**Los Angeles County Citizens Redistricting Commission**
**Ad Hoc Working Group on Map B-1 (Now OP 64)**

## Ad Hoc Working Group Process

The Commissioners came prepared with completed worksheets of *specific* suggested changes and their reasoning. The Commissioners used a round-robin approach to be efficient and fair to all Commissioners' input, following this process:

1. Commissioner suggested a change to assigned draft map options (Option B-1 or Option F).
2. Thai V. Le made the changes to the assigned draft map option via redistricting mapping software.
3. All other attending Commissioners raised their hands to provide questions, comments, support, or opposition.
4. The Commissioner making suggested changes responded to questions and concerns, then made any adjusted recommendations to the original suggestion.
5. If there is a consensus, Thai V. Le proceeded to make changes to draft map options via redistricting mapping software.
6. Gayla Kraetsch Hartsough recorded changes made and the reasoning for the changes in a shared document.
7. If there is not a consensus, the Ad Hoc Working Group moved to the next Commissioner's suggestion.

Abbreviations used:
SD = Supervisorial District
NC = Neighborhood Council in the City of Los Angeles

## Concepts and Overall Observations Discussed

- Think about economic assets and environmental problems assigned to SDs (e.g., LAX, Puente Landfill, beaches)
- Rationale for LAX to be part of SD 2 for economic development
  - LAX commitment to local hiring of unrepresented communities to the east
  - Nearby Inglewood stadium
  - Add El Segundo to be part of SD 2 with LAX
- Keep cities and unincorporated areas together unless compelling reason to split them
- Map scorecard: Map B-1 superior to current SDs
- Overlay of COIs to check alignment with B-1; avoid COI splits in NELA, ELA, SELA, etc. in particular
- Maintains southern geography of Los Angeles County
- Map looks logical in terms of shapes (does not look "gerrymandered")
- Public testimonies supporting separation of SGV foothills, although others have asked for whole SGV
- Least number of splits for SFV
- Higher density of Latino populations, which will need to be justified
- Historic neighborhoods kept together
- Boundaries between SD 3 and SD 5 require discussions
- Boundaries between SD 5 and SD 1 require discussions around Pomona
- Number of NCs that are split appears low compared to other maps
- 2 majority minority districts that appear not to be contrived
- SD 5 has to dip into SGV, SFV, or both because of population; received more public support for splitting SGV along foothills
- Dislikes U-shape of SD 4
- Potential concerns of packing:
  - SD 2 has 95% communities of color (Stecher's new map tries to address that issue)
  - SD 1 has 90% communities of color
- Specific changes:
- Would include El Segundo with LAX and put both in SD 2

## Changes Made and Reasoning Behind the Changes

| # | Changes Made | Reasoning |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Put all of Glendale into SD 5 (it was split between SD 3 and SD 5) | Keep city whole |
| 2 | Keep Sylmar (SD 5), Lakeview Terrace (SD 5), Granada Hills South (SD 3) NCs in the same SD -- move to SD 3 | Keeps NCs together, based on public testimony on these communities |
| 3 | Keep Porter Ranch together in SD 5 | Porter Ranch was split; most was in SD 5 and some split in SD 3 |
| 4 | Keep Sun Valley together | Sun Valley is split between SD 3 and SD 5; most of the population is in the western part of Sun Valley closer to SD 3 |
| 5 | Pomona has a sizeable population -- tiny split of southeastern Pomona in SD 1; most are in SD 5 | Pomona should be kept whole. Foothill communities (Claremont, Bradbury) are very different from other part of SGV (La Puente); Pomona has Cal-Poly |
| 6 | Unsplit San Dimas in SD 5 and SD 1 -- should be in SD 5 | Keep cities and unincorporated areas whole as much as possible; San Dimas is a foothills community |
| 7 | Unsplit Charter Oaks in SD 5 and SD 1 -- should be in SD 5 | Keep cities and unincorporated areas whole as much as possible; Have its own school district so should be together |
| 8 | Unsplit Covina and unincorporated Covina; put all in SD 1 (a small portion was in SD 5) | Do not split up cities or unincorporated areas |
| 9 | Unsplit Atwater Village SD 3 and SD 1 | Move to SD 3 |

| # | Changes Made | Reasoning |
|---|---|---|
| 10 | Unsplit Baldwin Park; put in SD 1 | Do not split up cities or unincorporated areas |
| 11 | Unsplit El Monte (majority in SD 1); put in SD 1 | Do not split up cities or unincorporated areas |
| 12 | Unsplit Temple City put in SD 1 | Has large Asian population |
| 13 | Unsplit Northeast San Gabriel (majority in SD 5); should be with City of San Gabriel; combine with SD 1 | Try to keep unincorporated areas with neighboring cities of same names |
| 14 | Unsplit Elysia Valley and Elisia Park; move to SD 3 | Do not split up cities or unincorporated areas |
| 15 | Add Commerce and Bell Gardens to SELA COI (majority is in SD 2) | One of densest populated areas of LA County; strong COI public testimony to be part of SELA; much in common with other SELA communities in terms of culture |
| 16 | Unsplit westside Inglewood, Crenshaw, Hawthorne (mostly SD 4); put with SD 2 | Do not split up cities or unincorporated areas |
| 17 | Unsplit Ladera Heights and Baldwin Hills; currently in SD 2 and SD 4 | Move to SD 4 |
| 18 | Move Downey to SD 2? | Not finalized; agreed upon |
| 19 | Move Cerritos, Gateway cities, Norwalk to SD 4 | Done to balance population in SD 4 |

| # | Changes Made | Reasoning |
|---|---|---|
| 20 | Unsplit Harbor City and Harbor Gateway | Move to SD 2 where most of the population is; strip is part of LA City to connect with San Pedro and the Port of Los Angeles |
| 21 | Unsplit Melrose (SD 3 and SD 4); small piece in SD 4 | Move to SD 3 |
| 22 | Unsplit Hancock Park in SD 2 | Do not split up cities or unincorporated areas |
| 23 | Unsplit Miracle Mile (Split SD 3 and SD 4) | Move to SD 4 |
| 24 | Unsplit Carson (split SD 2 and SD 4) | Move to SD 4; balances population |
| 25 | Unsplit Cerritos and Artesia (split between SD 1 and SD 4) | Move to SD 1; Asian, Indian, and Portuguese populations; wealthier communities |
| 26 | Connect Paramount (54,000) with Lakewood in SD 4 | Share the same Sheriff's station and other municipal services |
| 27 | Connect Bellflower with SD 4 | Large bedroom community, similar to Downey, Bellflower, Lakewood; also share Sheriff services with neighboring communities |