



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

### **Ad Hoc Working Group Process**

The members of the Ad Hoc Working Group modifying Map B-1 (posted as OP 64) were:

- Co-Chair Daniel Mayeda
- Commissioner Hailes Soto
- Commissioner Jean Franklin
- Commissioner Mark Mendoza
- Commissioner Mary Kenney

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 all of Porter Ranch together in SD 5	Porter Ranch was split; most was in SD 5 and some split in SD 3
4	Keep all of Sun Valley together in SD 3	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; keep all of Pomona 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 all be in SD 5	Keep cities and unincorporated areas whole as much as possible; San Dimas is a foothills community

#	Changes Made	Reasoning
7	Unsplit Charter Oaks in SD 5 and SD 1 – all 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; put all in SD 3	Do not split up cities or unincorporated areas
10	Unsplit Baldwin Park; put all in SD 1	Do not split up cities or unincorporated areas
11	Unsplit El Monte (majority in SD 1); put all in SD 1	Do not split up cities or unincorporated areas
12	Unsplit Temple City in SD 1 and SD 5; put all in SD 1	Do not split up cities or unincorporated areas. Put Temple City with other nearby cities with large Asian populations (e.g., San Gabriel, Alhambra)
13	Unsplit Northeast San Gabriel unincorporated area, now mostly in SD 5 but partly in SD 1; should be with City of San Gabriel in SD 1	Try to keep unincorporated areas with neighboring cities of same names
14	Unsplit Elysian Valley and Elysian Park; move all to SD 3	Do not split up cities or unincorporated areas
15	Add Commerce and Bell Gardens to SD 2 to keep with rest of SELA COI (majority is already 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 history and culture

#	Changes Made	Reasoning
16	Unsplit westside Inglewood and Crenshaw; put all in SD 2	Do not split up cities or unincorporated areas
17	Unsplit Ladera Heights and Baldwin Hills; currently in both SD 2 and SD 4, but should move all to SD 2	Do not split up cities or unincorporated areas; those areas historically aligned with Inglewood, View Park, Windsor Hills, all in SD 2
18	Move Downey to SD 2?	Not finalized; still up for discussion
19	Move Cerritos, Gateway cities, Norwalk to SD 4	Done to balance population among the districts, increase population in SD 4
20	Unsplit Harbor Gateway in SD 2 and SD 4; move all to SD 2	Move to SD 2 where most of the population in that area 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 should be moved to SD 3	Do not split up cities or unincorporated areas
22	Unsplit Hancock Park; put all in SD 2	Do not split up cities or unincorporated areas
23	Unsplit Miracle Mile (Split SD 3 and SD 4); move all to SD 4	Do not split up cities or unincorporated areas
24	Unsplit Carson (split SD 2 and SD 4); move all to SD 4	There was conflicting public input on whether Carson belongs with the South Bay communities or more with the central/south LA communities. No consensus to move all of

#	Changes Made	Reasoning
		Carson into SD 2 so kept all of Carson in SD 4 to help balance the population among the districts
25	Unsplit Cerritos and Artesia (split between SD 1 and SD 4); move all to SD 1	Do not split up cities or unincorporated areas; large Asian, Indian, and Portuguese populations; wealthier communities
26	Connect Paramount (currently in SD 2, pop 54,000) with Lakewood in SD 4	Share the same Sheriff's station and other municipal services; balances population better between SD 2 and SD 4
27	Connect Bellflower (currently in SD 1) with SD 4	Large bedroom community, similar to Lakewood; also shares Sheriff services with neighboring communities