against minority voters. Adherence to the Voting Rights Act must be a principal basis upon which to conduct redistricting, particularly in a county such as Los Angeles which has had a court finding that a segment of the population had been subject to intentional discrimination for the purpose of denying them the opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice.

Commissioner Acebo inquired about any litigation against the 2001 adopted plan.

Ms. Takade indicated that there was no litigation against the 2001 adopted plan.

Commissioner Acebo stated that during the presentation of S1 by the plan author, Commissioner Acebo inquired if a racial polarization analysis was done by Mr. Marqueece Harris-Dawson (Community Coalition, West Los Angeles CDC, Ward AME EDC District 5). In addition, Mr. Harris-Dawson indicated that one of the principles he used to draw S1 was to keep the core communities of South Central Los Angeles. However, Commissioner Acebo also stated that the Benchmark plan does not do anything to disenfranchise those core elements of South Central Los Angeles. Additionally, Commissioner Acebo reiterated there has been a significant amount of letters, comments and testimony about the major shifts that S1 suggests. Regardless of the plan, Commissioner Acebo does not believe there is any conscious effort to disenfranchise any group. Commissioner Acebo expressed his concerns about what are the Committee's constitutional requirements. In conclusion, Commissioner Acebo has yet to hear what the adverse effects are to groups with respects to their voting disenfranchisement and what has been said in the record.

Commissioner Martinez responded by indicating that the Latino population has grown significantly in the last ten years.

Commissioner Reyes respectfully disagreed with Commissioner Acebo's comment that the Committee was only obligated to consider that which has been provided to the Committee by way of data or testimony. Commissioner Reyes was reminded of a similar discussion which took place during a California Citizens Redistricting Commission meeting between one of the commissioners and their legal counsel. The question was that some communities may not have had the opportunity to attend the meetings due to lack of political power or inability to take time off work, and should those communities' considerations be ignored or taken into consideration independently? Commissioner Reyes does not believe those communities concerns should be ignored. Although there was no litigation against the 2001 plan, there were several complaints and as Commissioner Martinez indicated, there have been significant changes in demographics since 2001.

In response to Commissioner Acebo's question, Commissioner Harris stated that he is unsure of any injury to the Voting Rights Act and people's ability to cast a vote. However, from a policy perspective, since Supervisor Ridley-Thomas has come into office, there has been an increase in vote by mail ballots due in large part to increased access to vote by mail applications. In regards to the equitable delivery of healthcare, that issue has been raised and addressed. The service planning areas that disproportionately serve Latinos and African Americans are finally getting an appropriate amount of resources. In addition, the local hiring for public works projects for residents who live within a five mile radius of the project has also been implemented.

Commissioner Hoffenblum noted that the Committee should decide what

plans to consider for recommendation today in order to allow enough time for possible revisions to be made at the next BRC meeting scheduled for July 13, 2011. In addition, this will allow time for members of the public to review the plans.

Mr. Zimmerman confirmed that in order for any additional staff reports or analysis to be done, decisions on what plans to consider for possible recommendation to the Board of Supervisors should be made today. In addition, minor adjustments can be made during Wednesday's meeting.

Commissioner Martinez inquired about the amount of time required to post the agenda for review by the public.

Ms. Takade indicated that any plans to be considered for possible recommendation on the July 13, 2011 meeting would have to be placed on the agenda today.

Commissioner Martinez also asked if a voting analysis would be done by the July 13, 2011 meeting.

Chair Pedersen indicated that a Voting Rights Act analysis would be done for the Board of Supervisors, but could not be done by the July 13, 2011 meeting.

Commissioner Martinez expressed her concern for not conducting a Voting Rights Act analysis prior to making a recommendation to the Board.

Ms. Takade added that adjustments by the Board of Supervisors could be made if it was discovered that there may be violations of the Voting Rights Act.

Chair Pedersen expressed his concern with the 3.5 million people that would be reassigned in S1. In addition, the Committee has heard from a number of constituents who have reiterated their desire not to change the boundaries.

Commissioner Hatanaka stated that he realizes that race cannot be the predominant factor when drawing a map. However, when comparing the A1 Benchmark to the A1 Benchmark with revisions, the A1 Benchmark with revisions does a better job of representing ethnic groups. In addition, if you look at the reasons why the 1st District was created and what it has done for Latino representation, you will see that in the next ten years the Latino population will be substantial in the 4th and 5th Districts.

Commissioner Martinez stated that Mr. Alan Clayton has made several public comments regarding packing and the maps seen today do nothing to address this issue.

Chair Pedersen responding by stating that Ms. Brill will analyze the recommended plan for packing, and if it is determined that packing exists, then adjustments will have to be made. However, Ms. Brill did review the current Benchmark and determined, based upon initial review, that it likely meets Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act requirements.

After discussion, the Committee confirmed the two plans being considered for possible recommendation subject to adjustments.

Commissioner Reyes requested R1 also be included as one of the plans considered for possible recommendation.

After discussion, Commissioner Reyes withdrew his request to include R1 as one of the plans to be considered for possible recommendation due to the fact that R1 is an incomplete plan, and a full staff report would not be available. Therefore, the First District appointees joined the 2nd District appointees in recommending S1 as their baseline plan.

Commissioner Acebo stated that Commissioner Martinez's concerns regarding the issue of packing should be taken into serious consideration when staff conducts their analysis.

Commissioner Martinez indicated that additional information will be brought forth for Ms. Brill's analysis.

Commissioner Hatanaka inquired about the possibility of getting a thumbnail review of the plans to be considered for possible recommendation to the Board of Supervisors prior to recommending a plan.

Ms. Brill stated that during the July 6, 2011 BRC meeting, her preliminary review of election data showed substantial crossover voting. In addition, there was no indication that suggested the only way to comply with the Voting Rights Act was to draw two majority Latino CVAP districts. In addition, there was some good evidence that suggested that the existing plans likely comply. Ms. Brill reiterated that that is not her formal opinion at this point that they do comply; that is why a motion was passed to conduct a more detailed analysis.

The thumbnail analysis on the propositions, general, and primary elections revealed successes and some losses for Latino candidates. While there appears to be the ability to draw two majority Latino CVAP districts, it is unlikely that this is required to ensure that Latino candidates of choice are not defeated.

Commissioner Reyes requested that Ms. Brill discuss her propositions analysis.

Ms. Brill stated that she reviewed all 50 propositions from 2006 through 2010. Her analysis revealed that 41 out of the 50 propositions that were favored by the 1st District were also favored by at least two other districts. Additionally, if a proposition involved a minority group, the courts may give special attention to that particular proposition. Ms. Brill also stated that the 1st District did not stand out from the other districts with respect to proposition voting.

Commissioner Escandon asked Ms. Brill to restate her comments on packing and cracking during the July 6, 2011 BRC meeting.

Ms. Brill clarified her earlier statements by indicating that she did not find the terms packing and cracking to be especially helpful because they often assume a conclusion. It is difficult to draw a conclusion as to ability to elect from simply looking at the numbers. You must look at it whether the minority group is usually defeated in the relevant district. Also, depending on what the crossover vote was, even without a 50 percent CVAP, you could still have a district in which Latino candidates of choice are not usually defeated.

Commissioner Acebo suggested using Mr. Ely's and staffs' expertise to provide some idea or other options that the Committee has not considered on the issue of packing and cracking.

Chair Pedersen stated that Ms. Brill has already indicated that based on her initial review of the plans, there does not appear to be any packing and cracking or that those plans violated Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

Commissioner Escandon indicated that the Committee should not shy away from using the terms packing and cracking.

Commissioner Reyes agrees with Commissioner Escandon that the Committee should not shy away from using the terms packing and cracking as those terms have often been used by the United States Supreme Court.

Commissioner Escandon suggested the Committee notate or include within the Guidelines for Reviewing Proposals that the Committee tried, to the best of their ability, to avoid packing and cracking to address any potential questions that may arise in litigation in the future.

Chair Pedersen stated that since the Committee had already voted on the Guidelines for Reviewing Proposals, it would not be re-visited.

Commissioner Harris asked Ms. Brill if a polarization analysis were to be conducted, how far back would she need to go.

Ms. Brill indicated the most recent data is more relevant and since there wasn't anything significant during her analysis from 2006-2010, she did not see the need to go back any further than 2006 for that preliminary analysis.

Commissioner Harris requested Ms. Brill to conduct an analysis on Proposition 54 from 2003. Proposition 54 was an effort to eliminate any sort of designation of race or ethnicity on government forms.

Commissioner Hoffenblum stated that the issue of cracking and packing is subjective; the Committee needs to use its own judgment.

Commissioner Escandon reiterated that it would be irresponsible of the Committee not to consider the issue of packing and cracking.

Chair Pedersen stated that the issues of packing and cracking will be considered.

On motion of Commissioner Acebo, seconded by Commissioner Martinez, the Committee directed staff to work in conjunction with Mr. Ely to review S1 as amended and A1 as amended in order to determine if there are any issues relating to packing and cracking or any other pertinent information to brought to the Committees attention.

Alan Clayton, as member of the public, addressed the Committee on the issue of polarized voting in Los Angeles County. Mr. Clayton referenced a court case against the Upper San Gabriel Valley Water District in which Mr. Ely drew the boundary lines for the Department of Justice.

A polarized voting study was conducted and the case was eventually settled. As a result, two Latino 50 percent majority districts were drawn. In addition, the terms packing and cracking have been used by the United States Supreme Court and the issue is putting an excessive number of a minority group in an area where you can draw two reasonably compact districts which meet the qualifications that the United States Supreme Court has laid down. The issue here is the Committee has five complete plans that have two reasonably compact districts with 50 percent or more Latino citizen voting age population. In addition, the plans do not lower the African American population.

Acebo's motion, seconded by Commissioner Martinez passed with the following vote:

Ayes: 10 - Chair Pedersen, Commissioner Reyes, Commissioner Martinez, Commissioner Escandon, Commissioner Harris, Commissioner Acebo, Commissioner Hatanaka, Commissioner Napolitano, Commissioner Hoffenblum and Commissioner Sun

Excused: 7 - Vice Chair Holoman, Commissioner Andrade, Commissioner Friedman, Commissioner Flores, Commissioner Hernandez, Commissioner Mejia and Commissioner Tse

III. FUTURE MEETINGS

9. Future dates for Boundary Review Committee meetings. (11-3282)

Mr. Zimmerman stated that there are two plans: A1 amendments submitted by Commissioner Hoffenblum and S1 amendments submitted by Commissioner Harris. Those reports will be posted on the website for review and reported on Wednesday, July 13, 2011.

Chair Pedersen reiterated this Wednesday will be the last meeting of the Boundary Review Committee.

Attachments: [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT_Calendar of Upcoming meetings](#)

IV. MISCELLANEOUS

Matters Not Posted

10. 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. (11-3283)

No action was taken by the Committee.

Additional Public Comment

11. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Committee on items of interest that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee. (11-3284)

Alan Clayton had a concern about population deviation. He asked the Committee to be flexible with deviation. He expressed his support of the African American Coalition map as the option to go forward, stating that it is a well thought out map that is very legal.

Adjournment

12. Adjournment for the meeting of July 11, 2011. (11-3285)

The meeting was adjourned at 5:44 p.m.