

doing things wrong

THOUGHTS FOR 12/8/2021

(Mendoza: Distributing Economic Assets was a big thing in the City of LA. [Headlines re USC] Distribution helps equalize power among board/council members because, for one thing, economic engines drive political donations, and for whatever reason, board/council members cede control of what goes on in districts to whoever got elected from there.)

The WG map makers have made maps that are very similar, too similar, to last decade's districts, esp. re D5.

The Western Connection thought had not set sail or left the station when Commissioner Kenney said it seemed so. But it does seem set to sink below the horizon. So, even though it's a great idea, and my map would have had about 80% of the SFV's population contained in one district, I haven't focused on the thought much in the past few days. (But I think it's still a good thought.)

We never set a policy that communities of interest are any less important for us to keep intact or avoid separating than are cities (whose borders often appear to be gerrymanders) or county-government defined unincorporated areas. Where cities sprawl, I think it would be more than acceptable for us to divide cities, especially gerrymander cities, to avoid dividing communities of interest or separating communities of interest from similar communities.

Inter-Gov orgs do not necessarily define communities of interest. Some may have arisen in part to lobby particular supervisors in response to historical supervisorial districting that we are here to avoid perpetuating. ~~School districts may be COIs, but some of them were probably created with exclusionary intent.~~

The "Tri-Cities" is a political fiction, possibly designed to fit old District 5 or run an airport. I think Pasadena no longer has an ownership or management state in BUR. The Airport is no longer the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena airport. It's not even officially Bob Hope airport anymore. It's now "Hollywood Burbank Airport," so maps should keep Burbank with Hollywood! The Media Business is extremely important in L.A. I'll say more about that in a bit.

But first: Geography. Burbank streets blend into Glendale. Then there is a huge gulf of wildland and sparsely populated area between Glendale and Pasadena, because Glendale (and Burbank) are in the San Fernando Valley while Pasadena is outside it.

Also: Giving special weight to elected officials' requests because they come from elected officials is not what independent redistricting is about. At all. Elected officials are often on "teams" you may not know about or Parties you do that are connected to Supervisors or people who are likely to be future candidates for Supervisor. I live in Burbank, and do not see where

the “Tri-Cities” designation is now useful or realistic to the point where it dictates an overriding need for all three cities to have the same Supervisor. Pasadena has the Rose Bowl and Parade. It’s “The Pasadena Tournament of Roses,” not the Tri-Cities tournament of Roses. After the parade, the floats go off for display near San Marino, not Glendale....

Much of Burbank, especially the part west of Interstate 5 is in the Media Business, and intimately connected to the neighboring media business areas in the Valley, especially Studio City and Sherman Oaks. Warner Brothers Animation is headquartered in Sherman Oaks. So I have to ask, “”have you not heard of Warner Burbank Studios? The Tonight Show, coming to you from “Beautiful Downtown Burbank?””

The media business is probably what most people worldwide think of when they think of Los Angeles, California.

Please stop thinking about detaching Burbank, a keystone of the Media Business, from the Valley’s main media area of which Burbank is clearly a part, and of which proud. And note that my map OP 093 connects this area to North Hollywood, much of Hollywood proper, and to West Hollywood. Many many of the Media Business’ creative people and studio executives live or work in those areas.

NOW SHARE SCREEN!!!

AnyhowTM and AnywayTM

Valley - 1.85 million, still no Supe.

Diverse, but Distinct. Just try to drive here. And if you do, look around and see the differences.

Not too much Westside with Valley. Eg No Santa Monica or Venice or Westwood

Turns out, according to Stuart Waldman's shapefile definition of the SFV, I am still the only commission member who lives in the Valley ... unless anyone wants to speak up now. Yes, I know some of you have lived here in the past, which gives you some "Valley Cred".

my update of OP 086, which features a Valley-focused district:

That district:

No too much of Westside

But now includes West Hollywood and nearby areas, in response to comments

Also consolidates Horse Country because of comments.

Glendale's Stub is districted together with neighboring communities-OK to divide Glendale here.

now to Proposed District 2:

Lots of Liberals in the northern part of Proposed District 2, whether they know it or not, and many of them are consciously environmentalists and opposed to discrimination. I know that area. I used to live there.

Please: any supervisor could give proper attention to wildlife and wetlands. Doesn't have to be the current incumbent in the existing district. I say this as someone who has volunteered for clean-ups there and knows and has offered advocacy support to Marcia Hanscom, the Ballona Wetlands advocate who we heard speak last night.

And as to Ms. Hanscom's concern that she may no longer be represented by the Supervisor she helped elect *starting next week:* That wouldn't be this commission's doing or intent, I think. The BOS may be trying to make it so, but I don't think the Board can legally do that.

District maps are drawn for future elections. Representation ordinarily flows through elections. When voters vote for 4 years of representation, they're generally entitled to it, except in case of resignation, disability, or death. That was the best argument against shortening the L.A. City Council's 4-year terms by just ½ year rather than lengthening them by 1-½ years, when the Council put aligning city and state-and-federal election schedules on the ballot some time ago.

An elected official should know that to stop representing any part of the district that ELECTED you before the term to which you were elected ends would mean shirking responsibilities.

from the socio-economic overlays now in our redistricting software, it looks like there would be much more population & CVEP in environmentally and economically disadvantaged parts of the District 2 proposed here than in the more well-off areas.

REPAIRING/RESTORING a Historic Community

Manhattan Beach, in particular, is known to have been connected with neighborhoods from which it was cut off due to government actions. (Bus Line termination, Eminent Domain) Yes, those were racist actions. And racism is pervasive in our society. (Still true, even though I think I was eight years old when my father told me it was the fundamental problem in American politics.) But we can perform this exercise in historic restoration without relying on the racial

nature of the injustice. A historic community was fractured, but not as badly as Humpty Dumpty. We can put it back together again.

Current facts on the ground matter less than the history in this case.

All of the above outweighs the need to keeping the "Beach Cities" together in one district.

In part because of comments, Manhattan Beach is the only one of the "Beach Cities" in the District 2 proposed here. Bruce's Beach is in Manhattan Beach, and history places it in community with long-disadvantaged neighborhoods to its northeast and east.

Pomona is SEPARATE, despite protestations. Separate valley. When I packed up after work in Diamond Bar and drove to Pomona, it sure felt like going to a distant land. One of the maps I looked at yesterday connects the bulk of a district to Pomona by an uninhabited land bridge less than 600 feet wide. The current map with Pomona in District 1 pretty much gerrymanders to get there. Pomona plus East LA is not a contiguous community of interest.

The map here has Carson in proposed District 2, as commenters prefer. It has the SELA partnership cities together in one district. proposed D4. Gateway Cities are together there. .

AnyhowTM and AnywayTM

In addition here, East Los Angeles is districted together with the places many commenters have urged it be with, including Montebello, Pico Rivera and Commerce.

The Cantonese and Mandarin Chinese food belt people know well is in that district too, and from what I've read and heard, even if China is not unified, the communities there get along well understand that as a numerical matter, they're not likely to get a district of their own. Other historic communities with continued Asian populations or business presence are mapped in that district too, FWIW. That includes The Koreatown Neighborhood Council area, Chinatown, and Little Tokyo.

Now regarding proposed District 5, note that all of the Angeles National Forest/San Gabriel Foothill communities are together there in that district, as are the County Fairplex-associated communities of La Verne or Pomona, as well as the East County colleges belt in Claremont and Pomona. Finally, Whittier, Rowland Heights and Walnut are connected too, as requested.

[All of what we're doing relates to a policy debate I think we all should be aware of, but need not and cannot settle here: To what extent should elected representatives have control over what

government does in the districts that elected them? (In the City of L.A., City Councilmembers generally appear to have granted each other near-total control.) What are the upsides or downsides of expecting representatives to fix problems in their own districts? Won't wealthier districts then be able to do more through targeted public-private partnerships, leaving poor-district representatives in the dust?]