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 8, 2011

3:00 PM

Present: Chair Pedersen, Vice Chair Holoman, Commissioner Ollague, Commissioner Choi, Commissioner Escandon, Commissioner Harris, Commissioner Friedman, Commissioner Acebo, Commissioner Hatanaka, Commissioner Napolitano, Commissioner Hernandez, Commissioner Hoffenblum and Commissioner Mejia

Excused: Commissioner Andrade, Commissioner Reyes, Commissioner Martinez, Commissioner Flores, Commissioner Hollister, Commissioner Sun and Commissioner Tse

I. ROLL CALL

1. Call to Order and Introduction by Chair Pedersen. (11-2687)

The meeting was called to order by Chair Pedersen at 3:13 p.m.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER

2. Approval of Minutes from the meeting of June 1, 2011. (11-2688)

On motion of Commissioner Hoffenblum, seconded by Commissioner Ollague, this item was approved.

Attachments: SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

III. REPORTS

3. Report on status of redistricting software, redistricting website activity, and "Open House" public assistance sessions. (11-2689)

Martin Zimmerman of the Chief Executive Office (CEO) reported that there were no new issues regarding the redistricting software. Plans have been successfully submitted. The software vendor reported there have been 717 unique individuals that have signed in and worked with the software.

Susan Herman, of the CEO reported that there have been 15,116 unique individual visits to the redistricting website. On average, users are visiting approximately eight and a half pages, with May 25, 2011 being the busiest day since the launch of the redistricting website. The most popular pages visited include; submitted plans, creating a plan, and the BRC members. A popup was placed on the redistricting website following the June 1, 2011 BRC meeting informing visitors to the website of the extended deadline for plan submission. The redistricting website has received some international visits from countries such as; Canada, United Kingdom, Mexico, Germany, Italy and Australia.

Commissioner Ollague inquired about any additional open house sessions.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that the open house sessions have all been completed.

4. Report on status of submitted plans. (11-2690)

Mr. Zimmerman reported a total of 12 viable plans have been submitted. Three of those plans are on the agenda today for presentation. The remaining plans will be addressed at future BRC meetings. Subsequent to the June 1, 2011 BRC meeting, plans have been submitted by; Christopher Kan, Leo Estrada (second plan), Keith Privett, Seyou Oh, Alan Clayton/ Diane Velasquez, and Alan Clayton/John Wong.

Chair Pedersen inquired if the plans submitted today are on the redistricting website.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that staff have not yet had an opportunity to post the latest three submitted plans to the redistricting website.

Commissioner Ollague inquired if the plan submitted by Mr. Clayton and Diane Velasquez was attributed to an organization?

Mr. Zimmerman responded that it did not appear that the plan submitted by Mr. Clayton was affiliated with any organization.

5. Consideration of additional redistricting data. (11-2691)

Mr. Zimmerman reported that this item is a standing item on the BRC agenda in case there are any additional proposals by the BRC members.

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

- Plan B1, submitted by Alan Chan
- Plan C1, submitted by John Purpura
- Plan D1, submitted by Yoav Shernock

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. (11-2692)

Chair Pedersen suggested there be a 10 minute allowance for each plan presentation by the author then allowing additional time for discussion and questions from the Committee.

Mr. Zimmerman stated since this was the first meeting where submitted plans are being reviewed, he wanted to suggest a procedure: every plan would have a basic presentation made by staff and major elements would be highlighted both verbally and on the screen (with reference to handouts). Next, the author would be allowed time to provide their presentation and to answer questions posed by the Committee. Plans would then be tabled for potential further consideration after all the plans have been presented. Staff will work interactively with the Committee to establish criteria and categories for plans to help identify those meriting further consideration at a future meeting. Summary presentations made by staff will be general, as all detailed information is available to the public on the website and in handouts.

Once criteria are established and the Committee is focused on a recommended plan, the Committee will have an opportunity to make changes to the plan and view resulting data during the meeting. Commissioner Ollague requested that staff look at access for Commissioners to the monitors within the Board Room for upcoming meetings.

After discussion, Mr. Zimmerman reported on B1, C1 and D1 submitted plans as follows:

Proposed Plan B1 by Alan Chan:

1. **Proposes reassignment of 430 redistricting units that make up 48 whole or partial communities (pages 7 and 8).**
2. **Total population deviation is 1.32 % (page 17).**
3. **The total number of people moved from one district to another is 1,454,997(page 5).**
4. **The summary chart on page 9 of the staff report reflects the population moved from and to each District.**
5. **Deferred and Advanced Voting – This is where people will either vote twice in a 4-year period or they will go without voting for a period of 6 years because of the District moved from or to. Countywide, 14.6 % of the constituents of LA County will be affected in terms of their voting ability to be advanced or deferred. Reports submitted by County Counsel and provided to the public go into greater detail by District.**
6. **Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) – The chart on page 30 of the staff report provides CVAP by District; examples noted were:**
   - **District 1 – Hispanic (43%), Non-Hispanic White (21%), Non-Hispanic African-American (4.6%), Asian (30.3%)**
   - **District 4 - Hispanic (36.3%), Non-Hispanic White (40.7%), Non-Hispanic African American (7.6%), Asian (13.4%)**

Commissioner Hoffenblum questioned how long it takes to develop these reports. Both Gerardo Ramirez and Mr. Zimmerman responded that on average it takes approximately two to five hours.

7. **This plan does not displace any Supervisor from his or her District. The Districts are contiguous and reasonably compact.**
8. **Major facilities moved – The staff report (page 44) reflects an exhaustive list of County facilities, both those that are not affected by the plan and those that would change districts. The County Counsel report (starting on page 3) lists only those facilities which would move. Highlights in this plan:**
   - **Arboretum – District 5 to 1**
   - **Alhambra Court House – District 5 to 1**
   - **Huntington Court House – District 1 to 2**
   - **Museum of Art – District 3 to 1**
   - **Amigo Park - District 1 to 4**

Commissioner Hoffenblum also questioned if the authors of the plan were properly notified of this meeting. Mr. Zimmerman stated all authors were notified via email.

Commissioner Ollague questioned how this plan, and the others to be addressed today, consider the Voting Rights Act, CVAP Data, Latino Citizen Data, Latino Voter Registration Data, and the Latino Population; also for the African-American population. Has there been any analysis on the above.

Nancy Takade, County Counsel stated specific analysis has not been performed during the preliminary review of all the plans.

Commissioner Hatanaka expressed his concern with this proposal, where 1.5 million people, 10% of the County population, would be relocated and have their voting timeframe affected.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that Deferred/Advanced Voting is something that the Committee may consider when developing the criteria for subsequent review.

Later in the meeting, Alan Chan, a resident of Arcadia and author of Plan B1, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from the Committee. He noted that he has seen a growth in the number of Asian Americans in his community and submitted a plan to provide an opportunity for Asian Americans to have a greater voice in government and to try to unify more of the San Gabriel Valley area. He stated that a plan was submitted to the State Redistricting Commission similar to the Asian Pacific Legal Center's plan which recommends keeping the San Gabriel Valley area, including the communities of Arcadia, Monterey Park, Alhambra, South Pasadena, Rowland Heights and Hacienda Heights together.

Commissioner Hoffenblum asked, under the Benchmark, what was the highest Asian American percentage of all five districts. Mr. Ramirez responded that the 1st District was highest at 18.2 (Page 23 – Benchmark Plan, Page 18 – B1), followed by the 4th District at 16.9, and the 5th District at 16.5.

Commissioner Ollague questioned David Ely, consultant to the Committee, if the State Redistricting was using the same CVAP numbers as that of the County.

Mr. Ely responded that the State uses a straight block allocation of the special tabulation from the 2000-05 ACS which reflects somewhere in the 5-year time period. The Citizenship rates were taken and applied to the total population numbers in the 2010 Census. Assuming there has been growth in the Hispanic population, the numbers would be higher.

Commissioner Ollague asked Mr. Chan how he addressed the Asian Pacific Islander community with regards to the South Bay Area. Mr. Chan responded that he did not focus on the South Bay area as he was not familiar with that part of the County. His focus was on the San Gabriel Valley area.

Proposed Plan C1 by John Purpura:

1. **Proposes reassignment of 1,079 redistricting units that make up 30 whole or partial communities (pages 9 and 10).**
2. **Total population deviation in the plan is 0.08 % (page 23).**
3. **The total number of people moved from one district to another is 3,723,924 (page 11).**
4. **The summary chart on page 11 of the staff report reflects the population moved from and to each district.**
5. **Deferred/Advanced Voting – countywide, 37.9 % of the residents of the County would have their ability to vote advanced or deferred. Reports submitted by County Counsel provide greater detail by District.**
6. **Citizens Voting Age Population (CVAP) – The chart on page 36 of the staff report provides CVAP District; examples include:**
   - **District 1 – Hispanic (42.7%), Non-Hispanic White (27%), Non-Hispanic African-American (3.4%), Asian (25.7%)**
   - **District 2 - Hispanic (47.4%), Non-Hispanic White (9.1%), Non-Hispanic African-American (34.7%), Asian (7.3%)**
   - **District 5 - Hispanic (30.2%), Non-Hispanic White (49.6%), Non-Hispanic African-American (8.0%), Asian (10.6%)**

Commissioner Ollague requested for the record, the Benchmark Plan percentage for Non-Hispanic African-American for the 2nd District. Mr. Zimmerman referred to Plan A1 "Report on Benchmark Redistricting Plan" (page 23), noting that the figure is 36.5%.

7. This plan does displace Supervisor Gloria Molina from the 1st District and places her residency to 3rd District. There would be two Supervisors within the 3rd District and none for 1st District. The districts are contiguous and reasonably compact.

Commissioner Ollague inquired as to the Hispanic CVAP population for the 3rd District in this plan. Mr. Zimmerman responded that it was with 18.4% (page 36).

8. Major facilities moved – The staff report (page 50) reflects an exhaustive list of County facilities, both those that are not affected by the plan and those that would change districts. The County Counsel report (page 5) lists only those facilities which would move. Highlights in this plan include:
   - Brackett Field Airport – District 5 to 1
   - Whiteman Airport – District 3 to 5
   - Arboretum – District 5 to 1
   - Hall of Justice – District 1 to 2
   - Civic Center – District 1 to 2
   - Marina del Rey – District 4 to 3

Mr. Purpura did not attend the meeting.

Commissioner Ollague stated the plan submitted by Mr. Purpura would impact the incumbency of the 1st District Supervisor and would reduce the African American CVAP percentage in the 2nd District.

Proposed Plan D1 by Yoav Shernock:

1. Proposes reassignment of 144 redistricting units that make up 23 whole or partial communities (pages 8 and 9).
2. Total Population Deviation in the plan is 0.07 % (page 16).
3. The total number of people moved from one district to another is 494,018 (page 9).
4. The summary chart on page 9 of the staff report reflects the population moved from and to each district (page 9).
5. Deferred/Advanced Voting – countywide, 4.3% of the residents of LA County would be affected in terms of their voting ability being advanced or deferred. Reports submitted by County Counsel provide greater detail by District.

6. Citizens Voting Age Population (CVAP) – The chart on page 29 of the staff report provides CVAP by District; examples include:
   - District 1 – Hispanic (56.9%), Non-Hispanic White (15.7%), Non-Hispanic African-American (3.6%), Asian (22.7%)
   - District 2 - Hispanic (33.3%), Non-Hispanic White (18.1%), Non-Hispanic African-American (35.8%), Asian (10.7%)
   - District 5 - Hispanic (24.6%), Non-Hispanic White (51.7%), Non-Hispanic African-American (7.0%), Asian (15.1%)
7. This plan does not displace any Supervisor from his or her District. The Districts are contiguous and reasonably compact.
8. Major facilities moved – The staff report (page 43) reflects an exhaustive list of County facilities, both those that are not affected and those that would change districts. The County Counsel report (page 3) lists only those facilities that would move. Highlights in this plan:
   - Department of Public Works Headquarters – District 5 to 1
   - Marina del Rey – District 4 to 3
   - Bob Hope Patriotic Hall – District 1 to 2

Mr. Shernock did not attend the meeting.

Commissioner Ollague stated the report shows the Latino CVAP in District 1 at 51% and African-American CVAP at 35.8% in the 2nd District, whereas the Benchmark shows 36.5% African-American in the 2nd District.

At the request of Commissioner Ollague, Mr. Zimmerman noted the political affiliation (Democratic and Republican) for the proposed districts for Plan D1 (Page 24) and Plan B1 vs. the Benchmark:

D1	Democratic (Benchmark)	Democratic (Plan)	Republican (Benchmark)	Republican (Plan)
District 1	57.5	54.9	16.9	18.5
District 2	66.3	66.3	11.5	11.5
District 3	52.9	52.6	19.7	19.9
District 4	45.0	46.3	29.9	29.1
District 5	40.4	40.0	34.2	34.7

B1	Democratic (Benchmark)	Democratic (Plan)	Republican (Benchmark)	Republican (Plan)
District 1	57.5	50.8	16.9	20.6
District 2	66.3	67.0	11.5	11.5
District 3	52.9	52.8	19.7	19.7
District 4	45.0	47.2	29.9	28.6
District 5	40.4	41.6	34.2	34.0

Commissioner Hoffenblum requested that staff make additional efforts to contact the submitters of proposed plans. Their input and clarification is greatly needed at the meetings.

Attachments: SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Plan B1
SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - County Counsel Plan Summary of B1
SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Plan C1
SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - County Counsel Plan Summary of C1
SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Plan D1
SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - County Counsel Plan Summary of D1
SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Plan A1 Benchmark Plan
SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - County Counsel Plan Summary of A1

IV. FUTURE MEETINGS

7. Future dates for Boundary Review Committee meetings. (11-2694)

Mr. Zimmerman reported that the most recently approved meeting schedule has the BRC meeting every Wednesday at 3 p.m. with its last scheduled meeting on July 13, 2011. Once all plans have been submitted as of 5 p.m., June 10, 2011, staff will have the necessary information to determine if additional meetings will be required. However, three additional meetings are tentatively scheduled for Monday June 20, 27 and July 11, if needed. Staff is currently working on the logistics for those additional meetings.

After discussion, the Committee determined the following:

- **Beginning June 15, 2011, the BRC meetings will begin at 2 p.m.**
- **Four plans will be presented at the June 15, 2011 meeting.**
- **Plan authors will be notified that there plan is under review and will also be informed that, due to time constraints, their plan may be continued to the following BRC meeting.**
- **The Committee will take up those plans whose authors are present first. In addition, special consideration may be given to those plan authors who traveled a great distance to present their plan.**
- **Plan authors will be asked to be prepared to answer the optional questions included in the plan submission form.**

Attachments: SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Revised Proposed Boundary Review

V. MISCELLANEOUS

Matters Not Posted

8. 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. (11-2695)

Commissioner Ollague inquired if there should be criteria for reviewing submitted plans, such as consideration of two Section 2 Latino CVAP districts along with an African American CVAP of more than 36.4 percent, and if so, when should the Committee begin to review the data..

Commissioner Acebo asked Ms. Takade whether there are statutory and case authorities describing different criteria to be considered when redistricting.

Ms. Takade confirmed there are such criteria that the Committee should consider, and the Committee should view these criteria in their entirety and not consider only one factor.

Public Comment

9. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Committee on items of interest that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee. (11-2696)

Ms. Lynne Ebenkamp, Fourth District constituent and resident of Rowland Heights stated that she is concerned about some of the plans submitted for redistricting, especially those which include moving Rowland Heights from the Fourth District. Ms. Ebenkamp stressed the need for continuity of representation from the Board of Supervisors. Currently, Rowland Heights is divided into two districts. Ms. Ebenkamp asked the Committee to combine all of Rowland Heights into the Fourth District. In addition, it would be wise to add Walnut, Hacienda Heights, and Diamond Bar to the Fourth District. All four are hillside communities with similar demographics, problems and needs. Supervisor Knabe has worked closely with our community for many years and he is familiar with our area. Ms. Ebenkamp urged the Committee to keep Rowland Heights intact, within the Fourth Distinct.

Mr. Ted Ebenkamp, Fourth District constituent and resident of Rowland Heights (who noted that he was incorrectly identified as John Eckman on the May 5, 2011 Community meeting summary notes) stated that only about 10 percent of Rowland Heights is First District and urges the Committee to consolidate that small portion with the remaining 90 percent of Rowland Heights which is in the Fourth District. Supervisor Knabe has worked closely with our community over the years on a number of issues important to our residents and is familiar with our problems and concerns. Also, please include Walnut, Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights, Diamond Bar, and the eastern portion of Industry bordering the Puente Groundwater Basin in the Fourth District. . It is a shallow aquifer which yields only a meager supply of very poor quality water that is unsuitable for indoor domestic use. These areas are thus 100 percent dependent upon water imported from either the Colorado River or the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta for indoor use. Grouping them together would bring all of the areas served by the Walnut Valley and Rowland Water District into one supervisorial distinct and this again would make sense from a land use planning standpoint.

Mr. Henry Woo, Fourth District constituent and resident of Rowland Heights stated that consolidating Rowland Heights into the Fourth District would result in the community having their concerns and requests responded to much more quickly. Mr. Woo stated that the Fourth District has responded to the communities' needs more quickly than the First District. Additionally, the divide of the community is apparent when crossing between areas of Rowland Heights that are in the First District compared to areas that are in the Fourth District. This divide is apparent when driving on Colima Road. Mr. Woo urges the Committee to consolidate Rowland Heights into the Fourth District and would oppose Rowland Heights moving to any other district.

Adjournment

10. Adjournment for the meeting of June 8, 2011. (11-2697)

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.