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The Honorable City Council
City of Los Angeles
c/o City Clerk
200 North Spring Street, Room 360
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Dear Honorable Council Members:
On behalf of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commisson, transmitted herewith please find the Commission's Final Report and Recommendations. The centerpiece of the Report is the Commission's Final Map Recommendation, or Recommended Plan, for new Council Districts in fulfillment of the Commission's charge under the City Charter.

The Report and Recommended Plan represent over five months of analysis and deliberation by the Commission. It is also the result of unprecedented public participation by thousands of Angelenos. Through the process of listeming to the hopes and concerns of communities and neighborhoods across the City, the Commission respectfully helieves that is has designed a Recommended Plan that provides fair and effective representation for all the people of the City, provides the opportunity for all voters to elect candidates of their choice, meets the requirements of federal and state law, and is fully compliant with the City Charter.

The Commissioners and staff are grateful for the opportunity to have served our City in this historic process. We express our appreciation to the people of Los Angeles for having the wisdom to create a mechanism that encourages public participation in the vital process of revising and recreating our Council Districts for the next decade.

Very Truly Yours,

> Executive Director

Cc: Honorable Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa
Honorable City Attorney Carmen Trutanich
Honorable City Controller Wendy Greuel
Gerry F. Miller, Chief Legislative Analyst
Members of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
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# REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS <br> OF THE LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION 

## I. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (hereinafter the "Commission") was created by the voters of the City of Los Angeles (the "City") through the adoption of the Los Angeles City Charter ("Charter ") in 1999. The purpose of the Commission, according to Charter Section 204, is to advise the Los Angeles City Council ("City Council" or "Council") on the drawing of new Council District boundaries. On February 22, 2012, the Commission culminated over five months of work by adopting a proposed redistricting plan for consideration by the City Council. This report, including the Commission's adopted map of new Council District boundaries, is submitted in fulfillment of the Commission's responsibilities under the Charter.

In conducting its work, the Commission held its meetings in public in compliance with the California Ralph M. Brown Act, also known as the Open Meeting Law (Cal. Gov. Code§ 54950 et seq.). During these meetings, the Commission adopted its work plan, reviewed the applicable criteria for redistricting, received legal briefings from the Office of the Los Angeles City Attorney on legal issues pertaining to redistricting, developed data to be used with specialized software, and received analyses from noted experts in the field of demographics and population trend analysis, among other tasks.

As part of its expansive public outreach effort, the Commission also held 22 public testimony hearings across the City to receive public comments concerning redistricting. More than 5,000 people attended the Commission meetings and hearings and more than 6,551 pieces of written and verbal testimony were received by the Commission's staff. The Commission's very public and open process, as explained in greater detail in Appendix $H$, included extensive and unprecedented community outreach and participation, and the review by the Commission and/or its staff of numerous redistricting plans, options, adjustments, and maps submitted by Commissioners, interested organizations and individuals.

As a result of this process, and after careful consideration of voluminous public testimony and established legal requirements, the Commission is recommending that the current Council District boundaries be modified as described in this Report. In so recommending, the Commission has expressly found that the Recommended Plan provides fair and effective representation for all the people of the City of Los Angeles, enhances the opportunity for all voters to elect candidates of their choice, meets all requirements of federal and state law, and is fully compliant with Charter Section 204.

Additionally, the Recommended Plan accomplishes the following:

- Neighborhood Councils are more unified: Of the City's 95 Neighborhood Councils, the number that are divided between Council districts is reduced from 53 to 29, while the number of Neighborhood Councils split between three Council districts is reduced from thirteen to only three. Whereas Encino, Palms, and Lake Balboa are each currently split between three Council districts, each is united within single districts under the Recommended Plan. Overall, a total of 24 Neighborhood Councils that are currently split across multiple districts are united within single districts.
- Preserves communities as established by the Los Angeles City Council: The Recommended Plan identifies and preserves whole the following communities as identified by the City of Los Angeles' community renaming policy, or grandfathered in from previous policies and actions of the City Council [See Appendix J]: Historic Filipinotown, Koreatown, Little Armenia, Little Bangladesh, Little Ethiopia, Little Tokyo, Rose Hill, Sherman Oaks, and Thai Town.
- The opportunities of all voters to elect candidates of their choice is maintained: The number of districts from which Latino communities have an equal opportunity to elect Latino candidates is maintained throughout the City with five majority Latino Citizen Voting Age Population districts and one coalition district. The voting strength of African-Americans has also been maintained in Council Districts 8, 9, and 10, with one majority Black Citizen Voting Age Population district and two coalition districts.
- Maintains an overall deviation of less than 5 percent: Based on the policy decision made by the Commission on February 15 to maintain a 5 percent overall deviation ( $+/-2.5$ percent) or lower across the City, the Recommended Plan, with an overall deviation of 4.96 percent, goes further than the current Council District boundaries enacted in 2002 which tolerated an overall deviation of 10 percent, a reduction of more that half in keeping with the one person, one vote principle.

Based on the Commission's conclusions, it now recommends that the Council take the following actions:

1. Approve and adopt this "Report and Recommendations of the Los Angeles

City Council Redistricting Commission" (the "Report"),
2. Adopt as the City's Decennial Redistricting Plan, the Commission's Recommended Plan discussed in this Report,
3. Adopt an ordinance, as approved by the City Attorney, which establishes Council District boundaries in accordance with this Report.

## II. THE CHARTER REQUIREMENTS AND THE FORMATION OF THE COMMISSION

## Charter Section 204

The Charter directs that every ten years the City Council, based on recommendations from a Commission, shall redraw Council District lines by an ordinance to be adopted no later than July 1. Charter Section 204 governing redistricting mandates that new Council districts "shall each contain, as nearly as practicable, equal portions of the total population of the City as shown by the Federal Census immediately preceding the formation of districts." (See Appendix A: Charter Section 204). As will be more fully described below, Section 204 sets forth certain other criteria, firmly based in established legal precepts, to be used in the process of redistricting. The Charter also requires that the Commission "seek public input throughout the redistricting process."

## The Commission's Formation

In October, 1999, the City Council adopted an ordinance, pursuant to Section 204, to create the Commission and establish March 1 as the deadline for the submission of the Commission's recommendation to the Council. In accordance with Section 204, the Commission was comprised of twenty-one (21) voting members appointed as follows: three by Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, two by Council President Eric Garcetti, and one each by City Attorney Carmen Trutanich, Controller Wendy Greuel, and the remaining 14 members of the City Council. (See Appendix B: "List of Commissioners by Appointing Authority.")

The first meeting of the Commission was held on September 9, 2011. At that meeting, the Commission received information regarding rules and procedures, including the Brown Act and Robert's Rules of Order, and reviewed various legal issues concerning redistricting. Public comment was invited at the initial meeting and during all subsequent Commission meetings. At the Commission's second meeting on September 27, Arturo Vargas was elected Chair, and at the following meeting on October 12, Jacquelyn "Jackie" Dupont-Walker and Rob Kadota were elected Vice Chairs. The Commission also established three Ad Hoc committees to work with staff on certain tasks necessary to the execution of the Commission's work plan: Outreach, Communities of Interest, and Data.

## The Commission's Staff

In accordance with the Charter, the Commission appointed an Executive Director and other staff to assist the Commission in the execution of its charge. At its November 9 meeting, the Commission selected a recognized redistricting expert, Andrew Westall, as Executive Director. Mr. Westall began his service on November 21. In the ensuing weeks, Mr. Westall hired Myriam Lopez as the Commission's Executive Assistant; Rani Woods as the Outreach Director; an Outreach Staff consisting of Lawrence Joe, Rashad Rucker-Trapp, Paulina Velasco, and Steven Wood; and Daniella Masterson as the Media Director. The Commission also hired Nicole Boyle as their Technical Director.

## III. THE COMMISSION'S WORK PLAN

## A Multi-Phased Approach

From the outset, as a methodological approach to conducting its work, the Commission and its staff contemplated a multi-phased process involving significant public participation. The first phase of the Commission's work would be aimed at fifteen public testimony hearings throughout the City of Los Angeles between December 2011 and January 2012. The second phase was for the Commission to tour the City of Los Angeles on January 14 in order to get a better understanding of where current Council Districts divided communities throughout the City, including: Downtown, Palms, Baldwin Hills, Leimert Park, Koreatown, Pacoima, Lake View Terrace, Sun Valley, North Hollywood, Studio City, Valley Village, Sherman Oaks, Encino, Lake Balboa, and Reseda. The third phase was to work in Ad Hoc Regional Line Drawing Committees to develop an initial Draft Map for public comment. During the third phase, a fourth phase was completed on January 18 in which the Commission solicited and received presentations from over 25 organizations and individuals who presented public map submissions. The result of these four phases of work was the Commission's adoption on January 25 of a Draft Map of proposed new Council Districts.

The fifth phase of the Commission's work began with the release of the Draft Map. During February, the Commission conducted seven regional public testimony hearings, averaging over 400 in attendance, to gain public reaction and identify opportunities to make improvements toward a final map. After the second round of public testimony hearings was completed, the sixth phase was begun with each Commissioner given an opportunity to make suggested adjustments to the Draft Map. On February 15, the Commission debated and approved possible adjustments, where 42 out of 80 suggested adjustments were approved. At the direction of the Commission, the Technical Director released an Adjusted Draft Map for public comment on February 17. The final phase of the process took place on February 22, where individual Commissioners proposed fourteen amendments to the Adjusted Draft Map, five of which were approved. At the end of the meeting, the Commission voted 16-5 on the Final Map Recommendation.

## Ad Hoc Committees Lay the Groundwork

The Commission decided to organize its early efforts around developing a baseline understanding of three foundational elements stemming directly from Charter Section 204: communities of interest, data/technical issues, and public participation. It therefore established three working Ad Hoc committees to examine issues related to these three substantive areas. The three Ad Hoc committees were the Outreach, Communities of Interest, and Data committees.

Working with the Commission's Ad Hoc Committee on Outreach, staff developed an extensive and ambitious outreach program that centered on holding 22 public testimony hearings expressly for the purpose of gaining community input on how new districts should be designed and constituted. The various elements and results of the Commission's unprecedented outreach program are more fully detailed in Appendix H . The Commission knew from the beginning that a crucial element of its work would be to
gain a comprehensive understanding of how Angelenos identify and define their communities, and how Neighborhood Councils, which came to fruition since the last redistricting, correlate to resident's understanding of communities. The Ad Hoc Committee on Communities of Interest reviewed numerous criteria and indicia of what constitutes a community and considered various types of geographic and socio-economic information that would be crucial in helping the Commission making its recommendations. The Ad Hoc Committee on Data took a similar approach regarding data elements that should be considered by the Commission and its staff in designing new Council Districts. The data elements described herein and relied on in designing the Recommended Plan are the direct result of the Ad Hoc Committees on Communities of Interest and Data work. The complete list of adopted data elements is attached as Appendix F.

## IV. REVIEW OF REDISTRICTING CRITERIA AND LEGAL ISSUES

## Introduction

As stated above, the Charter requires that new districts be as equal in population "as practicable." The Charter also specifies that all districts "shall be drawn in conformance with requirements of state and federal law and, to the extent feasible, shall keep neighborhoods and communities intact, utilize natural boundaries or street lines, and be geographically compact." The Charter-established criteria thus embrace the foundational elements of redistricting: population equality, legal compliance, physical compactness, contiguity, and a respect for communities of interest. From the outset of its work, the Commission has been keenly aware of the application of federal law, particularly the 14th Amendment, the Voting Rights Act (42 U.S.C. § 1971 et seq.) and related case law with regard to the manner in which City redistricting must be conducted.

The Commission considered all relevant provisions of law and carefully reviewed redistricting plans that were submitted in accordance with the public process outlined previously. This review resulted in a recommendation that the Council adopt the Commission's Final Map Recommendation which, in the Commission's determination, provides fair and effective representation for all the people of the City, enhances the opportunity for all voters to elect candidates of their choice, and otherwise meet all of the requirements of law. The following sections discuss some of the more relevant aspects of the legal issues surrounding the principles of population equality, the Voting Rights Act, and the proscription against the use of race as a predominant factor in redistricting. A more complete analysis of the legal issues pertaining to redistricting is attached as Appendix C : "Letter from the City Attorney to the Commission."

## Population Equality

The Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution requires that electoral districts afford their residents equality of representation the "one person, one vote" principle. However, in addition to weighting votes equally, equality of representation also means that each person in a given district (whether eligible to vote or not) must have the same opportunity to be represented by his or her elected official as each person in every other district. (See, Garza v. County of Los Angeles, 918 F.2d 763 (9th Cir. 1990) (total population - rather than voting age population, eligible voters, or registered voters- is an appropriate standard to measure equal representation)). This is achieved by providing that each district contains substantially the same number of people.

Decennial redistricting is required to equalize population. (Reynolds v. Sims, 377 U.S. at 569 (plan must achieve "substantial equality of population among the various districts")). Slight deviation is permissible provided, however, that it is necessary in order to achieve a rational state policy.

## Measuring Deviation

The most prevalent yardstick courts use to measure deviation is the total population deviation. The total population in the jurisdiction is divided by the number of
districts in order to identify the "ideal" population number for each district. Expressed as a percent, this number indexes the difference between the district with the most population and the district with the least population based on the ideal per-district population. To determine the total deviation, the absolute value of the highest positive deviation from the ideal and lowest negative deviation from the ideal are aggregated.

As an example, in the case of the City, the official Census population figure for the City is $3,792,621$, making the ideal population per Council District 252,841 (3,792,621 divided by 15). In the Recommended Plan, Council District 12 has a population of 259,073 (2.46\%) and Council District 14 has a population of 246,509 (-2.50\%), making the total population deviation for the City $4.96 \%$. As more fully-described below, this deviation in the proposed plan is within a range determined by courts to qualify as being constitutional. Furthermore, based on the policy decision made by the Commission on February 15 to maintain a 5 percent overall deviation ( $+/-2.5$ percent) or lower across the City, the Recommended Plan goes further than the current Council District boundaries enacted in 2002 which tolerated an overall deviation of 10 percent, a reduction of more than half in keeping with the one person, one vote principle.

## Different Deviation Standards for Congressional Redistricting and Their Application to Los Angeles City Redistricting

Article I, Section 2 of the United States Constitution requires that congressional representatives must be "apportioned among the several states ... according to their numbers." In the landmark decision of Wesberry v. Sanders 376 U.S. 1 (1964), the United States Supreme Court interpreted this to require that the population of each congressional district within a state must be "as nearly equal in population as practicable." By virtue of the Equal Protection Clause of the $14^{\text {th }}$ Amendment, the "one person, one vote" principle is extended to state legislative and municipal districts. The strict standard applied to the equalization of population in congressional redistricting contrasts with the more lenient equal population standard that has been applied to other state legislative plans, including municipal redistricting plans.

In local plans, the requirement of equal representation has been interpreted by courts to require only substantial equality of population. Traditionally, courts have upheld redistricting plans with a maximum population deviation of less than $10 \%$, considering such minor deviations insufficient to establish "a prima facie case of invidious discrimination under the Fourteenth Amendment." (Brown v. Thompson, 462 U.S. 835, 842 [quoting Gaffney v. Cummings, 412 U.S. 735, 745 (1973)].) More recently, however, the courts have clarified that plans with a population deviation under $10 \%$ do not enjoy a "safe harbor" from any and all constitutional challenges. (See Larios v. Cox, 300 F.Supp.2d 1320 (N.D. Ga. 2004), aff'd 504 U.S. 947 (2004) [affirming decision that state redistricting plan with deviation less than $10 \%$ violated equal population principle].)

Accordingly, while local districts need only be substantially equal in population, local redistricting plans should reflect a good faith effort to draw equipopulous districts with deviations from population equality supported by legitimate public policy rationales. (See Reynolds, supra, 377 U.S. at 579 ["So long as the divergences from a strict population are based on legitimate considerations incident to the effectuation of a rational state policy, some deviations from the equal-population principle are constitutionally permissible"];

Larios, supra, 300 F.Supp.2d at 1337-1338 [holding that population deviations must be supported by legitimate state interests].) Examples of legitimate public policy rationales that would justify minor population deviations include compliance with the Voting Rights Act and consideration of traditional redistricting criteria such as communities of interest, existing boundaries and geographic compactness.

## Voting Rights Act

The Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended (42 U.S.C. § 1971 et seq.) seeks to provide assurance that all persons have equal voting opportunities. Specifically, it prohibits states and their political subdivisions from denying or abridging citizens' right to vote "on account of race or color" (42 U.S.C §§ 1973a, 1973c) or membership in a "language minority group" (42 U.S.C. § $1973 \mathrm{~b}(\mathrm{f})(2)$ ). Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, as amended, is applicable to the City's redistricting process and provides as follows:
"(a) No voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State or political subdivision in a manner which results in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color, or in contravention of the guarantees set forth in section $1973 \mathrm{~b}(\mathrm{f})(2)$ of this title, as provided in subsection (b) of this section.
"(b) A violation of subsection (a) of this section is established if, based on the totality of the circumstances, it is shown that the political processes leading to nomination or election in the State or political subdivision are not equally open to participation by members of a class of less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice. The extent to which members of a protected class have been elected to office in the State or political subdivision is one circumstance which may be considered: Provided, That nothing in this section establishes a right to have members of a protected class elected in numbers equal to their proportion in the population." (42 U.S.C. § 1973.)

Thus, Section 2 prohibits any practice or procedure that, in the context of social and historical conditions, impairs the ability of a racial minority to elect candidates of choice on an equal basis with other voters. In interpreting Section 2, the United States Supreme Court has held that a plaintiff must satisfy three (3) preconditions before a court will undertake a detailed analysis of a challenged plan. (Thornburg v. Gingles, 478 U.S. 30 (1986)). A plaintiff must show that the minority group is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in a single-member district; that it is politically cohesive; and that, in the absence of special circumstances, bloc voting by the white majority usually defeats the minority's preferred candidate. (478 U.S at 50-51.)

If the preconditions are satisfied, a court will conduct a detailed and rigorous analysis of a challenged plan, factoring in the totality of the circumstances. (42 U.S. §1973(b); Thornburg v. Gingles, supra, 478 U.S. at 36-37.) This analysis looks to objective factors, including:

1. whether there is any history of official discrimination;
2. whether racially polarized voting exists;
3. whether voting practices exist that enhance opportunity for discrimination;
4. whether there is a denial of access to a candidate slating process;
5. whether members of a minority group bear lingering effects of discrimination in education, employment and health, which hinder effective participation;
6. whether political campaigns have been characterized by racial appeals;
7. the extent to which members of the protected class have been elected;
8. whether there is a significant lack of responsiveness by elected officials to the particularized needs of the group; and
9. whether the policy underlying the use of the voting qualification, standard, practice, or procedure is tenuous. (478 U.S. at 36-37.)

The Supreme Court has further explained how manipulation of district lines can dilute the voting strength of politically cohesive minority group members, whether by fragmenting the minority voters among several districts where a bloc-voting majority can routinely outvote them, or by packing them into one or a small number of districts to drawing, "cracking" or "packing," where its result, interacting with social and historical conditions, impairs the ability of a protected class to elect its candidate of choice on an equal basis with other voters. (See Johnson v. De Grandy, 512 U.S. 997, 1007 (1994)).

Cracking, fracturing, or fragmenting is defined as the dilution of the strength of minority voters by "dividing the minority group among various districts so that it is a majority in none[.]" (Voinovich v. Quilter, 507 U.S. 146, 153-154 (1993) [quoting Thornburg v. Gingles, supra, 478 U.S. at 46 n.11].) Packing is defined as the dilution of minority voters' strength by concentrating it "into districts where they constitute an excessive majority." (Voinovich, supra.)

Finally, it must be stressed that Section 2 does not require the creation of the maximum possible number of majority-minority districts. (Johnson v. DeGrandy, supra, 512 U.S. at 1017; 42 U.S.C. § 1973(b)). There exists no right to have members of a protected class elected in numbers equal to their proportion in the population. Rather, Section 2 prohibits adoption of a redistricting plan that, viewed in the totality of circumstances, would deny minority voters equal measure of political and electoral opportunity. (512 U.S. at 1013-1014.)

## Shaw v. Reno

Since 1990, the United States Supreme Court has clarified that the use of race as a predominant factor is prohibitive absent special circumstances. The Court held that a violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution may exist where a legislature's boundary drawing, though "race neutral on its face," nonetheless can be understood only as an effort to "separate voters into different districts on the basis of race," and where the separation lacks sufficient justification. (Shaw v. Reno, 509 U.S. 630, 649 (1993).) Other cases have built upon Shaw in demonstrating the Court's willingness to invalidate redistricting plans as race gerrymandering where race is shown to be a predominant factor, and where no compelling justification for doing so is offered.

## V. REVIEW OF THE COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDED PLAN

## The Recommended Plan Satisfies the Equal Population Principle as Embodied in the United States Constitution

The total population of the City, according to the 2010 Census, is 3,792,621. Divided among the 15 Council districts, the ideal population for each district becomes 252,841. In the Recommended Plan, Council District 12 has a population of 259,073 ( $+2.46 \%$ ) and Council District 14 has a population of 246,509 ( $-2.50 \%$ ), making the total population deviation for the City $4.96 \%$. Based on the policy decision made by the Commission on February 15 to maintain a 5 percent overall deviation ( $+/-2.5$ percent) or lower across the City, the Recommended Plan goes further than the current Council District boundaries enacted in 2002 which tolerated an overall deviation of 10 percent, a reduction of more than half in keeping with the one person, one vote principle. The Final Map Recommendation has made good faith efforts to draw equipopulous districts with slight deviations based on the public policy rationales of: keeping at least two-thirds of the Neighborhood Councils whole, including minimizing splits between Council Districts to the extent possible; maintaining and respect communities and neighborhoods that had been identified by the City of Los Angeles' community renaming policy, or grandfathered in from previous policies and actions of the City Council; and compliance with federal, state, and municipal law.

## Communities are More Intact and Unified

The Recommended Plan is an important improvement on the existing Council boundaries by significantly reducing the number of Los Angeles Neighborhood Councils that are divided between multiple Council districts. The Commission's adopted database identifies 95 currently certified Neighborhood Councils across the City. Of these 95 Neighborhood Councils, 53 are currently divided across multiple Council districts: 40 split between two districts, and 13 split between three districts. The Final Map Recommendation reduces the number of split Neighborhood Councils from 53 to 29. The number of Neighborhood Councils split between two districts is reduced from 40 to 26, and the number of Neighborhood Councils divided between three districts is reduced from thirteen to three. Three communities that are currently split among three districts Encino, Palms, and Lake Balboa -are completely united within single districts under the Recommended Plan.

Through its actions on February 15 and February 22, the Commission also made the de facto policy decision to maintain and respect communities and neighborhoods that had been identified by the City of Los Angeles' community renaming policy, or grandfathered in from previous policies and actions of the City Council: Historic Filipinotown, Koreatown, Little Armenia, Little Bangladesh, Little Ethiopia, Little Tokyo, Rose Hill, Sherman Oaks, and Thai Town. [see Appendix J]

## Neighborhood Councils Compels Respect for a New Community of Interest

The formation and certification of 95 Neighborhood Councils since the adoption of the Los Angeles City Charter in 1999 created a new opportunity and challenge for the

Commission. During the 2001-02 Commission's work, less than 30 Neighborhood Councils were formed and were not considered a Community of Interest at the time of recommending new Council District boundaries. In 2011-12, that notion has changed dramatically. Throughout the process, the Commission received presentations from the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment and held discussions regarding the certification process of Neighborhood Councils. It must be noted that Neighborhood Councils vary widely in population, geographic boundaries, and demographics. As a result, a "one size fits all" approach to evaluating their weight and defining communities of interest could not apply to the Commission's Recommended Plan.

During the first fifteen public testimony hearings, the Commission received numerous public comments asking for Neighborhood Councils to be kept whole while drawing Council Districts. During that time, members of the public also submitted public map submissions attempting to keep all Neighborhood Councils whole in a single plan without complete success and without consideration of other redistricting factors. While Neighborhood Councils are now an identifiable Community of Interest throughout the City, the Commission realized the impracticability of keeping every Neighborhood Council whole in the City. With that in mind, the Commission adopted a policy decision on February 15 to keep at least two-thirds of the Neighborhood Councils whole and to minimize splits between Council Districts to the extent possible.

Of these 95 Neighborhood Councils, 53 are currently divided across multiple Council districts: 40 split between two districts, and 13 split between three districts. The Final Map Recommendation reduces the number of split Neighborhood Councils from 53 to 29. The number of Neighborhood Councils split between two districts is reduced from 40 to 26, and the number of Neighborhood Councils divided between three districts is reduced from thirteen to three. Three communities that are currently split among three districts - Encino, Palms, and Lake Balboa - are completely united within single districts under the Recommended Plan.

## The Recommended Plan Respects the Voting Rights Act Without Resorting to the Use of Race as a Predominant Factor

The Recommended Plan respects the increasing diversity of the City in a manner that is legally compliant.

The number of districts from which Latino communities have an equal opportunity to elect Latino candidates is maintained throughout the City with the same five majority Latino Citizen Voting Age Population districts and one coalition district. Of the five districts with both a Latino Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) above 50\% and Latino registration above $35 \%$ (Districts 1, 6, 7, 9, and 14), all Districts, with the exception of District 9, see a slight reduction in both Latino CVAP and registration in order to accommodate the guiding policy decision of keeping at least two-thirds of the Neighborhood Councils whole, and minimizing the number of splits between Council Districts.

The CVAP and registration reductions for District 6 and District 7 reflect the opportunity to keep two areas of the City whole in a particular Council District, Lake Balboa in District 6 and the Foothill communities of Sunland, Tujunga, Shadow Hills, and

Lake View Terrace in District 7. While these reductions were a result of keeping Neighborhood Councils whole in this portion of the City, District 6 maintains a majority Latino citizen voting age population (52.2\%) and registration (50.1\%), while District 7 also maintains a majority Latino CVAP (54.4\%) and just under a majority registration (49.4\%). Thus, the Commission is confident that by respecting existing communities in the Northeast San Fernando Valley (e.g., Panorama City, Pacoima, Lake View Terrace, and the Foothill communities are unified in single districts), with a resulting reallocation of Latino voters and citizen voting-age residents between District 7, District 6, and District 2, the San Fernando Valley portion of the Recommended Plan successfully complies with the Voting Rights Act.

The Commission also strove to be mindful of the requirements of the Voting Rights Act with respect to Districts 1, 9, 13, and 14 in the south, east, and central parts of the City. Recommended Districts 1 and 14 continue to afford the Latino community an equal opportunity to elect candidates of their choice, as CVAP in each district remains above $50 \%$ and registration in each district remains above $50 \%$. By keeping Neighborhood Councils whole in District 9, with the exception of the landmarks of the Convention Center, Staples Center, L.A. Live, the University of Southern California ("USC"), and adjacent properties, in addition to using the natural boundary of the I-110 Freeway south of USC, the population in District 9 led to a slight increase in Latino citizen voting age residents (50.5\%) and registration (45.2\%).

Council District 13 is the fifth existing district in which the Latino community has an equal opportunity to elect a candidate of its choice. Both CVAP and registration are maintained in District 13 under the Recommended Plan, as CVAP slightly decreases from $37.5 \%$ to $33.6 \%$ and Latino registration slightly decreases from $40.4 \%$ to $36.2 \%$. The amazing cultural and ethnic diversity of District 13 presented a particular challenge to the Commission to balance the strictures of the Voting Rights Act with the interest in respecting the intactness of communities. The Commission is proud to recommend a plan that maintains both Latino VAP and registration in District 13 while keeping intact communities such as Little Armenia, Historic Filipinotown, and Thai Town and preserving the district's politically progressive character.

The voting strength of African-Americans has also been maintained in the same Districts, Council Districts 8, 9, and 10, with one majority Black Citizen Voting Age Population district and two coalition districts. Both African-American citizen voting age population and registration increase for Districts 9 and 10 under the Recommended Plan, while District 8 maintains majority African-American CVAP (59.2\%) and registration numbers ( $63.8 \%$ ).

It must be stressed that the Commission accomplished all of the foregoing without using race as a predominant factor in its process. The entirety of the record attendant to the Commission's process shows that various community-of-interest criteria and indicia were relied upon by the Commission in its deliberations. Among the raceneutral principles guiding the Commission's deliberations were the attempt to create districts that are compact and contiguous and that oblige the direction of the Charter to respect the intactness of communities and neighborhoods, and in particular Neighborhood Councils and communities identified through the City's legislative process, as much as possible. It should also be stressed that the Commission do not seek to
"create" majority-minority Council Districts, but instead chose to not radically alter the current configuration of Council Districts to reduce such districts or create different ones. In this respect, the Recommended Plan simply reflects the ongoing demographics changes in the City. By limiting the demographic element of race to testing possible district designs to ensure no dilution of minority voting strength, the Commission has successfully balanced the strictures of the Voting Rights Act, the Equal Protection Clause, and the City Charter.

## VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE CITY COUNCIL AND THE 2021-22 COMMISSION

## Additional Map Recommendations

- Split four Census Blocks (2010 TIGER/Line, vintage 2010): 2113102000; $2113201001 ; 2113202000$ and 211320200 to keep the businesses between Alexandria Avenue and New Hampshire Avenue on the north side of Third Street in the community known as Little Bangladesh whole in District 10
- Split four Census Blocks: 2168003000; 2168003001; 2168001000 and 2168002001 and move Census Block 2168002000 to keep the businesses between Pico Boulevard and Olympic Boulevard on the west side of Fairfax Avenue in the community known as Little Ethiopia whole in District 10
- Split sixteen Census Blocks: 1924202003; 1924202004; 1924202007; 2115001000; 2115001010; 1925101004; 1925101003; 2115002000; 2115002011; 2117031000;
- 2117031003; 2117041000; 2131001000; 2126202003; 2126202000 and 2126102000 to keep the businesses between Olympic Boulevard and Rosewood Avenue on the west and east sides of Western Avenue in the community known as Koreatown whole in District 10
- Split ten Census Blocks: 1862011003; 1834021002; 1834021001; 1834021000; 1834021005; 1834021007; 1834011001; 1834011000; 1834011004 and 1834011005 to keep the businesses between West Avenue 49 and Eagle Rock Boulevard on the north side of York Boulevard in the community known as Highland Park whole in District 1
- Split one Census Block: 9800201003 to keep the section of Verdugo Mountain Park within the Sun Valley Neighborhood Council whole in District 2


## Administrative Recommendations

- In the 2021-22 FY Budget, provide for the following personnel resolutions and authorities for Commission personnel under the City Clerk's office: Executive Director (1), Commission Executive Assistant (1), Outreach Director (1), Technical Director (1), Media Director (1), Outreach Specialists (4-6). Furthermore, pay for the above listed positions should be commiserate with similar City personnel classifications and/or reflective of adjustments in inflation between 2011 and 2021.
- Permanently amend Section 2.21 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code to ensure that the first meeting of the Commission takes place no later than August 31, and the deadline for the proposal to be forwarded to the City Council moved to April 15 , as opposed to the current deadline of March 1.
- The City Council should instruct the CLA to convene the first Commission meeting on a Saturday where time is scheduled for more interactive introductions among the
members.
- The City Council should designate the Council Chambers as the regular location for Commission meetings so Commissioners and residents of the City can plan for arrangements for attendance and parking.
- Once a budget is adopted by the Commission, there should be policies established so the procurement of office space, capital equipment, telephone service, internet service, and supplies can be acquired in a timely manner.
- Upgrade the technical capabilities of the John Ferraro Council Chambers and the Van Nuys City Hall Council Chambers to allow for direct plugin of a laptop to the Councilmember computer screens and Channel 35 live feed. This would allow for interactive mapping during the Commission meetings.
- Provide a policy waiver for basic meals for members of the Commission when the Commission meets in the late afternoon/evenings requiring Commissioners to arrive immediately after the workday.


## Recommendations for the 2021-22 Commission

- All staff should be in place to begin a robust outreach program by November 1, 2021
- Public Testimony hearings should not begin before January 1, 2022.
- Ensure that all comments, written testimony, COI statements, email, etc. are transmitted directly to the Commission versus requiring Commissioners to visit the Commission office to review the submitted testimony
- Don't waste time with regional work done in small, less than quorum groups. It is useless to draw maps for a piece of the City without seeing how it affects neighboring districts.
- Allow more time in preparation of the map. The rush heightened the tension and reduced time for cool deliberation.
- Make sure that an undercount study can be completed in time for inclusion in the Commission's deliberations.
- Allow two weeks for the staff to complete the Final Report and Recommendations after the vote on the Final Map Recommendation
- Adopt a set of binding Guidelines and Guiding Principles that prioritize the criteria to be used to develop an impartial and disinterested map
- Additional Outreach Recommendations Included in Appendix H


## VII. DISCUSSION OF MAJOR ISSUES CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION

## Koreatown

Perhaps the most vexing regional issue that the Commission dealt with had to do with the treatment of the Koreatown community and how its current fragmentation among three Council districts, and depending on the definition four districts, could be reduced. While several different boundaries defining Koreatown were reviewed by the Commission, including the Olympic Division LAPD boundaries and the Koreatown boundaries as identified by the L.A. Times L.A. Communities project, the two boundaries given the most emphasis and weight were the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council boundaries and the Koreatown boundaries as defined through the City of Los Angeles' community renaming policy.

The demographics of these two designations are different. Wilshire CenterKoreatown Neighborhood Council boundaries contain a population of 95,324 residents ( $52.4 \%$ Latino; $35.4 \%$ Asian), the largest Neighborhood Council in the City of Los Angeles by more than 10,000 people. Under the current Council District boundaries, the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council is split between three Council Districts, District 4 ( 35,087 or $36.8 \%$ ), District 10 ( 35,361 or $37.1 \%$ ), and District 13 ( 24,876 or 26.1\%).

Koreatown, as defined through the community renaming policy in 2010, has a smaller population of 53,155 residents ( $46.9 \%$ Latino; $40.0 \%$ Asian). The community renaming process for Koreatown, beginning in February 2009 and ending in August 2010, was the subject of much discussion and community input from the Korean-American, Latino, Bangladeshi, and Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council communities. Under the current Council District boundaries, the Koreatown community is split between two Council Districts, District 4 (24,463 or $46.0 \%$ ) and District 10 ( 28,692 or $54.0 \%$ ). An analysis of ethnic population densities places the majority of Korean-American residents mostly in the City's Koreatown community definition versus the broader Neighborhood Council definition.

Most of the public testimony in the pre-draft map public hearings asked for Koreatown (in generic terms), the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council, or the Olympic Division LAPD boundaries to be kept whole in one Council District. After the initial draft map was released, the testimony clearly focused around two issues; keeping the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council whole in District 13, as supported by the majority of public comment during this time (primarily supported by the KoreanAmerican community) or maintaining the initial draft map split of the Neighborhood Council at Third Street which included most of the Koreatown community boundaries as identified by the City of Los Angeles in District 10 (primarily supported by the Latino and Bangladeshi communities).

While Commissioners Kim and Ahn advocated that the Neighborhood Council boundaries should be kept whole in District 13, Commissioners Ellison and Dupont-Walker advocated that the Koreatown community boundaries be kept whole in Council District 10, where the plurality of the Neighborhood Council and Koreatown community population currently reside. As stated previously, the Commission adopted a policy decision on February 15 to keep at least two-thirds of the Neighborhood Councils whole and to
minimize splits between Council Districts to the extent possible. Through its actions on February 15 and February 22, the Commission also made the de facto policy decision to maintain and respect communities and neighborhoods that had been identified by the City of Los Angeles' community renaming policy, or grandfathered in from previous policies and actions of the City Council.

The final decision by the Commission was to keep the Koreatown community boundaries (as defined by the City community renaming process) whole in District 10, maintaining $70.1 \%(66,777)$ of the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council boundaries in District 10, while the remaining $29.9 \%(28,546)$ of the population within the Neighborhood Council boundaries would be maintained in District 13, reducing the number of splits in the Neighborhood Council. As the largest Neighborhood Council in the City of Los Angeles, members of the Commission may not have found it practical or feasible to maintain the entire Neighborhood Council boundaries under one Council District without creating major disruptions to other communities and Council Districts throughout the City. In conformance with Section 204(d) of the Los Angeles City Charter, this decision ensures that for the first time in over forty years, the Koreatown community as defined by the City will be kept whole in one Council District, even though the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council will not.

- Council District 4 - Robby O'Donnell 01/13/2012
- Splits the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council and Koreatown community boundaries between CD 4 and another District
- Citywide Map - Neighborhood Councils Intact - Barry Johnson 01/13/2012
- Keeps the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council whole in CD 13
- Council District 13 - Korean American Coalition 01/17/2012
- Splits the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council between CD 13 and another District; Keeps the Koreatown community boundaries whole in CD 13
- Council District 4 - Lorna Hennington 01/17/2012
- Splits the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council and Koreatown community boundaries between CD 4 and another District
- Council District 4 - Stephen Rebello 01/17/2012
- Splits the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council and Koreatown community boundaries between CD 4 and another District
- Citywide Map - Asian Pacific American Legal Center 01/17/2012
- Splits the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council between CD 13 and CD 14; Keeps the Koreatown community boundaries whole in CD 13
- Citywide Map (without CDs 8, 9, and 10) - Dr. Tom Williams 01/17/2012
- Keeps the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council whole in CD 13
- Council Districts 8, 9, and 10 - Historic South Central - NAACP 01/18/2012
- Splits the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council and Koreatown community boundaries between CD 10 and another District
- Council District 4 - Peter White 01/18/2012
- Splits the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council and Koreatown community boundaries between CD 4 and another District
- Council Districts 8, 9, 10, 14, and 15 - Coalition for Fairness in Redistricting 01/18/2012
- Splits the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council and Koreatown community boundaries between CD 10 and another District
- Council Districts 13, 4, and 1 - Atwater Village NC and Atwater Village Chamber of Commerce 01/18/2012
- Splits the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council and Koreatown community boundaries between CD 13 and another District
- Citywide Map - Log Cabin Los Angeles 01/18/2012
- Splits the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council between CD 1, 4, and 10; splits the Koreatown community boundaries between CD 4 and CD 10
- Citywide Map - MALDEF 01/19/2012
- Keeps the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council whole in CD 10
- Citywide Map - Grace Yoo 02/13/2012
- Keeps the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council whole in CD 13
- Asian CVAP 50\%+1 Council District- Grace Yoo 02/13/2012
- Splits the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council and Koreatown community boundaries between CD 13 and another District
- Citywide Map - Dr. Daniel Wiseman 02/13/2012
- Keeps the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council whole in CD 10


## South Los Angeles

Another area of major discussion by the Commission was the redrawing of Council District boundaries south of I-10 Freeway and west of the I-405 Freeway/City of Culver City/County of Los Angeles boundaries. This area of the City, currently represented by three African-American Councilmembers, received a lot of attention by the Commission due to many neighborhoods being split under the current Council District boundaries (e.g. Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw, Leimert Park, Crenshaw Manor, Vermont Square, VermontSlauson, Adams-Normandie, University Park, Vermont Vista, Broadway-Manchester, and Green Meadows). A lot of time and discussion was also given to the desire of the Councilmembers from District 8 and District 9 who advocated for their districts to stay exactly the same, or change as little as possible, a difficult task.

While the public testimony was mixed in this part of the City during the first round of Public Testimony hearings, with most supporting the status quo, the majority of support during the second round of regional hearings and after the release of the Adjusted Draft Map asked for Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw and Leimert Park to be kept whole in one Council District, either District 8 or District 10.

As stated previously, the Commission adopted a policy decision on February 15 to keep at least two-thirds of the Neighborhood Councils whole and to minimize splits between Council Districts to the extent possible. With this action, the Commission respected the boundaries of Neighborhood Councils when drawing Districts 8, 9, 10, and 15, minimizing Neighborhood Council boundary splits throughout the four Districts south of the I-10 Freeway, only splitting Empowerment Congress Southeast, Empowerment Congress North (USC landmark), Westchester-Playa Del Rey (I-405 Freeway), and Downtown Los Angeles (Convention Center/Staples Center/L.A. Live landmark). As part of the final decision of the Commission, the Final Map Recommendation keeps the Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw and Leimert Park communities whole, along with the Empowerment Congress West Area Neighborhood Development Council, in District 10 in conformance with this guiding policy and Section 204(d) of the Los Angeles City Charter. This decision ensures that for the first time in over forty years, the Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw and Leimert Park communities will be kept whole in one Council District. It also ensures that the communities of Crenshaw Manor, Vermont Square, and Vermont-Slauson are also

## kept whole within a particular Council District.

- Council District 10 - Brandie Gordon 01/13/2012
- Keeps the Empowerment Congress West Area Neighborhood Development Council and the Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw and Leimert Park communities whole in CD 10
- Citywide Map - Neighborhood Councils Intact - Barry Johnson 01/13/2012
- Keeps the Empowerment Congress West Area Neighborhood Development Council and the Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw and Leimert Park communities whole in CD 10
- Citywide Map - Asian Pacific American Legal Center 01/17/2012
- Splits the Empowerment Congress West Area Neighborhood Development Council and the Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw and Leimert Park communities between CD 8 and CD 10
- Council Districts 8, 9, and 10 - Historic South Central - NAACP 01/18/2012
- Splits the Empowerment Congress West Area Neighborhood Development Council and the Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw and Leimert Park communities between CD 8 and CD 10
- Council Districts 8, 9, 10, 14, and 15 - Coalition for Fairness in Redistricting 01/18/2012
- Splits the Empowerment Congress West Area Neighborhood Development Council and the Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw and Leimert Park communities between CD 8 and CD 10
- Citywide Map - Log Cabin Los Angeles 01/18/2012
- Splits the Empowerment Congress West Area Neighborhood Development Council and the Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw and Leimert Park communities between CD 8 and CD 10
- Council District 10 or Council District 8 - United Community Associations 01/18/2012
- Keeps the Empowerment Congress West Area Neighborhood Development Council and the Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw and Leimert Park communities whole in either CD 8 or CD 10
- Windsor Village in CD 10 or CD 4 - R.J. Strotz 01/18/2012
- Splits the Empowerment Congress West Area Neighborhood Development Council and the Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw and Leimert Park communities between CD 8 and CD 10
- South LA-Westchester District - Damien Goodmon 01/18/2012
- Removes the Empowerment Congress West Area Neighborhood Development Council and the Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw and Leimert Park communities wholly from CD 8
- Citywide Map - MALDEF 01/19/2012
- Splits the Empowerment Congress West Area Neighborhood Development Council and the Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw and Leimert Park communities between CD 8 and CD 10
- Council Districts 8, 9, 10, and 15 - South LA Redistricting Collaborative 01/19/2012
- Keeps the Empowerment Congress West Area Neighborhood Development Council and the Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw and Leimert Park communities whole in CD 10
- Citywide Map - Grace Yoo 02/13/2012
- Splits the Empowerment Congress West Area Neighborhood Development Council and the Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw and Leimert Park communities between CD 8 and CD 10
- Citywide Map - Dr. Daniel Wiseman 02/13/2012
- Keeps the Empowerment Congress West Area Neighborhood Development Council and the Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw and Leimert Park communities whole in CD 8


## Downtown Los Angeles

Another vexing regional issue for the Commission was the area of Downtown Los Angeles. Downtown Los Angeles has been split between District 1, District 9, and District 14 for twenty years, and during the 2001-02 Commission process, no decision could be made about how to fix the divided neighborhoods within Downtown Los Angeles.

One of the largest pressure points on the Commission was to equalize the population for Districts 1, 13, and 14, inevitably growing the size of each District south and west from the eastern boundary of the City of Los Angeles. These Districts needed to grow by 66,204 residents in order to achieve an ideal District population. With an average deviation of negative $8.7 \%$ among the three Districts, disruption of existing communities in 1,13 , and 14 needed to be minimized, while still meeting the goals of the Commission adopted policy decision to keep at least two-thirds of the Neighborhood Councils whole and to minimize splits between Council Districts to the extent possible. An additional consideration that was weighed heavily was how to absorb the shifts from Districts 1, 13, and 14 to Districts $4,8,9$, and 10 , while meeting these policy goals and ensuring compliance with applicable federal, state, and municipal law.

During the public testimony of the pre-draft map public hearings, testimony was once again mixed with residents of District 9 asking to keep the status quo, residents of District 14 asking to keep the District as part of Downtown or include more of the neighborhoods, and other residents of Downtown Los Angeles asking for particular neighborhoods to be kept whole (e.g. Skid Row, Artist District, etc.), for the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council to be kept whole in one Council District, or for the area bounded by the 101 State Highway on the north, the Los Angeles River on the east, the I-10 Freeway on the south, and I-110 Freeway on the west to be kept whole in one District.

In the initial Draft Map, the Commission placed most of area within the Downtown Los Angeles community whole in District 14, with exception of splitting the Fashion District and South Park between District 9 and District 14. In order to balance population for the reasons stated above, the South Central Neighborhood Council and the Central Alameda Neighborhood Council were also split between District 9 and District 14.

During the public testimony of the pre-final map public hearings, testimony was again similar to those described in the first round. At the February 15 meeting of the Commission, two adjustments were made to the Draft Map to remove the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council from District 1 and to use the southern boundary of the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council (Washington Boulevard) as the boundary between District 9 and District 14, with the exception of the of the Convention Center/Staples Center/L.A. Live landmarks in CD 9.

The final decision by the Commission, reflecting the above adjustments with the exception of keeping the Vista Hermosa Park/Ed Roybal Learning Center landmarks in CD 1, is in conformance with Section 204(d) of the Los Angeles City Charter and in keeping with the policy decision to keep at least two-thirds of the Neighborhood Councils whole and to minimize splits between Council Districts to the extent possible. This decision ensures that for the first time in twenty years, $98.2 \%$ of the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council, and all of the residents residing in between the three freeways and the Los Angeles River, will be kept whole in one Council District. This action also reunites the South Central Neighborhood Council and the Central Alameda Neighborhood Council and makes them whole in District 9.

- Citywide Map - Neighborhood Councils Intact - Barry Johnson 01/13/2012
- Keeps the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council whole in CD 9
- Citywide Map - Asian Pacific American Legal Center 01/17/2012
- Splits the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council between CD 9 and CD 14 and splits the Downtown Los Angeles community between CD 9 and CD 14
- Citywide Map (without CDs 8, 9, and 10) - Dr. Tom Williams 01/17/2012
- Splits the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council between CD 1 and CD 13, and keeps the Downtown Los Angeles community whole in CD 1
- Council Districts 8, 9, and 10 - Historic South Central - NAACP 01/18/2012
- Splits the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council and the Downtown Los Angeles community between CD 9 and another District
- Council Districts 8, 9, 10, 14, and 15 - Coalition for Fairness in Redistricting 01/18/2012
- Splits the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council between CD 9, CD 14 and another District, and splits the Downtown Los Angeles community between CD 9 and CD 14
- Council Districts 13, 4, and 1 - Atwater Village NC and Atwater Village Chamber of Commerce 01/18/2012
- Splits the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council between CD 1 and another District
- Citywide Map - Log Cabin Los Angeles 01/18/2012
- Splits the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council between CD 1, CD 9 and CD 14, and splits the Downtown Los Angeles community between CD 9 and CD 14 between CD 9 and CD 14
- Council District 14 - Laura Velkei 01/18/2012
- Splits the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council between CD 1, CD 9, CD 14 and keeps the Downtown Los Angeles community whole in CD 14
- Downtown Neighborhood - Jerry McCarthy 01/18/2012
- Splits the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council between CD 14 and another District and keeps the Downtown Los Angeles community whole in CD 14
- Council District 14 - Eastern Columbia and 9th and Hill Street Park 01/18/2012
- Splits the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council between CD 14 and another District and keeps the Downtown Los Angeles community whole in CD 14
- Citywide Map - MALDEF 01/19/2012
- Splits the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council between CD 14 and CD 1 and keeps the Downtown Los Angeles community whole in CD 14
- Council Districts 8, 9, 10, and 15 - South LA Redistricting Collaborative 01/19/2012
- Keeps the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council whole in CD 9
- Citywide Map - Grace Yoo 02/13/2012
- Splits the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council between CD 9 and CD 14 and splits the Downtown Los Angeles community between CD 9 and CD 14
- Asian CVAP 50\%+1 Council District- Grace Yoo 02/13/2012
- Splits the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council between Districts and splits the Downtown Los Angeles community between Districts
- Citywide Map - Dr. Daniel Wiseman 02/13/2012
- Keeps the Downtown Los Angeles Neighborhood Council whole in CD 1


## Westchester and the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX)

During the pre-draft map public hearings, the Westchester community was not vocal in their concerns with the redistricting process. Few members of the community participated in the process due to the fact that District 11, which currently encompasses all
of the Westchester-Playa Del Rey Neighborhood Council, in general uses the natural boundaries of Mulholland Drive to the north, the I-405 Freeway to the east, the City of El Segundo to the south, and the Pacific Ocean to the west. When the initial Draft Map was released on January 25, Westchester awoke.

Under the initial Draft Map, the Westchester community was split between District 11 and District 8 , with the bulk of the population located in District 8 west of Lincoln Boulevard and north of Westchester Parkway. Both the community of Westchester and the Councilmembers from District 8 and District 11 were vocal about the splitting of the community and removing the bulk of the residents from the District in which the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) was maintained, District 11. Over 700 people attended a pre-final map hearing on February 2 to express their anger and concerns over splitting the Westchester community and dividing the residents from the airport. Although the public testimony was virtually non-existent in the first round of hearings, the community was very vocal with regard to maintaining the natural boundaries of District 11 as had been the case since 2002 .

During the Commission meeting on February 15, the Commission made the policy decision to use the Natural Boundaries of District 11; Mulholland Drive, I-405 Freeway, City boundary, and the Pacific Ocean; and if necessary split the Mar Vista Community Council at the I-405 Freeway. With the release of the Adjusted Draft Map on February 17, the revised District 11 followed the policy decision of the Commission by keeping all of the Neighborhood Councils whole within the District, with the exception of splitting the Westchester-Playa Del Rey Neighborhood Council at the I-405 Freeway.

The final decision by the Commission, reflecting the above adjustment, is in conformance with Section 204(d) of the Los Angeles City Charter and in keeping with the policy decision to keep at least two-thirds of the Neighborhood Councils whole and to minimize splits between Council Districts to the extent possible.

[^0]- $\quad$ Citywide Map - Grace Yoo 02/13/2012
- Splits the Westchester-Playa Del Rey Neighborhood Council between CD 11 and CD 8 at the I-405 Freeway
- $\quad$ Citywide Map - Dr. Daniel Wiseman 02/13/2012
- Splits the Westchester-Playa Del Rey Neighborhood Council between CD 11 and CD 8 at La Cienega Boulevard.


## The Foothill communities of the Northeast San Fernando Valley

A final difficult regional issue of the Commission was where to place the Foothill communities of Sunland, Tujunga, Shadow Hills, and Lake View Terrace. Under the current Council District boundaries, this region of the City had been in District 2 for the last ten years as a result of the creation of District 6 in 2002, in order to meet the requirements of the federal Voting Rights Act due to a historical pattern of racially polarized voting in the previous ten years.

During the pre-draft map public hearings, residents of the Foothill communities expressed their desire to remain whole in District 2 or District 7, and wanted to include the entire community of Lake View Terrace which had been split under the current boundaries. When the initial Draft Map was released on January 25, the Commission split the Foothill communities along the I-210 Freeway in order to keep Lake View Terrace, Sunland and Tujunga whole in District 7, as well as keep Shadow Hills and Sun Valley whole in District 6. This split along the natural boundary of the I-210 Freeway was unacceptable to most of the residents within the Foothill communities, and mistakenly did not recognize the split to Lake View Terrace.

As a result, the public testimony during the pre-final map public hearings centered around keeping all four of these communities whole within one Council District. Most of the testimony did not state a preference as to which District, just that the community be kept intact due to rural nature of this part of the City, truly an anomaly within the urban and suburban expanses of the City of Los Angeles.

With adjustments to be made at the February 15 Commission meeting, five Commissioners proposed adjustments to make the Foothill communities whole in District 7, the most out of any area in the City. The final decision by the Commission, reflecting the above adjustment, is in conformance with Section 204(d) of the Los Angeles City Charter and in keeping with the policy decision to keep at least two-thirds of the Neighborhood Councils whole and to minimize splits between Council Districts to the extent possible. The current configuration of District 7 keeps the Foothill Trails Neighborhood Council and the Sunland-Tujunga Neighborhood Council whole and together within one Council District.

- Citywide Map - Neighborhood Councils Intact - Barry Johnson 01/13/2012
- Keeps the Foothill communities whole in CD 7
- Council Districts 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 12 - Valley Alliance of Neighborhood Councils 01/17/2012
- Keeps the Foothill communities whole in CD 6
- Citywide Map - Asian Pacific American Legal Center 01/17/2012
- Keeps the Foothill communities whole in CD 7
- Citywide Map (without CDs 8, 9, and 10) - Dr. Tom Williams 01/17/2012
- Keeps the Foothill communities whole in CD 2
- Council Districts 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 12 - Glenn Bailey 01/18/2012
- Keeps the Foothill communities whole in CD 2
- Council Districts 2, 4, 5, 11, and 13 - Los Angeles/Valley Pride 01/18/2012
- Keeps the Foothill communities whole in either CD 2 or CD 4
- Citywide Map - Log Cabin Los Angeles 01/18/2012
- Keeps the Foothill communities whole in CD 7
- Council District 2 - Sun Valley Neighborhood Council 01/18/2012
- Keeps the Foothill communities whole in CD 2
- Citywide Map - MALDEF 01/19/2012
- Splits the Foothill communities between CD 6 and CD 7
- Citywide Map - Grace Yoo 02/13/2012
- Keeps the Foothill communities whole in CD 7
- Citywide Map - Dr. Daniel Wiseman 02/13/2012
- Keeps the Foothill communities whole in CD 2


# Appendix A: Charter Section 204 and Administrative Code Sec. 2.21 

## Sec. 204. Election of City Council Members; Redistricting.

(a) Redistricting by Ordinance. Commencing in 2002, the Council shall by ordinance redraw district lines to be used for all elections of Council members, including their recall, and for filling any vacancy in the office of member of the Council, after the effective date of the redistricting ordinance. Districts so formed shall each contain, as nearly as practicable, equal portions of the total population of the City as shown by the Federal Census immediately preceding the formation of districts.
(b) Redistricting Commission. There shall be a Redistricting Commission to advise the Council on drawing of Council district lines. The Commission members shall be appointed in the following manner: one by each Council member except that the Council President shall appoint two members, three by the Mayor, one by the City Attorney, and one by the Controller. No City officer or employee shall be eligible to serve on the Commission. The Redistricting Commission shall appoint a director and other personnel, consistent with budgetary approval, which positions shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the Charter.
(c) Redistricting Process. The Redistricting Commission shall be appointed no later than the date by which the Census Bureau is to release decennial census data. A new Commission shall be appointed to advise the Council prior to each subsequent redistricting. The Commission shall begin the redistricting process at any time after the necessary data are obtained from the most recent Federal Census, but no later than January 1, 2002, and each subsequent tenth anniversary of that date. The Commission shall seek public input throughout the redistricting process. The Commission shall present its proposal for redistricting to the Council no later than a date prescribed by ordinance.

The Council shall adopt a redistricting ordinance no later than July 1, 2002, and each subsequent tenth anniversary of that date. Nothing in this section shall prohibit the Council from redistricting with greater frequency provided that districts so formed each contain, as nearly as practicable, equal portions of the total population of the City as shown by the Federal Census immediately preceding the formation of districts or based upon other population reports or estimates determined by the Council to be substantially reliable.
(d) Criteria for Redistricting. All districts shall be drawn in conformance with requirements of state and federal law and, to the extent feasible, shall keep neighborhoods and communities intact, utilize natural boundaries or street lines, and be geographically compact.
(e) Effect of Redistricting on Incumbents. No change in the boundary or location of any district by redistricting shall operate to abolish or terminate the term of office of any member of the Council prior to expiration of the term of office for which the member was elected.
(f) Annexation or Consolidation. Any territory annexed to or consolidated with the City shall, prior to or concurrently with completion of the proceedings therefor, be added to an adjacent district or districts by the Council by ordinance, which addition shall be effective upon completion of the annexation or consolidation proceedings notwithstanding any other provision of the Charter to the contrary.
(g) Terms. The terms of office for those members of the Council elected from oddnumbered districts shall commence during each fourth anniversary of the year 1997 and for the members elected from even-numbered districts shall commence during each fourth anniversary of the year 1999.

COUNCIL DISTRICTS

Sec. 2.21. Redistricting - Deadline for Presentation of Plans to Council (Charter §§ 204, 802).
(a) The Redistricting Commission established by Charter Section 204(b) and appointed for each decennial redistricting shall present its proposal to the City Council for redistricting the City Council on or before March 29, 2002, and, thereafter, every ten years after March 1, 2002.
(b) The Redistricting Commission established by Charter Section 802(b) and appointed for each decennial redistricting shall present its proposal to the City Council for redistricting the Board of Education on or before March 29, 2002, and, thereafter, every ten years after March 1, 2002.
(c) If the Council decides to consider redistricting the Council or the Board of Education districts, or both, sooner than the next decennial Census, it shall appoint a Redistricting Commission or Commissions for that purpose and shall adopt an ordinance establishing a date by which the relevant Redistricting Commission will be required to submit its redistricting proposal.

## SECTION HISTORY

Based on Charter, Sec. 6(2)(a).
Amended by: Ord. No. 154,252, Eff. 9-11-80; Title and Section, Ord. No. 158,965, Eff. 6-30-84;
Ord. No. 172,894, Eff. 12-13-99, Oper. 7-1-00; In Entirety, Ord. No. 174,456, Eff. 4-7-02.

# Appendix B: List of Commissioners by Appointing Official 

| Arturo Vargas CHAIR | Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa |
| :---: | :---: |
| Jacquelyn Dupont-Walker VICE CHAIR | Councilmember Eric Garcetti, District 13 |
| Rob Kadota VICE CHAIR | Councilmember Bill Rosendahl, District 11 |
| Robert Ahn | Councilmember Eric Garcetti, District 13 |
| Bobbie Jean Anderson | Councilmember Bernard C. Parks, District 8 |
| Jose Cornejo | Councilmember Tony Cardenas, District 6 |
| Julie Downey | City Attorney Carmen Trutanich |
| Christopher Ellison | Council President Herb J. Wesson, District 10 |
| David Ford | Councilmember Dennis Zine, District 3 |
| Jerry Gaines | Former Councilmember Janice Hahn, District 15 |
| Helen B. Kim | City Controller Wendy Greuel |
| Amber Martinez | Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa |
| Grover McKean | Councilmember Tom LaBonge, District 4 |
| Craig Miller | Councilmember Paul Krekorian, District 2 |
| David Roberti | Councilmember Paul Koretz, District 5 |
| David Roberts | Councilmember Jan Perry, District 9 |
| Ken Sampson | Councilmember Mitchell Englander, District 12 |
| Antonio Sanchez | Councilmember Jose Huizar, District 14 |
| Mona Soo Hoo | Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa |
| David Trujillo | Councilmember Ed P. Reyes, District 1 |
| Michael Trujillo | Councilmember Richard Alarcon, District 7 |

Appendix C: Letter from the City Attorney to the Commission dated February 27, 2012


CARMEN A. TRUTANICH
City Attorney
February 27, 2012

City Council Redistricting Commission
of the City of Los Angeles
Room 275, City Hall
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Dear Commissioners:
This memorandum discusses the legal criteria applicable to the work of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (the Commission) and expresses our views regarding the proposed City Council district map adopted as your Commission's recommendation to the City Council.

## City Charter

The Los Angeles City Charter requires the City Council to redraw the lines for the City's fifteen Council Districts at least once every ten years. The Charter creates the City Council Redistricting Commission to advise the Council on the redrawing of Council District lines. The Charter requires the Redistricting Commission to obtain public input, prepare a redistricting proposal and present it to the City Council. The Charter provides that the City Council has the ultimate authority to adopt a redistricting plan, and must do so by ordinance. (See City Charter § 204.)

The Charter requires that Council Districts "contain, as nearly as practicable, equal portions of the total population of the City." (Charter § 204(a).) The Charter also specifies that Council Districts "shall be drawn in conformance with requirements of state and federal law and, to the extent feasible, shall keep neighborhoods and communities intact, utilize natural boundaries or street lines, and be geographically compact." (Charter § 204(d).) The Charter thus frames several key legal criteria and standards applicable to redistricting: the Equal Population Principle; consideration of Traditional Redistricting Criteria such as communities of interest, existing boundaries and geographical compactness; and compliance with the federal Equal Protection
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Clause and Voting Rights Act. We discuss each of these foundational elements of redistricting below.

## Equal Population Principle

The Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution requires that electoral districts afford their residents equality of representation. This is embodied in the "one person, one vote" equal population principle. In keeping with this principle, the United States Supreme Court has held that redistricting plans for local legislative districts must achieve "substantial equality of population among the various districts." (Reynolds v. Sims, 377 U.S. 533, 579 (1964).) The City Charter similarly provides that Council districts must be drawn with equal populations "as nearly as practicable." (Charter § 204(a).) State law also is in accord. (See Cal. Elections Code § 21620 [requiring city council districts "to be as nearly equal in population as may be"].)

The Supreme Court has held that local redistricting plans satisfy the equal population principle so long as there is "substantial equality" of population across the districts. (Reynolds, supra, 377 U.S. at 579.) That is, exact population equality is not a constitutional requirement for city council districts. Traditionally, courts have upheld redistricting plans with a maximum population deviation of less than $10 \%$, considering such minor deviations insufficient to establish "a prima facie case of invidious discrimination under the Fourteenth Amendment." (Brown v. Thompson, 462 U.S. 835, 842 [quoting Gaffney v. Cummings, 412 U.S. 735, 745 (1973)].) More recently, however, the courts have clarified that plans with a population deviation under $10 \%$ do not enjoy a "safe harbor" from any and all constitutional challenges. (See Larios v. Cox, 300 F.Supp.2d 1320 (N.D. Ga. 2004), aff'd 504 U.S. 947 (2004) [affirming decision that state redistricting plan with deviation less than $10 \%$ violated equal population principle].)

Accordingly, while local districts need only be substantially equal in population, local redistricting plans should reflect a good faith effort to draw equipopulous districts with deviations from population equality supported by legitimate public policy rationales. (See Reynolds, supra, 377 U.S. at 579 ["So long as the divergences from a strict population are based on legitimate considerations incident to the effectuation of a rational state policy, some deviations from the equal-population principle are constitutionally permissible"]; Larios, supra, 300 F.Supp.2d at 1337-1338 [holding that population deviations must be supported by legitimate state interests].) Examples of legitimate public policy rationales that would justify minor population deviations include compliance with the Voting Rights Act and consideration of traditional redistricting criteria such as communities of interest, existing boundaries and geographic compactness (see below).

City Council Redistricting Commission
of the City of Los Angeles
Page 3

Courts will measure a redistricting plan's population deviation for purposes of complying with the equal population principle based on the total population of the City. Based on the 2010 census figures, the total population of the City is $3,792,621$, and therefore the ideal population of each Council District is 252,841. A court would then determine the percent deviation from the ideal population for each district, expressed as a positive percentage for districts with total population greater than the ideal and a negative percentage for districts with total population less than the ideal. The overall population deviation is determined based on the difference between the districts with the greatest positive and greatest negative percent deviations.

## Traditional Redistricting Criteria

Federal, state and city law have established several traditional redistricting criteria which should be considered by a redistricting body to the extent feasible when drawing district lines. (See City Charter § 204(d) [districts shall "to the extent feasible" keep "neighborhoods and communities intact, utilize natural boundaries or street lines, and be geographically compact"]; Cal. Elections Code § 21620 [city council "may give consideration to the following factors: (1) topography; (2) geography; (3) cohesiveness, contiguity, integrity, and compactness of territory; and (4) community of interest of the districts."].) The Supreme Court has held that focusing on traditional redistricting criteria is important to ensure that race is not the sole or predominant redistricting factor in violation of the Equal Protection Clause (Miller v. Johnson, supra, 515 U.S. at 916 [holding that race must not subordinate traditional redistricting principles "including but not limited to compactness, contiguity, and respect for political subdivisions or communities defined by actual shared interest"].)

Traditional redistricting criteria may be summarized as including, but not limited to, the following:

Contiguity - all parts of a district should connect
Compactness - districts should be geographically compact
Existing Boundaries - districting bodies should consider boundaries such as geographic, street and political boundaries
Communities of Interest - districts should preserve communities of people sharing common interests

Redistricting bodies must consider all of these factors to the extent feasible when drawing district lines.

The concept of preserving communities of interest involves drawing district lines in a manner that preserves communities that share common interests in a single district and/or minimizes their division to the extent feasible. Examples of common interests that may identify a community of interest include shared income levels, educational
backgrounds, housing patterns (e.g., urban, rural, suburban, industrial), cultural and language characteristics, ethnicity, religion, employment and economic patters including transportation and work opportunities, health and environmental conditions, crimerelated factors, schools and other common issues. (See Bush v. Vera, supra, 517 U.S. at 964; Miller, supra, 515 U.S. at 919-920.) The California Constitutional provision applicable to congressional and state legislative redistricting defines a "community of interest" as "a contiguous population which shares common social and economic interests that should be included within a single district for purposes of its effective and fair representation." (Cal. Const., Art. 21, § 2(d)(4).) Examples of shared common interests listed in the state constitutional provision include similar living standards, transportation facilities and work opportunities. (ld.)

## Federal Voting Rights Act

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (the VRA) seeks to provide assurance that all persons have equal voting opportunities. Section 2 of the VRA applies to the City's redistricting process and provides that no "standard, practice or procedure shall be imposed or applied ... in a manner which results in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color" or language minority status. (42 U.S.C. §§ 1973(a), 1973b(f)(2).) Redistricting plans must be analyzed under Section 2 to ensure that minority voters are not deprived of an equal opportunity to elect representatives of their choice in violation of the VRA. ${ }^{1}$ A violation of Section 2 is established if "based on the totality of circumstances, it is shown that the political processes leading to nomination or election ... are not equally open to participation by members of a class of citizens protected by [the VRA] in that its members have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice." (42 U.S.C. § 1973(b).)

The VRA protects against vote dilution of covered minority constituencies. Vote dilution can occur when a redistricting plan minimizes or cancels the power of minority groups to elect representatives of their choice. Examples of vote dilution include "fracturing" and "packing." "Fracturing" can occur when a minority group is large enough to form the majority in a single, compact district but the redistricting plan disperses the minority group's voters into several different districts such that it is not a majority in any district. (See Voinovich v. Quilter, 507 U.S. 146, 153 (1993).) "Packing" can occur when a redistricting plan concentrates minority voters into a single or small number of districts thereby minimizing their influence in other districts. (See Voinovich, supra, 507 U.S. at 153.)

In Thomburg v. Gingles, 478 U.S. 30 (1986), the Supreme Court established a multi-part test to determine whether a redistricting plan violates Section 2 of the VRA.
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The first part of the test requires a plaintiff to satisfy three preconditions, known as the "Gingles preconditions:"

1. The minority group must be sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in a single-member district
2. The minority group must be politically cohesive
3. The majority votes sufficiently as a bloc to enable it usually to defeat the minority's preferred candidate
(Gingles, supra, 478 U.S. at 50-51; Growe v. Emison, 507 U.S. 25, 37-42 [applying Gingles test to single-member districts].)

With regard to the first Gingles precondition, the courts have held that a minority group is sufficiently large only if its citizen voting age population ("CVAP") in the proposed district is greater than 50 percent. (Romero v. City of Pomona, 883 F.2d 1418, 1426 (9th Cir. 1989) [holding that CVAP, rather than total population, is the appropriate measure of population under the Gingles test]; see also LULAC v. Perry, 548 U.S. 399,429 [observing that citizen voting age population "fits the language of $\S 2$ because only eligible voters affect a group's opportunity to elect candidates"].) Although the Supreme Court has held that a minority group cannot establish Section 2 liability if it is large enough to influence elections but not large enough to form a majority of a district (Bartlett v. Strickland, 129 S.Ct. 1231, 1246 (2009)), the Court also has stated that redistricting bodies are not prohibited from drawing such districts provided that race is not the predominant factor. (/d. at 1248.)

The second Gingles precondition requires evidence that "a significant number of minority group members usually vote for the same candidates" or otherwise share common political preferences. (Gingles, supra, 478 U.S. at 56.) The third Gingles precondition requires evidence showing that majority voters vote sufficiently as a bloc usually to defeat the minority group's preferred candidate. (Gingles, supra, 478 U.S. at 53-74.) Both of these factors require an examination of past election data and other evidence to show political cohesiveness and racially polarized voting in the area.

If all three Gingles preconditions are satisfied, a court will then move to the second part of the Gingles test to examine the totality of the circumstances to determine whether minority voters have been denied an equal opportunity to elect representatives of their choice. This analysis looks to objective factors, including the following:

1. The extent of any history of official discrimination that affected the right of minority group members to register, vote or otherwise participate in the democratic process;
2. The extent to which voting in elections is racially polarized;
3. The extent to which the jurisdiction has used voting practices or procedures that may enhance the opportunity for discrimination;
4. Whether minority group members have been denied access to candidate slating processes;
5. The extent to which minority group members bear the effects of discrimination in areas such as education, employment and health, which hinder their ability to participate effectively in the political process;
6. Whether political campaigns have been characterized by racial appeals;
7. The extent to which minority group members have been elected to public office;
8. Whether there is a significant lack of responsiveness on the part of elected officials to the particularized needs of the minority group; and
9. Whether the policy underlying the use of the voting qualification, standard, practice or procedure is tenuous.
(See Gingles, supra, 478 U.S. at $36-37$.) Also relevant as part of the totality of circumstances portion of the analysis is the proportionality between the minority group's population in the jurisdiction and the number of districts in which the group forms an effective majority. (See Johnson v. DeGrandy, 512 U.S. 997, 1000 (1994).)

Notably, Section 2 of the VRA does not require the creation of the maximum possible number of majority-minority districts. (See Johnson v. DeGrandy, supra, 512 U.S. at 1017 [there is no requirement that members of a protected class be elected in numbers equal to their proportion of the population].) Rather, Section 2 prohibits adoption of a redistricting plan that, viewed in the totality of circumstances, would deny minority voters equal measure of political and electoral opportunity. (Id. at 1013-1014.)

## Equal Protection Clause and Consideration of Race

The Supreme Court has held that the Equal Protection Clause generally prohibits the use of race as the sole or predominant factor in drawing district lines. (See Millerv. Johnson, 515 U.S. 900,920 (1995); Shaw v. Reno, 509 U.S. 630 (1993).) If race is determined to be the sole or predominant factor in redistricting, the courts will apply "strict scrutiny" and invalidate the plan unless it is narrowly tailored to serve a compelling governmental interest.

The Supreme Court also has held, however, that the Equal Protection Clause does not prohibit all consideration of race in redistricting. The Court has acknowledged that redistricting bodies "almost always [will] be aware of racial demographics." (Miller, supra, 515 U.S. at 916; see Shaw v. Reno, supra, 509 U.S. at 646 [redistricting body is "aware of race when it draws district lines, just as it is aware of age, economic status, religious and political persuasion, and a variety of other demographic factors."].) Accordingly, the Supreme Court has held that race may be a factor in redistricting, and that strict scrutiny will not apply unless race is the sole or predominant factor. (See Bush v. Vera, 517 U.S. 952, 958-959 (1996) ["[s]trict scrutiny does not apply merely because redistricting is performed with consciousness of race."].) Thus, while
redistricting bodies may consider race in a mix with other factors, it may not subordinate traditional redistricting principles to racial considerations. (See Miller, supra, 515 U.S. at 916.)

Courts have examined several different factors in determining whether race was the sole or predominant factor behind a redistricting plan. The shape of the districts is one such factor. (See Miller, supra, 515 U.S. at 913; see Shaw v. Reno, supra, 509 U.S. at 647 ["reapportionment is one area in which appearances do matter"].) Courts will also look to testimony and other evidence reflecting legislative motives. (See Miller, supra, 515 U.S. at 919; Bush, supra, 517 U.S. at 962 .) Courts will also deem relevant the extent to which a redistricting body based its plan on traditional, race-neutral criteria such as preserving communities of interest, observing existing boundaries and geographic compactness.

## Conclusion

We have reviewed the Commission's proposed map under the legal criteria described above. Our review is based on the information available to us, the justifications presented in the record of the Commission's proceedings as well as those that have been provided by the Commission in its report accompanying the proposed map. Based on these considerations, and in light of the inherent discretion the Commission has with regard to making policy recommendations pertaining to redistricting, we believe that the Commission's proposed map is legally defensible under the applicable redistricting law and criteria detailed above. Under applicable law, the analysis of any redistricting proposal is fact specific and, therefore, can be impacted by information not adduced at the time of its adoption. Of course, other options, including amended versions of the proposed map, also may be legally viable. We will be prepared to advise the City Council as it undertakes its review and deliberation of the Commission's proposed map.

Very truly yours,
CARMEN A. TRUTANICH, City Attorney


PEDRO B. ECHEVERRIA Chief Assistant City Attorney

## PBE:HUT:ac

cc: Gerry Miller, Chief Legislative Analyst

Appendix D: Recommended District Maps and Related Statistical Data



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 01 | LACCRC Final Map <br> District 01 | Current District 01 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 246,531 | 233,203 | 13,328 |
| Deviation | $-6,310$ | $-19,638$ | 13,328 |
| \%Deviation | $-2.5 \%$ | $-7.8 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ |
| Latino | 177,012 | 169,564 | 7,448 |
| \%Latino | $71.8 \%$ | $72.7 \%$ | $-0.9 \%$ |
| White | 19,949 | 14,565 | 5,384 |
| \%White | $8.1 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| Black | 6,406 | 6,998 | -592 |
| \%Black | $2.6 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $-0.4 \%$ |
| Asian | 40,975 | 40,088 | 887 |
| \%Asian | $16.6 \%$ | $17.2 \%$ | $-0.6 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 01 | LACCRC Final Map <br> District 01 | Current District 01 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total VAP | 184,395 | 174,481 | 9,914 |
| \% VAP | $74.8 \%$ | $74.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Latino VAP | 124,710 | 119,389 | 5,321 |
| \%Latino VAP | $67.6 \%$ | $68.4 \%$ | $-0.8 \%$ |
| White VAP | 17,766 | 13,124 | 4,642 |
| \%White VAP | $9.6 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| Black VAP | 5,197 | 5,737 | -540 |
| \%Black VAP | $2.8 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $-0.5 \%$ |
| Asian VAP | 35,127 | 34,745 | 382 |
| \%Asian VAP | $19.0 \%$ | $19.9 \%$ | $-0.9 \%$ |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population - 2006-2010

| District 01 | LACCRC Final Map <br> District 01 | Current District 01 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total CVAP | 101,997 | 91,082 | 10,915 |
| Latino CVAP | 53,237 | 48,568 | 4,669 |
| \% Latino CVAP | $52.2 \%$ | $53.3 \%$ | $-1.1 \%$ |
| White CVAP | 16,502 | 11,963 | 4,538 |
| \% White CVAP | $16.2 \%$ | $13.1 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ |
| Black CVAP | 4,975 | 5,526 | -551 |
| \% Black CVAP | $4.9 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $-1.2 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP | 26,235 | 24,110 | 2,125 |
| \% Asian CVAP | $25.7 \%$ | $26.5 \%$ | $-0.7 \%$ |


| District 01 | LACCRC Final Map District 01 | Current District 01 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Registration | 74,163 | 63,110 | 11,053 |
| Spanish Surname Registration | 40,138 | 35,831 | 4,307 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration | 54.1\% | 56.8\% | -2.7\% |
| African-American Registration | 4,495 | 4,857 | -362 |
| \%African-American Registration | 6.1\% | 7.7\% | -1.6\% |
| Asian Surname Registration | 10,168 | 8,987 | 1,181 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 13.7\% | 14.2\% | -0.5\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration | 709 | 428 | 281 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration | 1.0\% | 0.7\% | 0.3\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration | 94 | 55 | 39 |
| \%Armenian <br> Surname <br> Registration | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% |
| No Ethnic Registration | 18,788 | 12,746 | 6,042 |
| \%No Ethnic <br> Registration | 25.3\% | 20.2\% | 5.1\% |


| District 01 | LACCRC Final Map District 01 | Current District 01 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian Surname Registration | 10,168 | 8,987 | 1,181 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 13.7\% | 14.2\% | -0.5\% |
| Chinese <br> Surname <br> Registration | 3,810 | 3,383 | 427 |
| \%Chinese <br> Surname Registration | 5.1\% | 5.4\% | -0.2\% |
| Filipino Surname Registration | 1,773 | 1,130 | 643 |
| \%Filipino <br> Surname <br> Registration | 2.4\% | 1.8\% | 0.6\% |
| Indian Surname Registration | 174 | 172 | 2 |
| \%Indian <br> Surname Registration | 0.2\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Japanese <br> Surname <br> Registration | 357 | 218 | 139 |
| \%Japanese <br> Surname <br> Registration | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 0.1\% |
| Korean <br> Surname Registration | 2,639 | 2,795 | -156 |
| \%Korean Surname Registration | 3.6\% | 4.4\% | -0.9\% |
| Vietnamese <br> Surname <br> Registration | 1,415 | 1,289 | 126 |
| \%Vietnamese <br> Surname Registration | 1.9\% | 2.0\% | -0.1\% |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 02 | LACCRC Final Map <br> District 02 | Current District 02 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 257,291 | 265,357 | $-8,066$ |
| Deviation | 4,450 | 12,516 | $-8,066$ |
| \%Deviation | $1.8 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ | $-3.2 \%$ |
| Latino | 115,818 | 88,917 | 26,901 |
| \%Latino | $45.0 \%$ | $33.5 \%$ | $11.5 \%$ |
| White | 106,739 | 139,654 | $-32,915$ |
| \%White | $41.5 \%$ | $52.6 \%$ | $-11.1 \%$ |
| Black | 11,351 | 10,543 | 808 |
| \%Black | $4.4 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Asian | 19,679 | 22,303 | $-2,624$ |
| \%Asian | $7.6 \%$ | $8.4 \%$ | $-0.8 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 02 | LACCRC Final Map <br> District 02 | Current District 02 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total CVAP | 148,807 | 168,258 | $-19,451$ |
| Latino CVAP | 42,228 | 36,038 | 6,191 |
| \% Latino CVAP | $28.4 \%$ | $21.4 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ |
| White CVAP | 82,106 | 107,020 | $-24,914$ |
| \% White CVAP | $55.2 \%$ | $63.6 \%$ | $-8.4 \%$ |
| Black CVAP | 8,941 | 8,195 | 747 |
| \% Black CVAP | $6.0 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP | 13,322 | 14,595 | $-1,274$ |
| \% Asian CVAP | $9.0 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 02 | LACCRC Final Map <br> District 02 | Current District 02 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total VAP | 201,354 | 211,779 | $-10,425$ |
| \% VAP | $78.3 \%$ | $79.8 \%$ | $-1.5 \%$ |
| Latino VAP | 81,318 | 63,159 | 18,159 |
| \%Latino VAP | $40.4 \%$ | $29.8 \%$ | $10.6 \%$ |
| White VAP | 91,514 | 118,890 | $-27,376$ |
| \%White VAP | $45.4 \%$ | $56.1 \%$ | $-10.7 \%$ |
| Black VAP | 9,323 | 8,408 | 915 |
| \%Black VAP | $4.6 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| Asian VAP | 16,386 | 18,326 | $-1,940$ |
| \%Asian VAP | $8.1 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ | $-0.5 \%$ |


| District 02 | LACCRC Final Map District 02 | Current District 02 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Registration | 111,376 | 129,409 | -18,033 |
| Spanish Surname Registration | 28,357 | 24,223 | 4,134 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration | 25.5\% | 18.7\% | 6.7\% |
| African-American Registration | 6,911 | 6,464 | 447 |
| \%African-American Registration | 6.2\% | 5.0\% | 1.2\% |
| Asian Surname Registration | 4,882 | 5,650 | -768 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 4.4\% | 4.4\% | 0.0\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration | 6,518 | 7,698 | -1,180 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration | 5.9\% | 5.9\% | -0.1\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration | 6,580 | 9,230 | -2,650 |
| \%Armenian <br> Surname <br> Registration | 5.9\% | 7.1\% | -1.2\% |
| No Ethnic Registration | 70,697 | 92,580 | -21,883 |
| \%No Ethnic Registration | 63.5\% | 71.5\% | -8.1\% |


| District 02 | LACCRC Final Map District 02 | Current District 02 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian Surname Registration | 4,882 | 5,650 | -768 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 4.4\% | 4.4\% | 0.0\% |
| Chinese Surname Registration | 859 | 1,069 | -210 |
| \%Chinese Surname Registration | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | -0.1\% |
| Filipino Surname Registration | 1,776 | 1,768 | 8 |
| \%Filipino <br> Surname <br> Registration | 1.6\% | 1.4\% | 0.2\% |
| Indian Surname Registration | 617 | 692 | -75 |
| \%Indian Surname Registration | 0.6\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% |
| Japanese Surname Registration | 514 | 615 | -101 |
| \%Japanese <br> Surname <br> Registration | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% |
| Korean Surname Registration | 716 | 1,151 | -435 |
| \%Korean Surname Registration | 0.6\% | 0.9\% | -0.2\% |
| Vietnamese <br> Surname <br> Registration | 400 | 355 | 45 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Registration | 0.4\% | 0.3\% | 0.1\% |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 03 | LACCRC Final Map <br> District 03 | Current District 03 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 259,045 | 275,047 | $-16,002$ |
| Deviation | 6,204 | 22,206 | $-16,002$ |
| \%Deviation | $2.5 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $-6.3 \%$ |
| Latino | 96,755 | 93,336 | 3,419 |
| \%Latino | $37.4 \%$ | $33.9 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ |
| White | 111,978 | 128,786 | $-16,808$ |
| \%White | $43.2 \%$ | $46.8 \%$ | $-3.6 \%$ |
| Black | 11,966 | 11,728 | 238 |
| \%Black | $4.6 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Asian | 34,640 | 37,215 | $-2,575$ |
| \%Asian | $13.4 \%$ | $13.5 \%$ | $-0.2 \%$ |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 03 | LACCRC Final Map <br> District 03 | Current District 03 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total VAP | 199,798 | 212,827 | $-13,029$ |
| \% VAP | $77.1 \%$ | $77.4 \%$ | $-0.2 \%$ |
| Latino VAP | 66,594 | 64,590 | 2,004 |
| \%Latino VAP | $33.3 \%$ | $30.3 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ |
| White VAP | 94,272 | 107,465 | $-13,193$ |
| \%White VAP | $47.2 \%$ | $50.5 \%$ | $-3.3 \%$ |
| Black VAP | 8,842 | 8,617 | 225 |
| \%Black VAP | $4.4 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Asian VAP | 27,442 | 29,351 | $-1,909$ |
| \%Asian VAP | $13.7 \%$ | $13.8 \%$ | $-0.1 \%$ |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population - 2006-2010

| District 03 | LACCRC Final Map <br> District 03 | Current District 03 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total CVAP | 151,053 | 165,552 | $-14,499$ |
| Latino CVAP | 33,787 | 33,655 | 133 |
| \% Latino CVAP | $22.4 \%$ | $20.3 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ |
| White CVAP | 86,749 | 99,691 | $-12,942$ |
| \% White CVAP | $57.4 \%$ | $60.2 \%$ | $-2.8 \%$ |
| Black CVAP | 8,406 | 8,314 | 92 |
| \% Black CVAP | $5.6 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP | 20,302 | 21,914 | $-1,613$ |
| \% Asian CVAP | $13.4 \%$ | $13.2 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 03 | LACCRC Final Map District 03 | Current District 03 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Registration | 116,413 | 131,092 | -14,679 |
| Spanish Surname Registration | 22,179 | 22,923 | -744 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration | 19.1\% | 17.5\% | 1.6\% |
| African-American Registration | 6,635 | 6,624 | 11 |
| \%African-American Registration | 5.7\% | 5.1\% | 0.6\% |
| Asian Surname Registration | 8,296 | 9,320 | -1,024 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 7.1\% | 7.1\% | 0.0\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration | 9,315 | 11,109 | -1,794 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration | 8.0\% | 8.5\% | -0.5\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration | 2,512 | 2,828 | -316 |
| \%Armenian <br> Surname <br> Registration | 2.2\% | 2.2\% | 0.0\% |
| No Ethnic Registration | 77,676 | 90,568 | -12,892 |
| \%No Ethnic <br> Registration | 66.7\% | 69.1\% | -2.4\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 03 | LACCRC Final Map District 03 | Current District 03 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian Surname Registration | 8,296 | 9,320 | -1,024 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 7.1\% | 7.1\% | 0.0\% |
| Chinese <br> Surname Registration | 1,397 | 1,825 | -428 |
| \%Chinese Surname Registration | 1.2\% | 1.4\% | -0.2\% |
| Filipino Surname Registration | 2,004 | 2,141 | -137 |
| \%Filipino Surname Registration | 1.7\% | 1.6\% | 0.1\% |
| Indian Surname Registration | 1,715 | 1,814 | -99 |
| \%Indian Surname Registration | 1.5\% | 1.4\% | 0.1\% |
| Japanese <br> Surname <br> Registration | 584 | 694 | -110 |
| \%Japanese <br> Surname <br> Registration | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% |
| Korean Surname Registration | 753 | 931 | -178 |
| \%Korean <br> Surname <br> Registration | 0.6\% | 0.7\% | -0.1\% |
| Vietnamese <br> Surname <br> Registration | 1,843 | 1,915 | -72 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Registration | 1.6\% | 1.5\% | 0.1\% |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 04 | LACCRC Final <br> Map District 04 | Current <br> District 04 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 250,511 | 246,051 | 4,460 |
| Deviation | $-2,330$ | $-6,790$ | 4,460 |
| \%Deviation | $-0.9 \%$ | $-2.7 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| Latino | 37,771 | 59,602 | $-21,831$ |
| \%Latino | $15.1 \%$ | $24.2 \%$ | $-9.1 \%$ |
| White | 154,144 | 117,739 | 36,405 |
| \%White | $61.5 \%$ | $47.9 \%$ | $13.7 \%$ |
| Black | 13,291 | 13,761 | -470 |
| \%Black | $5.3 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $-0.3 \%$ |
| Asian | 41,388 | 50,976 | $-9,588$ |
| \%Asian | $16.5 \%$ | $20.7 \%$ | $-4.2 \%$ |


| District 04 | LACCRC Final Map <br> District 04 | Current <br> District 04 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total VAP | 214,386 | 211,121 | 3,265 |
| \% VAP | $85.6 \%$ | $85.8 \%$ | $-0.2 \%$ |
| Latino VAP | 29,731 | 45,651 | $-15,920$ |
| \%Latino VAP | $13.9 \%$ | $21.6 \%$ | $-7.8 \%$ |
| White VAP | 135,652 | 106,914 | 28,738 |
| \%White VAP | $63.3 \%$ | $50.6 \%$ | $12.6 \%$ |
| Black VAP | 11,280 | 12,018 | -738 |
| \%Black VAP | $5.3 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ | $-0.4 \%$ |
| Asian VAP | 34,571 | 43,219 | $-8,648$ |
| \%Asian VAP | $16.1 \%$ | $20.5 \%$ | $-4.3 \%$ |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population - 2006-2010

| District 04 | LACCRC Final <br> Map District 04 | Current <br> District 04 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total CVAP | 181,139 | 162,749 | 18,390 |
| Latino CVAP | 20,639 | 26,135 | $-5,495$ |
| \% Latino CVAP | $11.4 \%$ | $16.1 \%$ | $-4.7 \%$ |
| White CVAP | 123,882 | 96,800 | 27,082 |
| \% White CVAP | $68.4 \%$ | $59.5 \%$ | $8.9 \%$ |
| Black CVAP | 10,863 | 11,368 | -505 |
| \% Black CVAP | $6.0 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ | $-1.0 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP | 23,191 | 25,945 | $-2,754$ |
| \% Asian CVAP | $12.8 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ | $-3.1 \%$ |


| District 04 | LACCRC Final Map District 04 | Current District 04 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Registration | 148,474 | 126,187 | 22,287 |
| Spanish Surname Registration | 13,871 | 17,469 | -3,598 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration | 9.3\% | 13.8\% | -4.5\% |
| African-American Registration | 9,489 | 9,791 | -302 |
| \%African-American Registration | 6.4\% | 7.8\% | -1.4\% |
| Asian Surname Registration | 10,789 | 11,086 | -297 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 7.3\% | 8.8\% | -1.5\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration | 12,434 | 6,706 | 5,728 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration | 8.4\% | 5.3\% | 3.1\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration | 3,371 | 3,048 | 323 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration | 2.3\% | 2.4\% | -0.1\% |
| No Ethnic Registration | 113,456 | 87,171 | 26,285 |
| \%No Ethnic <br> Registration | 76.4\% | 69.1\% | 7.3\% |


| District 04 | LACCRC Final Map District 04 | Current <br> District 04 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian Surname Registration | 10,789 | 11,086 | -297 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 7.3\% | 8.8\% | -1.5\% |
| Chinese <br> Surname <br> Registration | 2,405 | 2,159 | 246 |
| \%Chinese <br> Surname Registration | 1.6\% | 1.7\% | -0.1\% |
| Filipino Surname Registration | 1,724 | 2,047 | -323 |
| \%Filipino <br> Surname Registration | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | -0.5\% |
| Indian Surname Registration | 934 | 932 | 2 |
| \%Indian <br> Surname Registration | 0.6\% | 0.7\% | -0.1\% |
| Japanese <br> Surname <br> Registration | 1,040 | 962 | 78 |
| \%Japanese <br> Surname <br> Registration | 0.7\% | 0.8\% | -0.1\% |
| Korean Surname Registration | 4,289 | 4,617 | -328 |
| \%Korean <br> Surname Registration | 2.9\% | 3.7\% | -0.8\% |
| Vietnamese <br> Surname <br> Registration | 397 | 369 | 28 |
| \%Vietnamese <br> Surname Registration | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 05 | LACCRC Final Map <br> District 05 | Current <br> District 05 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 251,856 | 268,877 | $-17,021$ |
| Deviation | -985 | 16,036 | $-17,021$ |
| \%Deviation | $-0.4 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ | $-6.7 \%$ |
| Latino | 32,581 | 23,830 | 8,751 |
| \%Latino | $12.9 \%$ | $8.9 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ |
| White | 164,268 | 193,821 | $-29,553$ |
| \%White | $65.2 \%$ | $72.1 \%$ | $-6.9 \%$ |
| Black | 11,586 | 9,403 | 2,183 |
| \%Black | $4.6 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |
| Asian | 39,346 | 37,909 | 1,437 |
| \%Asian | $15.6 \%$ | $14.1 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 05 | LACCRC Final Map <br> District 05 | Current <br> District 05 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total CVAP | 183,671 | 200,953 | $-17,281$ |
| Latino CVAP | 18,644 | 16,104 | 2,541 |
| \% Latino CVAP | $10.2 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| White CVAP | 127,987 | 150,644 | $-22,657$ |
| \% White CVAP | $69.7 \%$ | $75.0 \%$ | $-5.3 \%$ |
| Black CVAP | 8,999 | 7,355 | 1,644 |
| \% Black CVAP | $4.9 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP | 25,419 | 24,243 | 1,176 |
| \% Asian CVAP | $13.8 \%$ | $12.1 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 05 | LACCRC Final <br> Map District 05 | Current <br> District 05 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total VAP | 213,510 | 227,713 | $-14,203$ |
| \% VAP | $84.8 \%$ | $84.7 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Latino VAP | 25,664 | 19,559 | 6,105 |
| \%Latino VAP | $12.0 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ |
| White VAP | 139,818 | 163,844 | $-24,026$ |
| \%White VAP | $65.5 \%$ | $72.0 \%$ | $-6.5 \%$ |
| Black VAP | 9,715 | 7,940 | 1,775 |
| \%Black VAP | $4.6 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |
| Asian VAP | 34,998 | 33,239 | 1,759 |
| \%Asian VAP | $16.4 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 05 | LACCRC Final Map District 05 | Current District 05 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Registration | 150,406 | 168,711 | -18,305 |
| Spanish Surname Registration | 11,294 | 9,627 | 1,667 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration | 7.5\% | 5.7\% | 1.8\% |
| African-American Registration | 7,686 | 6,175 | 1,511 |
| \%African-American Registration | 5.1\% | 3.7\% | 1.5\% |
| Asian Surname Registration | 11,679 | 11,561 | 118 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 7.8\% | 6.9\% | 0.9\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration | 21,865 | 26,144 | -4,279 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration | 14.5\% | 15.5\% | -1.0\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration | 1,680 | 2,093 | -413 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration | 1.1\% | 1.2\% | -0.1\% |
| No Ethnic Registration | 117,334 | 138,833 | -21,499 |
| \%No Ethnic Registration | 78.0\% | 82.3\% | -4.3\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 05 | LACCRC Final Map District 05 | Current <br> District 05 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian Surname Registration | 11,679 | 11,561 | 118 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 7.8\% | 6.9\% | 0.9\% |
| Chinese Surname Registration | 4,238 | 4,323 | -85 |
| \%Chinese Surname Registration | 2.8\% | 2.6\% | 0.3\% |
| Filipino Surname Registration | 1,387 | 1,371 | 16 |
| \%Filipino Surname Registration | 0.9\% | 0.8\% | 0.1\% |
| Indian Surname Registration | 2,246 | 2,088 | 158 |
| \%Indian Surname Registration | 1.5\% | 1.2\% | 0.3\% |
| Japanese Surname Registration | 1,175 | 1,200 | -25 |
| \%Japanese Surname Registration | 0.8\% | 0.7\% | 0.1\% |
| Korean Surname Registration | 1,657 | 1,636 | 21 |
| \%Korean Surname Registration | 1.1\% | 1.0\% | 0.1\% |
| Vietnamese Surname Registration | 976 | 943 | 33 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Registration | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.1\% |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 06 | LACCRC Final <br> Map District 06 | Current <br> District 06 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 258,926 | 243,233 | 15,693 |
| Deviation | 6,085 | $-9,608$ | 15,693 |
| \%Deviation | $2.4 \%$ | $-3.8 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ |
| Latino | 182,303 | 172,736 | 9,567 |
| \%Latino | $70.4 \%$ | $71.0 \%$ | $-0.6 \%$ |
| White | 39,180 | 37,792 | 1,388 |
| \%White | $15.1 \%$ | $15.5 \%$ | $-0.4 \%$ |
| Black | 9,090 | 8,192 | 898 |
| \%Black | $3.5 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Asian | 25,359 | 21,728 | 3,631 |
| \%Asian | $9.8 \%$ | $8.9 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 06 | LACCRC Final <br> Map District 06 | Current <br> District 06 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total CVAP | 112,059 | 109,666 | 2,393 |
| Latino CVAP | 58,472 | 59,642 | $-1,170$ |
| \% Latino CVAP | $52.2 \%$ | $54.4 \%$ | $-2.2 \%$ |
| White CVAP | 30,678 | 29,486 | 1,192 |
| \% White CVAP | $27.4 \%$ | $26.9 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| Black CVAP | 6,589 | 5,949 | 640 |
| \% Black CVAP | $5.9 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP | 14,921 | 13,208 | 1,713 |
| \% Asian CVAP | $13.3 \%$ | $12.0 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 06 | LACCRC Final Map <br> District 06 | Current <br> District 06 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total VAP | 187,114 | 177,180 | 9,934 |
| \% VAP | $72.3 \%$ | $72.8 \%$ | $-0.6 \%$ |
| Latino VAP | 123,666 | 118,415 | 5,251 |
| \%Latino VAP | $66.1 \%$ | $66.8 \%$ | $-0.7 \%$ |
| White VAP | 33,542 | 32,404 | 1,138 |
| \%White VAP | $17.9 \%$ | $18.3 \%$ | $-0.4 \%$ |
| Black VAP | 7,030 | 6,374 | 656 |
| \%Black VAP | $3.8 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Asian VAP | 20,794 | 18,011 | 2,783 |
| \%Asian VAP | $11.1 \%$ | $10.2 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 06 | LACCRC Final Map District 06 | Current District 06 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Registration | 78,894 | 77,490 | 1,404 |
| Spanish Surname Registration | 39,517 | 40,904 | -1,387 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration | 50.1\% | 52.8\% | -2.7\% |
| African-American Registration | 5,333 | 4,685 | 648 |
| \%African-American Registration | 6.8\% | 6.0\% | 0.7\% |
| Asian Surname Registration | 5,114 | 4,639 | 475 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 6.5\% | 6.0\% | 0.5\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration | 1,390 | 1,246 | 144 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration | 1.8\% | 1.6\% | 0.2\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration | 2,184 | 2,460 | -276 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration | 2.8\% | 3.2\% | -0.4\% |
| No Ethnic Registration | 28,344 | 26,690 | 1,654 |
| \%No Ethnic Registration | 35.9\% | 34.4\% | 1.5\% |


| District 06 | LACCRC Final Map District 06 | Current District 06 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian Surname Registration | 5,114 | 4,639 | 475 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 6.5\% | 6.0\% | 0.5\% |
| Chinese Surname Registration | 549 | 496 | 53 |
| \%Chinese Surname Registration | 0.7\% | 0.6\% | 0.1\% |
| Filipino Surname Registration | 2,657 | 2,392 | 265 |
| \%Filipino Surname Registration | 3.4\% | 3.1\% | 0.3\% |
| Indian Surname Registration | 449 | 403 | 46 |
| \%Indian Surname Registration | 0.6\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% |
| Japanese Surname Registration | 381 | 364 | 17 |
| \%Japanese Surname Registration | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% |
| Korean Surname Registration | 487 | 490 | -3 |
| \%Korean Surname Registration | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Vietnamese Surname Registration | 591 | 494 | 97 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Registration | 0.7\% | 0.6\% | 0.1\% |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 07 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 07 | Current <br> District 07 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 259,008 | 253,314 | 5,694 |
| Deviation | 6,167 | 473 | 5,694 |
| \%Deviation | $2.4 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| Latino | 178,451 | 201,407 | $-22,956$ |
| \%Latino | $68.9 \%$ | $79.5 \%$ | $-10.6 \%$ |
| White | 51,434 | 21,767 | 29,667 |
| \%White | $19.9 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ |
| Black | 9,712 | 10,458 | -746 |
| \%Black | $3.7 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ | $-0.4 \%$ |
| Asian | 16,715 | 17,313 | -598 |
| \%Asian | $6.5 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ | $-0.4 \%$ |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 07 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 07 | Current <br> District 07 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total VAP | 187,637 | 176,791 | 10,846 |
| \% VAP | $72.4 \%$ | $69.8 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ |
| Latino VAP | 120,423 | 134,262 | $-13,839$ |
| \%Latino VAP | $64.2 \%$ | $75.9 \%$ | $-11.8 \%$ |
| White VAP | 44,222 | 18,970 | 25,252 |
| \%White VAP | $23.6 \%$ | $10.7 \%$ | $12.8 \%$ |
| Black VAP | 7,367 | 7,924 | -557 |
| \%Black VAP | $3.9 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ | $-0.6 \%$ |
| Asian VAP | 13,664 | 14,024 | -360 |
| \%Asian VAP | $7.3 \%$ | $7.9 \%$ | $-0.7 \%$ |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 07 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 07 | Current <br> District 07 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total CVAP | 132,292 | 110,107 | 22,185 |
| Latino CVAP | 72,014 | 72,360 | -346 |
| \% Latino CVAP | $54.4 \%$ | $65.7 \%$ | $-11.3 \%$ |
| White CVAP | 40,706 | 18,059 | 22,647 |
| \% White CVAP | $30.8 \%$ | $16.4 \%$ | $14.4 \%$ |
| Black CVAP | 7,202 | 7,687 | -486 |
| \% Black CVAP | $5.4 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ | $-1.5 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP | 10,748 | 10,764 | -15 |
| \% Asian CVAP | $8.1 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ | $-1.7 \%$ |


| District 07 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 07 | Current District 07 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Registration | 98,333 | 78,684 | 19,649 |
| Spanish Surname Registration | 48,622 | 48,246 | 376 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration | 49.4\% | 61.3\% | -11.9\% |
| African-American Registration | 6,887 | 7,375 | -488 |
| \%African-American Registration | 7.0\% | 9.4\% | -2.4\% |
| Asian Surname Registration | 4,498 | 4,172 | 326 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 4.6\% | 5.3\% | -0.7\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration | 973 | 621 | 352 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration | 1.0\% | 0.8\% | 0.2\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration | 3,415 | 375 | 3,040 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration | 3.5\% | 0.5\% | 3.0\% |
| No Ethnic Registration | 37,846 | 18,451 | 19,395 |
| \%No Ethnic Registration | 38.5\% | 23.4\% | 15.0\% |


| District 07 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 07 | Current District 07 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian Surname Registration | 4,498 | 4,172 | 326 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 4.6\% | 5.3\% | -0.7\% |
| Chinese Surname Registration | 498 | 403 | 95 |
| \%Chinese Surname Registration | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% |
| Filipino Surname Registration | 2,081 | 2,282 | -201 |
| \%Filipino Surname Registration | 2.1\% | 2.9\% | -0.8\% |
| Indian Surname Registration | 417 | 383 | 34 |
| \%Indian Surname Registration | 0.4\% | 0.5\% | -0.1\% |
| Japanese Surname Registration | 393 | 327 | 66 |
| \%Japanese Surname Registration | 0.4\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% |
| Korean Surname Registration | 838 | 401 | 437 |
| \%Korean Surname Registration | 0.9\% | 0.5\% | 0.3\% |
| Vietnamese Surname Registration | 271 | 376 | -105 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Registration | 0.3\% | 0.5\% | -0.2\% |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 08 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 08 | Current <br> District 08 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 246,597 | 256,660 | $-10,063$ |
| Deviation | $-6,244$ | 3,819 | $-10,063$ |
| \%Deviation | $-2.5 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $-4.0 \%$ |
| Latino | 138,458 | 126,125 | 12,333 |
| \%Latino | $56.1 \%$ | $49.1 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ |
| White | 5,790 | 10,747 | $-4,957$ |
| \%White | $2.3 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ | $-1.8 \%$ |
| Black | 93,132 | 106,981 | $-13,849$ |
| \%Black | $37.8 \%$ | $41.7 \%$ | $-3.9 \%$ |
| Asian | 5,022 | 8,221 | $-3,199$ |
| \%Asian | $2.0 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $-1.2 \%$ |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 08 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 08 | Current <br> District 08 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total CVAP | 119,264 | 135,325 | $-16,061$ |
| Latino CVAP | 39,112 | 36,845 | 2,266 |
| \% Latino CVAP | $32.8 \%$ | $27.2 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ |
| White CVAP | 4,453 | 9,120 | $-4,668$ |
| \% White CVAP | $3.7 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $-3.0 \%$ |
| Black CVAP | 70,641 | 81,546 | $-10,904$ |
| \% Black CVAP | $59.2 \%$ | $60.3 \%$ | $-1.0 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP | 2,608 | 5,089 | $-2,481$ |
| \% Asian CVAP | $2.2 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ | $-1.6 \%$ |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 08 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 08 | Current <br> District 08 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total VAP | 178,107 | 188,349 | $-10,242$ |
| \% VAP | $72.2 \%$ | $73.4 \%$ | $-1.2 \%$ |
| Latino VAP | 93,913 | 84,650 | 9,263 |
| \%Latino VAP | $52.7 \%$ | $44.9 \%$ | $7.8 \%$ |
| White VAP | 4,963 | 9,913 | $-4,950$ |
| \%White VAP | $2.8 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $-2.5 \%$ |
| Black VAP | 71,469 | 82,472 | $-11,003$ |
| \%Black VAP | $40.1 \%$ | $43.8 \%$ | $-3.7 \%$ |
| Asian VAP | 4,686 | 7,915 | $-3,229$ |
| \%Asian VAP | $2.6 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ | $-1.6 \%$ |


| District 08 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 08 | Current District 08 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Registration | 106,492 | 117,491 | -10,999 |
| Spanish Surname Registration | 28,725 | 25,944 | 2,781 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration | 27.0\% | 22.1\% | 4.9\% |
| African-American Registration | 67,907 | 78,518 | -10,611 |
| \%African-American Registration | 63.8\% | 66.8\% | -3.1\% |
| Asian Surname Registration | 2,079 | 2,695 | -616 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 2.0\% | 2.3\% | -0.3\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration | 497 | 760 | -263 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration | 0.5\% | 0.6\% | -0.2\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration | 22 | 47 | -25 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| No Ethnic Registration | 6,194 | 8,125 | -1,931 |
| \%No Ethnic Registration | 5.8\% | 6.9\% | -1.1\% |


| District 08 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 08 | Current District 08 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian Surname Registration | 2,079 | 2,695 | -616 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 2.0\% | 2.3\% | -0.3\% |
| Chinese Surname Registration | 384 | 697 | -313 |
| \%Chinese Surname Registration | 0.4\% | 0.6\% | -0.2\% |
| Filipino Surname Registration | 826 | 740 | 86 |
| \%Filipino Surname Registration | 0.8\% | 0.6\% | 0.1\% |
| Indian Surname Registration | 339 | 427 | -88 |
| \%Indian Surname Registration | 0.3\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% |
| Japanese Surname Registration | 137 | 249 | -112 |
| \%Japanese Surname Registration | 0.1\% | 0.2\% | -0.1\% |
| Korean Surname Registration | 297 | 449 | -152 |
| \%Korean Surname Registration | 0.3\% | 0.4\% | -0.1\% |
| Vietnamese Surname Registration | 96 | 133 | -37 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Registration | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 09 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 09 | Current <br> District 09 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 249,728 | 261,470 | $-11,742$ |
| Deviation | $-3,113$ | 8,629 | $-11,742$ |
| \%Deviation | $-1.2 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $-4.6 \%$ |
| Latino | 191,053 | 197,334 | $-6,281$ |
| \%Latino | $76.5 \%$ | $75.5 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| White | 8,142 | 9,423 | $-1,281$ |
| \%White | $3.3 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $-0.3 \%$ |
| Black | 42,476 | 42,650 | -174 |
| \%Black | $17.0 \%$ | $16.3 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| Asian | 5,975 | 9,666 | $-3,691$ |
| \%Asian | $2.4 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $-1.3 \%$ |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population - 2006-2010

| District 09 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 09 | Current <br> District 09 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total CVAP | 86,754 | 94,581 | $-7,826$ |
| Latino CVAP | 43,802 | 45,801 | $-1,999$ |
| \% Latino CVAP | $50.5 \%$ | $48.4 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| White CVAP | 7,062 | 7,975 | -912 |
| \% White CVAP | $8.1 \%$ | $8.4 \%$ | $-0.3 \%$ |
| Black CVAP | 30,784 | 32,562 | $-1,778$ |
| \% Black CVAP | $35.5 \%$ | $34.4 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP | 3,804 | 6,716 | $-2,911$ |
| \% Asian CVAP | $4.4 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ | $-2.7 \%$ |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 09 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 09 | Current <br> District 09 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total VAP | 167,978 | 181,100 | $-13,122$ |
| \% VAP | $67.3 \%$ | $69.3 \%$ | $-2.0 \%$ |
| Latino VAP | 122,253 | 128,556 | $-6,303$ |
| \%Latino VAP | $72.8 \%$ | $71.0 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| White VAP | 7,560 | 8,735 | $-1,175$ |
| \%White VAP | $4.5 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $-0.3 \%$ |
| Black VAP | 30,897 | 32,806 | $-1,909$ |
| \%Black VAP | $18.4 \%$ | $18.1 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Asian VAP | 5,802 | 9,216 | $-3,414$ |
| \%Asian VAP | $3.5 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ | $-1.6 \%$ |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 09 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 09 | Current District 09 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Registration | 68,633 | 74,120 | -5,487 |
| Spanish Surname Registration | 31,055 | 32,566 | -1,511 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration | 45.2\% | 43.9\% | 1.3\% |
| African-American Registration | 29,563 | 29,446 | 117 |
| \%African-American Registration | 43.1\% | 39.7\% | 3.3\% |
| Asian Surname Registration | 1,817 | 3,838 | -2,021 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 2.6\% | 5.2\% | -2.5\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration | 330 | 370 | -40 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration | 16 | 45 | -29 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% |
| No Ethnic Registration | 4,683 | 6,996 | -2,313 |
| \%No Ethnic Registration | 6.8\% | 9.4\% | -2.6\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 09 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 09 | Current District 09 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian Surname Registration | 1,817 | 3,838 | -2,021 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 2.6\% | 5.2\% | -2.5\% |
| Chinese Surname Registration | 454 | 920 | -466 |
| \%Chinese Surname Registration | 0.7\% | 1.2\% | -0.6\% |
| Filipino Surname Registration | 671 | 830 | -159 |
| \%Filipino Surname Registration | 1.0\% | 1.1\% | -0.1\% |
| Indian Surname Registration | 236 | 227 | 9 |
| \%Indian Surname Registration | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Japanese Surname Registration | 92 | 329 | -237 |
| \%Japanese Surname Registration | 0.1\% | 0.4\% | -0.3\% |
| Korean Surname Registration | 285 | 1,429 | -1,144 |
| \%Korean Surname Registration | 0.4\% | 1.9\% | -1.5\% |
| Vietnamese Surname Registration | 79 | 103 | -24 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Registration | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 10 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 10 | Current <br> District 10 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 249,305 | 240,450 | 8,855 |
| Deviation | $-3,536$ | $-12,391$ | 8,855 |
| \%Deviation | $-1.4 \%$ | $-4.9 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| Latino | 117,415 | 116,413 | 1,002 |
| \%Latino | $47.1 \%$ | $48.4 \%$ | $-1.3 \%$ |
| White | 17,361 | 24,168 | $-6,807$ |
| \%White | $7.0 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ | $-3.1 \%$ |
| Black | 68,836 | 58,183 | 10,653 |
| \%Black | $27.6 \%$ | $24.2 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ |
| Asian | 41,200 | 37,171 | 4,029 |
| \%Asian | $16.5 \%$ | $15.5 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population - 2006-2010

| District 10 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 10 | Current <br> District 10 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total CVAP | 125,681 | 123,084 | 2,597 |
| Latino CVAP | 34,658 | 34,681 | -23 |
| \% Latino CVAP | $27.6 \%$ | $28.2 \%$ | $-0.6 \%$ |
| White CVAP | 13,959 | 19,560 | $-5,601$ |
| \% White CVAP | $11.1 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ | $-4.8 \%$ |
| Black CVAP | 54,206 | 45,350 | 8,856 |
| \% Black CVAP | $43.1 \%$ | $36.8 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP | 20,465 | 21,045 | -581 |
| \% Asian CVAP | $16.3 \%$ | $17.1 \%$ | $-0.8 \%$ |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 10 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 10 | Current <br> District 10 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total VAP | 192,651 | 186,183 | 6,468 |
| \% VAP | $77.3 \%$ | $77.4 \%$ | $-0.2 \%$ |
| Latino VAP | 82,030 | 81,437 | 593 |
| \%Latino VAP | $42.6 \%$ | $43.7 \%$ | $-1.2 \%$ |
| White VAP | 15,470 | 21,732 | $-6,262$ |
| \%White VAP | $8.0 \%$ | $11.7 \%$ | $-3.6 \%$ |
| Black VAP | 55,687 | 46,767 | 8,920 |
| \%Black VAP | $28.9 \%$ | $25.1 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| Asian VAP | 36,090 | 32,823 | 3,267 |
| \%Asian VAP | $18.7 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |


| District 10 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 10 | Current <br> District 10 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Registration | 101,780 | 99,197 | 2,583 |
| Spanish Surname Registration | 23,401 | 23,819 | -418 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration | 23.0\% | 24.0\% | -1.0\% |
| African-American Registration | 51,539 | 42,820 | 8,719 |
| \%African-American Registration | 50.6\% | 43.2\% | 7.5\% |
| Asian Surname Registration | 9,406 | 9,875 | -469 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 9.2\% | 10.0\% | -0.7\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration | 1,176 | 1,634 | -458 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | -0.5\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration | 112 | 108 | 4 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% |
| No Ethnic Registration | 16,602 | 21,822 | -5,220 |
| \%No Ethnic Registration | 16.3\% | 22.0\% | -5.7\% |


| District 10 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 10 | Current <br> District 10 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian Surname Registration | 9,406 | 9,875 | -469 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 9.2\% | 10.0\% | -0.7\% |
| Chinese Surname Registration | 1,139 | 1,350 | -211 |
| \%Chinese Surname Registration | 1.1\% | 1.4\% | -0.2\% |
| Filipino Surname Registration | 1,480 | 1,307 | 173 |
| \%Filipino Surname Registration | 1.5\% | 1.3\% | 0.1\% |
| Indian Surname Registration | 555 | 644 | -89 |
| \%Indian Surname Registration | 0.5\% | 0.6\% | -0.1\% |
| Japanese Surname Registration | 998 | 1,047 | -49 |
| \%Japanese Surname Registration | 1.0\% | 1.1\% | -0.1\% |
| Korean Surname Registration | 5,033 | 5,247 | -214 |
| \%Korean Surname Registration | 4.9\% | 5.3\% | -0.3\% |
| Vietnamese Surname Registration | 201 | 280 | -79 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Registration | 0.2\% | 0.3\% | -0.1\% |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 11 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 11 | Current <br> District 11 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 257,182 | 261,061 | $-3,879$ |
| Deviation | 4,341 | 8,220 | $-3,879$ |
| \%Deviation | $1.7 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $-1.5 \%$ |
| Latino | 48,364 | 78,536 | $-30,172$ |
| \%Latino | $18.8 \%$ | $30.1 \%$ | $-11.3 \%$ |
| White | 154,775 | 116,680 | 38,095 |
| \%White | $60.2 \%$ | $44.7 \%$ | $15.5 \%$ |
| Black | 12,233 | 12,484 | -251 |
| \%Black | $4.8 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Asian | 37,209 | 49,230 | $-12,021$ |
| \%Asian | $14.5 \%$ | $18.9 \%$ | $-4.4 \%$ |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 11 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 11 | Current <br> District 11 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total CVAP | 185,934 | 191,118 | $-5,184$ |
| Latino CVAP | 24,825 | 26,050 | $-1,225$ |
| \% Latino CVAP | $13.4 \%$ | $13.6 \%$ | $-0.3 \%$ |
| White CVAP | 125,374 | 126,187 | -812 |
| \% White CVAP | $67.4 \%$ | $66.0 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ |
| Black CVAP | 9,141 | 11,504 | $-2,363$ |
| \% Black CVAP | $4.9 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ | $-1.1 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP | 23,608 | 24,244 | -635 |
| \% Asian CVAP | $12.7 \%$ | $12.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 11 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 11 | Current <br> District 11 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total VAP | 215,969 | 222,569 | $-6,600$ |
| \% VAP | $84.0 \%$ | $84.1 \%$ | $-0.1 \%$ |
| Latino VAP | 36,470 | 38,602 | $-2,132$ |
| \%Latino VAP | $16.9 \%$ | $17.3 \%$ | $-0.5 \%$ |
| White VAP | 134,211 | 135,052 | -841 |
| \%White VAP | $62.1 \%$ | $60.7 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ |
| Black VAP | 9,869 | 12,263 | $-2,394$ |
| \%Black VAP | $4.6 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ | $-0.9 \%$ |
| Asian VAP | 31,767 | 32,762 | -995 |
| \%Asian VAP | $14.7 \%$ | $14.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |


| District 11 | LACCRC <br> Final Map District 11 | Current District 11 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Registration | 156,364 | 159,823 | -3,459 |
| Spanish Surname Registration | 16,341 | 17,043 | -702 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration | 10.5\% | 10.7\% | -0.2\% |
| African-American Registration | 7,363 | 9,410 | -2,047 |
| \%African-American Registration | 4.7\% | 5.9\% | -1.2\% |
| Asian Surname Registration | 11,646 | 11,825 | -179 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 7.4\% | 7.4\% | 0.0\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration | 12,724 | 12,635 | 89 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration | 8.1\% | 7.9\% | 0.2\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration | 769 | 773 | -4 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% |
| No Ethnic Registration | 118,454 | 118,972 | -518 |
| \%No Ethnic Registration | 75.8\% | 74.4\% | 1.3\% |


| District 11 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 11 | Current District 11 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian Surname Registration | 11,646 | 11,825 | -179 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 7.4\% | 7.4\% | 0.0\% |
| Chinese Surname Registration | 3,474 | 3,485 | -11 |
| \%Chinese Surname Registration | 2.2\% | 2.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Filipino Surname Registration | 1,499 | 1,547 | -48 |
| \%Filipino Surname Registration | 1.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Indian Surname Registration | 1,497 | 1,584 | -87 |
| \%Indian Surname Registration | 1.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Japanese Surname Registration | 3,050 | 3,046 | 4 |
| \%Japanese Surname Registration | 2.0\% | 1.9\% | 0.0\% |
| Korean Surname Registration | 1,452 | 1,461 | -9 |
| \%Korean Surname Registration | 0.9\% | 0.9\% | 0.0\% |
| Vietnamese Surname Registration | 674 | 702 | -28 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Registration | 0.4\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 12 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 12 | Current <br> District 12 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 259,073 | 261,061 | $-1,988$ |
| Deviation | 6,232 | 8,220 | $-1,988$ |
| \%Deviation | $2.5 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $-0.8 \%$ |
| Latino | 69,807 | 78,536 | $-8,729$ |
| \%Latino | $26.9 \%$ | $30.1 \%$ | $-3.1 \%$ |
| White | 123,538 | 116,680 | 6,858 |
| \%White | $47.7 \%$ | $44.7 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ |
| Black | 11,512 | 12,484 | -972 |
| \%Black | $4.4 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $-0.3 \%$ |
| Asian | 50,115 | 49,230 | 885 |
| \%Asian | $19.3 \%$ | $18.9 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 12 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 12 | Current <br> District 12 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total CVAP | 173,489 | 170,594 | 2,895 |
| Latino CVAP | 34,602 | 37,210 | $-2,607$ |
| \% Latino CVAP | $19.9 \%$ | $21.8 \%$ | $-1.9 \%$ |
| White CVAP | 98,371 | 92,808 | 5,563 |
| \% White CVAP | $56.7 \%$ | $54.4 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| Black CVAP | 8,410 | 9,052 | -642 |
| \% Black CVAP | $4.8 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $-0.5 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP | 29,721 | 29,132 | 590 |
| \% Asian CVAP | $17.1 \%$ | $17.1 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 12 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 12 | Current <br> District 12 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total VAP | 204,490 | 205,700 | $-1,210$ |
| \% VAP | $78.9 \%$ | $78.8 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Latino VAP | 49,126 | 54,911 | $-5,785$ |
| \%Latino VAP | $24.0 \%$ | $26.7 \%$ | $-2.7 \%$ |
| White VAP | 104,020 | 99,153 | 4,867 |
| \%White VAP | $50.9 \%$ | $48.2 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ |
| Black VAP | 8,731 | 9,507 | -776 |
| \%Black VAP | $4.3 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $-0.4 \%$ |
| Asian VAP | 39,620 | 39,086 | 534 |
| \%Asian VAP | $19.4 \%$ | $19.0 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |


| District 12 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 12 | Current District 12 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Registration | 142,834 | 137,964 | 4,870 |
| Spanish Surname Registration | 24,665 | 25,770 | -1,105 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration | 17.3\% | 18.7\% | -1.4\% |
| African-American Registration | 7,242 | 7,721 | -479 |
| \%African-American Registration | 5.1\% | 5.6\% | -0.5\% |
| Asian Surname Registration | 13,801 | 13,229 | 572 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 9.7\% | 9.6\% | 0.1\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration | 8,760 | 7,752 | 1,008 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration | 6.1\% | 5.6\% | 0.5\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration | 4,454 | 4,425 | 29 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration | 3.1\% | 3.2\% | -0.1\% |
| No Ethnic Registration | 96,329 | 90,414 | 5,915 |
| \%No Ethnic Registration | 67.4\% | 65.5\% | 1.9\% |


| District 12 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 12 | Current District 12 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian Surname Registration | 13,801 | 13,229 | 572 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 9.7\% | 9.6\% | 0.1\% |
| Chinese Surname Registration | 2,962 | 2,620 | 342 |
| \%Chinese Surname Registration | 2.1\% | 1.9\% | 0.2\% |
| Filipino Surname Registration | 2,816 | 2,806 | 10 |
| \%Filipino Surname Registration | 2.0\% | 2.0\% | -0.1\% |
| Indian Surname Registration | 2,521 | 2,502 | 19 |
| \%Indian Surname Registration | 1.8\% | 1.8\% | 0.0\% |
| Japanese Surname Registration | 1,142 | 1,091 | 51 |
| \%Japanese Surname Registration | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.0\% |
| Korean Surname Registration | 3,148 | 3,024 | 124 |
| \%Korean Surname Registration | 2.2\% | 2.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Vietnamese Surname Registration | 1,212 | 1,186 | 26 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Registration | 0.8\% | 0.9\% | 0.0\% |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 13 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 13 | Current <br> District 13 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 246,566 | 226,542 | 20,024 |
| Deviation | $-6,275$ | $-26,299$ | 20,024 |
| \%Deviation | $-2.5 \%$ | $-10.4 \%$ | $7.9 \%$ |
| Latino | 131,263 | 130,451 | 812 |
| \%Latino | $53.2 \%$ | $57.6 \%$ | $-4.3 \%$ |
| White | 56,634 | 45,697 | 10,937 |
| \%White | $23.0 \%$ | $20.2 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ |
| Black | 8,996 | 7,445 | 1,551 |
| \%Black | $3.6 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Asian | 46,267 | 39,972 | 6,295 |
| \%Asian | $18.8 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 13 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 13 | Current <br> District 13 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total CVAP | 123,103 | 109,628 | 13,474 |
| Latino CVAP | 41,379 | 41,074 | 305 |
| \% Latino CVAP | $33.6 \%$ | $37.5 \%$ | $-3.9 \%$ |
| White CVAP | 45,216 | 36,108 | 9,108 |
| \% White CVAP | $36.7 \%$ | $32.9 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| Black CVAP | 7,619 | 6,322 | 1,297 |
| \% Black CVAP | $6.2 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP | 27,189 | 24,681 | 2,508 |
| \% Asian CVAP | $22.1 \%$ | $22.5 \%$ | $-0.4 \%$ |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 13 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 13 | Current <br> District 13 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total VAP | 199,570 | 180,489 | 19,081 |
| \% VAP | $80.9 \%$ | $79.7 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ |
| Latino VAP | 96,606 | 95,157 | 1,449 |
| \%Latino VAP | $48.4 \%$ | $52.7 \%$ | $-4.3 \%$ |
| White VAP | 52,305 | 41,980 | 10,325 |
| \%White VAP | $26.2 \%$ | $23.3 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ |
| Black VAP | 7,989 | 6,574 | 1,415 |
| \%Black VAP | $4.0 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Asian VAP | 39,978 | 34,469 | 5,509 |
| \%Asian VAP | $20.0 \%$ | $19.1 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |


| District 13 | LACCRC <br> Final Map District 13 | Current District 13 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Registration | 93,768 | 83,478 | 10,290 |
| Spanish Surname Registration | 33,925 | 33,763 | 162 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration | 36.2\% | 40.4\% | -4.3\% |
| African-American Registration | 6,748 | 5,587 | 1,161 |
| \%African-American Registration | 7.2\% | 6.7\% | 0.5\% |
| Asian Surname Registration | 9,703 | 8,633 | 1,070 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 10.3\% | 10.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration | 1,966 | 1,535 | 431 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration | 2.1\% | 1.8\% | 0.3\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration | 2,367 | 2,104 | 263 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 0.0\% |
| No Ethnic Registration | 42,961 | 35,148 | 7,813 |
| \%No Ethnic Registration | 45.8\% | 42.1\% | 3.7\% |


| District 13 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 13 | Current <br> District 13 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian Surname Registration | 9,703 | 8,633 | 1,070 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 10.3\% | 10.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Chinese Surname Registration | 1,652 | 1,537 | 115 |
| \%Chinese Surname Registration | 1.8\% | 1.8\% | -0.1\% |
| Filipino Surname Registration | 3,961 | 3,864 | 97 |
| \%Filipino Surname Registration | 4.2\% | 4.6\% | -0.4\% |
| Indian Surname Registration | 503 | 395 | 108 |
| \%Indian Surname Registration | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.1\% |
| Japanese Surname Registration | 677 | 553 | 124 |
| \%Japanese Surname Registration | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | 0.1\% |
| Korean Surname Registration | 2,470 | 1,793 | 677 |
| \%Korean Surname Registration | 2.6\% | 2.1\% | 0.5\% |
| Vietnamese Surname Registration | 440 | 491 | -51 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Registration | 0.5\% | 0.6\% | -0.1\% |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 14 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 14 | Current <br> District 14 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 246,509 | 232,574 | 13,935 |
| Deviation | $-6,332$ | $-20,267$ | 13,935 |
| \%Deviation | $-2.5 \%$ | $-8.0 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ |
| Latino | 164,010 | 165,047 | $-1,037$ |
| \%Latino | $66.5 \%$ | $71.0 \%$ | $-4.4 \%$ |
| White | 31,168 | 28,792 | 2,376 |
| \%White | $12.6 \%$ | $12.4 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Black | 15,285 | 9,117 | 6,168 |
| \%Black | $6.2 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| Asian | 33,377 | 27,331 | 6,046 |
| \%Asian | $13.5 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population - 2006-2010

| District 14 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 14 | Current <br> District 14 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total CVAP | 132,422 | 121,212 | 11,210 |
| Latino CVAP | 67,874 | 69,450 | $-1,576$ |
| \% Latino CVAP | $51.3 \%$ | $57.3 \%$ | $-6.0 \%$ |
| White CVAP | 26,853 | 24,440 | 2,413 |
| \% White CVAP | $20.3 \%$ | $20.2 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Black CVAP | 13,848 | 7,937 | 5,911 |
| \% Black CVAP | $10.5 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP | 22,157 | 17,992 | 4,165 |
| \% Asian CVAP | $16.7 \%$ | $14.8 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 14 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 14 | Current <br> District 14 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total VAP | 191,465 | 175,893 | 15,572 |
| \% VAP | $77.7 \%$ | $75.6 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ |
| Latino VAP | 116,742 | 116,757 | -15 |
| \%Latino VAP | $61.0 \%$ | $66.4 \%$ | $-5.4 \%$ |
| White VAP | 28,870 | 25,969 | 2,901 |
| \%White VAP | $15.1 \%$ | $14.8 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Black VAP | 14,089 | 8,121 | 5,968 |
| \%Black VAP | $7.4 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ |
| Asian VAP | 29,578 | 23,301 | 6,277 |
| \%Asian VAP | $15.4 \%$ | $13.2 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 14 | LACCRC <br> Final Map <br> District 14 | Current <br> District 14 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Registration | 95,229 | 93,103 | 2,126 |
| Spanish Surname Registration | 52,039 | 54,788 | -2,749 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration | 54.6\% | 58.8\% | -4.2\% |
| African-American Registration | 7,448 | 3,928 | 3,520 |
| \%African-American Registration | 7.8\% | 4.2\% | 3.6\% |
| Asian Surname Registration | 9,755 | 8,085 | 1,670 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 10.2\% | 8.7\% | 1.6\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration | 937 | 947 | -10 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration | 1.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration | 352 | 337 | 15 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration | 0.4\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% |
| No Ethnic Registration | 24,641 | 25,378 | -737 |
| \%No Ethnic Registration | 25.9\% | 27.3\% | -1.4\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 14 | LACCRC <br> Final Map District 14 | Current District 14 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian Surname Registration | 9,755 | 8,085 | 1,670 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 10.2\% | 8.7\% | 1.6\% |
| Chinese Surname Registration | 2,818 | 2,370 | 448 |
| \%Chinese Surname Registration | 3.0\% | 2.5\% | 0.4\% |
| Filipino Surname Registration | 2,685 | 3,090 | -405 |
| $\begin{array}{r}\begin{array}{r}\text { \%Filipino Surname } \\ \text { Registration }\end{array} \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 2.8\% | 3.3\% | -0.5\% |
| Indian Surname Registration | 343 | 274 | 69 |
| \%Indian Surname Registration | 0.4\% | 0.3\% | 0.1\% |
| Japanese Surname Registration | 978 | 823 | 155 |
| \%Japanese Surname Registration | 1.0\% | 0.9\% | 0.1\% |
| Korean Surname Registration | 2,306 | 945 | 1,361 |
| \%Korean Surname Registration | 2.4\% | 1.0\% | 1.4\% |
| Vietnamese Surname Registration | 625 | 583 | 42 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Registration | 0.7\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 15 | LACCRC Final <br> Map District <br> 15 | Current <br> District 15 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 254,493 | 264,069 | $-9,576$ |
| Deviation | 1,652 | 11,228 | $-9,576$ |
| \%Deviation | $0.7 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $-3.8 \%$ |
| Latino | 157,761 | 164,329 | $-6,568$ |
| \%Latino | $62.0 \%$ | $62.2 \%$ | $-0.2 \%$ |
| White | 41,808 | 41,867 | -59 |
| \%White | $16.4 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| Black | 33,489 | 36,300 | $-2,811$ |
| \%Black | $13.2 \%$ | $13.7 \%$ | $-0.6 \%$ |
| Asian | 16,990 | 17,009 | -19 |
| \%Asian | $6.7 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 15 | LACCRC Final <br> Map District <br> 15 | Current <br> District 15 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total VAP | 179,672 | 185,921 | $-6,249$ |
| \% VAP | $70.6 \%$ | $70.4 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Latino VAP | 102,947 | 107,098 | $-4,151$ |
| \%Latino VAP | $57.3 \%$ | $57.6 \%$ | $-0.3 \%$ |
| White VAP | 36,127 | 36,167 | -40 |
| \%White VAP | $20.1 \%$ | $19.5 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| Black VAP | 23,200 | 25,157 | $-1,957$ |
| \%Black VAP | $12.9 \%$ | $13.5 \%$ | $-0.6 \%$ |
| Asian VAP | 14,281 | 14,297 | -16 |
| \%Asian VAP | $7.9 \%$ | $7.7 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population - 2006-2010

| District 15 | LACCRC Final <br> Map District <br> 15 | Current <br> District 15 | Difference |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total CVAP | 129,670 | 133,425 | $-3,756$ |
| Latino CVAP | 57,775 | 59,438 | $-1,663$ |
| \% Latino CVAP | $44.6 \%$ | $44.5 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| White CVAP | 34,921 | 34,959 | -38 |
| \% White CVAP | $26.9 \%$ | $26.2 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| Black CVAP | 23,033 | 24,990 | $-1,957$ |
| \% Black CVAP | $17.8 \%$ | $18.7 \%$ | $-1.0 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP | 11,261 | 11,274 | -13 |
| \% Asian CVAP | $8.7 \%$ | $8.4 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 15 | LACCRC Final Map District 15 | Current District 15 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Registration | 100,072 | 103,372 | -3,300 |
| Spanish Surname Registration | 38,083 | 39,296 | -1,213 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration | 38.1\% | 38.0\% | 0.0\% |
| African-American Registration | 22,250 | 24,095 | -1,845 |
| \%African-American Registration | 22.2\% | 23.3\% | -1.1\% |
| Asian Surname Registration | 5,255 | 5,293 | -38 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 5.3\% | 5.1\% | 0.1\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration | 744 | 753 | -9 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | 0.0\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration | 101 | 101 | 0 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% |
| No Ethnic Registration | 33,071 | 33,182 | -111 |
| \%No Ethnic Registration | 33.0\% | 32.1\% | 0.9\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 15 | LACCRC Final Map District 15 | Current District 15 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asian Surname Registration | 5,255 | 5,293 | -38 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration | 5.3\% | 5.1\% | 0.1\% |
| Chinese Surname Registration | 791 | 793 | -2 |
| \%Chinese Surname Registration | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.0\% |
| Filipino Surname Registration | 1,663 | 1,688 | -25 |
| \%Filipino Surname Registration | 1.7\% | 1.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Indian Surname Registration | 324 | 333 | -9 |
| \%Indian Surname Registration | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Japanese Surname Registration | 1,429 | 1,429 | 0 |
| \%Japanese Surname Registration | 1.4\% | 1.4\% | 0.0\% |
| Korean Surname Registration | 739 | 740 | -1 |
| \%Korean Surname Registration | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | 0.0\% |
| Vietnamese Surname Registration | 309 | 310 | -1 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Registration | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% |

Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District | Total <br> Population | Deviation | \%Deviation | Latino | \%Latino | White | \%White | Black | \%Black | Asian | \%Asian |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 | 246,531 | $-6,310$ | $-2.5 \%$ | 177,012 | $71.8 \%$ | 19,949 | $8.1 \%$ | 6,406 | $2.6 \%$ | 40,975 | $16.6 \%$ |
| 02 | 257,291 | 4,450 | $1.8 \%$ | 115,818 | $45.0 \%$ | 106,739 | $41.5 \%$ | 11,351 | $4.4 \%$ | 19,679 | $7.6 \%$ |
| 03 | 259,045 | 6,204 | $2.5 \%$ | 96,755 | $37.4 \%$ | 111,978 | $43.2 \%$ | 11,966 | $4.6 \%$ | 34,640 | $13.4 \%$ |
| 04 | 250,511 | $-2,330$ | $-0.9 \%$ | 37,771 | $15.1 \%$ | 154,144 | $61.5 \%$ | 13,291 | $5.3 \%$ | 41,388 | $16.5 \%$ |
| 05 | 251,856 | -985 | $-0.4 \%$ | 32,581 | $12.9 \%$ | 164,268 | $65.2 \%$ | 11,586 | $4.6 \%$ | 39,346 | $15.6 \%$ |
| 06 | 258,926 | 6,085 | $2.4 \%$ | 182,303 | $70.4 \%$ | 39,180 | $15.1 \%$ | 9,090 | $3.5 \%$ | 25,359 | $9.8 \%$ |
| 07 | 259,008 | 6,167 | $2.4 \%$ | 178,451 | $68.9 \%$ | 51,434 | $19.9 \%$ | 9,712 | $3.7 \%$ | 16,715 | $6.5 \%$ |
| 08 | 246,597 | $-6,244$ | $-2.5 \%$ | 138,458 | $56.1 \%$ | 5,790 | $2.3 \%$ | 93,132 | $37.8 \%$ | 5,022 | $2.0 \%$ |
| 09 | 249,728 | $-3,113$ | $-1.2 \%$ | 191,053 | $76.5 \%$ | 8,142 | $3.3 \%$ | 42,476 | $17.0 \%$ | 5,975 | $2.4 \%$ |
| 10 | 249,305 | $-3,536$ | $-1.4 \%$ | 117,415 | $47.1 \%$ | 17,361 | $7.0 \%$ | 68,836 | $27.6 \%$ | 41,200 | $16.5 \%$ |
| 11 | 257,182 | 4,341 | $1.7 \%$ | 48,364 | $18.8 \%$ | 154,775 | $60.2 \%$ | 12,233 | $4.8 \%$ | 37,209 | $14.5 \%$ |
| 12 | 259,073 | 6,232 | $2.5 \%$ | 69,807 | $26.9 \%$ | 123,538 | $47.7 \%$ | 11,512 | $4.4 \%$ | 50,115 | $19.3 \%$ |
| 13 | 246,566 | $-6,275$ | $-2.5 \%$ | 131,263 | $53.2 \%$ | 56,634 | $23.0 \%$ | 8,996 | $3.6 \%$ | 46,267 | $18.8 \%$ |
| 14 | 246,509 | $-6,332$ | $-2.5 \%$ | 164,010 | $66.5 \%$ | 31,168 | $12.6 \%$ | 15,285 | $6.2 \%$ | 33,377 | $13.5 \%$ |
| 15 | 254,493 | 1,652 | $0.7 \%$ | 157,761 | $62.0 \%$ | 41,808 | $16.4 \%$ | 33,489 | $13.2 \%$ | 16,990 | $6.7 \%$ |


| District | Total VAP | \% VAP | Latino VAP | \%Latino VAP | White VAP | \%White VAP | Black VAP | \%Black VAP | Asian VAP | \%Asian VAP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 | 184,395 | 74.8\% | 124,710 | 67.6\% | 17,766 | 9.6\% | 5,197 | 2.8\% | 35,127 | 19.0\% |
| 02 | 201,354 | 78.3\% | 81,318 | 40.4\% | 91,514 | 45.4\% | 9,323 | 4.6\% | 16,386 | 8.1\% |
| 03 | 199,798 | 77.1\% | 66,594 | 33.3\% | 94,272 | 47.2\% | 8,842 | 4.4\% | 27,442 | 13.7\% |
| 04 | 214,386 | 85.6\% | 29,731 | 13.9\% | 135,652 | 63.3\% | 11,280 | 5.3\% | 34,571 | 16.1\% |
| 05 | 213,510 | 84.8\% | 25,664 | 12.0\% | 139,818 | 65.5\% | 9,715 | 4.6\% | 34,998 | 16.4\% |
| 06 | 187,114 | 72.3\% | 123,666 | 66.1\% | 33,542 | 17.9\% | 7,030 | 3.8\% | 20,794 | 11.1\% |
| 07 | 187,637 | 72.4\% | 120,423 | 64.2\% | 44,222 | 23.6\% | 7,367 | 3.9\% | 13,664 | 7.3\% |
| 08 | 178,107 | 72.2\% | 93,913 | 52.7\% | 4,963 | 2.8\% | 71,469 | 40.1\% | 4,686 | 2.6\% |
| 09 | 167,978 | 67.3\% | 122,253 | 72.8\% | 7,560 | 4.5\% | 30,897 | 18.4\% | 5,802 | 3.5\% |
| 10 | 192,651 | 77.3\% | 82,030 | 42.6\% | 15,470 | 8.0\% | 55,687 | 28.9\% | 36,090 | 18.7\% |
| 11 | 215,969 | 84.0\% | 36,470 | 16.9\% | 134,211 | 62.1\% | 9,869 | 4.6\% | 31,767 | 14.7\% |
| 12 | 204,490 | 78.9\% | 49,126 | 24.0\% | 104,020 | 50.9\% | 8,731 | 4.3\% | 39,620 | 19.4\% |
| 13 | 199,570 | 80.9\% | 96,606 | 48.4\% | 52,305 | 26.2\% | 7,989 | 4.0\% | 39,978 | 20.0\% |
| 14 | 191,465 | 77.7\% | 116,742 | 61.0\% | 28,870 | 15.1\% | 14,089 | 7.4\% | 29,578 | 15.4\% |
| 15 | 179,672 | 70.6\% | 102,947 | 57.3\% | 36,127 | 20.1\% | 23,200 | 12.9\% | 14,281 | 7.9\% |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population - 2006-2010

| District | Total CVAP | Latino CVAP | \% Latino CVAP | White CVAP | \% White CVAP | Black CVAP | $\%$ Black CVAP | Asian CVAP | \% Asian CVAP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 | 101,997 | 53,237 | $52.2 \%$ | 16,502 | $16.2 \%$ | 4,975 | $4.9 \%$ | 26,235 | $25.7 \%$ |
| 02 | 148,807 | 42,228 | $28.4 \%$ | 82,106 | $55.2 \%$ | 8,941 | $6.0 \%$ | 13,322 | $9.0 \%$ |
| 03 | 151,053 | 33,787 | $22.4 \%$ | 86,749 | $57.4 \%$ | 8,406 | $5.6 \%$ | 20,302 | $13.4 \%$ |
| 04 | 181,139 | 20,639 | $11.4 \%$ | 123,882 | $68.4 \%$ | 10,863 | $6.0 \%$ | 23,191 | $12.8 \%$ |
| 05 | 183,671 | 18,644 | $10.2 \%$ | 127,987 | $69.7 \%$ | 8,999 | $4.9 \%$ | 25,419 | $13.8 \%$ |
| 06 | 112,059 | 58,472 | $52.2 \%$ | 30,678 | $27.4 \%$ | 6,589 | $5.9 \%$ | 14,921 | $13.3 \%$ |
| 07 | 132,292 | 72,014 | $54.4 \%$ | 40,706 | $30.8 \%$ | 7,202 | $5.4 \%$ | 10,748 | $8.1 \%$ |
| 08 | 119,264 | 39,112 | $32.8 \%$ | 4,453 | $3.7 \%$ | 70,641 | $59.2 \%$ | 2,608 | $2.2 \%$ |
| 09 | 86,754 | 43,802 | $50.5 \%$ | 7,062 | $8.1 \%$ | 30,784 | $35.5 \%$ | 3,804 | $4.4 \%$ |
| 10 | 125,681 | 34,658 | $27.6 \%$ | 13,959 | $11.1 \%$ | 54,206 | $43.1 \%$ | 20,465 | $16.3 \%$ |
| 11 | 185,934 | 24,825 | $13.4 \%$ | 125,374 | $67.4 \%$ | 9,141 | $4.9 \%$ | 23,608 | $12.7 \%$ |
| 12 | 173,489 | 34,602 | $19.9 \%$ | 98,371 | $56.7 \%$ | 8,410 | $4.8 \%$ | 29,721 | $17.1 \%$ |
| 13 | 123,103 | 41,379 | $33.6 \%$ | 45,216 | $36.7 \%$ | 7,619 | $6.2 \%$ | 27,189 | $22.1 \%$ |
| 14 | 132,422 | 67,874 | $51.3 \%$ | 26,853 | $20.3 \%$ | 13,848 | $10.5 \%$ | 22,157 | $16.7 \%$ |
| 15 | 129,670 | 57,775 | $44.6 \%$ | 34,921 | $26.9 \%$ | 23,033 | $17.8 \%$ | 11,261 | $8.7 \%$ |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District | Total Registration | Spanish Surname Registration | \%Spanish Surname Registration | AfricanAmerican Registration | \%AfricanAmerican Registration | Asian Surname Registration | \%Asian Surname Registration | Jewish Surname Registration | \%Jewish Surname Registration | Armenian Surname Registration | \%Armenian Surname Registration |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 | 74,163 | 40,138 | 54.1\% | 4,495 | 6.1\% | 10,168 | 13.7\% | 709 | 1.0\% | 94 | 0.1\% |
| 02 | 111,376 | 28,357 | 25.5\% | 6,911 | 6.2\% | 4,882 | 4.4\% | 6,518 | 5.9\% | 6,580 | 5.9\% |
| 03 | 116,413 | 22,179 | 19.1\% | 6,635 | 5.7\% | 8,296 | 7.1\% | 9,315 | 8.0\% | 2,512 | 2.2\% |
| 04 | 148,474 | 13,871 | 9.3\% | 9,489 | 6.4\% | 10,789 | 7.3\% | 12,434 | 8.4\% | 3,371 | 2.3\% |
| 05 | 150,406 | 11,294 | 7.5\% | 7,686 | 5.1\% | 11,679 | 7.8\% | 21,865 | 14.5\% | 1,680 | 1.1\% |
| 06 | 78,894 | 39,517 | 50.1\% | 5,333 | 6.8\% | 5,114 | 6.5\% | 1,390 | 1.8\% | 2,184 | 2.8\% |
| 07 | 98,333 | 48,622 | 49.4\% | 6,887 | 7.0\% | 4,498 | 4.6\% | 973 | 1.0\% | 3,415 | 3.5\% |
| 08 | 106,492 | 28,725 | 27.0\% | 67,907 | 63.8\% | 2,079 | 2.0\% | 497 | 0.5\% | 22 | 0.0\% |
| 09 | 68,633 | 31,055 | 45.2\% | 29,563 | 43.1\% | 1,817 | 2.6\% | 330 | 0.5\% | 16 | 0.0\% |
| 10 | 101,780 | 23,401 | 23.0\% | 51,539 | 50.6\% | 9,406 | 9.2\% | 1,176 | 1.2\% | 112 | 0.1\% |
| 11 | 156,364 | 16,341 | 10.5\% | 7,363 | 4.7\% | 11,646 | 7.4\% | 12,724 | 8.1\% | 769 | 0.5\% |
| 12 | 142,834 | 24,665 | 17.3\% | 7,242 | 5.1\% | 13,801 | 9.7\% | 8,760 | 6.1\% | 4,454 | 3.1\% |
| 13 | 93,768 | 33,925 | 36.2\% | 6,748 | 7.2\% | 9,703 | 10.3\% | 1,966 | 2.1\% | 2,367 | 2.5\% |
| 14 | 95,229 | 52,039 | 54.6\% | 7,448 | 7.8\% | 9,755 | 10.2\% | 937 | 1.0\% | 352 | 0.4\% |
| 15 | 100,072 | 38,083 | 38.1\% | 22,250 | 22.2\% | 5,255 | 5.3\% | 744 | 0.7\% | 101 | 0.1\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District | Asian <br> Surname <br> Registration | \%Asian <br> Surname <br> Registration | Chinese <br> Surname <br> Registration | \%Chinese <br> Surname <br> Registration | Filipino <br> Surname <br> Registration | \%Filipino <br> Surname <br> Registration | Indian <br> Surname <br> Registration | \%Indian <br> Surname <br> Registration |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 | 10,168 | $13.7 \%$ | 3,810 | $5.1 \%$ | 1,773 | $2.4 \%$ | 174 | $0.2 \%$ |
| 02 | 4,882 | $4.4 \%$ | 859 | $0.8 \%$ | 1,776 | $1.6 \%$ | 617 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 03 | 8,296 | $7.1 \%$ | 1,397 | $1.2 \%$ | 2,004 | $1.7 \%$ | 1,715 | $1.5 \%$ |
| 04 | 10,789 | $7.3 \%$ | 2,405 | $1.6 \%$ | 1,724 | $1.2 \%$ | 934 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 05 | 11,679 | $7.8 \%$ | 4,238 | $2.8 \%$ | 1,387 | $0.9 \%$ | 2,246 | $1.5 \%$ |
| 06 | 5,114 | $6.5 \%$ | 549 | $0.7 \%$ | 2,657 | $3.4 \%$ | 449 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 07 | 4,498 | $4.6 \%$ | 498 | $0.5 \%$ | 2,081 | $2.1 \%$ | 417 | $0.4 \%$ |
| 08 | 2,079 | $2.0 \%$ | 384 | $0.4 \%$ | 826 | $0.8 \%$ | 339 | $0.3 \%$ |
| 09 | 1,817 | $2.6 \%$ | 454 | $0.7 \%$ | 671 | $1.0 \%$ | 236 | $0.3 \%$ |
| 10 | 9,406 | $9.2 \%$ | 1,139 | $1.1 \%$ | 1,480 | $1.5 \%$ | 555 | $0.5 \%$ |
| 11 | 11,646 | $7.4 \%$ | 3,474 | $2.2 \%$ | 1,499 | $1.0 \%$ | 1,497 | $1.0 \%$ |
| 12 | 13,801 | $9.7 \%$ | 2,962 | $2.1 \%$ | 2,816 | $2.0 \%$ | 2,521 | $1.8 \%$ |
| 13 | 9,703 | $10.3 \%$ | 1,652 | $1.8 \%$ | 3,961 | $4.2 \%$ | 503 | $0.5 \%$ |
| 14 | 9,755 | $10.2 \%$ | 2,818 | $3.0 \%$ | 2,685 | $2.8 \%$ | 343 | $0.4 \%$ |
| 15 | 5,255 | $5.3 \%$ | 791 | $0.8 \%$ | 1,663 | $1.7 \%$ |  | 324 |

Table 6: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration Continued

| District | Japanese <br> Surname <br> Registration | \%Japanese <br> Surname <br> Registration | Korean <br> Surname <br> Registration | \%Korean <br> Surname <br> Registration | Vietnamese <br> Surname <br> Registration | \%Vietnamese <br> Surname <br> Registration |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 | 357 | $0.5 \%$ | 2,639 | $3.6 \%$ | 1,415 | $1.9 \%$ |
| 02 | 514 | $0.5 \%$ | 716 | $0.6 \%$ | 400 | $0.4 \%$ |
| 03 | 584 | $0.5 \%$ | 753 | $0.6 \%$ | 1,843 | $1.6 \%$ |
| 04 | 1,040 | $0.7 \%$ | 4,289 | $2.9 \%$ | 397 | $0.3 \%$ |
| 05 | 1,175 | $0.8 \%$ | 1,657 | $1.1 \%$ | 976 | $0.6 \%$ |
| 06 | 381 | $0.5 \%$ | 487 | $0.6 \%$ | 591 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 07 | 393 | $0.4 \%$ | 838 | $0.9 \%$ | 271 | $0.3 \%$ |
| 08 | 137 | $0.1 \%$ | 297 | $0.3 \%$ | 96 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 09 | 92 | $0.1 \%$ | 285 | $0.4 \%$ | 79 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 10 | 998 | $1.0 \%$ | 5,033 | $4.9 \%$ | 201 | $0.2 \%$ |
| 11 | 3,050 | $2.0 \%$ | 1,452 | $0.9 \%$ | 674 | $0.4 \%$ |
| 12 | 1,142 | $0.8 \%$ | 3,148 | $2.2 \%$ | 1,212 | $0.8 \%$ |
| 13 | 677 | $0.7 \%$ | 2,470 | $2.6 \%$ | 440 | $0.5 \%$ |
| 14 | 978 | $1.0 \%$ | 2,306 | $2.4 \%$ | 625 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 15 | 1,429 | $1.4 \%$ | 739 | $0.7 \%$ | 309 | $0.3 \%$ |

Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District | Total <br> Population <br> (Final Map) | Total <br> Population <br> (Current) | Deviation <br> (Final Map) | Deviation <br> (Current) | \%Deviation <br> (Final Map) | \%Deviation <br> (Current) | \%Latino <br> (Final Map) | \%Latino <br> (Current) | \%White <br> (Final Map) | \%White <br> (Current) | \%Black <br> (Final Map) | \%Black <br> (Current) | \%Asian <br> (Final Map) | \%Asian <br> (Current) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 | 246,531 | 233,203 | $-6,310$ | $-19,638$ | $-2.5 \%$ | $-7.8 \%$ | $71.8 \%$ | $72.7 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $16.6 \%$ | $17.2 \%$ |
| 02 | 257,291 | 265,357 | 4,450 | 12,516 | $1.8 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ | $45.0 \%$ | $33.5 \%$ | $41.5 \%$ | $52.6 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ | $8.4 \%$ |
| 03 | 259,045 | 275,047 | 6,204 | 22,206 | $2.5 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $37.4 \%$ | $33.9 \%$ | $43.2 \%$ | $46.8 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $13.4 \%$ | $13.5 \%$ |
| 04 | 250,511 | 246,051 | $-2,330$ | $-6,790$ | $-0.9 \%$ | $-2.7 \%$ | $15.1 \%$ | $24.2 \%$ | $61.5 \%$ | $47.9 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $16.5 \%$ | $20.7 \%$ |
| 05 | 251,856 | 268,877 | -985 | 16,036 | $-0.4 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ | $12.9 \%$ | $8.9 \%$ | $65.2 \%$ | $72.1 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $15.6 \%$ | $14.1 \%$ |
| 06 | 258,926 | 243,233 | 6,085 | $-9,608$ | $2.4 \%$ | $-3.8 \%$ | $70.4 \%$ | $71.0 \%$ | $15.1 \%$ | $15.5 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ | $8.9 \%$ |
| 07 | 259,008 | 253,314 | 6,167 | 473 | $2.4 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $68.9 \%$ | $79.5 \%$ | $19.9 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ |
| 08 | 246,597 | 256,660 | $-6,244$ | 3,819 | $-2.5 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $56.1 \%$ | $49.1 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ | $37.8 \%$ | $41.7 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ |
| 09 | 249,728 | 261,470 | $-3,113$ | 8,629 | $-1.2 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $76.5 \%$ | $75.5 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $17.0 \%$ | $16.3 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ |
| 10 | 249,305 | 240,450 | $-3,536$ | $-12,391$ | $-1.4 \%$ | $-4.9 \%$ | $47.1 \%$ | $48.4 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ | $27.6 \%$ | $24.2 \%$ | $16.5 \%$ | $15.5 \%$ |
| 11 | 257,182 | 264,713 | 4,341 | 11,872 | $1.7 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $18.8 \%$ | $19.3 \%$ | $60.2 \%$ | $58.7 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ | $14.5 \%$ | $14.4 \%$ |
| 12 | 259,073 | 261,061 | 6,232 | 8,220 | $2.5 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $26.9 \%$ | $30.1 \%$ | $47.7 \%$ | $44.7 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $19.3 \%$ | $18.9 \%$ |
| 13 | 246,566 | 226,542 | $-6,275$ | $-26,299$ | $-2.5 \%$ | $-10.4 \%$ | $53.2 \%$ | $57.6 \%$ | $23.0 \%$ | $20.2 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $18.8 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ |
| 14 | 246,509 | 232,574 | $-6,332$ | $-20,267$ | $-2.5 \%$ | $-8.0 \%$ | $66.5 \%$ | $71.0 \%$ | $12.6 \%$ | $12.4 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $13.5 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ |
| 15 | 254,493 | 264,069 | 1,652 | 11,228 | $0.7 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $62.0 \%$ | $62.2 \%$ | $16.4 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ | $13.2 \%$ | $13.7 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ |


| District | Total VAP (Final Map) | Total VAP (Current) | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% VAP } \\ \text { (Final Map) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { VAP } \\ \text { (Current) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { \%Latino VAP } \\ \text { (Final Map) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \%Latino } \\ & \text { VAP } \\ & \text { (Current) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \%White VAP } \\ & \text { (Final Map) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \%White } \\ & \text { VAP } \\ & \text { (Current) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { \%Black VAP } \\ \text { (Final Map) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \%Black } \\ & \text { VAP } \\ & \text { (Current) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { \%Asian VAP } \\ & \text { (Final Map) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { Asian VAP } \\ \text { (Current) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 | 184,395 | 174,481 | 74.8\% | 74.8\% | 67.6\% | 68.4\% | 9.6\% | 7.5\% | 2.8\% | 3.3\% | 19.0\% | 19.9\% |
| 02 | 201,354 | 211,779 | 78.3\% | 79.8\% | 40.4\% | 29.8\% | 45.4\% | 56.1\% | 4.6\% | 4.0\% | 8.1\% | 8.7\% |
| 03 | 199,798 | 212,827 | 77.1\% | 77.4\% | 33.3\% | 30.3\% | 47.2\% | 50.5\% | 4.4\% | 4.0\% | 13.7\% | 13.8\% |
| 04 | 214,386 | 211,121 | 85.6\% | 85.8\% | 13.9\% | 21.6\% | 63.3\% | 50.6\% | 5.3\% | 5.7\% | 16.1\% | 20.5\% |
| 05 | 213,510 | 227,713 | 84.8\% | 84.7\% | 12.0\% | 8.6\% | 65.5\% | 72.0\% | 4.6\% | 3.5\% | 16.4\% | 14.6\% |
| 06 | 187,114 | 177,180 | 72.3\% | 72.8\% | 66.1\% | 66.8\% | 17.9\% | 18.3\% | 3.8\% | 3.6\% | 11.1\% | 10.2\% |
| 07 | 187,637 | 176,791 | 72.4\% | 69.8\% | 64.2\% | 75.9\% | 23.6\% | 10.7\% | 3.9\% | 4.5\% | 7.3\% | 7.9\% |
| 08 | 178,107 | 188,349 | 72.2\% | 73.4\% | 52.7\% | 44.9\% | 2.8\% | 5.3\% | 40.1\% | 43.8\% | 2.6\% | 4.2\% |
| 09 | 167,978 | 181,100 | 67.3\% | 69.3\% | 72.8\% | 71.0\% | 4.5\% | 4.8\% | 18.4\% | 18.1\% | 3.5\% | 5.1\% |
| 10 | 192,651 | 186,183 | 77.3\% | 77.4\% | 42.6\% | 43.7\% | 8.0\% | 11.7\% | 28.9\% | 25.1\% | 18.7\% | 17.6\% |
| 11 | 215,969 | 222,569 | 84.0\% | 84.1\% | 16.9\% | 17.3\% | 62.1\% | 60.7\% | 4.6\% | 5.5\% | 14.7\% | 14.7\% |
| 12 | 204,490 | 205,700 | 78.9\% | 78.8\% | 24.0\% | 26.7\% | 50.9\% | 48.2\% | 4.3\% | 4.6\% | 19.4\% | 19.0\% |
| 13 | 199,570 | 180,489 | 80.9\% | 79.7\% | 48.4\% | 52.7\% | 26.2\% | 23.3\% | 4.0\% | 3.6\% | 20.0\% | 19.1\% |
| 14 | 191,465 | 175,893 | 77.7\% | 75.6\% | 61.0\% | 66.4\% | 15.1\% | 14.8\% | 7.4\% | 4.6\% | 15.4\% | 13.2\% |
| 15 | 179,672 | 185,921 | 70.6\% | 70.4\% | 57.3\% | 57.6\% | 20.1\% | 19.5\% | 12.9\% | 13.5\% | 7.9\% | 7.7\% |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population - 2006-2010
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \text { District } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Total CVAP } \\ \text { (Final Map) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Total CVAP } \\ \text { (Current) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% Latino } \\ \text { CVAP } \\ \text { (Final Map) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% Latino } \\ \text { CVAP } \\ \text { (Current) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% White } \\ \text { CVAP (Final } \\ \text { Map) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% White } \\ \text { CVAP } \\ \text { (Current) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% Black } \\ \text { CVAP (Final } \\ \text { Map) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% Black } \\ \text { CVAP } \\ \text { (Current) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% Asian } \\ \text { CVAP (Final } \\ \text { Map) }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { CVAP } \\ \text { (Current) }\end{array}\right]$

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District | Total Registration (Final Map) | Total Registration (Current) | \%Spanish Surname Registration (Final Map) | \%Spanish <br> Surname <br> Registration (Current) | \%African- <br> American Registration (Final Map) | \%African- <br> American <br> Registration (Current) | \%Asian Surname Registration (Final Map) | \%Asian Surname Registration (Current) | \%Jewish <br> Surname <br> Registration <br> (Final Map) | \%Jewish <br> Surname <br> Registration (Current) | \%Armenian <br> Surname <br> Registration <br> (Final Map) | \%Armenian <br> Surname <br> Registration (Current) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 | 74,163 | 63,110 | 54.1\% | 56.8\% | 6.1\% | 7.7\% | 13.7\% | 14.2\% | 1.0\% | 0.7\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% |
| 02 | 111,376 | 129,409 | 25.5\% | 18.7\% | 6.2\% | 5.0\% | 4.4\% | 4.4\% | 5.9\% | 5.9\% | 5.9\% | 7.1\% |
| 03 | 116,413 | 131,092 | 19.1\% | 17.5\% | 5.7\% | 5.1\% | 7.1\% | 7.1\% | 8.0\% | 8.5\% | 2.2\% | 2.2\% |
| 04 | 148,474 | 126,187 | 9.3\% | 13.8\% | 6.4\% | 7.8\% | 7.3\% | 8.8\% | 8.4\% | 5.3\% | 2.3\% | 2.4\% |
| 05 | 150,406 | 168,711 | 7.5\% | 5.7\% | 5.1\% | 3.7\% | 7.8\% | 6.9\% | 14.5\% | 15.5\% | 1.1\% | 1.2\% |
| 06 | 78,894 | 77,490 | 50.1\% | 52.8\% | 6.8\% | 6.0\% | 6.5\% | 6.0\% | 1.8\% | 1.6\% | 2.8\% | 3.2\% |
| 07 | 98,333 | 78,684 | 49.4\% | 61.3\% | 7.0\% | 9.4\% | 4.6\% | 5.3\% | 1.0\% | 0.8\% | 3.5\% | 0.5\% |
| 08 | 106,492 | 117,491 | 27.0\% | 22.1\% | 63.8\% | 66.8\% | 2.0\% | 2.3\% | 0.5\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| 09 | 68,633 | 74,120 | 45.2\% | 43.9\% | 43.1\% | 39.7\% | 2.6\% | 5.2\% | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| 10 | 101,780 | 99,197 | 23.0\% | 24.0\% | 50.6\% | 43.2\% | 9.2\% | 10.0\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% |
| 11 | 156,364 | 159,823 | 10.5\% | 10.7\% | 4.7\% | 5.9\% | 7.4\% | 7.4\% | 8.1\% | 7.9\% | 0.5\% | 0.5\% |
| 12 | 142,834 | 137,964 | 17.3\% | 18.7\% | 5.1\% | 5.6\% | 9.7\% | 9.6\% | 6.1\% | 5.6\% | 3.1\% | 3.2\% |
| 13 | 93,768 | 83,478 | 36.2\% | 40.4\% | 7.2\% | 6.7\% | 10.3\% | 10.3\% | 2.1\% | 1.8\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |
| 14 | 95,229 | 93,103 | 54.6\% | 58.8\% | 7.8\% | 4.2\% | 10.2\% | 8.7\% | 1.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.4\% |
| 15 | 100,072 | 103,372 | 38.1\% | 38.0\% | 22.2\% | 23.3\% | 5.3\% | 5.1\% | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District | \%Asian <br> Surname <br> Registration <br> (Final Map) | \%Asian <br> Surname <br> Registration <br> (Current) | \%Chinese <br> Surname <br> Registration <br> (Final Map) | \%Chinese <br> Surname <br> Registration <br> (Current) | \%Filipino <br> Surname <br> Registration <br> (Final Map) | \%Filipino <br> Surname <br> Registration <br> (Current) | \%Indian <br> Surname <br> Registration <br> (Final Map) | \%Indian <br> Surname <br> Registration <br> (Current) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 | $13.7 \%$ | $14.2 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| 02 | $4.4 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| 03 | $7.1 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ |
| 04 | $7.3 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| 05 | $7.8 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |
| 06 | $6.5 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| 07 | $4.6 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| 08 | $2.0 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| 09 | $2.6 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| 10 | $9.2 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| 11 | $7.4 \%$ | $7.4 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| 12 | $9.7 \%$ | $9.6 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| 13 | $10.3 \%$ | $10.3 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| 14 | $10.2 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| 15 | $5.3 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |

Table 6: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration Continued

| District | \%Japanese <br> Surname <br> Registration <br> (Final Map) | \%Japanese <br> Surname <br> Registration <br> (Current) | \%Korean <br> Surname <br> Registration <br> (Final Map) | \%Korean <br> Surname <br> Registration <br> (Current) | \%Vietnameses <br> Surname <br> (Final Map) | \%Vietnamese <br> Surname <br> Registration <br> (Current) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 | 357 | $0.3 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ |
| 02 | 514 | $0.5 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| 03 | 584 | $0.5 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ |
| 04 | 1,040 | $0.8 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| 05 | 1,175 | $0.7 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| 06 | 381 | $0.5 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| 07 | 393 | $0.4 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| 08 | 137 | $0.2 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| 09 | 92 | $0.4 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| 10 | 998 | $1.1 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| 11 | 3,050 | $1.9 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| 12 | 1,142 | $0.8 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |
| 13 | 677 | $0.7 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| 14 | 978 | $0.9 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| 15 | 1,429 | $1.4 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |



- 002 - OLD NORTHRIDGE CC

006 -ARLETA NC
009 - FOOTHILL TRAILS DISTRICT NC
013-CANOGA PARKNC
016 - WOODLAND HILLS-WARNER CENTER NC
019 - LaKE balboa nC
022 - NOHO WEST NC
025 - nc valley village
028-GREATER TOLUCA LAKE NC
032 - CENTRAL HOLLYWOOD NC
036 -GREATER GRIFFITH PARK NC
039 -GLASSELL PARK NC
042 - ARROYO SECO NC146 - historic ciltural nc050- BOYLE HEIGHTS NC
054 - MACARTHUR PARK NC 060 - P.LC.O. NC
063 - WESTWOOD NC
066 - WEST LOS ANGELES NC
070 - DEL REY NC
074- UNITED NEIGHBORHOODS OF THE HISTORIC ARLINGTO 077 -EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS NORTH AREA NDC 080 - PARK MESA HEIGHTS NC084 -EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS SOUTHWEST AREA NDC 088 - WATTS NC
092 - HARBOR CITY NC095 -CENTRAL SAN PEDRO NC
699 - CHATSWORTH NC
102 - GREATER CYPRESS PARK NC
110 - CENTRAL ALAMEDA NC113 - NORTHRIDGE WEST
117 - PACIFIC PALISADES NC
120 - NORTHRIDGE EAST
123 - UNITED FOR VICTORY

004 - GRANADA HILLS NORTH NC
007 - PACOIMA NC
010-SUNLAND-TUJUNGA NC
014-WINNETKA NC
017-TARZANA NC
020 -VAN NUYS NC 023 - NORTH HOLLYWOOD NORTHEAST NC 026 - SHERMAN OAKS NC
029 - HOLLYWOOD HILLS WEST NC
033 - HOLLYWOOD STUDIO DISTRICT NC
037 -atwater village nc
040 - EAGLE ROCK NC 043 -ELYSIAN VALLEY RIVERSIDE NC
047 - LINCOLN HEIGHTS NC
052 - DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES
055 - WILSHIRE CENTER - KOREATOWN NC
061 - SOUTH ROBERTSON NC
064 - BEL AIR-BEVERLY CREST NC 067 - MAR VISTA CC 071 - NC WESTCHESTER/PLAYA DEL REY 075 - WeSt Adams nc 078 - SOUTH CENTRAL NC
081 - EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS CENTRAL AREA NDC 086 - COMMUNITY AND NEIGHBORS FOR NINTH DISTRICT UN 090 - HARBOR GATEWAY NORTH NC
093 - WILMINGTON NC
096 - COASTAL SAN PEDRO NC
100 - PANORAMA CITY NC
104-OLYMPIC PARK NC
111 - NORTH HILLS WEST NC
114 - PORTER RANCH NC
118-GRANADA HILLS SOUTH NC
121 - WESTLAKE SOUTH NC
124 - NORTHRIDGE SOUTH NC
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005-SYLMAR NC
008 - SUN VALLEY AREA NC
011 - WEST HILLS NC
011 - WEST HILLS
015 - RESEDA NC
018 - ENCINO NC
021 - GREATER VALLEY GLEN COUNCIL
024 - MID-TOWN NORTH HOLLYWOOD NC
027 - STUDIO CITY NC 030 - HOLLYWOOD UNITED NC 030 - HOLLYWOOD UNITED N 038 - SILVER LAKE NC 041-HISTORIC HIGHLAND PARK NC 044 - GREATER ECHO PARK ELYSIAN NC 048 - LA- 32 NC
053 - RAMPART VILLAGE NC
058 - MID CITY WEST CC
062 - WESTSIDE NC
065 - BRENTWOOD CC
068 - VENICE NC
073 - MID CITY NC
076 - PICO UNION NC
079 - EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS WEST AREA NDC 082 - VERNON/MAIN NC
 CONGRS SOUTIEAST AREA NDC 091 - HARBOR GATEWAY SOUTH NC 094 - NORTHWEST SAN PEDRO NC
097 - WESTLAKE NORTH NC
101 - MISSION HILLS NC
109 - VOICES OF 90037
112 - NORTH HILLS EAST
115 - PALMS NC
119 - GREATER WILSHIRE NC
122 - HISTORIC FILIPINOTOWN NC


| District O1 |
| :--- |
| Neighborhood Councils \# of times NC split by <br> Final Map Districts NC Population in District Other City Council <br> District/s <br> District    |
| ARROYO SECO NC |
| DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES |
| EAGLE ROCK NC |
| GLASSELL PARK NC |

Please note that splits of neighborhood council populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two neighborhood
councils \& splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report. Unsplit neighborhood councils with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of NCs that are split by census blocks.


## District 02

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|c|}\hline \text { Neighborhood Councils } & \begin{array}{c}\text { \# of times NC split by } \\
\text { Final Map Districts }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { NC Population in District }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { O of NC Population in the } \\
\text { District }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Other City Council } \\
\text { District/s }\end{array}
$$ <br>

\hline GREATER VALLEY GLEN COUNCIL \& 0 \& 47,309 \& 100.0 \& \mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}\end{array}\right]\)| n/a |
| :--- |
| MID-TOWN NORTH HOLLYWOOD NC |

Please note that splits of neighborhood council populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two neighborhood
councils \& splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report. Unsplit neighborhood councils with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of NCs that are split by census blocks.


## District 03

| Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by <br> Final Map Districts | NC Population in District | O of NC Population in the <br> District | Other City Council <br> District/s |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CANOGA PARK NC | 0 | 51,643 | 99.9 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| RESEDA NC | 1 | 54,606 | 79.9 | 12 |
| TARZANA NC | 0 | 35,682 | 100.0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| WINNETKA NC | 0 | 46,919 | 100.0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| WOODLAND HILLS-WARNER CENTER NC | 0 | 70,111 | 100.0 |  |

Please note that splits of neighborhood council populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two neighborhood
councils \& splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report. Unsplit neighborhood councils with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of NCs that are split by census blocks


## District 04

| Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map Districts | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEL AIR-BEVERLY CREST NC | 1 | 14,397 | 53.1 | 05 |
| CENTRAL HOLLYWOOD NC | 1 | 4,549 | 27.2 | 13 |
| GREATER GRIFFITH PARK NC | 1 | 32,277 | 95.6 | 13 |
| GREATER TOLUCA LAKE NC | 0 | 11,706 | 100.0 | n/a |
| GREATER WILSHIRE NC | 1 | 43,400 | 89.4 | 05 |
| HOLLYWOOD HILLS WEST NC | 1 | 30,090 | 76.9 | 13 |
| HOLLYWOOD UNITED NC | 1 | 12,337 | 63.6 | 13 |
| MID CITY WEST CC | 1 | 23,513 | 40.6 | 05 |
| SHERMAN OAKS NC | 0 | 63,839 | 100.0 | n/a |
| SILVER LAKE NC | 1 | 4,299 | 13.2 | 13 |
| STUDIO CITY NC | 1 | 199 | 0.6 | 02 |
| VAN NUYS NC | 2 | 6,862 | 8.7 | 02, 06 |

Please note that splits of neighborhood council populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two neighborhood
councils \& splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report. Unsplit neighborhood councils with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of NCs that are split by census blocks.


## District 05

| Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map Districts | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEL AIR-BEVERLY CREST NC | 1 | 12,705 | 46.9 | 04 |
| ENCINO NC | 0 | 43,981 | 99.6 | n/a |
| GREATER WILSHIRE NC | 1 | 5,150 | 10.6 | 04 |
| MID CITY WEST CC | 1 | 34,335 | 59.4 | 04 |
| P.I.C.O. NC | 1 | 3,289 | 15.2 | 10 |
| PALMS NC | 0 | 27,275 | 100.0 | n/a |
| SOUTH ROBERTSON NC | 0 | 40,967 | 100.0 | n/a |
| WESTSIDE NC | 0 | 31,155 | 100.0 | n/a |
| WESTWOOD NC | 0 | 51,503 | 100.0 | n/a |

Please note that splits of neighborhood council populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two neighborhood
councils \& splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report. Unsplit neighborhood councils with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of NCs that are split by census blocks.


District 06

| Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map Districts | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ARLETA NC | 0 | 35,332 | 100.0 | n/a |
| LAKE BALBOA NC | 0 | 42,183 | 99.9 | n/a |
| NORTH HILLS EAST | 1 | 20,812 | 52.7 | 07 |
| NORTH HOLLYWOOD NORTHEAST NC | 1 | 10,396 | 30.9 | 02 |
| PANORAMA CITY NC | 0 | 67,394 | 100.0 | n/a |
| SUN VALLEY AREA NC | 1 | 25,617 | 53.4 | 02 |
| VAN NUYS NC | 2 | 56,770 | 72.0 | 02, 04 |

Please note that splits of neighborhood council populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two neighborhood
councils \& splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report. Unsplit neighborhood councils with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of NCs that are split by census blocks.

District 07

| Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by <br> Final Map Districts | NC Population in District | O of NC Population in the <br> District | Other City Council <br> District/s |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FOOTHILL TRAILS DISTRICT NC | 0 | 20,962 | 98.8 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| MISSION HILLS NC | 0 | 22,762 | 99.9 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| NORTH HILLS EAST | 1 | 18,650 | 47.3 | 06 |
| PACOIMA NC | 0 | 74,752 | 100.0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| SUNLAND-TUJUNGA NC | 0 | 43,253 | 100.0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| SYLMAR NC | 0 | 78,846 | 100.0 |  |

Please note that splits of neighborhood council populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two neighborhood
councils \& splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report. Unsplit neighborhood councils with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of NCs that are split by census blocks.


## District 08

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|c|}\hline \text { Neighborhood Councils } & \begin{array}{c}\text { \# of times NC split by } \\
\text { Final Map Districts }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { NC Population in District }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Other City Council } \\
\text { District/s }\end{array}
$$ <br>

District\end{array}\right]\)| $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| :--- |
| EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS CENTRAL AREA |
| EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS NORTH AREA NDC |

Please note that splits of neighborhood council populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two neighborhood
councils \& splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report. Unsplit neighborhood councils with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of NCs that are split by census blocks.


District 09
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|c|}\hline \text { Neighborhood Councils } & \begin{array}{c}\text { \# of times NC split by } \\
\text { Final Map Districts }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { NC Population in District }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Other City Council } \\
\text { District/s }\end{array}
$$ <br>
\hline CENTRAL ALAMEDA NC \& 0 \& 30,570 \& 100.0 <br>

District\end{array}\right]\)| $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| :--- |
| COMMUNITY AND NEIGHBORS FOR NINTH <br> DISTRICT NC |
| DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES |

Please note that splits of neighborhood council populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two neighborhood
councils \& splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report. Unsplit neighborhood councils with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of NCs that are split by census blocks.


District 10

| Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map Districts | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS WEST AREA NDC | 0 | 36,838 | 100.0 | n/a |
| MID CITY NC | 0 | 28,861 | 100.0 | n/a |
| OLYMPIC PARK NC | 0 | 18,805 | 100.0 | n/a |
| P.I.C.O. NC | 1 | 18,296 | 84.8 | 05 |
| UNITED NEIGHBORHOODS OF THE HISTORIC ARLINGTON | 0 | 52,594 | 100.0 | n/a |
| WEST ADAMS NC | 0 | 27,007 | 100.0 | n/a |
| WILSHIRE CENTER - KOREATOWN NC | 1 | 66,777 | 70.1 | 13 |

Please note that splits of neighborhood council populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two neighborhood
councils \& splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report. Unsplit neighborhood councils with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of NCs that are split by census blocks.


## District 11

| Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by <br> Final Map Districts | NC Population in District | O of NC Population in the <br> District | Other City Council <br> District/s |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEL REY NC | 0 | 31,023 | 100.0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| MAR VISTA CC | 0 | 50,187 | 100.0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| NC WESTCHESTER/PLAYA DEL REY | 1 | 50,945 | 90.3 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| VENICE NC | 0 | 36,875 | 100.0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| WEST LOS ANGELES NC | 0 | 30,629 | 100.0 |  |

Please note that splits of neighborhood council populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two neighborhood
councils \& splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report. Unsplit neighborhood councils with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of NCs that are split by census blocks.


District 12

| Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map Districts | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CHATSWORTH NC | 0 | 33,463 | 100.0 | n/a |
| GRANADA HILLS NORTH NC | 0 | 25,245 | 100.0 | n/a |
| GRANADA HILLS SOUTH NC | 0 | 28,442 | 100.0 | n/a |
| NORTH HILLS WEST NC | 0 | 20,964 | 100.0 | n/a |
| NORTHRIDGE EAST | 0 | 25,350 | 100.0 | n/a |
| NORTHRIDGE SOUTH NC | 0 | 30,918 | 100.0 | n/a |
| NORTHRIDGE WEST | 0 | 21,006 | 100.0 | n/a |
| PORTER RANCH NC | 0 | 21,027 | 100.0 | n/a |
| RESEDA NC | 1 | 13,712 | 20.1 | 03 |
| WEST HILLS NC | 0 | 38,686 | 100.0 | n/a |

Please note that splits of neighborhood council populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two neighborhood
councils \& splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report. Unsplit neighborhood councils with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of NCs that are split by census blocks.


## District 13

| Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map Districts | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ATWATER VILLAGE NC | 0 | 14,094 | 100.0 | n/a |
| CENTRAL HOLLYWOOD NC | 1 | 12,203 | 72.8 | 04 |
| EAST HOLLYWOOD NC | 0 | 46,425 | 100.0 | n/a |
| ELYSIAN VALLEY RIVERSIDE NC | 0 | 6,889 | 100.0 | n/a |
| GREATER ECHO PARK ELYSIAN NC | 1 | 31,375 | 68.7 | 01 |
| GREATER GRIFFITH PARK NC | 1 | 1,477 | 4.4 | 04 |
| HOLLYWOOD HILLS WEST NC | 1 | 8,973 | 22.9 | 04 |
| HOLLYWOOD STUDIO DISTRICT NC | 0 | 29,213 | 100.0 | n/a |
| HOLLYWOOD UNITED NC | 1 | 7,046 | 36.4 | 04 |
| RAMPART VILLAGE NC | 0 | 24,107 | 100.0 | n/a |
| SILVER LAKE NC | 1 | 28,265 | 86.8 | 04 |
| WESTLAKE NORTH NC | 1 | 10,992 | 43.5 | 01 |
| WILSHIRE CENTER - KOREATOWN NC | 1 | 28,546 | 29.9 | 10 |

Please note that splits of neighborhood council populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two neighborhood
councils \& splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report. Unsplit neighborhood councils with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of NCs that are split by census blocks


## District 14

| Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map Districts | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ARROYO SECO NC | 1 | 6,534 | 29.3 | 01 |
| BOYLE HEIGHTS NC | 0 | 84,001 | 100.0 | n/a |
| DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES | 2 | 37,732 | 98.1 | 01, 09 |
| EAGLE ROCK NC | 1 | 28,858 | 93.9 | 01 |
| GLASSELL PARK NC | 1 | 14,553 | 63.4 | 01 |
| HISTORIC CULTURAL NC | 1 | 6,365 | 32.3 | 01 |
| HISTORIC HIGHLAND PARK NC | 1 | 13,596 | 24.4 | 01 |
| LA-32 NC | 1 | 41,529 | 92.0 | 01 |
| LINCOLN HEIGHTS NC | 1 | 1,698 | 5.5 | 01 |

Please note that splits of neighborhood council populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two neighborhood
councils \& splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report. Unsplit neighborhood councils with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of NCs that are split by census blocks.


| District 15 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map Districts | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| CENTRAL SAN PEDRO NC | 0 | 29,628 | 100.0 | n/a |
| COASTAL SAN PEDRO NC | 0 | 26,959 | 100.0 | n/a |
| EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS SOUTHEAST AREA NDC | 2 | 207 | 0.3 | 08, 08 |
| HARBOR CITY NC | 0 | 22,497 | 100.0 | n/a |
| HARBOR GATEWAY NORTH NC | 0 | 34,052 | 100.0 | n/a |
| HARBOR GATEWAY SOUTH NC | 0 | 22,496 | 100.0 | n/a |
| NORTHWEST SAN PEDRO NC | 0 | 21,055 | 100.0 | n/a |
| WATTS NC | 0 | 39,522 | 100.0 | n/a |
| WILMINGTON NC | 0 | 54,200 | 100.0 | n/a |

Please note that splits of neighborhood council populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two neighborhood
councils \& splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report. Unsplit neighborhood councils with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of NCs that are split by census blocks.

Table 1: Neighborhood Council Splits Summary

| Total Neighborhood Councils that are Split | 29 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Neighborhood Councils that are Not Split | 66 |
| Neighborhood Councils Split Once (2 dsitricts) | 26 |
| Neighborhood Councils Split Twice (3 districts) | 3 |
| Neighborhood Councils Split 3 Times (4 districts) | 0 |

Table 2: Neighborhood Council Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

| District 01 | Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map Districts | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ARROYO SECO NC | 1 | 15,785 | 70.7 | 14 |
|  | DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES | 2 | 166 | 0.4 | 09, 14 |
|  | EAGLE ROCK NC | 1 | 1,878 | 6.1 | 14 |
|  | GLASSELL PARK NC | 1 | 8,419 | 36.6 | 14 |
|  | GREATER CYPRESS PARK NC | 0 | 12,825 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | GREATER ECHO PARK ELYSIAN NC | 1 | 14,025 | 30.7 | 13 |
|  | HISTORIC CULTURAL NC | 1 | 13,347 | 67.7 | 14 |
|  | HISTORIC HIGHLAND PARK NC | 1 | 42,111 | 75.6 | 14 |
|  | LA-32 NC | 1 | 3,611 | 8.0 | 14 |
|  | LINCOLN HEIGHTS NC | 1 | 29,454 | 94.5 | 14 |
|  | MACARTHUR PARK NC | 0 | 29,052 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | PICO UNION NC | 0 | 39,977 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | WESTLAKE NORTH NC | 1 | 14,303 | 56.5 | 13 |
|  | WESTLAKE SOUTH NC | 0 | 21,842 | 100.0 | n/a |
| District 02 | Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
|  | GREATER VALLEY GLEN COUNCIL | 0 | 47,309 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | MID-TOWN NORTH HOLLYWOOD NC | 0 | 68,275 | 99.6 | n/a |

Please note that splits of NC populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two NCs splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report.

Table 2: Neighborhood Council Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

|  | NC VALLEY VILLAGE | 0 | 23,080 | 100.0 | n/a |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NOHO WEST NC | 0 | 20,907 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | NORTH HOLLYWOOD NORTHEAST NC | 1 | 23,284 | 69.1 | 06 |
|  | STUDIO CITY NC | 1 | 33,850 | 99.4 | 04 |
|  | SUN VALLEY AREA NC | 1 | 22,242 | 46.4 | 06 |
|  | VAN NUYS NC | 2 | 15,192 | 19.3 | 04, 06 |
| District 03 | Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
|  | CANOGA PARK NC | 0 | 51,643 | 99.9 | n/a |
|  | RESEDA NC | 1 | 54,606 | 79.9 | 12 |
|  | TARZANA NC | 0 | 35,682 | 100.0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
|  | WINNETKA NC | 0 | 46,919 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | WOODLAND HILLS-WARNER CENTER NC | 0 | 70,111 | 100.0 | n/a |
| District 04 | Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
|  | BEL AIR-BEVERLY CREST NC | 1 | 14,397 | 53.1 | 05 |
|  | CENTRAL HOLLYWOOD NC | 1 | 4,549 | 27.2 | 13 |
|  | GREATER GRIFFITH PARK NC | 1 | 32,277 | 95.6 | 13 |
|  | GREATER TOLUCA LAKE NC | 0 | 11,706 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | GREATER WILSHIRE NC | 1 | 43,400 | 89.4 | 05 |

Please note that splits of NC populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two NCs splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report.

Table 2: Neighborhood Council Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

|  | HOLLYWOOD HILLS WEST NC | 1 | 30,090 | 76.9 | 13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HOLLYWOOD UNITED NC | 1 | 12,337 | 63.6 | 13 |
|  | MID CITY WEST CC | 1 | 23,513 | 40.6 | 05 |
|  | SHERMAN OAKS NC | 0 | 63,839 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | SILVER LAKE NC | 1 | 4,299 | 13.2 | 13 |
|  | STUDIO CITY NC | 1 | 199 | 0.6 | 02 |
|  | VAN NUYS NC | 2 | 6,862 | 8.7 | 02, 06 |
| District 05 | Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
|  | BEL AIR-BEVERLY CREST NC | 1 | 12,705 | 46.9 | 04 |
|  | ENCINO NC | 0 | 43,981 | 99.6 | n/a |
|  | GREATER WILSHIRE NC | 1 | 5,150 | 10.6 | 04 |
|  | MID CITY WEST CC | 1 | 34,335 | 59.4 | 04 |
|  | P.I.C.O. NC | 1 | 3,289 | 15.2 | 10 |
|  | PALMS NC | 0 | 27,275 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | SOUTH ROBERTSON NC | 0 | 40,967 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | WESTSIDE NC | 0 | 31,155 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | WESTWOOD NC | 0 | 51,503 | 100.0 | n/a |
| District 06 | Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |

Please note that splits of NC populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two NCs splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report.

Table 2: Neighborhood Council Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District


Please note that splits of NC populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two NCs splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report.

Table 2: Neighborhood Council Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

|  | EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS SOUTHWEST AREA NDC | 0 | 28,233 | 100.0 | n/a |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NC WESTCHESTER/PLAYA DEL REY | 1 | 5,484 | 9.7 | 11 |
|  | PARK MESA HEIGHTS NC | 0 | 35,918 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | VOICES OF 90037 | 0 | 45,935 | 100.0 | n/a |
| District 09 | Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
|  | CENTRAL ALAMEDA NC | 0 | 30,570 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | COMMUNITY AND NEIGHBORS FOR NINTH DISTRICT NC | 0 | 44,227 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES | 2 | 547 | 1.4 | 01, 14 |
|  | EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS NORTH AREA NDC | 1 | 14,739 | 19.7 | 08 |
|  | EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS SOUTHEAST AREA NDC | 2 | 61,297 | 82.5 | 08, 15 |
|  | SOUTH CENTRAL NC | 0 | 43,120 | 100.0 | n/a |
| District 10 | Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
|  | EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS WEST AREA ND | 0 | 36,838 | 100.0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
|  | MID CITY NC | 0 | 28,861 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | OLYMPIC PARK NC | 0 | 18,805 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | P.I.C.O. NC | 1 | 18,296 | 84.8 | 05 |
|  | UNITED NEIGHBORHOODS OF THE HISTORIC ARLINGTON | 0 | 52,594 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | WEST ADAMS NC | 0 | 27,007 | 100.0 | n/a |

Please note that splits of NC populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two NCs splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report.

Table 2: Neighborhood Council Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

|  | WILSHIRE CENTER - KOREATOWN NC | 1 | 66,777 | 70.1 | 13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District 11 | Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
|  | DEL REY NC | 0 | 31,023 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | MAR VISTA CC | 0 | 50,187 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | NC WESTCHESTER/PLAYA DEL REY | 1 | 50,945 | 90.3 | 08 |
|  | VENICE NC | 0 | 36,875 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | WEST LOS ANGELES NC | 0 | 30,629 | 100.0 | n/a |
| District 12 | Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
|  | CHATSWORTH NC | 0 | 33,463 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | GRANADA HILLS NORTH NC | 0 | 25,245 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | GRANADA HILLS SOUTH NC | 0 | 28,442 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | NORTH HILLS WEST NC | 0 | 20,964 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | NORTHRIDGE EAST | 0 | 25,350 | 100.0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
|  | NORTHRIDGE SOUTH NC | 0 | 30,918 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | NORTHRIDGE WEST | 0 | 21,006 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | PORTER RANCH NC | 0 | 21,027 | 100.0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
|  | RESEDA NC | 1 | 13,712 | 20.1 | 03 |
|  | WEST HILLS NC | 0 | 38,686 | 100.0 | n/a |

Please note that splits of NC populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two NCs splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report.

Table 2: Neighborhood Council Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

| District 13 | Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ATWATER VILLAGE NC | 0 | 14,094 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | CENTRAL HOLLYWOOD NC | 1 | 12,203 | 72.8 | 04 |
|  | EAST HOLLYWOOD NC | 0 | 46,425 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | ELYSIAN VALLEY RIVERSIDE NC | 0 | 6,889 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | GREATER ECHO PARK ELYSIAN NC | 1 | 31,375 | 68.7 | 01 |
|  | GREATER GRIFFITH PARK NC | 1 | 1,477 | 4.4 | 04 |
|  | HOLLYWOOD HILLS WEST NC | 1 | 8,973 | 22.9 | 04 |
|  | HOLLYWOOD STUDIO DISTRICT NC | 0 | 29,213 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | HOLLYWOOD UNITED NC | 1 | 7,046 | 36.4 | 04 |
|  | RAMPART VILLAGE NC | 0 | 24,107 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | SILVER LAKE NC | 1 | 28,265 | 86.8 | 04 |
|  | WESTLAKE NORTH NC | 1 | 10,992 | 43.5 | 01 |
|  | WILSHIRE CENTER - KOREATOWN NC | 1 | 28,546 | 29.9 | 10 |
| District 14 | Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { NC Population } \\ \text { in District } \end{array}$ | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
|  | ARROYO SECO NC | 1 | 6,534 | 29.3 | 01 |
|  | BOYLE HEIGHTS NC | 0 | 84,001 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES | 2 | 37,732 | 98.1 | 01, 09 |

Please note that splits of NC populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two NCs splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report.

Table 2: Neighborhood Council Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

|  | EAGLE ROCK NC | 1 | 28,858 | 93.9 | 01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | GLASSELL PARK NC | 1 | 14,553 | 63.4 | 01 |
|  | HISTORIC CULTURAL NC | 1 | 6,365 | 32.3 | 01 |
|  | HISTORIC HIGHLAND PARK NC | 1 | 13,596 | 24.4 | 01 |
|  | LA-32 NC | 1 | 41,529 | 92.0 | 01 |
|  | LINCOLN HEIGHTS NC | 1 | 1,698 | 5.5 | 01 |
| District 15 | Neighborhood Councils | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
|  | CENTRAL SAN PEDRO NC | 0 | 29,628 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | COASTAL SAN PEDRO NC | 0 | 26,959 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS SOUTHEAST AREA NDC | 2 | 207 | 0.3 | 08, 08 |
|  | HARBOR CITY NC | 0 | 22,497 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | HARBOR GATEWAY NORTH NC | 0 | 34,052 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | HARBOR GATEWAY SOUTH NC | 0 | 22,496 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | NORTHWEST SAN PEDRO NC | 0 | 21,055 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | WATTS NC | 0 | 39,522 | 100.0 | n/a |
|  | WILMINGTON NC | 0 | 54,200 | 100.0 | n/a |

Table 3: Neighborhood Council Splits by Neighborhood Council

| Neighborhood Council | LACCRC Final Map Recommendation February, 22nd, 2012 | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ARLETA NC | 06 | 0 | 35,332 | 100.0 | n/a |
| ARROYO SECO NC | 01 | 1 | 15,785 | 70.7 | 14 |
| ARROYO SECO NC | 14 | 1 | 6,534 | 29.3 | 01 |
| ATWATER VILLAGE NC | 13 | 0 | 14,094 | 100.0 | n/a |
| BEL AIR-BEVERLY CREST NC | 04 | 1 | 14,397 | 53.1 | 05 |
| BEL AIR-BEVERLY CREST NC | 05 | 1 | 12,705 | 46.9 | 04 |
| BOYLE HEIGHTS NC | 14 | 0 | 84,001 | 100.0 | n/a |
| CANOGA PARK NC | 03 | 0 | 51,643 | 99.9 | n/a |
| CENTRAL ALAMEDA NC | 09 | 0 | 30,570 | 100.0 | n/a |
| CENTRAL HOLLYWOOD NC | 04 | 1 | 4,549 | 27.2 | 13 |
| CENTRAL HOLLYWOOD NC | 13 | 1 | 12,203 | 72.8 | 04 |
| CENTRAL SAN PEDRO NC | 15 | 0 | 29,628 | 100.0 | n/a |
| CHATSWORTH NC | 12 | 0 | 33,463 | 100.0 | n/a |
| COASTAL SAN PEDRO NC | 15 | 0 | 26,959 | 100.0 | n/a |
| COMMUNITY AND NEIGHBORS FOR NINTH DISTRI | 09 | 0 | 44,227 | 100.0 | n/a |
| DEL REY NC | 11 | 0 | 31,023 | 100.0 | n/a |
| DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES | 01 | 2 | 166 | 0.4 | 09, 14 |
| DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES | 09 | 2 | 547 | 1.4 | 01, 14 |
| DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES | 14 | 2 | 37,732 | 98.1 | 01, 09 |

Please note that splits of NC populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two NCs splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report.

Table 3: Neighborhood Council Splits by Neighborhood Council

| Neighborhood Council | LACCRC Final Map <br> Recommendation - <br> February, 22nd, 2012 | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City <br> Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EAGLE ROCK NC | 01 | 1 | 1,878 | 6.1 | 14 |
| EAGLE ROCK NC | 14 | 1 | 28,858 | 93.9 | 01 |
| EAST HOLLYWOOD NC | 13 | 0 | 46,425 | 100.0 | n/a |
| ELYSIAN VALLEY RIVERSIDE NC | 13 | 0 | 6,889 | 100.0 | n/a |
| EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS CENTRAL AREA NDC | 08 | 0 | 42,854 | 100.0 | n/a |
| EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS NORTH AREA NDC | 08 | 1 | 60,056 | 80.3 | 09 |
| EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS NORTH AREA NDC | 09 | 1 | 14,739 | 19.7 | 08 |
| EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS SOUTHEAST AREA NDC | 08 | 2 | 12,759 | 17.2 | 09, 15 |
| EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS SOUTHEAST AREA NDC | 09 | 2 | 61,297 | 82.5 | 08, 15 |
| EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS SOUTHEAST AREA NDC | 15 | 2 | 207 | 0.3 | 08, 08 |
| EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS SOUTHWEST AREA NDC | 08 | 0 | 28,233 | 100.0 | n/a |
| EMPOWERMENT CONGRESS WEST AREA NDC | 10 | 0 | 36,838 | 100.0 | n/a |
| ENCINO NC | 05 | 0 | 43,981 | 99.6 | n/a |
| FOOTHILL TRAILS DISTRICT NC | 07 | 0 | 20,962 | 98.8 | n/a |
| GLASSELL PARK NC | 01 | 1 | 8,419 | 36.6 | 14 |
| GLASSELL PARK NC | 14 | 1 | 14,553 | 63.4 | 01 |
| GRANADA HILLS NORTH NC | 12 | 0 | 25,245 | 100.0 | n/a |
| GRANADA HILLS SOUTH NC | 12 | 0 | 28,442 | 100.0 | n/a |
| GREATER CYPRESS PARK NC | 01 | 0 | 12,825 | 100.0 | n/a |

Please note that splits of NC populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two NCs splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report.

Table 3: Neighborhood Council Splits by Neighborhood Council

| Neighborhood Council | LACCRC Final Map <br> Recommendation - <br> February, 22nd, 2012 | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City <br> Council <br> District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GREATER ECHO PARK ELYSIAN NC | 01 | 1 | 14,025 | 30.7 | 13 |
| GREATER ECHO PARK ELYSIAN NC | 13 | 1 | 31,375 | 68.7 | 01 |
| GREATER GRIFFITH PARK NC | 04 | 1 | 32,277 | 95.6 | 13 |
| GREATER GRIFFITH PARK NC | 13 | 1 | 1,477 | 4.4 | 04 |
| GREATER TOLUCA LAKE NC | 04 | 0 | 11,706 | 100.0 | n/a |
| GREATER VALLEY GLEN COUNCIL | 02 | 0 | 47,309 | 100.0 | n/a |
| GREATER WILSHIRE NC | 04 | 1 | 43,400 | 89.4 | 05 |
| GREATER WILSHIRE NC | 05 | 1 | 5,150 | 10.6 | 04 |
| HARBOR CITY NC | 15 | 0 | 22,497 | 100.0 | n/a |
| HARBOR GATEWAY NORTH NC | 15 | 0 | 34,052 | 100.0 | n/a |
| HARBOR GATEWAY SOUTH NC | 15 | 0 | 22,496 | 100.0 | n/a |
| HISTORIC CULTURAL NC | 01 | 1 | 13,347 | 67.7 | 14 |
| HISTORIC CULTURAL NC | 14 | 1 | 6,365 | 32.3 | 01 |
| HISTORIC HIGHLAND PARK NC | 01 | 1 | 42,111 | 75.6 | 14 |
| HISTORIC HIGHLAND PARK NC | 14 | 1 | 13,596 | 24.4 | 01 |
| HOLLYWOOD HILLS WEST NC | 04 | 1 | 30,090 | 76.9 | 13 |
| HOLLYWOOD HILLS WEST NC | 13 | 1 | 8,973 | 22.9 | 04 |
| HOLLYWOOD STUDIO DISTRICT NC | 13 | 0 | 29,213 | 100.0 | n/a |
| HOLLYWOOD UNITED NC | 04 | 1 | 12,337 | 63.6 | 13 |

Please note that splits of NC populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two NCs splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report.

Table 3: Neighborhood Council Splits by Neighborhood Council

| Neighborhood Council | LACCRC Final Map Recommendation February, 22nd, 2012 | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City <br> Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HOLLYWOOD UNITED NC | 13 | 1 | 7,046 | 36.4 | 04 |
| LA-32 NC | 01 | 1 | 3,611 | 8.0 | 14 |
| LA-32 NC | 14 | 1 | 41,529 | 92.0 | 01 |
| LAKE BALBOA NC | 06 | 0 | 42,183 | 99.9 | n/a |
| LINCOLN HEIGHTS NC | 01 | 1 | 29,454 | 94.5 | 14 |
| LINCOLN HEIGHTS NC | 14 | 1 | 1,698 | 5.5 | 01 |
| MACARTHUR PARK NC | 01 | 0 | 29,052 | 100.0 | n/a |
| MAR VISTA CC | 11 | 0 | 50,187 | 100.0 | n/a |
| MID CITY NC | 10 | 0 | 28,861 | 100.0 | n/a |
| MID CITY WEST CC | 04 | 1 | 23,513 | 40.6 | 05 |
| MID CITY WEST CC | 05 | 1 | 34,335 | 59.4 | 04 |
| MID-TOWN NORTH HOLLYWOOD NC | 02 | 0 | 68,275 | 99.6 | n/a |
| MISSION HILLS NC | 07 | 0 | 22,762 | 99.9 | n/a |
| NC VALLEY VILLAGE | 02 | 0 | 23,080 | 100.0 | n/a |
| NC WESTCHESTER/PLAYA DEL REY | 08 | 1 | 5,484 | 9.7 | 11 |
| NC WESTCHESTER/PLAYA DEL REY | 11 | 1 | 50,945 | 90.3 | 08 |
| NOHO WEST NC | 02 | 0 | 20,907 | 100.0 | n/a |
| NORTH HILLS EAST | 06 | 1 | 20,812 | 52.7 | 07 |
| NORTH HILLS EAST | 07 | 1 | 18,650 | 47.3 | 06 |

Please note that splits of NC populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two NCs splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report.

Table 3: Neighborhood Council Splits by Neighborhood Council

| Neighborhood Council | LACCRC Final Map <br> Recommendation - <br> February, 22nd, 2012 | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City <br> Council <br> District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NORTH HILLS WEST NC | 12 | 0 | 20,964 | 100.0 | n/a |
| NORTH HOLLYWOOD NORTHEAST NC | 02 | 1 | 23,284 | 69.1 | 06 |
| NORTH HOLLYWOOD NORTHEAST NC | 06 | 1 | 10,396 | 30.9 | 02 |
| NORTHRIDGE EAST | 12 | 0 | 25,350 | 100.0 | n/a |
| NORTHRIDGE SOUTH NC | 12 | 0 | 30,918 | 100.0 | n/a |
| NORTHRIDGE WEST | 12 | 0 | 21,006 | 100.0 | n/a |
| NORTHWEST SAN PEDRO NC | 15 | 0 | 21,055 | 100.0 | n/a |
| OLYMPIC PARK NC | 10 | 0 | 18,805 | 100.0 | n/a |
| P.I.C.O. NC | 05 | 1 | 3,289 | 15.2 | 10 |
| P.I.C.O. NC | 10 | 1 | 18,296 | 84.8 | 05 |
| PACOIMA NC | 07 | 0 | 74,752 | 100.0 | n/a |
| PALMS NC | 05 | 0 | 27,275 | 100.0 | n/a |
| PANORAMA CITY NC | 06 | 0 | 67,394 | 100.0 | n/a |
| PARK MESA HEIGHTS NC | 08 | 0 | 35,918 | 100.0 | n/a |
| PICO UNION NC | 01 | 0 | 39,977 | 100.0 | n/a |
| PORTER RANCH NC | 12 | 0 | 21,027 | 100.0 | n/a |
| RAMPART VILLAGE NC | 13 | 0 | 24,107 | 100.0 | n/a |
| RESEDA NC | 03 | 1 | 54,606 | 79.9 | 12 |
| RESEDA NC | 12 | 1 | 13,712 | 20.1 | 03 |

Please note that splits of NC populations of 1 person or less; splits due to census blocks that are split between two NCs splits due to shared asset areas have been omitted from the report.

Table 3: Neighborhood Council Splits by Neighborhood Council

| Neighborhood Council | LACCRC Final Map Recommendation February, 22nd, 2012 | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SHERMAN OAKS NC | 04 | 0 | 63,839 | 100.0 | n/a |
| SILVER LAKE NC | 04 | 1 | 4,299 | 13.2 | 13 |
| SILVER LAKE NC | 13 | 1 | 28,265 | 86.8 | 04 |
| SOUTH CENTRAL NC | 09 | 0 | 43,120 | 100.0 | n/a |
| SOUTH ROBERTSON NC | 05 | 0 | 40,967 | 100.0 | n/a |
| STUDIO CITY NC | 02 | 1 | 33,850 | 99.4 | 04 |
| STUDIO CITY NC | 04 | 1 | 199 | 0.6 | 02 |
| SUN VALLEY AREA NC | 02 | 1 | 22,242 | 46.4 | 06 |
| SUN VALLEY AREA NC | 06 | 1 | 25,617 | 53.4 | 02 |
| SUNLAND-TUJUNGA NC | 07 | 0 | 43,253 | 100.0 | n/a |
| SYLMAR NC | 07 | 0 | 78,846 | 100.0 | n/a |
| TARZANA NC | 03 | 0 | 35,682 | 100.0 | n/a |
| UNITED NEIGHBORHOODS OF THE HISTORIC ARLINGTON NC | 10 | 0 | 52,594 | 100.0 | n/a |
| VAN NUYS NC | 02 | 2 | 15,192 | 19.3 | 04, 06 |
| VAN NUYS NC | 04 | 2 | 6,862 | 8.7 | 02, 06 |
| VAN NUYS NC | 06 | 2 | 56,770 | 72.0 | 02, 04 |
| VENICE NC | 11 | 0 | 36,875 | 100.0 | n/a |
| VOICES OF 90037 | 08 | 0 | 45,935 | 100.0 | n/a |
| WATTS NC | 15 | 0 | 39,522 | 100.0 | n/a |

Table 3: Neighborhood Council Splits by Neighborhood Council

| Neighborhood Council | LACCRC Final Map <br> Recommendation - <br> February, 22nd, 2012 | \# of times NC split by Final Map | NC Population in District | \% of NC Population in the District | Other City <br> Council <br> District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WEST ADAMS NC | 10 | 0 | 27,007 | 100.0 | n/a |
| WEST HILLS NC | 12 | 0 | 38,686 | 100.0 | n/a |
| WEST LOS ANGELES NC | 11 | 0 | 30,629 | 100.0 | n/a |
| WESTLAKE NORTH NC | 01 | 1 | 14,303 | 56.5 | 13 |
| WESTLAKE NORTH NC | 13 | 1 | 10,992 | 43.5 | 01 |
| WESTLAKE SOUTH NC | 01 | 0 | 21,842 | 100.0 | n/a |
| WESTSIDE NC | 05 | 0 | 31,155 | 100.0 | n/a |
| WESTWOOD NC | 05 | 0 | 51,503 | 100.0 | n/a |
| WILMINGTON NC | 15 | 0 | 54,200 | 100.0 | n/a |
| WILSHIRE CENTER - KOREATOWN NC | 10 | 1 | 66,777 | 70.1 | 13 |
| WILSHIRE CENTER - KOREATOWN NC | 13 | 1 | 28,546 | 29.9 | 10 |
| WINNETKA NC | 03 | 0 | 46,919 | 100.0 | n/a |
| WOODLAND HILLS-WARNER CENTER NC | 03 | 0 | 70,111 | 100.0 | n/a |




District 01

| LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chinatown | 1 | 9,480 | 56.3 | 14 |
| Cypress Park | 0 | 9,310 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Downtown | 2 | 1,525 | 3.6 | 09, 14 |
| Eagle Rock | 1 | 2,016 | 6.2 | 14 |
| Echo Park | 1 | 15,251 | 42.6 | 13 |
| Elysian Park | 1 | 2,240 | 96.4 | 13 |
| Glassell Park | 1 | 8,449 | 38.0 | 14 |
| Highland Park | 1 | 43,772 | 79.8 | 14 |
| Koreatown | 3 | 4,057 | 3.9 | 04, 10, 13 |
| Lincoln Heights | 1 | 27,791 | 98.6 | 14 |
| Montecito Heights | 1 | 8,910 | 54.0 | 14 |
| Mount Washington | 0 | 12,507 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Pico-Union | 2 | 40,615 | 99.3 | 08, 10 |
| Westlake | 3 | 60,570 | 57.0 | 10, 13, 14 |

Please note that splits of LA Times neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times
neighborhoods. Unsplit LA Times neighborhoods with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of LA Times neighborhoods that are split by census blocks.


District 02

| LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Hollywood | 1 | 74,383 | 96.9 | 04 |
| Shadow Hills | 2 | 5,282 | 37.9 | 06, 07 |
| Sherman Oaks | 1 | 729 | 1.1 | 04 |
| Studio City | 1 | 33,170 | 90.6 | 04 |
| Sun Valley | 1 | 42,239 | 54.2 | 06 |
| Toluca Lake | 1 | 1,488 | 17.2 | 04 |
| Valley Glen | 0 | 59,143 | 99.3 | n/a |
| Valley Village | 1 | 22,952 | 94.6 | 04 |
| Van Nuys | 2 | 17,873 | 17.1 | 04, 06 |

Please note that splits of LA Times neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times
neighborhoods. Unsplit LA Times neighborhoods with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of LA Times neighborhoods that are split by census blocks.


District 03

| LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times <br> Neighborhood split by <br> Final Map | LA Times Neighborhood <br> Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population <br> in the District | Other City Council <br> District/s |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Canoga Park | 0 | 57,144 | 99.9 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Lake Balboa | 2 | 11 | 0.0 | 06,12 |
| Reseda | 1 | 54,586 | 80.1 | 12 |
| Tarzana | 1 | 45,702 | 98.2 | 12 |
| Winnetka | 1 | 63,404 | 98.0 | 100.0 |
| Woodland Hills | 0 |  |  |  |

Please note that splits of LA Times neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times neighborhoods. Unsplit LA Times neighborhoods with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of LA Times neighborhoods that are split by census blocks.


District 04
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|c|}\hline \text { LA Times Neighborhoods } & \begin{array}{c}\text { \# of times LA Times } \\ \text { Neighborhood split by } \\ \text { Final Map }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { LA Times Neighborhood } \\ \text { Population in District }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Of Council } \\ \text { Population in the District }\end{array} \\ \text { District/s }\end{array}\right\}$

Please note that splits of LA Times neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times
neighborhoods. Unsplit LA Times neighborhoods with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of LA Times neighborhoods that are split by census blocks.


District 05
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|c|}\hline \text { LA Times Neighborhoods } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Of times LA Times } \\
\text { Neighborhood split by } \\
\text { Final Map }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { LA Times Neighborhood Council } \\
\text { Population in District }\end{array}
$$ <br>

District/s of LA Times\end{array}\right\}\)| Neighborhood Population <br> in the District |
| :---: |
| Bel-Air |

District 05

| LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times <br> Neighborhood split by <br> Final Map | LA Times Neighborhood <br> Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population <br> in the District | Other City Council <br> District/s |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West Los Angeles | 0 | 13,900 | 100.0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Westwood | 0 | 51,433 | 100.0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |

Please note that splits of LA Times neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times neighborhoods. Unsplit LA Times neighborhoods with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of LA Times neighborhoods that are split by census blocks.


District 06
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|c|}\hline \text { LA Times Neighborhoods } & \begin{array}{c}\text { \# of times LA Times } \\ \text { Neighborhood split by } \\ \text { Final Map }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { LA Times Neighborhood } \\ \text { Population in District }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of LA Times } \\ \text { Neighborhood Population } \\ \text { in the District }\end{array} \\ \text { District/s Council }\end{array}\right\}$

Please note that splits of LA Times neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times
neighborhoods. Unsplit LA Times neighborhoods with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of LA Times neighborhoods that are split by census blocks.


District 07

| LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hansen Dam | 0 | 170 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Lake View Terrace | 0 | 12,050 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Mission Hills | 0 | 19,307 | 100.0 | n/a |
| North Hills | 2 | 18,641 | 32.7 | 06, 12 |
| Pacoima | 1 | 77,418 | 98.7 | 06 |
| Panorama City | 1 | 197 | 0.3 | 06 |
| Shadow Hills | 2 | 8,419 | 60.4 | 02, 06 |
| Sunland | 0 | 15,797 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Sylmar | 0 | 78,691 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Tujunga | 0 | 27,980 | 100.0 | n/a |

Please note that splits of LA Times neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times
neighborhoods. Unsplit LA Times neighborhoods with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of LA Times neighborhoods that are split by census blocks.


District 08

| LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adams-Normandie | 0 | 17,194 | 99.8 | n/a |
| Chesterfield Square | 0 | 6,322 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Exposition Park | 1 | 33,499 | 97.4 | 09 |
| Gramercy Park | 0 | 10,272 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Harvard Park | 0 | 11,360 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Hyde Park | 0 | 36,704 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Leimert Park | 1 | 607 | 5.0 | 10 |
| Manchester Square | 0 | 11,800 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Pico-Union | 2 | 11 | 0.0 | 01, 10 |
| University Park | 1 | 9,397 | 40.4 | 09 |
| Vermont Knolls | 0 | 21,684 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Vermont Square | 0 | 49,488 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Vermont Vista | 2 | 5,315 | 21.2 | 09, 15 |
| Vermont-Slauson | 0 | 27,476 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Westchester | 1 | 5,610 | 13.9 | 11 |

Please note that splits of LA Times neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times neighborhoods. Unsplit LA Times neighborhoods with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of LA Times neighborhoods that are split by census blocks.


District 09

| LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Broadway-Manchester | 1 | 22,173 | 82.7 | 15 |
| Central-Alameda | 0 | 43,401 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Downtown | 2 | 484 | 1.1 | 01, 14 |
| Exposition Park | 1 | 831 | 2.4 | 08 |
| Florence | 0 | 49,026 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Green Meadows | 1 | 23,332 | 71.3 | 15 |
| Historic South-Central | 0 | 49,286 | 100.0 | n/a |
| South Park | 0 | 33,052 | 100.0 | n/a |
| University Park | 1 | 13,859 | 59.6 | 08 |
| Vermont Vista | 2 | 14,228 | 56.7 | 08, 15 |

Please note that splits of LA Times neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times
neighborhoods. Unsplit LA Times neighborhoods with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of LA Times neighborhoods that are split by census blocks.


District 10

| LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arlington Heights | 0 | 21,397 | 99.8 | n/a |
| Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw | 0 | 30,384 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Carthay | 1 | 40 | 0.8 | 05 |
| Harvard Heights | 0 | 18,758 | 99.5 | n/a |
| Jefferson Park | 0 | 24,008 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Koreatown | 3 | 63,961 | 61.1 | 01, 04, 13 |
| Larchmont | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 04 |
| Leimert Park | 1 | 11,569 | 95.0 | 08 |
| Mid-City | 1 | 39,445 | 76.6 | 05 |
| Mid-Wilshire | 1 | 15,824 | 36.4 | 04 |
| Pico-Union | 2 | 277 | 0.7 | 01, 08 |
| West Adams | 0 | 22,943 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Westlake | 3 | 538 | 0.5 | 01, 13, 14 |

Please note that splits of LA Times neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times neighborhoods. Unsplit LA Times neighborhoods with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of LA Times neighborhoods that are split by census blocks.


District 11

| LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brentwood | 0 | 32,531 | 99.7 | n/a |
| Del Rey | 0 | 28,586 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Mar Vista | 0 | 34,813 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Pacific Palisades | 0 | 24,490 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Palms | 1 | 10,976 | 25.6 | 05 |
| Playa del Rey | 0 | 10,751 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Playa Vista | 0 | 7,976 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Sawtelle | 1 | 35,301 | 98.4 | 05 |
| Venice | 0 | 36,909 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Westchester | 1 | 34,731 | 86.1 | 08 |

Please note that splits of LA Times neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times
neighborhoods. Unsplit LA Times neighborhoods with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of LA Times neighborhoods that are split by census blocks.


District 12

| LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chatsworth | 0 | 39,809 | 99.6 | n/a |
| Chatsworth Reservoir | 0 | 161 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Granada Hills | 0 | 53,639 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Lake Balboa | 2 | 3,375 | 13.0 | 03, 06 |
| North Hills | 2 | 20,888 | 36.7 | 06, 07 |
| Northridge | 0 | 62,278 | 99.8 | n/a |
| Porter Ranch | 0 | 25,499 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Reseda | 1 | 13,555 | 19.9 | 03 |
| West Hills | 0 | 38,779 | 98.8 | n/a |
| Winnetka | 1 | 988 | 2.0 | 03 |

Please note that splits of LA Times neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times neighborhoods. Unsplit LA Times neighborhoods with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of LA Times neighborhoods that are split by census blocks.


District 13

| LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Atwater Village | 0 | 14,083 | 100.0 | n/a |
| East Hollywood | 0 | 67,774 | 99.8 | n/a |
| Echo Park | 1 | 20,551 | 57.4 | 01 |
| Elysian Park | 1 | 84 | 3.6 | 01 |
| Elysian Valley | 0 | 6,911 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Hollywood | 2 | 48,920 | 69.8 | 04, 05 |
| Hollywood Hills | 1 | 2,951 | 13.0 | 04 |
| Koreatown | 3 | 17,479 | 16.7 | 01, 04, 10 |
| Los Feliz | 1 | 681 | 2.1 | 04 |
| Silver Lake | 1 | 25,249 | 85.0 | 04 |
| Westlake | 3 | 41,730 | 39.3 | 01, 10, 14 |

Please note that splits of LA Times neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times
neighborhoods. Unsplit LA Times neighborhoods with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of LA Times neighborhoods that are split by census blocks.


District 14

| LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boyle Heights | 0 | 91,231 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Chinatown | 1 | 7,360 | 43.7 | 01 |
| Downtown | 2 | 40,760 | 95.3 | 01, 09 |
| Eagle Rock | 1 | 30,331 | 93.8 | 01 |
| El Sereno | 0 | 40,545 | 99.9 | n/a |
| Glassell Park | 1 | 13,765 | 62.0 | 01 |
| Highland Park | 1 | 11,092 | 20.2 | 01 |
| Lincoln Heights | 1 | 407 | 1.4 | 01 |
| Montecito Heights | 1 | 7,580 | 46.0 | 01 |
| Westlake | 3 | 3,400 | 3.2 | 01, 10, 13 |

Please note that splits of LA Times neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times
neighborhoods. Unsplit LA Times neighborhoods with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of LA Times neighborhoods that are split by census blocks.


District 15
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|c|}\hline \text { LA Times Neighborhoods } & \begin{array}{c}\text { \# of times LA Times } \\
\text { Neighborhood split by } \\
\text { Final Map }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { LA Times Neighborhood } \\
\text { Population in District }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { \% of LA Times } \\
\text { Neighborhood Population } \\
\text { in the District }\end{array}
$$ <br>

District/s\end{array}\right]\)|  |
| :---: |
| Broadway-Manchester |
| Green Meadows |
| Harbor City |
| Harbor Gateway |
| San Pedro |
| 1 |

Please note that splits of LA Times neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times neighborhoods. Unsplit LA Times neighborhoods with less than $100 \%$ of their population in a district are indicative of LA Times neighborhoods that are split by census blocks.

Table 1: LA Times Neighborhood Splits Summary

| Total LA Times Neighborhoods that are Split | 48 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total LA Times Neighborhoods that are Not Split | 66 |
| LA Times Neighborhoods Split Once (2 dsitricts) | 38 |
| LA Times Neighborhoods Split Twice (3 districts) | 8 |
| LA Times Neighborhoods Split 3 Times (4 districts) | 2 |

Please note that splits of LA Times neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times neighborhoods. Unsplit LA Times neighborhoods with less than 100\% of their population in a district are indicative of LA Times neighborhoods that are split by census blocks.

Table 2: LA Times Neighborhood Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

| District 01 | LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times <br> Neighborhood split by Final Map Districts | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 | Chinatown | 1 | 9480 | 56.29363 | 14 |
| 01 | Cypress Park | 0 | 9310 | 100 | n/a |
| 01 | Downtown | 2 | 1525 | 3.565108 | 09, 14 |
| 01 | Eagle Rock | 1 | 2016 | 6.232484 | 14 |
| 01 | Echo Park | 1 | 15251 | 42.5971 | 13 |
| 01 | Elysian Park | 1 | 2240 | 96.40517 | 13 |
| 01 | Glassell Park | 1 | 8449 | 38.03139 | 14 |
| 01 | Highland Park | 1 | 43772 | 79.78311 | 14 |
| 01 | Koreatown | 3 | 4057 | 3.876351 | 04, 10, 13 |
| 01 | Lincoln Heights | 1 | 27791 | 98.55544 | 14 |
| 01 | Montecito Heights | 1 | 8910 | 54.03236 | 14 |
| 01 | Mount Washington | 0 | 12507 | 100 | n/a |
| 01 | Pico-Union | 2 | 40615 | 99.29567 | 08, 10 |
| 01 | Westlake | 3 | 60570 | 57.01384 | 10, 13, 14 |

 the report.

Table 2: LA Times Neighborhood Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

| District 02 | LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times <br> Neighborhood split by Final Map Districts | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02 | North Hollywood | 1 | 74383 | 96.8585 | 04 |
| 02 | Shadow Hills | 2 | 5282 | 37.8858 | 06, 07 |
| 02 | Sherman Oaks | 1 | 729 | 1.125001 | 04 |
| 02 | Studio City | 1 | 33170 | 90.61256 | 04 |
| 02 | Sun Valley | 1 | 42239 | 54.2453 | 06 |
| 02 | Toluca Lake | 1 | 1488 | 17.22661 | 04 |
| 02 | Valley Glen | 0 | 59143 | 99.31302 | n/a |
| 02 | Valley Village | 1 | 22952 | 94.60029 | 04 |
| 02 | Van Nuys | 2 | 17873 | 17.12428 | 04, 06 |
| District 03 | LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times <br> Neighborhood split by Final Map Districts | LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| 03 | Canoga Park | 0 | 57144 | 99.87095 | n/a |
| 03 | Lake Balboa | 2 | 11 | 0.041676 | 06, 12 |
| 03 | Reseda | 1 | 54586 | 80.07071 | 12 |
| 03 | Tarzana | 1 | 35702 | 98.21216 | 05 |
| 03 | Winnetka | 1 | 47430 | 97.95947 | 12 |

 the report.

Table 2: LA Times Neighborhood Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

| 03 | Woodland Hills | 0 | 63404 | 99.99471 | n/a |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District 04 | LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map Districts | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| 04 | Beverly Crest | 1 | 6442 | 58.52971 | 05 |
| 04 | Fairfax | 1 | 609 | 4.776685 | 05 |
| 04 | Griffith Park | 0 | 86 | 87.62488 | n/a |
| 04 | Hancock Park | 1 | 5880 | 57.0646 | 05 |
| 04 | Hollywood | 2 | 20340 | 29.04117 | 05, 13 |
| 04 | Hollywood Hills | 1 | 19689 | 86.96566 | 13 |
| 04 | Hollywood Hills West | 0 | 15600 | 99.89559 | n/a |
| 04 | Koreatown | 3 | 19156 | 18.30409 | 01, 10, 13 |
| 04 | Larchmont | 1 | 7780 | 98.29479 | 10 |
| 04 | Los Feliz | 1 | 31952 | 97.91362 | 13 |
| 04 | Mid-Wilshire | 1 | 27592 | 63.44716 | 10 |
| 04 | North Hollywood | 1 | 2413 | 3.141495 | 02 |
| 04 | Sherman Oaks | 1 | 64031 | 98.76117 | 02 |
| 04 | Silver Lake | 1 | 4446 | 14.97105 | 13 |

 the report.

Table 2: LA Times Neighborhood Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

| 04 | Studio City | 1 | 3436 | 9.387431 | 02 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04 | Toluca Lake | 1 | 7148 | 82.77338 | 02 |
| 04 | Valley Village | 1 | 1310 | 5.399709 | 02 |
| 04 | Van Nuys | 2 | 6684 | 6.403666 | 02, 06 |
| 04 | Windsor Square | 0 | 5445 | 100 | n/a |
| District 05 | LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map Districts | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| 05 | Bel-Air | 0 | 7973 | 99.53645 | n/a |
| 05 | Beverly Crest | 1 | 4562 | 41.44755 | 04 |
| 05 | Beverly Grove | 0 | 20709 | 100 | n/a |
| 05 | Beverlywood | 0 | 6492 | 100 | n/a |
| 05 | Carthay | 1 | 4674 | 99.16128 | 10 |
| 05 | Century City | 0 | 5853 | 100 | n/a |
| 05 | Cheviot Hills | 0 | 7295 | 100 | n/a |
| 05 | Encino | 0 | 42935 | 99.84866 | n/a |
| 05 | Fairfax | 1 | 12142 | 95.22331 | 04 |
| 05 | Hancock Park | 1 | 4420 | 42.89818 | 04 |

 the report.

Table 2: LA Times Neighborhood Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

| 05 | Hollywood | 2 | 778 | 1.11105 | 04, 13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 05 | Mid-City | 1 | 12077 | 23.44094 | 10 |
| 05 | Palms | 1 | 31868 | 74.38088 | 11 |
| 05 | Pico-Robertson | 0 | 18607 | 99.98157 | n/a |
| 05 | Rancho Park | 0 | 4367 | 100 | n/a |
| 05 | Sawtelle | 1 | 556 | 1.551494 | 11 |
| 05 | Sepulveda Basin | 1 | 277 | 73.51801 | 06 |
| 05 | Tarzana | 1 | 650 | 1.787822 | 03 |
| 05 | West Los Angeles | 0 | 13,900.00 | 100 | n/a |
| 05 | Westwood | 0 | 51433 | 100 | n/a |
| District 06 | LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map Districts | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| 06 | Arleta | 0 | 33835 | 99.87034 | n/a |
| 06 | Lake Balboa | 2 | 22490 | 86.916 | 03, 12 |
| 06 | North Hills | 2 | 17391 | 30.55369 | 07, 12 |
| 06 | Pacoima | 1 | 1054 | 1.342707 | 07 |
| 06 | Panorama City | 1 | 68087 | 99.71216 | 07 |

 the report.

Table 2: LA Times Neighborhood Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

| 06 | Sepulveda Basin | 1 | 99 | 26.35279 | 05 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 06 | Shadow Hills | 2 | 241 | 1.728158 | 02, 07 |
| 06 | Sun Valley | 1 | 35627 | 45.75468 | 02 |
| 06 | Van Nuys | 2 | 79815 | 76.47205 | 02, 04 |
| District 07 | LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times <br> Neighborhood split by Final Map Districts | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| 07 | Hansen Dam | 0 | 170 | 100 | n/a |
| 07 | Lake View Terrace | 0 | 12050 | 100 | n/a |
| 07 | Mission Hills | 0 | 19307 | 99.99993 | n/a |
| 07 | North Hills | 2 | 18641 | 32.74984 | 06, 12 |
| 07 | Pacoima | 1 | 77418 | 98.65729 | 06 |
| 07 | Panorama City | 1 | 197 | 0.287836 | 06 |
| 07 | Shadow Hills | 2 | 8419 | 60.38603 | 02, 06 |
| 07 | Sunland | 0 | 15797 | 100 | n/a |
| 07 | Sylmar | 0 | 78691 | 99.97708 | n/a |
| 07 | Tujunga | 0 | 27980 | 100 | n/a |
| District 08 | LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times <br> Neighborhood split by Final Map Districts | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |

Please note that splits of LA Times Neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times neighboroohds have been omitted from the report.

Table 2: LA Times Neighborhood Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

| 08 | Adams-Normandie | 0 | 17194 | 99.8 | n/a |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 08 | Chesterfield Square | 0 | 6322 | 100 | n/a |
| 08 | Exposition Park | 1 | 33499 | 97.38604 | 09 |
| 08 | Gramercy Park | 0 | 10272 | 100 | n/a |
| 08 | Harvard Park | 0 | 11360 | 100 | n/a |
| 08 | Hyde Park | 0 | 36704 | 100 | n/a |
| 08 | Leimert Park | 1 | 607 | 4.987163 | 10 |
| 08 | Manchester Square | 0 | 11800 | 100 | n/a |
| 08 | Pico-Union | 2 | 11 | 0.026796 | 01, 10 |
| 08 | University Park | 1 | 9397 | 40.40703 | 09 |
| 08 | Vermont Knolls | 0 | 21684 | 99.99999 | n/a |
| 08 | Vermont Square | 0 | 49,488.00 | 100 | n/a |
| 08 | Vermont Vista | 2 | 5,315.00 | 21.18278 | 09, 15 |
| 08 | Vermont-Slauson | 0 | 27,476.00 | 100 | n/a |
| 08 | Westchester | 1 | 5,610.00 | 13.9057 | 11 |
| District 09 | LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map Districts | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |

 the report.

Table 2: LA Times Neighborhood Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

| 09 | Broadway-Manchester | 1 | 22173 | 82.73071 | 15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 09 | Central-Alameda | 0 | 43401 | 99.99999 | n/a |
| 09 | Downtown | 2 | 484 | 1.132098 | 01, 14 |
| 09 | Exposition Park | 1 | 831 | 2.415166 | 08 |
| 09 | Florence | 0 | 49026 | 100 | n/a |
| 09 | Green Meadows | 1 | 23332 | 71.3455 | 15 |
| 09 | Historic South-Central | 0 | 49286 | 99.9978 | n/a |
| 09 | South Park | 0 | 33052 | 99.99999 | n/a |
| 09 | University Park | 1 | 13,859.00 | 59.59296 | 08 |
| 09 | Vermont Vista | 2 | 14,228 | 56.70972 | 08, 15 |
| District 10 | LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map Districts | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood <br> Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| 10 | Arlington Heights | 0 | 21397 | 99.7921 | n/a |
| 10 | Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw | 0 | 30384 | 100 | n/a |
| 10 | Carthay | 1 | 40 | 0.838712 | 05 |
| 10 | Harvard Heights | 0 | 18758 | 99.51877 | n/a |
| 10 | Jefferson Park | 0 | 24008 | 99.99218 | n/a |

 the report.

Table 2: LA Times Neighborhood Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

| 10 | Koreatown | 3 | 63961 | 61.11766 | 01, 04, 13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | Larchmont | 1 | 0 | 0 | 04 |
| 10 | Leimert Park | 1 | 11569 | 95.01283 | 08 |
| 10 | Mid-City | 1 | 39445 | 76.55905 | 05 |
| 10 | Mid-Wilshire | 1 | 15824 | 36.38764 | 04 |
| 10 | Pico-Union | 2 | 277 | 0.677122 | 01, 08 |
| 10 | West Adams | 0 | 22,943.00 | 100 | n/a |
| 10 | Westlake | 3 | 538 | 0.506431 | 01, 13, 14 |
| District 11 | LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map Districts | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| 11 | Brentwood | 0 | 32531 | 99.71612 | n/a |
| 11 | Del Rey | 0 | 28586 | 100 | n/a |
| 11 | Mar Vista | 0 | 34813 | 100 | n/a |
| 11 | Pacific Palisades | 0 | 24490 | 99.96027 | n/a |
| 11 | Palms | 1 | 10976 | 25.61912 | 05 |
| 11 | Playa del Rey | 0 | 10751 | 100 | n/a |
| 11 | Playa Vista | 0 | 7976 | 100 | n/a |

 the report.

Table 2: LA Times Neighborhood Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

| 11 | Sawtelle | 1 | 35301 | 98.4485 | 05 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 | Venice | 0 | 36909 | 100 | n/a |
| 11 | Westchester | 1 | 34,731.00 | 86.09429 | 08 |
| District 12 | LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map Districts | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| 12 | Chatsworth | 0 | 39809 | 99.60168 | n/a |
| 12 | Chatsworth Reservoir | 0 | 161 | 99.98103 | n/a |
| 12 | Granada Hills | 0 | 53639 | 99.99289 | n/a |
| 12 | Lake Balboa | 2 | 3375 | 13.04232 | 03, 06 |
| 12 | North Hills | 2 | 20888 | 36.69646 | 06, 07 |
| 12 | Northridge | 0 | 62278 | 99.806 | n/a |
| 12 | Porter Ranch | 0 | 25499 | 100 | n/a |
| 12 | Reseda | 1 | 13555 | 19.88381 | 03 |
| 12 | West Hills | 0 | 38,779.00 | 98.81169 | n/a |
| 12 | Winnetka | 1 | 988 | 2.040521 | 03 |
| District 13 | LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times <br> Neighborhood split by Final Map Districts | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| 13 | Atwater Village | 0 | 14083 | 99.99985 | n/a |

 the report.

Table 2: LA Times Neighborhood Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

| 13 | East Hollywood | 0 | 67774 | 99.82818 | n/a |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 | Echo Park | 1 | 20551 | 57.40289 | 01 |
| 13 | Elysian Park | 1 | 84 | 3.594825 | 01 |
| 13 | Elysian Valley | 0 | 6911 | 99.99986 | n/a |
| 13 | Hollywood | 2 | 48920 | 69.84777 | 04, 05 |
| 13 | Hollywood Hills | 1 | 2951 | 13.03433 | 04 |
| 13 | Koreatown | 3 | 17479 | 16.70188 | 01, 04, 10 |
| 13 | Los Feliz | 1 | 681 | 2.086377 | 04 |
| 13 | Silver Lake | 1 | 25249 | 85.02894 | 04 |
| 13 | Westlake | 3 | 41730 | 39.2797 | 01, 10, 14 |
| District 14 | LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map Districts | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood <br> Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| 14 | Boyle Heights | 0 | 91231 | 99.99975 | n/a |
| 14 | Chinatown | 1 | 7360 | 43.70636 | 01 |
| 14 | Downtown | 2 | 40760 | 95.30279 | 01, 09 |
| 14 | Eagle Rock | 1 | 30331 | 93.76751 | 01 |
| 14 | El Sereno | 0 | 40545 | 99.90802 | n/a |

 the report.

Table 2: LA Times Neighborhood Splits by LACCRC Final Map Recommendation District

| 14 | Glassell Park | 1 | 13765 | 61.95923 | 01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Highland Park | 1 | 11092 | 20.21688 | 01 |
| 14 | Lincoln Heights | 1 | 407 | 1.444551 | 01 |
| 14 | Montecito Heights | 1 | 7580 | 45.96763 | 01 |
| 14 | Westlake | 3 | 3400 | 3.20002 | 01, 10, 13 |
| District 15 | LA Times Neighborhoods | \# of times LA Times Neighborhood split by Final Map Districts | LA Times Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City Council District/s |
| 15 | Broadway-Manchester | 1 | 4628 | 17.26928 | 09 |
| 15 | Green Meadows | 1 | 9371 | 28.65449 | 09 |
| 15 | Harbor City | 0 | 24162 | 100 | n/a |
| 15 | Harbor Gateway | 0 | 40071 | 100 | n/a |
| 15 | San Pedro | 0 | 78682 | 100 | n/a |
| 15 | Vermont Vista | 2 | 5,547.00 | 22.10748 | 08, 09 |
| 15 | Watts | 0 | 39,544.00 | 99.99957 | n/a |
| 15 | Wilmington | 0 | 52321 | 100 | n/a |

 the report.

| LA Times Neighborhoods | LACCRC Final Map Recommendation February, 22nd, 2012 | \# of times LA <br> Times <br> Neighborhood split by Final Map | LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City <br> Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adams-Normandie | 08 | 0 | 17,194 | 99.8 | n/a |
| Arleta | 06 | 0 | 33,835 | 99.9 | n/a |
| Arlington Heights | 10 | 0 | 21,397 | 99.8 | n/a |
| Atwater Village | 13 | 0 | 14,083 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw | 10 | 0 | 30,384 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Bel-Air | 05 | 0 | 7,973 | 99.5 | n/a |
| Beverly Crest | 04 | 1 | 6,442 | 58.5 | 05 |
| Beverly Crest | 05 | 1 | 4,562 | 41.4 | 04 |
| Beverly Grove | 05 | 0 | 20,709 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Beverlywood | 05 | 0 | 6,492 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Boyle Heights | 14 | 0 | 91,231 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Brentwood | 11 | 0 | 32,531 | 99.7 | n/a |
| Broadway-Manchester | 09 | 1 | 22,173 | 82.7 | 15 |
| Broadway-Manchester | 15 | 1 | 4,628 | 17.3 | 09 |
| Canoga Park | 03 | 0 | 57,144 | 99.9 | n/a |
| Carthay | 05 | 1 | 4,674 | 99.2 | 10 |
| Carthay | 10 | 1 | 40 | 0.8 | 05 |
| Central-Alameda | 09 | 0 | 43,401 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Century City | 05 | 0 | 5,853 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Chatsworth | 12 | 0 | 39,809 | 99.6 | n/a |
| Chatsworth Reservoir | 12 | 0 | 161 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Chesterfield Square | 08 | 0 | 6,322 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Cheviot Hills | 05 | 0 | 7,295 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Chinatown | 01 | 1 | 9,480 | 56.3 | 14 |
| Chinatown | 14 | 1 | 7,360 | 43.7 | 01 |
| Cypress Park | 01 | 0 | 9,310 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Del Rey | 11 | 0 | 28,586 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Downtown | 01 | 2 | 1,525 | 3.6 | 09, 14 |
| Downtown | 09 | 2 | 484 | 1.1 | 01, 14 |

Please note that splits of LA Times Neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times neighboroohds have been omitted from the report.

| LA Times Neighborhoods | LACCRC Final Map Recommendation February, 22nd, 2012 | \# of times LA <br> Times <br> Neighborhood split by Final Map | LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City <br> Council <br> District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Downtown | 14 | 2 | 40,760 | 95.3 | 01, 09 |
| Eagle Rock | 01 | 1 | 2,016 | 6.2 | 14 |
| Eagle Rock | 14 | 1 | 30,331 | 93.8 | 01 |
| East Hollywood | 13 | 0 | 67,774 | 99.8 | n/a |
| Echo Park | 01 | 1 | 15,251 | 42.6 | 13 |
| Echo Park | 13 | 1 | 20,551 | 57.4 | 01 |
| El Sereno | 14 | 0 | 40,545 | 99.9 | n/a |
| Elysian Park | 01 | 1 | 2,240 | 96.4 | 13 |
| Elysian Park | 13 | 1 | 84 | 3.6 | 01 |
| Elysian Valley | 13 | 0 | 6,911 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Encino | 05 | 0 | 42,935 | 99.8 | n/a |
| Exposition Park | 08 | 1 | 33,499 | 97.4 | 09 |
| Exposition Park | 09 | 1 | 831 | 2.4 | 08 |
| Fairfax | 04 | 1 | 609 | 4.8 | 05 |
| Fairfax | 05 | 1 | 12,142 | 95.2 | 04 |
| Florence | 09 | 0 | 49,026 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Glassell Park | 01 | 1 | 8,449 | 38.0 | 14 |
| Glassell Park | 14 | 1 | 13,765 | 62.0 | 01 |
| Gramercy Park | 08 | 0 | 10,272 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Granada Hills | 12 | 0 | 53,639 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Green Meadows | 09 | 1 | 23,332 | 71.3 | 15 |
| Green Meadows | 15 | 1 | 9,371 | 28.7 | 09 |
| Griffith Park | 04 | 0 | 86 | 87.6 | n/a |
| Hancock Park | 04 | 1 | 5,880 | 57.1 | 05 |
| Hancock Park | 05 | 1 | 4,420 | 42.9 | 04 |
| Hansen Dam | 07 | 0 | 170 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Harbor City | 15 | 0 | 24,162 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Harbor Gateway | 15 | 0 | 40,071 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Harvard Heights | 10 | 0 | 18,758 | 99.5 | n/a |

Please note that splits of LA Times Neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times neighboroohds have been omitted from the report.

| LA Times Neighborhoods | LACCRC Final Map Recommendation February, 22nd, 2012 | \# of times LA <br> Times <br> Neighborhood split by Final Map | LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City <br> Council <br> District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Harvard Park | 08 | 0 | 11,360 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Highland Park | 01 | 1 | 43,772 | 79.8 | 14 |
| Highland Park | 14 | 1 | 11,092 | 20.2 | 01 |
| Historic South-Central | 09 | 0 | 49,286 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Hollywood | 04 | 2 | 20,340 | 29.0 | 05, 13 |
| Hollywood | 05 | 2 | 778 | 1.1 | 04, 13 |
| Hollywood | 13 | 2 | 48,920 | 69.8 | 04, 05 |
| Hollywood Hills | 04 | 1 | 19,689 | 87.0 | 13 |
| Hollywood Hills | 13 | 1 | 2,951 | 13.0 | 04 |
| Hollywood Hills West | 04 | 0 | 15,600 | 99.9 | n/a |
| Hyde Park | 08 | 0 | 36,704 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Jefferson Park | 10 | 0 | 24,008 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Koreatown | 01 | 3 | 4,057 | 3.9 | 04, 10, 13 |
| Koreatown | 04 | 3 | 19,156 | 18.3 | 01, 10, 13 |
| Koreatown | 10 | 3 | 63,961 | 61.1 | 01, 04, 13 |
| Koreatown | 13 | 3 | 17,479 | 16.7 | 01, 04, 10 |
| Lake Balboa | 03 | 2 | 11 | 0.0 | 06, 12 |
| Lake Balboa | 06 | 2 | 22,490 | 86.9 | 03, 12 |
| Lake Balboa | 12 | 2 | 3,375 | 13.0 | 03, 06 |
| Lake View Terrace | 07 | 0 | 12,050 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Larchmont | 04 | 1 | 7,780 | 98.3 | 10 |
| Larchmont | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 04 |
| Leimert Park | 08 | 1 | 607 | 5.0 | 10 |
| Leimert Park | 10 | 1 | 11,569 | 95.0 | 08 |
| Lincoln Heights | 01 | 1 | 27,791 | 98.6 | 14 |
| Lincoln Heights | 14 | 1 | 407 | 1.4 | 01 |
| Los Feliz | 04 | 1 | 31,952 | 97.9 | 13 |
| Los Feliz | 13 | 1 | 681 | 2.1 | 04 |
| Manchester Square | 08 | 0 | 11,800 | 100.0 | n/a |

Please note that splits of LA Times Neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times neighboroohds have been omitted from the report.

| LA Times Neighborhoods | LACCRC Final Map Recommendation February, 22nd, 2012 | \# of times LA <br> Times <br> Neighborhood split by Final Map | LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City <br> Council <br> District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mar Vista | 11 | 0 | 34,813 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Mid-City | 05 | 1 | 12,077 | 23.4 | 10 |
| Mid-City | 10 | 1 | 39,445 | 76.6 | 05 |
| Mid-Wilshire | 04 | 1 | 27,592 | 63.4 | 10 |
| Mid-Wilshire | 10 | 1 | 15,824 | 36.4 | 04 |
| Mission Hills | 07 | 0 | 19,307 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Montecito Heights | 01 | 1 | 8,910 | 54.0 | 14 |
| Montecito Heights | 14 | 1 | 7,580 | 46.0 | 01 |
| Mount Washington | 01 | 0 | 12,507 | 100.0 | n/a |
| North Hills | 06 | 2 | 17,391 | 30.6 | 07, 12 |
| North Hills | 07 | 2 | 18,641 | 32.7 | 06, 12 |
| North Hills | 12 | 2 | 20,888 | 36.7 | 06, 07 |
| North Hollywood | 02 | 1 | 74,383 | 96.9 | 04 |
| North Hollywood | 04 | 1 | 2,413 | 3.1 | 02 |
| Northridge | 12 | 0 | 62,278 | 99.8 | n/a |
| Pacific Palisades | 11 | 0 | 24,490 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Pacoima | 06 | 1 | 1,054 | 1.3 | 07 |
| Pacoima | 07 | 1 | 77,418 | 98.7 | 06 |
| Palms | 05 | 1 | 31,868 | 74.4 | 11 |
| Palms | 11 | 1 | 10,976 | 25.6 | 05 |
| Panorama City | 06 | 1 | 68,087 | 99.7 | 07 |
| Panorama City | 07 | 1 | 197 | 0.3 | 06 |
| Pico-Robertson | 05 | 0 | 18,607 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Pico-Union | 01 | 2 | 40,615 | 99.3 | 08, 10 |
| Pico-Union | 08 | 2 | 11 | 0.0 | 01, 10 |
| Pico-Union | 10 | 2 | 277 | 0.7 | 01, 08 |
| Playa del Rey | 11 | 0 | 10,751 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Playa Vista | 11 | 0 | 7,976 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Porter Ranch | 12 | 0 | 25,499 | 100.0 | n/a |

Please note that splits of LA Times Neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times neighboroohds have been omitted from the report.

Table 3: LA Times Neighborhood Splits by Neighborhood Council

| LA Times Neighborhoods | LACCRC Final Map <br> RecommendationFebruary, 22nd, 2012 | \# of times LA <br> Times <br> Neighborhood split by Final Map | LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in District | \% of LA Times <br> Neighborhood Population in the District | Other City <br> Council District/s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rancho Park | 05 | 0 | 4,367 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Reseda | 03 | 1 | 54,586 | 80.1 | 12 |
| Reseda | 12 | 1 | 13,555 | 19.9 | 03 |
| San Pedro | 15 | 0 | 78,682 | 100.0 | n/a |
| Sawtelle | 05 | 1 | 556 | 1.6 | 11 |
| Sawtelle | 11 | 1 | 35,301 | 98.4 | 05 |
| Sepulveda Basin | 05 | 1 | 277 | 73.5 | 06 |
| Sepulveda Basin | 06 | 1 | 99 | 26.4 | 05 |
| Shadow Hills | 02 | 2 | 5,282 | 37.9 | 06, 07 |
| Shadow Hills | 06 | 2 | 241 | 1.7 | 02, 07 |
| Shadow Hills | 07 | 2 | 8,419 | 60.4 | 02, 06 |

Please note that splits of LA Times Neighborhood populations of 1 person or less and splits due to census blocks that are split between two LA Times neighboroohds have been omitted from the report.


Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 01: Total Population 246, 531 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 10 | 13 | 14 |
| Area (square miles) from Current District | 12.59 | 0.13 | 0.51 | 3.27 |
| Total Population from Current District | 204,473 | 6,471 | 5,277 | 30,310 |
| \% of the Final Map District Total Population | 82.94\% | 2.62\% | 2.14\% | 12.29\% |
| Latino Total Population from Current District | 151,641 | 4,537 | 3,352 | 17,482 |
| \% Latino Total Population from Current District | 74.2\% | 70.1\% | 63.5\% | 57.7\% |
| White Total Population from Current District | 12,391 | 185 | 860 | 6,513 |
| \% White Total Population from Current District | 6.1\% | 2.9\% | 16.3\% | 21.5\% |
| Black Total Population from Current District | 5,460 | 199 | 65 | 682 |
| \% Black Total Population from Current District | 2.67\% | 3.08\% | 1.23\% | 2.25\% |
| Asian Total Population from Current District | 33,273 | 1,512 | 958 | 5,232 |
| \% Asian Total Population from Current District | 16.3\% | 23.4\% | 18.2\% | 17.3\% |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 01: Voting Age Population 184,395 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 10 | 13 | 14 |
| Total VAP of Population from Current District | 151,778 | 5,016 | 4,107 | 23,494 |
| \% of the Final Map District VAP | 82.31\% | 2.72\% | 2.23\% | 12.74\% |
| Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 106,438 | 3,305 | 2,409 | 12,558 |
| \% Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 70.1\% | 65.9\% | 58.7\% | 53.5\% |
| White VAP of Population from Current District | 11,063 | 152 | 791 | 5,760 |
| \% White VAP of Population from Current District | 7.3\% | 3.0\% | 19.3\% | 24.5\% |
| Black VAP of Population from Current District | 4,460 | 155 | 56 | 526 |
| \% Black VAP of Population from Current District | 2.94\% | 3.09\% | 1.36\% | 2.24\% |
| Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 28,563 | 1,379 | 815 | 4,370 |
| \% Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 18.8\% | 27.5\% | 19.8\% | 18.6\% |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population - 2006-2010

| District 01: Citizen Voting Age Population 101,997 |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 01 | 10 | 13 | 14 |
| Total CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 79,038 | 2,070 | 3,096 | 17,793 |
| \% of the Final Map District CVAP | $77.49 \%$ | $2.03 \%$ | $3.04 \%$ | $17.44 \%$ |
| Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 42,745 | 744 | 1,552 | 8,197 |
| \% Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $54.1 \%$ | $35.9 \%$ | $50.1 \%$ | $46.1 \%$ |
| White CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 10,169 | 137 | 711 | 5,485 |
| \% White CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $12.9 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ | $23.0 \%$ | $30.8 \%$ |
| Black CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 4,307 | 142 | 54 | 472 |
| \% Black CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $5.45 \%$ | $6.88 \%$ | $1.73 \%$ | $2.65 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 21,020 | 1,035 | 750 | 3,430 |
| Asian CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $26.6 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ | $24.2 \%$ | $19.3 \%$ |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 01: Total Registered Voters 74,163 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 10 | 13 | 14 |
| Total Registration of Population from Current District | 55,169 | 1,364 | 1,981 | 15,649 |
| \% of the Final Map District Voter Registration | 74.39\% | 1.84\% | 2.67\% | 21.10\% |
| Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 31,688 | 585 | 959 | 6,906 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 57.4\% | 42.9\% | 48.4\% | 44.1\% |
| African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 3,763 | 154 | 47 | 531 |
| \%African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 6.8\% | 11.3\% | 2.4\% | 3.4\% |
| Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 7,915 | 428 | 218 | 1,607 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 14.35\% | 31.38\% | 11.00\% | 10.27\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 389 | 4 | 34 | 282 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 0.7\% | 0.3\% | 1.7\% | 1.8\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 50 | 2 | 3 | 39 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% |
| No Ethnic Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 11,255 | 197 | 756 | 6,580 |
| \% No Ethnic Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 20.4\% | 14.4\% | 38.2\% | 42.0\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 01: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 10,168 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 10 | 13 | 14 |
| Total Asian Surname Reg. of Population from Current District | 7,915 | 428 | 218 | 1,607 |
| \% of the Final Map District Asian Surname Voter Reg. | 77.8\% | 4.2\% | 2.1\% | 15.8\% |
| Chinese Surname Reg. from Current District | 3,221 | 55 | 80 | 454 |
| \%Chinese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 40.7\% | 12.9\% | 36.7\% | 28.3\% |
| Filipino Surname Reg. from Current District | 930 | 34 | 71 | 738 |
| \%Filipino Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 11.7\% | 7.9\% | 32.6\% | 45.9\% |
| Indian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | 120 | 3 | 3 | 48 |
| \%Indian Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 1.5\% | 0.7\% | 1.4\% | 3.0\% |
| Japanese Surname Reg. from Current District | 180 | 6 | 11 | 160 |
| \%Japanese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 2.3\% | 1.4\% | 5.0\% | 10.0\% |
| Korean Surname Reg. from Current District | 2,195 | 326 | 11 | 107 |
| \% Korean Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 27.7\% | 76.2\% | 5.0\% | 6.7\% |
| Vietnamese Surname Reg. from Current District | 1269 | 4 | 42 | 100 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | 16.0\% | 0.9\% | 19.3\% | 6.2\% |



## District 02

Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 02: Total Population 257, 291 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 02 | 04 | 05 | 06 |
| Area (square miles) from Current | 17.44 | 2.68 | 1.45 | 3.23 |
| Total Population from Current District | 161,913 | 37,678 | 15,620 | 42,080 |
| \% of the Final Map District Total Population | 62.93\% | 14.64\% | 6.07\% | 16.36\% |
| Latino Total Population from Current District | 66,420 | 15,974 | 2,425 | 30,999 |
| \% Latino Total Population from Current District | 41.0\% | 42.4\% | 15.5\% | 73.7\% |
| White Total Population from Current District | 74,721 | 14,923 | 11,094 | 6,001 |
| \% White Total Population from Current District | 46.1\% | 39.6\% | 71.0\% | 14.3\% |
| Black Total Population from Current District | 6,198 | 3,099 | 806 | 1,248 |
| \% Black Total Population from Current District | 3.83\% | 8.22\% | 5.16\% | 2.97\% |
| Asian Total Population from Current District | 12,307 | 2,970 | 1,021 | 3,381 |
| \% Asian Total Population from Current District | 7.6\% | 7.9\% | 6.5\% | 8.0\% |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 02: Voting Age Population 201,354 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 02 | 04 | 05 | 06 |
| Total VAP of Population from Current District | 126,968 | 31,328 | 12,986 | 30,072 |
| \% of the Final Map District VAP | 63.06\% | 15.56\% | 6.45\% | 14.93\% |
| Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 46,931 | 11,621 | 1,839 | 20,927 |
| \% Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 37.0\% | 37.1\% | 14.2\% | 69.6\% |
| White VAP of Population from Current District | 63,217 | 13,852 | 9,395 | 5,050 |
| \% White VAP of Population from Current District | 49.8\% | 44.2\% | 72.3\% | 16.8\% |
| Black VAP of Population from Current District | 4,998 | 2,688 | 684 | 953 |
| \% Black VAP of Population from Current District | 3.94\% | 8.58\% | 5.27\% | 3.17\% |
| Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 10,111 | 2,594 | 851 | 2,830 |
| \% Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 8.0\% | 8.3\% | 6.6\% | 9.4\% |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population - 2006-2010

| District 02: Citizen Voting Age Population 148,807 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 02 | 04 | 05 | 06 |
| Total CVAP of Population from Current District | 95,519 | 24,124 | 11,496 | 17,669 |
| \% of the Final Map District CVAP | 64.19\% | 16.21\% | 7.73\% | 11.87\% |
| Latino CVAP of Population from Current District | 24,727 | 6,228 | 1,495 | 9,779 |
| \% Latino CVAP of Population from Current District | 25.9\% | 25.8\% | 13.0\% | 55.3\% |
| White CVAP of Population from Current District | 56,436 | 12,738 | 8,525 | 4,407 |
| \% White CVAP of Population from Current District | 59.1\% | 52.8\% | 74.2\% | 24.9\% |
| Black CVAP of Population from Current District | 4,824 | 2,632 | 600 | 886 |
| \% Black CVAP of Population from Current District | 5.05\% | 10.91\% | 5.22\% | 5.01\% |
| Asian CVAP of Population from Current District | 8,188 | 2,090 | 671 | 2,372 |
| \% Asian CVAP of Population from Current District | 8.6\% | 8.7\% | 5.8\% | 13.4\% |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 02: Total Registered Voters 111,376 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 02 | 04 | 05 | 06 |
| Total Registration of Population from Current District | 72,609 | 17,035 | 9,498 | 12,234 |
| \% of the Final Map District Voter Registration | 65.19\% | 15.30\% | 8.53\% | 10.98\% |
| Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 16,771 | 3,950 | 829 | 6,807 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 23.1\% | 23.2\% | 8.7\% | 55.6\% |
| African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 3,765 | 1,933 | 506 | 707 |
| \%African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 5.2\% | 11.3\% | 5.3\% | 5.8\% |
| Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 3,106 | 683 | 322 | 771 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 4.28\% | 4.01\% | 3.39\% | 6.30\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 4,600 | 586 | 1,170 | 162 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 6.3\% | 3.4\% | 12.3\% | 1.3\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 5,477 | 355 | 179 | 569 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 7.5\% | 2.1\% | 1.9\% | 4.7\% |
| No Ethnic Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 48,658 | 10,279 | 7,835 | 3,925 |
| \% No Ethnic Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 67.0\% | 60.3\% | 82.5\% | 32.1\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 02: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 4,882 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 02 | 04 | 05 | 06 |
| Total Asian Surname Reg. of Population from Current District | 3,106 | 683 | 322 | 771 |
| \% of the Final Map District Asian Surname Voter Reg. | 63.6\% | 14.0\% | 6.6\% | 15.8\% |
| Chinese Surname Reg. from Current District | 586 | 118 | 72 | 83 |
| \%Chinese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 18.9\% | 17.3\% | 22.4\% | 10.8\% |
| Filipino Surname Reg. from Current District | 1,053 | 213 | 94 | 416 |
| \%Filipino Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 33.9\% | 31.2\% | 29.2\% | 54.0\% |
| Indian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | 394 | 111 | 51 | 61 |
| \%Indian Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 12.7\% | 16.3\% | 15.8\% | 7.9\% |
| Japanese Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | 356 | 60 | 50 | 48 |
| \%Japanese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 11.5\% | 8.8\% | 15.5\% | 6.2\% |
| Korean Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | 494 | 113 | 32 | 77 |
| \% Korean Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 15.9\% | 16.5\% | 9.9\% | 10.0\% |
| Vietnamese Surname Reg. from Current District | 223 | 68 | 23 | 86 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 7.2\% | 10.0\% | 7.1\% | 11.2\% |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 03: Total Population 259,045 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 03 | 05 | 11 | 12 |
| Area (square miles) from Current District | 34.11 | 0.09 | 0.38 | 2.18 |
| Total Population from Current District | 232,839 | 264 | 0 | 25,942 |
| \% of the Final Map District Total Population | 89.88\% | 0.10\% | 0.00\% | 10.01\% |
| Latino Total Population from Current District | 83,794 | 5 | 0 | 12,956 |
| \% Latino Total Population from Current District | 36.0\% | 1.9\% | 0.0\% | 49.9\% |
| White Total Population from Current District | 104,872 | 234 | 0 | 6,872 |
| \% White Total Population from Current District | 45.0\% | 88.6\% | 0.0\% | 26.5\% |
| Black Total Population from Current District | 10,247 | 1 | 0 | 1,718 |
| \% Black Total Population from Current District | 4.40\% | 0.38\% | 0.00\% | 6.62\% |
| Asian Total Population from Current District | 30,567 | 22 | 0 | 4,051 |
| \% Asian Total Population from Current District | 13.1\% | 8.3\% | 0.0\% | 15.6\% |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 03: Voting Age Population 199,798 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 03 | 05 | 11 | 12 |
| Total VAP of Population from Current District | 180,247 | 210 | 0 | 19,341 |
| \% of the Final Map District VAP | 90.21\% | 0.11\% | 0.00\% | 9.68\% |
| Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 57,936 | 5 | 0 | 8,653 |
| \% Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 32.1\% | 2.4\% | 0.0\% | 44.7\% |
| White VAP of Population from Current District | 88,114 | 184 | 0 | 5,974 |
| \% White VAP of Population from Current District | 48.9\% | 87.6\% | 0.0\% | 30.9\% |
| Black VAP of Population from Current District | 7,556 | 1 | 0 | 1,285 |
| \% Black VAP of Population from Current District | 4.19\% | 0.48\% | 0.00\% | 6.64\% |
| Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 24,263 | 18 | 0 | 3,161 |
| \% Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 13.5\% | 8.6\% | 0.0\% | 16.3\% |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District O3: Citizen Voting Age Population 151,052 |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 03 | 05 | 11 | 12 |
| Total CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 136,935 | 201 | 0 | 13,917 |
| \% of the Final Map District CVAP | $90.65 \%$ | $0.13 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $9.21 \%$ |
| Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 29,074 | 5 | 0 | 4,709 |
| \% Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $21.2 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $33.8 \%$ |
| White CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 81,247 | 181 | 0 | 5,321 |
| \% White CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $59.3 \%$ | $89.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $38.2 \%$ |
| Black CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 7,269 | 1 | 0 | 1,136 |
| \% Black CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $5.31 \%$ | $0.49 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $8.17 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 17,726 | 13 | 0 | 2,563 |
| Asian CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $12.9 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $18.4 \%$ |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 03: Total Registered Voters 116,413 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 03 | 05 | 11 | 12 |
| Total Registration of Population from Current District | 106,659 | 172 | 0 | 9,582 |
| \% of the Final Map District Voter Registration | 91.62\% | 0.15\% | 0.00\% | 8.23\% |
| Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 19,539 | 1 | 0 | 2,639 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 18.3\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 27.5\% |
| African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 5,672 | 1 | 0 | 962 |
| \%African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 5.3\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 10.0\% |
| Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 7,392 | 4 | 0 | 900 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 6.93\% | 2.33\% | 0.00\% | 9.39\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 9,011 | 18 | 0 | 286 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 8.4\% | 10.5\% | 0.0\% | 3.0\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 2,386 | 20 | 0 | 106 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 2.2\% | 11.6\% | 0.0\% | 1.1\% |
| No Ethnic Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 72,433 | 166 | 0 | 5,077 |
| \% No Ethnic Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 67.9\% | 96.5\% | 0.0\% | 53.0\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 03: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 8,296 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 03 | 05 | 11 | 12 |
| Total Asian Surname Reg. of Population from Current District | 7,392 | 4 | 0 | 900 |
| \% of the Final Map District Asian Surname Voter Reg. | 89.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 10.8\% |
| Chinese Surname Reg. from Current District | 1,280 | 2 | 0 | 115 |
| \%Chinese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 17.3\% | 50.0\% | 0.0\% | 12.8\% |
| Filipino Surname Reg. from Current District | 1,783 | 0 | 0 | 221 |
| \%Filipino Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 24.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 24.6\% |
| Indian Surname Reg. from Current District | 1,504 | 0 | 0 | 211 |
| \%Indian Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 20.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 23.4\% |
| Japanese Surname Reg. from Current District | 537 | 2 | 0 | 45 |
| \%Japanese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 7.3\% | 50.0\% | 0.0\% | 5.0\% |
| Korean Surname Reg. from Current District | 692 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| \% Korean Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 9.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 6.8\% |
| Vietnamese Surname Reg. from Current District | 1596 | 0 | 0 | 247 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 21.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 27.4\% |



## District 04

Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 04: Total Population 250,511 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 02 | 04 | 05 | 10 |
| Area (square miles) from Current District | 4.66 | 25.03 | 12.62 | 0.77 |
| Total Population from Current District | 48,644 | 147,877 | 39,476 | 14,514 |
| \% of the Final Map District Total Population | 19.42\% | 59.03\% | 15.76\% | 5.79\% |
| Latino Total Population from Current District | 8,342 | 22,361 | 2,999 | 4,069 |
| \% Latino Total Population from Current District | 17.1\% | 15.1\% | 7.6\% | 28.0\% |
| White Total Population from Current District | 31,894 | 88,156 | 31,842 | 2,252 |
| \% White Total Population from Current District | 65.6\% | 59.6\% | 80.7\% | 15.5\% |
| Black Total Population from Current District | 3,219 | 7,445 | 1,336 | 1,291 |
| \% Black Total Population from Current District | 6.62\% | 5.03\% | 3.38\% | 8.89\% |
| Asian Total Population from Current District | 4,357 | 27,521 | 2,804 | 6,706 |
| \% Asian Total Population from Current District | 9.0\% | 18.6\% | 7.1\% | 46.2\% |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 04: Voting Age Population 214,386 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 02 | 04 | 05 | 10 |
| Total VAP of Population from Current District | 40,680 | 129,013 | 32,667 | 12,026 |
| \% of the Final Map District VAP | 18.98\% | 60.18\% | 15.24\% | 5.61\% |
| Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 6,303 | 18,101 | 2,344 | 2,983 |
| \% Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 15.5\% | 14.0\% | 7.2\% | 24.8\% |
| White VAP of Population from Current District | 27,593 | 79,371 | 26,661 | 2,027 |
| \% White VAP of Population from Current District | 67.8\% | 61.5\% | 81.6\% | 16.9\% |
| Black VAP of Population from Current District | 2,570 | 6,483 | 1,080 | 1,147 |
| \% Black VAP of Population from Current District | 6.32\% | 5.03\% | 3.31\% | 9.54\% |
| Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 3,601 | 23,045 | 2,205 | 5,720 |
| \% Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 8.9\% | 17.9\% | 6.7\% | 47.6\% |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 04: Citizen Voting Age Population 181,138 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 02 | 04 | 05 | 10 |
| Total CVAP of Population from Current District | 35,701 | 107,712 | 29,795 | 7,931 |
| \% of the Final Map District CVAP | 19.71\% | 59.46\% | 16.45\% | 4.38\% |
| Latino CVAP of Population from Current District | 4,516 | 12,776 | 2,101 | 1,246 |
| \% Latino CVAP of Population from Current District | 12.7\% | 11.9\% | 7.1\% | 15.7\% |
| White CVAP of Population from Current District | 25,289 | 71,914 | 24,782 | 1,896 |
| \% White CVAP of Population from Current District | 70.8\% | 66.8\% | 83.2\% | 23.9\% |
| Black CVAP of Population from Current District | 2,543 | 6,160 | 1,057 | 1,103 |
| \% Black CVAP of Population from Current District | 7.12\% | 5.72\% | 3.55\% | 13.91\% |
| Asian CVAP of Population from Current District | 2,842 | 15,241 | 1,512 | 3,596 |
| \% Asian CVAP of Population from Current District | 8.0\% | 14.1\% | 5.1\% | 45.3\% |

## District 04

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 04: Total Registered Voters 148,474 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 02 | 04 | 05 | 10 |
| Total Registration of Population from Current District | 28,121 | 87,408 | 27,076 | 5,869 |
| \% of the Final Map District Voter Registration | 18.94\% | 58.87\% | 18.24\% | 3.95\% |
| Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 2,793 | 8,824 | 1,237 | 1,017 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 9.9\% | 10.1\% | 4.6\% | 17.3\% |
| African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 2,038 | 5,410 | 945 | 1,096 |
| \%African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 7.2\% | 6.2\% | 3.5\% | 18.7\% |
| Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 1,191 | 7,034 | 929 | 1,635 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 4.24\% | 8.05\% | 3.43\% | 27.86\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 2,663 | 5,546 | 4,080 | 145 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 9.5\% | 6.3\% | 15.1\% | 2.5\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 598 | 2,386 | 378 | 9 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 2.1\% | 2.7\% | 1.4\% | 0.2\% |
| No Ethnic Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 21,983 | 65,755 | 23,679 | 2,039 |
| \% No Ethnic Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 78.2\% | 75.2\% | 87.5\% | 34.7\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 04: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 10,789 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 02 | 04 | 05 | 10 |
| Total Asian Surname Reg. of Population from Current District | 1,191 | 7,034 | 929 | 1,635 |
| \% of the Final Map District Asian Surname Voter Reg. | 11.0\% | 65.2\% | 8.6\% | 15.2\% |
| Chinese Surname Reg. from Current District | 295 | 1,610 | 289 | 211 |
| \%Chinese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 24.8\% | 22.9\% | 31.1\% | 12.9\% |
| Filipino Surname Reg. from Current District | 310 | 1,143 | 184 | 87 |
| \%Filipino Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | 26.0\% | 16.2\% | 19.8\% | 5.3\% |
| Indian Surname Reg. from Current District | 179 | 563 | 168 | 24 |
| \%Indian Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 15.0\% | 8.0\% | 18.1\% | 1.5\% |
| Japanese Surname Reg. from Current District | 152 | 702 | 112 | 74 |
| \%Japanese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | 12.8\% | 10.0\% | 12.1\% | 4.5\% |
| Korean Surname Reg. from Current District | 172 | 2,793 | 125 | 1,199 |
| \% Korean Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 14.4\% | 39.7\% | 13.5\% | 73.3\% |
| Vietnamese Surname Reg. from Current District | 83 | 223 | 51 | 40 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | 7.0\% | 3.2\% | 5.5\% | 2.4\% |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 05: Total Population 251,856 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 04 | 05 | 06 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Area (square miles) from Current District | 0.04 | 32.40 | 0.09 | 1.24 | 0.42 | 1.05 |
| Total Population from Current District | 340 | 204,900 | 86 | 25,918 | 11,111 | 9,501 |
| \% of the Final Map District Total Population | 0.13\% | 81.36\% | 0.03\% | 10.29\% | 4.41\% | 3.77\% |
| Latino Total Population from Current District | 20 | 17,282 | 12 | 10,233 | 3,186 | 1,848 |
| \% Latino Total Population from Current District | 5.9\% | 8.4\% | 14.0\% | 39.5\% | 28.7\% | 19.5\% |
| White Total Population from Current District | 227 | 146,544 | 57 | 7,650 | 3,680 | 6,110 |
| \% White Total Population from Current District | 66.8\% | 71.5\% | 66.3\% | 29.5\% | 33.1\% | 64.3\% |
| Black Total Population from Current District | 11 | 6,811 | 4 | 3,383 | 920 | 457 |
| \% Black Total Population from Current District | 3.24\% | 3.32\% | 4.65\% | 13.05\% | 8.28\% | 4.81\% |
| Asian Total Population from Current District | 78 | 31,297 | 12 | 3,999 | 3,035 | 925 |
| \% Asian Total Population from Current District | 22.9\% | 15.3\% | 14.0\% | 15.4\% | 27.3\% | 9.7\% |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 05: Voting Age Population 213,510 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 04 | 05 | 06 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Total VAP of Population from Current District | 239 | 174,679 | 65 | 21,304 | 9,560 | 7,663 |
| \% of the Final Map District | 0.11\% | 81.81\% | 0.03\% | 9.98\% | 4.48\% | 3.59\% |
| Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 14 | 14,497 | 9 | 7,375 | 2,406 | 1,363 |
| \% Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 5.9\% | 8.3\% | 13.8\% | 34.6\% | 25.2\% | 17.8\% |
| White VAP of Population from Current District | 152 | 124,030 | 44 | 7,061 | 3,425 | 5,106 |
| \% White VAP of Population from Current District | 63.6\% | 71.0\% | 67.7\% | 33.1\% | 35.8\% | 66.6\% |
| Black VAP of Population from Current District | 8 | 5,825 | 2 | 2,738 | 804 | 338 |
| \% Black VAP of Population from Current District | 3.35\% | 3.33\% | 3.08\% | 12.85\% | 8.41\% | 4.41\% |
| Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 64 | 27,922 | 9 | 3,583 | 2,675 | 745 |
| \% Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 26.8\% | 16.0\% | 13.8\% | 16.8\% | 28.0\% | 9.7\% |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population - 2006-2010

| District 05: Citizen Voting Age Population 183,671 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 04 | 05 | 06 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Total CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 223 | 154,366 | 59 | 15,712 | 6,773 | 6,539 |
| \% of the Final Map District CVAP | $0.12 \%$ | $84.04 \%$ | $0.03 \%$ | $8.55 \%$ | $3.69 \%$ | $3.56 \%$ |
| Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 10 | 11,711 | 5 | 4,288 | 1,623 | 1,006 |
| \% Latino CVAP of Population <br> from Current District | $4.4 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ | $27.3 \%$ | $24.0 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ |
| White CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 144 | 114,054 | 44 | 6,195 | 2,985 | 4,565 |
| \% White CVAP of Population <br> from Current District | $64.4 \%$ | $73.9 \%$ | $75.0 \%$ | $39.4 \%$ | $44.1 \%$ | $69.8 \%$ |
| \% Asian CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 61 | 21,073 | 7 | 2,392 | 1,362 | 525 |
| \% Asian CVAP of Population <br> from Current District | $27.2 \%$ | $13.7 \%$ | $11.2 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ | $20.1 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ |
| Brom Current District | $3.59 \%$ | $3.61 \%$ | $3.34 \%$ | $15.60 \%$ | $9.20 \%$ | $5.16 \%$ |
| Current District | 8 | 5,577 | 2 | 2,451 | 623 | 337 |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 05: Total Registered Voters 150,406 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 04 | 05 | 06 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Total Registration of Population from Current District | 190 | 127,546 | 43 | 12,256 | 5,041 | 5,330 |
| \% of the Final Map District Voter Registration | 0.13\% | 84.80\% | 0.03\% | 8.15\% | 3.35\% | 3.54\% |
| Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 5 | 7,123 | 7 | 2,626 | 827 | 706 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 2.6\% | 5.6\% | 16.3\% | 21.4\% | 16.4\% | 13.2\% |
| African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 9 | 4,600 | 2 | 2,223 | 591 | 261 |
| \%African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 4.7\% | 3.6\% | 4.7\% | 18.1\% | 11.7\% | 4.9\% |
| Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 35 | 9,782 | 0 | 1,033 | 592 | 237 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 18.42\% | 7.67\% | 0.00\% | 8.43\% | 11.74\% | 4.45\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 30 | 20,535 | 2 | 511 | 208 | 579 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 15.8\% | 16.1\% | 4.7\% | 4.2\% | 4.1\% | 10.9\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District O5: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 11,679 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 04 | 05 | 06 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Total Asian Surname Reg. of <br> Population from Current <br> District | 35 | 9,782 | 0 | 1,033 | 592 | 237 |
| \% of the Final Map District <br> Asian Surname Voter Reg. | $0.3 \%$ | $83.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ |
| Chinese Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | 9 | 3,780 | 0 | 239 | 165 | 45 |
| \%Chinese Surname Reg. of <br> Asian Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | $25.7 \%$ | $38.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $23.1 \%$ | $27.9 \%$ | $19.0 \%$ |
| Filipino Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | 3 | 1,039 | 0 | 220 | 73 | 52 |
| \%Japanese Surname Reg. of <br> Asian Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | $0.0 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ | $15.6 \%$ |
| \%Filipino Surname Reg. of <br> Asian Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | $8.6 \%$ | $10.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $21.3 \%$ | $12.3 \%$ | $21.9 \%$ |
| Indian Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | 1 | 1,770 | 0 | 252 | 165 | 58 |
| Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | $2.9 \%$ | $18.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $24.4 \%$ | $27.9 \%$ | $24.5 \%$ |
| Current District | 0 | 954 | 0 | 117 |  |  |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 05: Total Registered Voters 150,406 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 04 | 05 | 06 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Armenian Surname Registration <br> of Population from Current <br> District | 5 | 1,501 | 2 | 27 | 18 | 127 |
| \%egistration of Population from <br> Current District | $2.6 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ |
| No Ethnic Surname Registration <br> of Population from Current <br> District | 141 | 103,821 | 34 | 6,249 | 3,015 | 4,074 |
| \% No Ethnic Surname | $74.2 \%$ | $81.4 \%$ | $79.1 \%$ | $51.0 \%$ | $59.8 \%$ | $76.4 \%$ |
| Registration of Population from <br> Current District |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 05: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 11,679 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 04 | 05 | 06 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Korean Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | 19 | 1,389 | 0 | 136 | 85 | 28 |
| \% Korean Surname Reg. of <br> Asian Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | $54.3 \%$ | $14.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $13.2 \%$ | $14.4 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ |
| Vietnamese Surname Reg. <br> from Current District | 3 | 850 | 0 | 69 | 37 | 17 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of <br> Asian Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | $8.6 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 06: Total Population 258,926 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 02 | 06 | 07 | 12 |
| Area (square miles) from Current District | 0.66 | 22.28 | 2.56 | 1.81 |
| Total Population from Current District | 242 | 190,174 | 59,757 | 8,753 |
| \% of the Final Map District Total Population | 0.09\% | 73.45\% | 23.08\% | 3.38\% |
| Latino Total Population from Current District | 68 | 131,687 | 47,081 | 3,467 |
| \% Latino Total Population from Current District | 28.1\% | 69.2\% | 78.8\% | 39.6\% |
| White Total Population from Current District | 154 | 31,384 | 3,568 | 4,074 |
| \% White Total Population from Current District | 63.6\% | 16.5\% | 6.0\% | 46.5\% |
| Black Total Population from Current District | 5 | 6,848 | 1,959 | 278 |
| \% Black Total Population from Current District | 2.07\% | 3.60\% | 3.28\% | 3.18\% |
| Asian Total Population from Current District | 11 | 17,988 | 6,573 | 787 |
| \% Asian Total Population from Current District | 4.5\% | 9.5\% | 11.0\% | 9.0\% |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 06: Voting Age Population 187,114 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 02 | 06 | 07 | 12 |
| Total VAP of Population from Current District | 185 | 139,520 | 40,623 | 6,786 |
| \% of the Final Map District VAP | 0.10\% | 74.56\% | 21.71\% | 3.63\% |
| Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 47 | 90,675 | 30,521 | 2,423 |
| \% Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 25.4\% | 65.0\% | 75.1\% | 35.7\% |
| White VAP of Population from Current District | 123 | 27,011 | 3,004 | 3,404 |
| \% White VAP of Population from Current District | 66.5\% | 19.4\% | 7.4\% | 50.2\% |
| Black VAP of Population from Current District | 4 | 5,357 | 1,455 | 214 |
| \% Black VAP of Population from Current District | 2.16\% | 3.84\% | 3.58\% | 3.15\% |
| Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 7 | 14,864 | 5,275 | 648 |
| \% Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 3.8\% | 10.7\% | 13.0\% | 9.5\% |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 06: Citizen Voting Age Population 112,058 |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 02 | 06 | 07 | 12 |
| Total CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 148 | 87,416 | 19,229 | 5,267 |
| \% of the Final Map District CVAP | $0.13 \%$ | $78.01 \%$ | $17.16 \%$ | $4.70 \%$ |
| Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 18 | 46,038 | 10,942 | 1,473 |
| \% Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $12.1 \%$ | $52.7 \%$ | $56.9 \%$ | $28.0 \%$ |
| White CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 122 | 24,736 | 2,825 | 2,995 |
| \% White CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $82.1 \%$ | $28.3 \%$ | $14.7 \%$ | $56.9 \%$ |
| Black CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 0 | 5,000 | 1,375 | 214 |
| \% Black CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $0.00 \%$ | $5.72 \%$ | $7.15 \%$ | $4.06 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 6 | 10,538 | 3,866 | 512 |
| Asian CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $4.3 \%$ | $12.1 \%$ | $20.1 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration
$\left.\begin{array}{|r|c|c|c|c|}\hline \begin{array}{r}\text { District 06: Total Registered Voters 78,894, Total Asian Surname } \\ \text { Registered Voters 5,114 }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { Current Districts (2001) within } \\ \text { Final Map District }\end{array} & 02 & 06 & 07 & 12 \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { Total Registration of Population } \\ \text { from Current District }\end{array} & 170 & 61,849 & 12,224 & 4,651 \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { \% of the Final Map District Voter } \\ \text { Registration }\end{array} & 0.22 \% & 78.40 \% & 15.49 \% & 5.90 \% \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { Spanish Surname Registration of } \\ \text { Population from Current District }\end{array} & 40 & 31,351 & 6,982 & 1,144 \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { \%Spanish Surname Registration of } \\ \text { Population from Current District }\end{array} & 23.5 \% & 50.7 \% & 57.1 \% & 24.6 \% \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { Armenian Surname Registration of } \\ \text { Population from Current District }\end{array} & 4 & 1,886 & 114 & 180 \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { \%Armenian Surname Registration } \\ \text { of Population from Current } \\ \text { District }\end{array} & 2.4 \% & 3.0 \% & 0.9 \% & 3.9 \% \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { \%Jewish Surname Registration of } \\ \text { Population from Current District }\end{array} & 1.2 \% & 1.7 \% & 0.8 \% & 4.8 \% \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { Population from Current District }\end{array} & 0 & 3,904 & 1,221 & 208 \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { Jewish Surname Registration of } \\ \text { Population from Current District }\end{array} & 2 & 1,069 & 94 & 225 \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { \%African-American Registration of } \\ \text { Population from Current District }\end{array} & 0.0 \% & 6.3 \% & 10.0 \% & 4.5 \% \\ \hline \text { Population from Current District }\end{array}\right\}$

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 06: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 5,114 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 02 | 06 | 07 | 12 |
| Total Asian Surname Reg. of Population from Current District | 4 | 3,756 | 1,135 | 219 |
| \% of the Final Map District Asian Surname Voter Reg. | 0.1\% | 73.4\% | 22.2\% | 4.3\% |
| Chinese Surname Reg. from Current District | 3 | 394 | 109 | 43 |
| \%Chinese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 75.0\% | 10.5\% | 9.6\% | 19.6\% |
| Filipino Surname Reg. from Current District | 1 | 1,917 | 664 | 75 |
| \%Filipino Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 25.0\% | 51.0\% | 58.5\% | 34.2\% |
| Indian Surname Reg. from Current District | 0 | 332 | 95 | 22 |
| \%Indian Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 0.0\% | 8.8\% | 8.4\% | 10.0\% |
| Japanese Surname Reg. from Current District | 0 | 310 | 47 | 24 |
| \%Japanese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | 0.0\% | 8.3\% | 4.1\% | 11.0\% |
| Korean Surname Reg. from Current District | 0 | 398 | 63 | 26 |
| \% Korean Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 0.0\% | 10.6\% | 5.6\% | 11.9\% |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 06: Total Registered Voters 78,894, Total Asian Surname <br> Registered Voters 5,114 |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 02 | 06 | 07 | 12 |
| No Ethnic Surname Registration of <br> Population from Current District | 105 | 22,305 | 2,865 | 3,069 |
| \% No Ethnic Surname Registration <br> of Population from Current <br> District | $61.8 \%$ | $36.1 \%$ | $23.4 \%$ | $66.0 \%$ |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 06: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 5,114 |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 02 | 06 | 07 | 12 |
| Vietnamese Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | 0 | 405 | 157 | 29 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of <br> Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | $0.0 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ | $13.8 \%$ | $13.2 \%$ |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 07: Total Population 259,008 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 02 | 06 | 07 |
| Area (square miles) from Current District | 26.91 | 1.03 | 26.16 |
| Total Population from Current District | 54,558 | 10,893 | 193,557 |
| \% of the Final Map District Total Population | 21.06\% | 4.21\% | 74.73\% |
| Latino Total Population from Current District | 14,087 | 10,038 | 154,326 |
| \% Latino Total Population from Current District | 25.8\% | 92.2\% | 79.7\% |
| White Total Population from Current District | 32,885 | 350 | 18,199 |
| \% White Total Population from Current District | 60.3\% | 3.2\% | 9.4\% |
| Black Total Population from Current District | 1,121 | 92 | 8,499 |
| \% Black Total Population from Current District | 2.05\% | 0.84\% | 4.39\% |
| Asian Total Population from Current District | 5,628 | 347 | 10,740 |
| \% Asian Total Population from Current District | 10.3\% | 3.2\% | 5.5\% |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 07: Total Population 259,008 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 02 | 06 | 07 |
| Total VAP of Population from Current District | 43,946 | 7,523 | 136,168 |
| \% of the Final Map District VAP | 23.42\% | 4.01\% | 72.57\% |
| Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 9,878 | 6,804 | 103,741 |
| \% Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 22.5\% | 90.4\% | 76.2\% |
| White VAP of Population from Current District | 27,957 | 299 | 15,966 |
| \% White VAP of Population from Current District | 63.6\% | 4.0\% | 11.7\% |
| Black VAP of Population from Current District | 836 | 62 | 6,469 |
| \% Black VAP of Population from Current District | 1.90\% | 0.82\% | 4.75\% |
| Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 4,607 | 308 | 8,749 |
| \% Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 10.5\% | 4.1\% | 6.4\% |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 07: Citizen Voting Age Population 132,292 |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 02 | 06 | 07 |
| Total CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 36,891 | 4,523 | 90,879 |
| \% of the Final Map District CVAP | $27.89 \%$ | $3.42 \%$ | $68.70 \%$ |
| Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 6,777 | 3,820 | 61,418 |
| \% Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $18.4 \%$ | $84.5 \%$ | $67.6 \%$ |
| White CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 25,173 | 299 | 15,234 |
| \% White CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $68.2 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ | $16.8 \%$ |
| Black CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 828 | 62 | 6,312 |
| \% Black CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $2.24 \%$ | $1.36 \%$ | $6.95 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 3,559 | 292 | 6,898 |
| Current District CVAP of Population from | $9.6 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 07: Total Registered Voters 98,333 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 02 | 06 | 07 |
| Total Registration of Population from Current District | 28,509 | 3,364 | 66,460 |
| \% of the Final Map District Voter Registration | 28.99\% | 3.42\% | 67.59\% |
| Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 4,619 | 2,739 | 41,264 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 16.2\% | 81.4\% | 62.1\% |
| African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 661 | 72 | 6,154 |
| \%African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 2.3\% | 2.1\% | 9.3\% |
| Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 1,349 | 112 | 3,037 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 4.73\% | 3.33\% | 4.57\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 433 | 13 | 527 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 1.5\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 3,151 | 3 | 261 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 11.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.4\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 07: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 4,498 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 02 | 06 | 07 |
| Total Asian Surname Reg. of Population from Current District | 1,349 | 112 | 3,037 |
| \% of the Final Map District Asian Surname Voter Reg. | 30.0\% | 2.5\% | 67.5\% |
| Chinese Surname Reg. from Current District | 185 | 19 | 294 |
| \%Chinese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 13.7\% | 17.0\% | 9.7\% |
| Filipino Surname Reg. from Current District | 404 | 59 | 1,618 |
| \%Filipino Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 29.9\% | 52.7\% | 53.3\% |
| Indian Surname Reg. from Current District | 119 | 10 | 288 |
| \%Indian Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 8.8\% | 8.9\% | 9.5\% |
| Japanese Surname Reg. from Current District | 107 | 6 | 280 |
| \%Japanese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 7.9\% | 5.4\% | 9.2\% |
| Korean Surname Reg. from Current District | 485 | 15 | 338 |
| \% Korean Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 36.0\% | 13.4\% | 11.1\% |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 07: Total Registered Voters 98,333 |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 02 | 06 | 07 |
| No Ethnic Surname Registration of <br> Population from Current District | 21,834 | 426 | 15,586 |
| \% No Ethnic Surname Registration <br> of Population from Current <br> District | $76.6 \%$ | $12.7 \%$ | $23.5 \%$ |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 07: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 4,498 |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 02 | 06 | 07 |
| Vietnamese Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | 49 | 3 | 219 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of <br> Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | $3.6 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 08: Total Population 246,597 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 08 | 09 | 11 |
| Area (square miles) from Current District | 0.52 | 11.91 | 2.22 | 0.32 |
| Total Population from Current District | 11,059 | 183,979 | 46,522 | 5,037 |
| \% of the Final Map District Total Population | 4.48\% | 74.61\% | 18.87\% | 2.04\% |
| Latino Total Population from Current District | 8,303 | 95,352 | 34,039 | 764 |
| \% Latino Total Population from Current District | 75.1\% | 51.8\% | 73.2\% | 15.2\% |
| White Total Population from Current District | 745 | 3,575 | 408 | 1,062 |
| \% White Total Population from Current District | 6.7\% | 1.9\% | 0.9\% | 21.1\% |
| Black Total Population from Current District | 713 | 78,756 | 11,249 | 2,414 |
| \% Black Total Population from Current District | 6.45\% | 42.81\% | 24.18\% | 47.93\% |
| Asian Total Population from Current District | 1,194 | 2,878 | 304 | 646 |
| \% Asian Total Population from Current District | 10.8\% | 1.6\% | 0.7\% | 12.8\% |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

District 08: Voting Age Population 178,107

| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 08 | 09 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total VAP of Population from Current District | 8,539 | 133,108 | 32,249 | 4,211 |
| \% of the Final Map District VAP | 4.79\% | 74.73\% | 18.11\% | 2.36\% |
| Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 6,001 | 64,427 | 22,885 | 600 |
| \% Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 70.3\% | 48.4\% | 71.0\% | 14.2\% |
| White VAP of Population from Current District | 712 | 2,979 | 282 | 990 |
| \% White VAP of Population from Current District | 8.3\% | 2.2\% | 0.9\% | 23.5\% |
| Black VAP of Population from Current District | 583 | 60,512 | 8,434 | 1,940 |
| \% Black VAP of Population from Current District | 6.83\% | 45.46\% | 26.15\% | 46.07\% |
| Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 1,160 | 2,689 | 274 | 563 |
| \% Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 13.6\% | 2.0\% | 0.8\% | 13.4\% |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 08: Citizen Voting Age Population 119,263 |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 01 | 08 | 09 | 11 |
| Total CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 4,381 | 94,083 | 17,294 | 3,506 |
| \% of the Final Map District CVAP | $3.67 \%$ | $78.89 \%$ | $14.50 \%$ | $2.94 \%$ |
| Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 2,759 | 27,889 | 8,071 | 393 |
| \% Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $63.0 \%$ | $29.6 \%$ | $46.7 \%$ | $11.2 \%$ |
| White CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 619 | 2,630 | 275 | 929 |
| \% White CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $14.1 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $26.5 \%$ |
| Black CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 571 | 59,837 | 8,374 | 1,860 |
| \% Black CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $13.02 \%$ | $63.60 \%$ | $48.42 \%$ | $53.04 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 383 | 1,727 | 252 | 246 |
| Asian CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $8.7 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 08: Total Registered Voters 106,492 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 08 | 09 | 11 |
| Total Registration of Population from Current District | 3,436 | 84,803 | 15,416 | 2,837 |
| \% of the Final Map District Voter Registration | 3.23\% | 79.63\% | 14.48\% | 2.66\% |
| Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 2,203 | 19,996 | 6,214 | 312 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 64.1\% | 23.6\% | 40.3\% | 11.0\% |
| African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 492 | 57,722 | 8,114 | 1,579 |
| \%African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 14.3\% | 68.1\% | 52.6\% | 55.7\% |
| Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 153 | 1,521 | 294 | 111 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 4.45\% | 1.79\% | 1.91\% | 3.91\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 14 | 399 | 40 | 44 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 0.4\% | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 1.6\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 2 | 19 | 0 | 1 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| No Ethnic Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 554 | 4,229 | 576 | 835 |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 08: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 2,079 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 08 | 09 | 11 |
| Total Asian Surname Reg. of Population from Current District | 153 | 1,521 | 294 | 111 |
| \% of the Final Map District Asian Surname Voter Reg. | 7.4\% | 73.2\% | 14.1\% | 5.3\% |
| Chinese Surname Reg. from Current District | 30 | 289 | 39 | 26 |
| \%Chinese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 19.6\% | 19.0\% | 13.3\% | 23.4\% |
| Filipino Surname Reg. from Current District | 63 | 567 | 167 | 29 |
| \%Filipino Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 41.2\% | 37.3\% | 56.8\% | 26.1\% |
| Indian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | 28 | 252 | 38 | 21 |
| \%Indian Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 18.3\% | 16.6\% | 12.9\% | 18.9\% |
| Japanese Surname Reg. from Current District | 5 | 113 | 8 | 11 |
| \%Japanese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 3.3\% | 7.4\% | 2.7\% | 9.9\% |
| Korean Surname Reg. from Current District | 16 | 232 | 35 | 14 |
| \% Korean Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 10.5\% | 15.3\% | 11.9\% | 12.6\% |
| Vietnamese Surname Reg. from Current District | 11 | 68 | 7 | 10 |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 08: Total Registered Voters 106,492 |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 01 | 08 | 09 | 11 |
| \% No Ethnic Surname Registration <br> of Population from Current <br> District | $16.1 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $29.4 \%$ |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 08: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 2,079 |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within |  |
| Final Map District |  |$\quad 01$|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of <br> Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | $7.2 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 09: Total Population 249,728 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 08 | 09 | 15 |
| Area (square miles) from Current District | 3.31 | 9.84 | 0.69 |
| Total Population from Current District | 55,310 | 184,842 | 9,576 |
| \% of the Final Map District Total Population | 22.15\% | 74.02\% | 3.83\% |
| Latino Total Population from Current District | 28,744 | 155,741 | 6,568 |
| \% Latino Total Population from Current District | 52.0\% | 84.3\% | 68.6\% |
| White Total Population from Current District | 6,285 | 1,798 | 59 |
| \% White Total Population from Current District | 11.4\% | 1.0\% | 0.6\% |
| Black Total Population from Current District | 14,659 | 25,006 | 2,811 |
| \% Black Total Population from Current District | 26.50\% | 13.53\% | 29.35\% |
| Asian Total Population from Current District | 4,906 | 1,050 | 19 |
| \% Asian Total Population from Current District | 8.9\% | 0.6\% | 0.2\% |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 09: Voting Age Population 167,978 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 08 | 09 | 15 |
| Total VAP of Population from Current District | 41,016 | 120,713 | 6,249 |
| \% of the Final Map District VAP | 24.42\% | 71.86\% | 3.72\% |
| Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 18,810 | 99,292 | 4,151 |
| \% Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 45.9\% | 82.3\% | 66.4\% |
| White VAP of Population from Current District | 6,144 | 1,376 | 40 |
| \% White VAP of Population from Current District | 15.0\% | 1.1\% | 0.6\% |
| Black VAP of Population from Current District | 10,672 | 18,268 | 1,957 |
| \% Black VAP of Population from Current District | 26.02\% | 15.13\% | 31.32\% |
| Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 4,828 | 958 | 16 |
| \% Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 11.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.3\% |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 09: Citizen Voting Age Population 86,754 |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 08 | 09 | 15 |
| Total CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 27,854 | 55,144 | 3,756 |
| \% of the Final Map District CVAP | $32.11 \%$ | $63.56 \%$ | $4.33 \%$ |
| Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 8,001 | 34,138 | 1,663 |
| \% Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $28.7 \%$ | $61.9 \%$ | $44.3 \%$ |
| White CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 5,776 | 1,249 | 38 |
| \% White CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $20.7 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| Black CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 10,640 | 18,187 | 1,957 |
| \% Black CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $38.20 \%$ | $32.98 \%$ | $52.11 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 2,988 | 803 | 13 |
| Current District CVAP of Population from <br> C | $10.7 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 09: Total Registered Voters 68,663 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 08 | 09 | 15 |
| Total Registration of Population from Current District | 19,984 | 45,349 | 3,300 |
| \% of the Final Map District Voter Registration | 29.12\% | 66.07\% | 4.81\% |
| Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 5,308 | 24,534 | 1,213 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 26.6\% | 54.1\% | 36.8\% |
| African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 10,160 | 17,558 | 1,845 |
| \%African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 50.8\% | 38.7\% | 55.9\% |
| Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 932 | 847 | 38 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 4.66\% | 1.87\% | 1.15\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 221 | 100 | 9 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 1.1\% | 0.2\% | 0.3\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 10 | 6 | 0 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 09: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 1,817 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 08 | 09 | 15 |
| Total Asian Surname Reg. of Population from Current District | 932 | 847 | 38 |
| \% of the Final Map District Asian Surname Voter Reg. | 51.3\% | 46.6\% | 2.1\% |
| Chinese Surname Reg. from Current District | 342 | 110 | 2 |
| \%Chinese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 36.7\% | 13.0\% | 5.3\% |
| Filipino Surname Reg. from Current District | 127 | 519 | 25 |
| \%Filipino Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 13.6\% | 61.3\% | 65.8\% |
| Indian Surname Reg. from Current District | 142 | 85 | 9 |
| \%Indian Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 15.2\% | 10.0\% | 23.7\% |
| Japanese Surname Reg. from Current District | 63 | 29 | 0 |
| \%Japanese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 6.8\% | 3.4\% | 0.0\% |
| Korean Surname Reg. from Current District | 197 | 87 | 1 |
| \% Korean Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 21.1\% | 10.3\% | 2.6\% |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 09: Total Registered Voters 68,663 |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 08 | 09 | 15 |
| No Ethnic Surname Registration of <br> Population from Current District | 2,888 | 1,684 | 111 |
| \% No Ethnic Surname Registration <br> of Population from Current <br> District | $14.5 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 09: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 1,817 |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 08 | 09 | 15 |
| Vietnamese Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | 61 | 17 | 1 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of <br> Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | $6.5 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 10: Total Population 249,305 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 04 | 08 | 10 |
| Area (square miles) from Current District | 0.25 | 0.63 | 2.24 | 11.19 |
| Total Population from Current District | 6,970 | 31,417 | 17,371 | 193,547 |
| \% of the Final Map District Total Population | 2.80\% | 12.60\% | 6.97\% | 77.63\% |
| Latino Total Population from Current District | 5,084 | 12,728 | 2,029 | 97,574 |
| \% Latino Total Population from Current District | 72.9\% | 40.5\% | 11.7\% | 50.4\% |
| White Total Population from Current District | 151 | 2,242 | 887 | 14,081 |
| \% White Total Population from Current District | 2.2\% | 7.1\% | 5.1\% | 7.3\% |
| Black Total Population from Current District | 244 | 1,716 | 13,566 | 53,310 |
| \% Black Total Population from Current District | 3.50\% | 5.46\% | 78.10\% | 27.54\% |
| Asian Total Population from Current District | 1,459 | 14,350 | 437 | 24,954 |
| \% Asian Total Population from Current District | 20.9\% | 45.7\% | 2.5\% | 12.9\% |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 10: Voting Age Population 192,651 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 04 | 08 | 10 |
| Total VAP of Population from Current District | 5,230 | 25,359 | 14,225 | 147,837 |
| \% of the Final Map District VAP | 2.71\% | 13.16\% | 7.38\% | 76.74\% |
| Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 3,622 | 9,221 | 1,413 | 67,774 |
| \% Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 69.3\% | 36.4\% | 9.9\% | 45.8\% |
| White VAP of Population from Current District | 118 | 2,070 | 790 | 12,492 |
| \% White VAP of Population from Current District | 2.3\% | 8.2\% | 5.6\% | 8.4\% |
| Black VAP of Population from Current District | 200 | 1,472 | 11,288 | 42,727 |
| \% Black VAP of Population from Current District | 3.82\% | 5.80\% | 79.35\% | 28.90\% |
| Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 1,268 | 12,283 | 398 | 22,141 |
| \% Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 24.2\% | 48.4\% | 2.8\% | 15.0\% |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population - 2006-2010

| District 10: Citizen Voting Age Population 125,680 |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 01 | 04 | 08 | 10 |
| Total CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 2,521 | 12,401 | 13,388 | 97,371 |
| \% of the Final Map District CVAP | $2.01 \%$ | $9.87 \%$ | $10.65 \%$ | $77.48 \%$ |
| Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 1,613 | 3,687 | 955 | 28,404 |
| \% Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $64.0 \%$ | $29.7 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ | $29.2 \%$ |
| White CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 118 | 1,795 | 715 | 11,331 |
| \% White CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $4.7 \%$ | $14.5 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $11.6 \%$ |
| Black CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 189 | 1,295 | 11,068 | 41,653 |
| \% Black CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $7.51 \%$ | $10.45 \%$ | $82.67 \%$ | $42.78 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 591 | 5,478 | 374 | 14,023 |
| Asian CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $23.4 \%$ | $44.2 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $14.4 \%$ |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 10: Total Registered Voters 101,780 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 04 | 08 | 10 |
| Total Registration of Population from Current District | 1,686 | 7,682 | 12,704 | 79,708 |
| \% of the Final Map District Voter Registration | 1.66\% | 7.55\% | 12.48\% | 78.31\% |
| Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 998 | 2,172 | 640 | 19,591 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 59.2\% | 28.3\% | 5.0\% | 24.6\% |
| African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 188 | 1,368 | 10,636 | 39,347 |
| \%African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 11.2\% | 17.8\% | 83.7\% | 49.4\% |
| Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 322 | 2,063 | 242 | 6,779 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 19.10\% | 26.85\% | 1.90\% | 8.50\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 2 | 60 | 140 | 974 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 0.1\% | 0.8\% | 1.1\% | 1.2\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 0 | 24 | 18 | 70 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 10: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 9,406 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 04 | 08 | 10 |
| Total Asian Surname Reg. of Population from Current District | 322 | 2,063 | 242 | 6,779 |
| \% of the Final Map District Asian Surname Voter Reg. | 3.4\% | 12.4\% | 1.5\% | 40.8\% |
| Chinese Surname Reg. from Current District | 26 | 202 | 66 | 845 |
| \%Chinese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 8.1\% | 9.8\% | 27.3\% | 12.5\% |
| Filipino Surname Reg. from Current District | 54 | 414 | 46 | 966 |
| \%Filipino Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 16.8\% | 20.1\% | 19.0\% | 14.2\% |
| Indian Surname Reg. from Current District | 3 | 154 | 33 | 365 |
| \%Indian Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 0.9\% | 7.5\% | 13.6\% | 5.4\% |
| Japanese Surname Reg. from Current District | 17 | 58 | 73 | 850 |
| \%Japanese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 5.3\% | 2.8\% | 30.2\% | 12.5\% |
| Korean Surname Reg. from Current District | 219 | 1,208 | 20 | 3,586 |
| \% Korean Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 68.0\% | 58.6\% | 8.3\% | 52.9\% |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 10: Total Registered Voters 101,780 |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 01 | 04 | 08 | 10 |
| No Ethnic Surname Registration of <br> Population from Current District | 178 | 2,079 | 1,008 | 13,337 |
| \% No Ethnic Surname Registration <br> of Population from Current <br> District | $10.6 \%$ | $27.1 \%$ | $7.9 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 10: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 9,406 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 01 | 04 | 08 | 10 |
| Vietnamese Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | 3 | 27 | 4 | 167 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of <br> Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | $0.9 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 11: Total Population 257,182 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 05 | 11 |
| Area (square miles) from Current District | 0.52 | 64.88 |
| Total Population from Current District | 8,617 | 248,565 |
| \% of the Final Map District Total Population | 3.35\% | 96.65\% |
| Latino Total Population from Current District | 1,119 | 47,245 |
| \% Latino Total Population from Current District | 13.0\% | 19.0\% |
| White Total Population from Current District | 4,107 | 150,668 |
| \% White Total Population from Current District | 47.7\% | 60.6\% |
| Black Total Population from Current District | 449 | 11,784 |
| \% Black Total Population from Current District | 5.21\% | 4.74\% |
| Asian Total Population from Current District | 2,765 | 34,444 |
| \% Asian Total Population from Current District | 32.1\% | 13.9\% |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.
$\left.\begin{array}{|r|c|c|}\hline \text { District 11: Voting Age Population 215,969 } \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { Current Districts (2001) within } \\ \text { Final Map District }\end{array} & 05 & 11 \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { Total VAP of Population from } \\ \text { Current District }\end{array} & 7,171 & 208,798 \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { \% of the Final Map District VAP }\end{array} & 3.32 \% & 96.68 \% \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { Latino VAP of Population from } \\ \text { Current District }\end{array} & 874 & 35,596 \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { \% Latino VAP of Population from } \\ \text { Current District }\end{array} & 12.2 \% & 17.0 \% \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { White VAP of Population from } \\ \text { Current District }\end{array} & 3,574 & 130,637 \\ \hline \begin{array}{r}\text { \% Asian VAP of Population from } \\ \text { Current District }\end{array} & 31.3 \% & 14.1 \% \\ \hline \text { Black VAP of Population from } \\ \text { Current District }\end{array}\right\}$

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 11: Citizen Voting Age Population 185,934 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 05 | 11 |
| Total CVAP of Population from Current District | 5,095 | 180,839 |
| \% of the Final Map District CVAP | 2.74\% | 97.26\% |
| Latino CVAP of Population from Current District | 791 | 24,033 |
| \% Latino CVAP of Population from Current District | 15.5\% | 13.3\% |
| White CVAP of Population from Current District | 3,101 | 122,273 |
| \% White CVAP of Population from Current District | 60.9\% | 67.6\% |
| Black CVAP of Population from Current District | 121 | 9,021 |
| \% Black CVAP of Population from Current District | 2.37\% | 4.99\% |
| Asian CVAP of Population from Current District | 973 | 22,635 |
| \% Asian CVAP of Population from Current District | 19.1\% | 12.5\% |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 11: Total Registered Voters 156,364 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 05 | 11 |
| Total Registration of Population from Current District | 4,419 | 151,945 |
| \% of the Final Map District Voter Registration | 2.83\% | 97.17\% |
| Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 437 | 15,904 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 9.9\% | 10.5\% |
| African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 123 | 7,240 |
| \%African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 2.8\% | 4.8\% |
| Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 524 | 11,122 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 11.86\% | 7.32\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 341 | 12,383 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 7.7\% | 8.1\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 15 | 754 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 0.3\% | 0.5\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 11: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 11,646 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 05 | 11 |
| Total Asian Surname Reg. of Population from Current District | 524 | 11,122 |
| \% of the Final Map District Asian Surname Voter Reg. | 0.4\% | 9.4\% |
| Chinese Surname Reg. from Current District | 180 | 3,294 |
| \%Chinese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 34.4\% | 29.6\% |
| Filipino Surname Reg. from Current District | 54 | 1,445 |
| \%Filipino Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 10.3\% | 13.0\% |
| Indian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | 99 | 1,398 |
| \%Indian Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 18.9\% | 12.6\% |
| Japanese Surname Reg. from Current District | 82 | 2,968 |
| \%Japanese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 15.6\% | 26.7\% |
| Korean Surname Reg. from Current District | 90 | 1,362 |
| \% Korean Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | 17.2\% | 12.2\% |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 11: Total Registered Voters 156,364 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 05 | 11 |
| No Ethnic Surname Registration of <br> Population from Current District | 3,332 | 115,122 |
| \% No Ethnic Surname Registration <br> of Population from Current <br> District | $75.4 \%$ | $75.8 \%$ |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 11: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters <br> 11,646 |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 05 | 11 |
| Vietnamese Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | 19 | 655 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of <br> Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | $3.6 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 12: Total Population 259,073 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 03 | 12 |
| Area (square miles) from Current <br> District | 7.26 | 51.63 |
| Total Population from Current District | 42,208 | 216,865 |
| \% of the Final Map District Total Population | 16.29\% | 83.71\% |
| Latino Total Population from Current District | 9,542 | 60,265 |
| \% Latino Total Population from Current District | 22.6\% | 27.8\% |
| White Total Population from Current District | 23,914 | 99,624 |
| \% White Total Population from Current District | 56.7\% | 45.9\% |
| Black Total Population from Current District | 1,481 | 10,031 |
| \% Black Total Population from Current District | 3.51\% | 4.63\% |
| Asian Total Population from Current District | 6,648 | 43,467 |
| \% Asian Total Population from Current District | 15.8\% | 20.0\% |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 12: Voting Age Population 204,490 |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 03 | 12 |
| Total VAP of Population from <br> Current District | 32,580 | 171,910 |
| \% of the Final Map District VAP | $15.93 \%$ | $84.07 \%$ |
| Latino VAP of Population from <br> Current District | 6,654 | 42,472 |
| \% Asian VAP of Population from <br> Current District | $15.6 \%$ | $20.1 \%$ |
| Asian VAP of Population from <br> Current District | 5,088 | 34,532 |
| \% Black VAP of Population from <br> Current District | $3.26 \%$ | $4.46 \%$ |
| White VAP of Population from |  |  |
| Current District |  |  |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 12: Citizen Voting Age Population 173,488 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 03 | 12 |
| Total CVAP of Population from Current District | 28,617 | 144,872 |
| \% of the Final Map District CVAP | 16.50\% | 83.51\% |
| Latino CVAP of Population from Current District | 4,581 | 30,021 |
| \% Latino CVAP of Population from Current District | 16.0\% | 20.7\% |
| White CVAP of Population from Current District | 18,444 | 79,927 |
| \% White CVAP of Population from Current District | 64.5\% | 55.2\% |
| Black CVAP of Population from Current District | 1,046 | 7,365 |
| \% Black CVAP of Population from Current District | 3.65\% | 5.08\% |
| Asian CVAP of Population from Current District | 4,189 | 25,533 |
| \% Asian CVAP of Population from Current District | 14.6\% | 17.6\% |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 12: Total Registered Voters 142,834 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 03 | 12 |
| Total Registration of Population from Current District | 24,433 | 118,401 |
| \% of the Final Map District Voter Registration | 17.11\% | 82.89\% |
| Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 3,384 | 21,281 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 13.9\% | 18.0\% |
| African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 952 | 6,290 |
| \%African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 3.9\% | 5.3\% |
| Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 1,928 | 11,873 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 7.89\% | 10.03\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 2,098 | 6,662 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 8.6\% | 5.6\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 442 | 4,012 |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 12: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 13,801 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 03 | 12 |
| Total Asian Surname Reg. of Population from Current District | 1,928 | 11,873 |
| \% of the Final Map District Asian Surname Voter Reg. | 2.0\% | 12.3\% |
| Chinese Surname Reg. from Current District | 545 | 2,417 |
| \%Chinese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 28.3\% | 20.4\% |
| Filipino Surname Reg. from Current District | 358 | 2,458 |
| \%Filipino Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 18.6\% | 20.7\% |
| Indian Surname Reg. from Current District | 310 | 2,211 |
| \%Indian Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 16.1\% | 18.6\% |
| Japanese Surname Reg. from Current District | 157 | 985 |
| \%Japanese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 8.1\% | 8.3\% |
| Korean Surname Reg. from Current District | 239 | 2,909 |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 12: Total Registered Voters 142,834 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 03 | 12 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration <br> of Population from Current <br> District | $1.8 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ |
| No Ethnic Surname Registration of <br> Population from Current District | 18,135 | 78,194 |
| \% No Ethnic Surname Registration <br> of Population from Current <br> District | $74.2 \%$ | $66.0 \%$ |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 12: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 13,801 |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 03 | 12 |
| \% Korean Surname Reg. of Asian <br> Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | $12.4 \%$ | $24.5 \%$ |
| Vietnamese Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | 319 | 893 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of <br> Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | $16.5 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 13: Total Population 246,566 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 04 | 13 |
| Area (square miles) from Current District | 0.08 | 2.03 | 10.89 |
| Total Population from Current District | 5,836 | 28,739 | 211,991 |
| \% of the Final Map District Total Population | 2.37\% | 11.66\% | 85.98\% |
| Latino Total Population from Current District | 2,799 | 8,519 | 119,945 |
| \% Latino Total Population from Current District | 48.0\% | 29.6\% | 56.6\% |
| White Total Population from Current District | 242 | 12,191 | 44,201 |
| \% White Total Population from Current District | 4.1\% | 42.4\% | 20.9\% |
| Black Total Population from Current District | 261 | 1,490 | 7,245 |
| \% Black Total Population from Current District | 4.47\% | 5.18\% | 3.42\% |
| Asian Total Population from Current District | 2,485 | 6,057 | 37,725 |
| \% Asian Total Population from Current District | 42.6\% | 21.1\% | 17.8\% |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 13: Voting Age Population 199,570 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 04 | 13 |
| Total VAP of Population from Current District | 4,623 | 25,182 | 169,765 |
| \% of the Final Map District VAP | 2.32\% | 12.62\% | 85.07\% |
| Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 1,981 | 6,694 | 87,931 |
| \% Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 42.9\% | 26.6\% | 51.8\% |
| White VAP of Population from Current District | 225 | 11,469 | 40,611 |
| \% White VAP of Population from Current District | 4.9\% | 45.5\% | 23.9\% |
| Black VAP of Population from Current District | 206 | 1,367 | 6,416 |
| \% Black VAP of Population from Current District | 4.46\% | 5.43\% | 3.78\% |
| Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 2,170 | 5,233 | 32,575 |
| \% Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 46.9\% | 20.8\% | 19.2\% |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 13: Citizen Voting Age Population 123,102 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 01 | 04 | 13 |
| Total CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 2,198 | 18,289 | 102,616 |
| \% of the Final Map District CVAP | $1.79 \%$ | $14.86 \%$ | $83.36 \%$ |
| Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 849 | 3,434 | 37,096 |
| $\%$ Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $38.6 \%$ | $18.8 \%$ | $36.2 \%$ |
| White CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 182 | 10,209 | 34,826 |
| \% White CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $8.3 \%$ | $55.8 \%$ | $33.9 \%$ |
| Black CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 176 | 1,273 | 6,170 |
| $\%$ Black CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $8.00 \%$ | $6.96 \%$ | $6.01 \%$ |
| Asian CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 976 | 3,076 | 23,138 |
| $\%$ Asian CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $44.4 \%$ | $16.8 \%$ | $22.5 \%$ |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 13: Total Registered Voters 93,768 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 04 | 13 |
| Total Registration of Population from Current District | 1,309 | 13,872 | 78,587 |
| \% of the Final Map District Voter Registration | 1.40\% | 14.79\% | 83.81\% |
| Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 421 | 2,518 | 30,986 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 32.2\% | 18.2\% | 39.4\% |
| African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 237 | 1,071 | 5,440 |
| \%African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 18.1\% | 7.7\% | 6.9\% |
| Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 365 | 1,271 | 8,067 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 27.88\% | 9.16\% | 10.27\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 5 | 484 | 1,477 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 0.4\% | 3.5\% | 1.9\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 0 | 278 | 2,089 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 0.0\% | 2.0\% | 2.7\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 13: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 9,703 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 04 | 13 |
| Total Asian Surname Reg. of Population from Current District | 365 | 1,271 | 8,067 |
| \% of the Final Map District Asian Surname Voter Reg. | 0.8\% | 3.0\% | 18.8\% |
| Chinese Surname Reg. from Current District | 55 | 220 | 1,377 |
| \%Chinese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 15.1\% | 17.3\% | 17.1\% |
| Filipino Surname Reg. from Current District | 56 | 274 | 3,631 |
| \%Filipino Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 15.3\% | 21.6\% | 45.0\% |
| Indian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | 12 | 103 | 388 |
| \%Indian Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 3.3\% | 8.1\% | 4.8\% |
| Japanese Surname Reg. from Current District | 10 | 142 | 525 |
| \%Japanese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 2.7\% | 11.2\% | 6.5\% |
| Korean Surname Reg. from Current District | 229 | 484 | 1,757 |
| \% Korean Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 62.7\% | 38.1\% | 21.8\% |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 13: Total Registered Voters 93,768 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 01 | 04 | 13 |
| No Ethnic Surname Registration of <br> Population from Current District | 286 | 8,917 | 33,758 |
| \% No Ethnic Surname Registration <br> of Population from Current <br> District | $21.8 \%$ | $64.3 \%$ | $43.0 \%$ |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 13: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 9,703 |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 01 | 04 | 13 |
| Vietnamese Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | 3 | 48 | 389 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of <br> Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | $0.8 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ |

Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| District 14: Total Population 246,509 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 09 | 13 | 14 |
| Area (square miles) from Current District | 0.36 | 2.82 | 1.01 | 20.05 |
| Total Population from Current District | 4,865 | 30,106 | 9,274 | 202,264 |
| \% of the Final Map District Total Population | 1.97\% | 12.21\% | 3.76\% | 82.05\% |
| Latino Total Population from Current District | 1,737 | 7,554 | 7,154 | 147,565 |
| \% Latino Total Population from Current District | 35.7\% | 25.1\% | 77.1\% | 73.0\% |
| White Total Population from Current District | 1,036 | 7,217 | 636 | 22,279 |
| \% White Total Population from Current District | 21.3\% | 24.0\% | 6.9\% | 11.0\% |
| Black Total Population from Current District | 320 | 6,395 | 135 | 8,435 |
| \% Black Total Population from Current District | 6.58\% | 21.24\% | 1.46\% | 4.17\% |
| Asian Total Population from Current District | 1,677 | 8,312 | 1,289 | 22,099 |
| \% Asian Total Population from Current District | 34.5\% | 27.6\% | 13.9\% | 10.9\% |

Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| District 14: Voting Age Population 191,465 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 09 | 13 | 14 |
| Total VAP of Population from Current District | 4,311 | 28,138 | 6,617 | 152,399 |
| \% of the Final Map District VAP | 2.25\% | 14.70\% | 3.46\% | 79.60\% |
| Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 1,347 | 6,379 | 4,817 | 104,199 |
| \% Latino VAP of Population from Current District | 31.2\% | 22.7\% | 72.8\% | 68.4\% |
| White VAP of Population from Current District | 1,006 | 7,077 | 578 | 20,209 |
| \% White VAP of Population from Current District | 23.3\% | 25.2\% | 8.7\% | 13.3\% |
| Black VAP of Population from Current District | 288 | 6,104 | 102 | 7,595 |
| \% Black VAP of Population from Current District | 6.68\% | 21.69\% | 1.54\% | 4.98\% |
| Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 1,584 | 7,984 | 1,079 | 18,931 |
| \% Asian VAP of Population from Current District | 36.7\% | 28.4\% | 16.3\% | 12.4\% |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 14: Citizen Voting Age Population 132,421 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 09 | 13 | 14 |
| Total CVAP of Population from Current District | 2,945 | 22,142 | 3,916 | 103,419 |
| \% of the Final Map District CVAP | 2.22\% | 16.72\% | 2.96\% | 78.10\% |
| Latino CVAP of Population from Current District | 603 | 3,593 | 2,426 | 61,253 |
| \% Latino CVAP of Population from Current District | 20.5\% | 16.2\% | 62.0\% | 59.2\% |
| White CVAP of Population from Current District | 875 | 6,451 | 571 | 18,956 |
| \% White CVAP of Population from Current District | 29.7\% | 29.1\% | 14.6\% | 18.3\% |
| Black CVAP of Population from Current District | 283 | 6,001 | 98 | 7,465 |
| \% Black CVAP of Population from Current District | 9.61\% | 27.10\% | 2.51\% | 7.22\% |
| Asian CVAP of Population from Current District | 1,141 | 5,661 | 794 | 14,562 |
| \% Asian CVAP of Population from Current District | 38.7\% | 25.6\% | 20.3\% | 14.1\% |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 14: Total Registered Voters 95,229 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 09 | 13 | 14 |
| Total Registration of Population from Current District | 1,510 | 13,355 | 2,910 | 77,454 |
| \% of the Final Map District Voter Registration | 1.59\% | 14.02\% | 3.06\% | 81.33\% |
| Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 521 | 1,818 | 1,818 | 47,882 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 34.5\% | 13.6\% | 62.5\% | 61.8\% |
| African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 177 | 3,774 | 100 | 3,397 |
| \%African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 11.7\% | 28.3\% | 3.4\% | 4.4\% |
| Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 232 | 2,697 | 348 | 6,478 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 15.36\% | 20.19\% | 11.96\% | 8.36\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 18 | 230 | 24 | 665 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 1.2\% | 1.7\% | 0.8\% | 0.9\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 3 | 39 | 12 | 298 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 0.2\% | 0.3\% | 0.4\% | 0.4\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 14: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 9,755 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 01 | 09 | 13 | 14 |
| Total Asian Surname Reg. of Population from Current District | 232 | 2,697 | 348 | 6,478 |
| \% of the Final Map District Asian Surname Voter Reg. | 0.9\% | 10.9\% | 1.4\% | 26.3\% |
| Chinese Surname Reg. from Current District | 51 | 771 | 80 | 1,916 |
| \%Chinese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 22.0\% | 28.6\% | 23.0\% | 29.6\% |
| Filipino Surname Reg. from Current District | 27 | 144 | 162 | 2,352 |
| \%Filipino Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | 11.6\% | 5.3\% | 46.6\% | 36.3\% |
| Indian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | 9 | 104 | 4 | 226 |
| \%Indian Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 3.9\% | 3.9\% | 1.1\% | 3.5\% |
| Japanese Surname Reg. from Current District | 6 | 292 | 17 | 663 |
| \%Japanese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 2.6\% | 10.8\% | 4.9\% | 10.2\% |
| Korean Surname Reg. from Current District | 136 | 1,307 | 25 | 838 |
| \% Korean Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | 58.6\% | 48.5\% | 7.2\% | 12.9\% |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 14: Total Registered Voters 95,229 |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 01 | 09 | 13 | 14 |
| No Ethnic Surname Registration of <br> Population from Current District | 473 | 4,736 | 634 | 18,798 |
| \% No Ethnic Surname Registration <br> of Population from Current <br> District | $31.3 \%$ | $35.5 \%$ | $21.8 \%$ | $24.3 \%$ |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 14: Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 9,755 |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 01 | 09 | 13 | 14 |
| Vietnamese Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | 3 | 79 | 60 | 483 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of <br> Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | $1.3 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $17.2 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ |



Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.
District 15: Total Population 254,493

| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 15 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Area (square miles) from Current District | 37.41 |
| Total Population from Current District | 254,493 |
| \% of the Final Map District Total Population | 100.00\% |
| Latino Total Population from Current District | 157,761 |
| \% Latino Total Population from Current District | 62.0\% |
| White Total Population from Current District | 41,808 |
| \% White Total Population from Current District | 16.4\% |
| Black Total Population from Current District | 33,489 |
| \% Black Total Population from Current District | 13.16\% |
| Asian Total Population from Current District | 16,990 |
| \% Asian Total Population from Current District | 6.7\% |

Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| District 15: Citizen Voting Age <br> Population 129,669 |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 15 |
| Total CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 129,670 |
| \% of the Final Map District CVAP | $100.00 \%$ |
| Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | 57,775 |
| \% Latino CVAP of Population from <br> Current District | $44.6 \%$ |
| White CVAP of Population from |  |
| Current District |  |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 15: Total Registered Voters$100,072$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 15 |
| Total Registration of Population from Current District | 100,072 |
| \% of the Final Map District Voter Registration | 100.00\% |
| Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 38,083 |
| \%Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 38.1\% |
| African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 22,250 |
| \%African-American Registration of Population from Current District | 22.2\% |
| Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 5,255 |
| \%Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 5.25\% |
| Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 744 |
| \%Jewish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 0.7\% |
| Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 101 |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 15: Total Asian Surname Re Voters 5,255 | ered |
| :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 15 |
| Total Asian Surname Reg. of Population from Current District | 5,255 |
| \% of the Final Map District Asian Surname Voter Reg. | 15.9\% |
| Chinese Surname Reg. from Current District | 791 |
| \%Chinese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 15.1\% |
| Filipino Surname Reg. from Current District | 1,663 |
| \%Filipino Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 31.6\% |
| Indian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | 324 |
| \%Indian Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 6.2\% |
| Japanese Surname Reg. from Current District | 1,429 |
| \%Japanese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | 27.2\% |
| Korean Surname Reg. from Current District | 739 |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| District 15: Total Registered Voters 100,072 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | 15 |
| \%Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 0.1\% |
| No Ethnic Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 33,071 |
| \% No Ethnic Surname Registration of Population from Current District | 33.0\% |

Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| District 15: Total Asian Surname Registered <br> Voters 5,255 |  |
| ---: | :---: |
| Current Districts (2001) within <br> Final Map District | 15 |
| \% Korean Surname Reg. of Asian <br> Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | $14.1 \%$ |
| Vietnamese Surname Reg. from <br> Current District | 309 |
| \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of |  |
| Asian Surname Reg. from Current <br> District | $5.9 \%$ |

Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| Final Map District | Current <br> Districts (2001) within Final Map District | Area (square miles) from Current District | Total Population from Current District | \% of the Final <br> Map District <br> Total <br> Population | Latino Total Population from Current District | \% Latino Total Population from Current District | White Total Population from Current District | \% White Total Population from Current District | Black Total Population from Current District | \% Black Total Population from Current District | Asian Total Population from Current District | \% Asian Total Population from Current District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District 01: Total Population 246, 531 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 01 | 12.59 | 204,473 | 82.94\% | 151,641 | 74.2\% | 12,391 | 6.1\% | 5,460 | 2.67\% | 33,273 | 16.3\% |
|  | 10 | 0.13 | 6,471 | 2.62\% | 4,537 | 70.1\% | 185 | 2.9\% | 199 | 3.08\% | 1,512 | 23.4\% |
|  | 13 | 0.51 | 5,277 | 2.14\% | 3,352 | 63.5\% | 860 | 16.3\% | 65 | 1.23\% | 958 | 18.2\% |
|  | 14 | 3.27 | 30,310 | 12.29\% | 17,482 | 57.7\% | 6,513 | 21.5\% | 682 | 2.25\% | 5,232 | 17.3\% |
| District 02: Total Population 257, 291 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 02 | 17.44 | 161,913 | 62.93\% | 66,420 | 41.0\% | 74,721 | 46.1\% | 6,198 | 3.83\% | 12,307 | 7.6\% |
|  | 04 | 2.68 | 37,678 | 14.64\% | 15,974 | 42.4\% | 14,923 | 39.6\% | 3,099 | 8.22\% | 2,970 | 7.9\% |
|  | 05 | 1.45 | 15,620 | 6.07\% | 2,425 | 15.5\% | 11,094 | 71.0\% | 806 | 5.16\% | 1,021 | 6.5\% |
|  | 06 | 3.23 | 42,080 | 16.36\% | 30,999 | 73.7\% | 6,001 | 14.3\% | 1,248 | 2.97\% | 3,381 | 8.0\% |
| District 03: Total Population 259,045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 03 | 34.11 | 232,839 | 89.88\% | 83,794 | 36.0\% | 104,872 | 45.0\% | 10,247 | 4.40\% | 30,567 | 13.1\% |
|  | 05 | 0.09 | 264 | 0.10\% | 5 | 1.9\% | 234 | 88.6\% | 1 | 0.38\% | 22 | 8.3\% |
|  | 11 | 0.38 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | 12 | 2.18 | 25,942 | 10.01\% | 12,956 | 49.9\% | 6,872 | 26.5\% | 1,718 | 6.62\% | 4,051 | 15.6\% |
| District 04: Total Population 250,511 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 02 | 4.66 | 48,644 | 19.42\% | 8,342 | 17.1\% | 31,894 | 65.6\% | 3,219 | 6.62\% | 4,357 | 9.0\% |
|  | 04 | 25.03 | 147,877 | 59.03\% | 22,361 | 15.1\% | 88,156 | 59.6\% | 7,445 | 5.03\% | 27,521 | 18.6\% |
|  | 05 | 12.62 | 39,476 | 15.76\% | 2,999 | 7.6\% | 31,842 | 80.7\% | 1,336 | 3.38\% | 2,804 | 7.1\% |
|  | 10 | 0.77 | 14,514 | 5.79\% | 4,069 | 28.0\% | 2,252 | 15.5\% | 1,291 | 8.89\% | 6,706 | 46.2\% |


| District 05: Total Population 251,856 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 04 | 0.04 | 340 | 0.13\% | 20 | 5.9\% | 227 | 66.8\% | 11 | 3.24\% | 78 | 22.9\% |
|  | 05 | 32.40 | 204,900 | 81.36\% | 17,282 | 8.4\% | 146,544 | 71.5\% | 6,811 | 3.32\% | 31,297 | 15.3\% |
|  | 06 | 0.09 | 86 | 0.03\% | 12 | 14.0\% | 57 | 66.3\% | 4 | 4.65\% | 12 | 14.0\% |
|  | 10 | 1.24 | 25,918 | 10.29\% | 10,233 | 39.5\% | 7,650 | 29.5\% | 3,383 | 13.05\% | 3,999 | 15.4\% |

Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| Final Map District | Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | Area (square miles) from Current District | Total Population from Current District | \% of the Final <br> Map District <br> Total <br> Population | Latino Total Population from Current District | \% Latino Total Population from Current District | White Total Population from Current District | \% White Total Population from Current District | Black Total Population from Current District | \% Black Total <br> Population from Current District | Asian Total Population from Current District | \% Asian Total Population from Current District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 11 | 0.42 | 11,111 | 4.41\% | 3,186 | 28.7\% | 3,680 | 33.1\% | 920 | 8.28\% | 3,035 | 27.3\% |
|  | 12 | 1.05 | 9,501 | 3.77\% | 1,848 | 19.5\% | 6,110 | 64.3\% | 457 | 4.81\% | 925 | 9.7\% |

District 06: Total Population 258,926

|  | 02 | 0.66 | 242 | 0.09\% | 68 | 28.1\% | 154 | 63.6\% | 5 | 2.07\% | 11 | 4.5\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 06 | 22.28 | 190,174 | 73.45\% | 131,687 | 69.2\% | 31,384 | 16.5\% | 6,848 | 3.60\% | 17,988 | 9.5\% |
|  | 07 | 2.56 | 59,757 | 23.08\% | 47,081 | 78.8\% | 3,568 | 6.0\% | 1,959 | 3.28\% | 6,573 | 11.0\% |
|  | 12 | 1.81 | 8,753 | 3.38\% | 3,467 | 39.6\% | 4,074 | 46.5\% | 278 | 3.18\% | 787 | 9.0\% |
| District 07: 259,008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 02 | 26.91 | 54,558 | 21.06\% | 14,087 | 25.8\% | 32,885 | 60.3\% | 1,121 | 2.05\% | 5,628 | 10.3\% |
|  | 06 | 1.03 | 10,893 | 4.21\% | 10,038 | 92.2\% | 350 | 3.2\% | 92 | 0.84\% | 347 | 3.2\% |
|  | 07 | 26.16 | 193,557 | 74.73\% | 154,326 | 79.7\% | 18,199 | 9.4\% | 8,499 | 4.39\% | 10,740 | 5.5\% |
| District 08: Total Population 246,597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 01 | 0.52 | 11,059 | 4.48\% | 8,303 | 75.1\% | 745 | 6.7\% | 713 | 6.45\% | 1,194 | 10.8\% |
|  | 08 | 11.91 | 183,979 | 74.61\% | 95,352 | 51.8\% | 3,575 | 1.9\% | 78,756 | 42.81\% | 2,878 | 1.6\% |
|  | 09 | 2.22 | 46,522 | 18.87\% | 34,039 | 73.2\% | 408 | 0.9\% | 11,249 | 24.18\% | 304 | 0.7\% |
|  | 11 | 0.32 | 5,037 | 2.04\% | 764 | 15.2\% | 1,062 | 21.1\% | 2,414 | 47.93\% | 646 | 12.8\% |
| District 09: Total Population 249,728 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 08 | 3.31 | 55,310 | 22.15\% | 28,744 | 52.0\% | 6,285 | 11.4\% | 14,659 | 26.50\% | 4,906 | 8.9\% |
|  | 09 | 9.84 | 184,842 | 74.02\% | 155,741 | 84.3\% | 1,798 | 1.0\% | 25,006 | 13.53\% | 1,050 | 0.6\% |
|  | 15 | 0.69 | 9,576 | 3.83\% | 6,568 | 68.6\% | 59 | 0.6\% | 2,811 | 29.35\% | 19 | 0.2\% |
| District 10: Total Population 249,305 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 01 | 0.25 | 6,970 | 2.80\% | 5,084 | 72.9\% | 151 | 2.2\% | 244 | 3.50\% | 1,459 | 20.9\% |
|  | 04 | 0.63 | 31,417 | 12.60\% | 12,728 | 40.5\% | 2,242 | 7.1\% | 1,716 | 5.46\% | 14,350 | 45.7\% |
|  | 08 | 2.24 | 17,371 | 6.97\% | 2,029 | 11.7\% | 887 | 5.1\% | 13,566 | 78.10\% | 437 | 2.5\% |
|  | 10 | 11.19 | 193,547 | 77.63\% | 97,574 | 50.4\% | 14,081 | 7.3\% | 53,310 | 27.54\% | 24,954 | 12.9\% |

Table 1: Total Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 2.

| Final Map District | Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | Area (square miles) from Current District | Total Population from Current District | \% of the Final Map District Total Population | Latino Total Population from Current District | \% Latino Total Population from Current District | White Total Population from Current District | \% White Total Population from Current District | Black Total Population from Current District | \% Black Total <br> Population from Current District | Asian Total Population from Current District | \% Asian Total Population from Current District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District 11: Total Population 257,182 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 05 | 0.52 | 8,617 | 3.35\% | 1,119 | 13.0\% | 4,107 | 47.7\% | 449 | 5.21\% | 2,765 | 32.1\% |
|  | 11 | 64.88 | 248,565 | 96.65\% | 47,245 | 19.0\% | 150,668 | 60.6\% | 11,784 | 4.74\% | 34,444 | 13.9\% |
| District 12: Total Population 259,073 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 03 | 7.26 | 42,208 | 16.29\% | 9,542 | 22.6\% | 23,914 | 56.7\% | 1,481 | 3.51\% | 6,648 | 15.8\% |
|  | 12 | 51.63 | 216,865 | 83.71\% | 60,265 | 27.8\% | 99,624 | 45.9\% | 10,031 | 4.63\% | 43,467 | 20.0\% |
| District 13: Total Population 246,566 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 01 | 0.08 | 5,836 | 2.37\% | 2,799 | 48.0\% | 242 | 4.1\% | 261 | 4.47\% | 2,485 | 42.6\% |
|  | 04 | 2.03 | 28,739 | 11.66\% | 8,519 | 29.6\% | 12,191 | 42.4\% | 1,490 | 5.18\% | 6,057 | 21.1\% |
|  | 13 | 10.89 | 211,991 | 85.98\% | 119,945 | 56.6\% | 44,201 | 20.9\% | 7,245 | 3.42\% | 37,725 | 17.8\% |
| District 14: Total Population 246,509 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 01 | 0.36 | 4,865 | 1.97\% | 1,737 | 35.7\% | 1,036 | 21.3\% | 320 | 6.58\% | 1,677 | 34.5\% |
|  | 09 | 2.82 | 30,106 | 12.21\% | 7,554 | 25.1\% | 7,217 | 24.0\% | 6,395 | 21.24\% | 8,312 | 27.6\% |
|  | 13 | 1.01 | 9,274 | 3.76\% | 7,154 | 77.1\% | 636 | 6.9\% | 135 | 1.46\% | 1,289 | 13.9\% |
|  | 14 | 20.05 | 202,264 | 82.05\% | 147,565 | 73.0\% | 22,279 | 11.0\% | 8,435 | 4.17\% | 22,099 | 10.9\% |
| District 15: Total Population 254,493 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 15 | 37.41 | 254,493 | 100.00\% | 157,761 | 62.0\% | 41,808 | 16.4\% | 33,489 | 13.16\% | 16,990 | 6.7\% |

## Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| Final Map District | Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | Total VAP of Population from Current District | \% of the Final Map District VAP | Latino VAP of Population from Current District | \% Latino VAP of Population from Current District | White VAP of Population from Current District | \% White VAP of Population from Current District | Black VAP of Population from Current District | \% Black VAP of Population from Current District | Asian VAP of Population from Current District | \% Asian VAP of Population from Current District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

District 01: Voting Age Population 184,395

|  | 01 | 151,778 | 82.31\% | 106,438 | 70.1\% | 11,063 | 7.3\% | 4,460 | 2.94\% | 28,563 | 18.8\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10 | 5,016 | 2.72\% | 3,305 | 65.9\% | 152 | 3.0\% | 155 | 3.09\% | 1,379 | 27.5\% |
|  | 13 | 4,107 | 2.23\% | 2,409 | 58.7\% | 791 | 19.3\% | 56 | 1.36\% | 815 | 19.8\% |
|  | 14 | 23,494 | 12.74\% | 12,558 | 53.5\% | 5,760 | 24.5\% | 526 | 2.24\% | 4,370 | 18.6\% |
| District 02: Voting Age Population 201,354 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 02 | 126,968 | 63.06\% | 46,931 | 37.0\% | 63,217 | 49.8\% | 4,998 | 3.94\% | 10,111 | 8.0\% |
|  | 04 | 31,328 | 15.56\% | 11,621 | 37.1\% | 13,852 | 44.2\% | 2,688 | 8.58\% | 2,594 | 8.3\% |
|  | 05 | 12,986 | 6.45\% | 1,839 | 14.2\% | 9,395 | 72.3\% | 684 | 5.27\% | 851 | 6.6\% |
|  | 06 | 30,072 | 14.93\% | 20,927 | 69.6\% | 5,050 | 16.8\% | 953 | 3.17\% | 2,830 | 9.4\% |
| District 03: Voting Age Population 199,798 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 03 | 180,247 | 90.21\% | 57,936 | 32.1\% | 88,114 | 48.9\% | 7,556 | 4.19\% | 24,263 | 13.5\% |
|  | 05 | 210 | 0.11\% | 5 | 2.4\% | 184 | 87.6\% | 1 | 0.48\% | 18 | 8.6\% |
|  | 11 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | 12 | 19,341 | 9.68\% | 8,653 | 44.7\% | 5,974 | 30.9\% | 1,285 | 6.64\% | 3,161 | 16.3\% |

District 04: Voting Age Population 214,386

| 02 | 40,680 | 18.98\% | 6,303 | 15.5\% | 27,593 | 67.8\% | 2,570 | 6.32\% | 3,601 | 8.9\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04 | 129,013 | 60.18\% | 18,101 | 14.0\% | 79,371 | 61.5\% | 6,483 | 5.03\% | 23,045 | 17.9\% |
| 05 | 32,667 | 15.24\% | 2,344 | 7.2\% | 26,661 | 81.6\% | 1,080 | 3.31\% | 2,205 | 6.7\% |
| 10 | 12,026 | 5.61\% | 2,983 | 24.8\% | 2,027 | 16.9\% | 1,147 | 9.54\% | 5,720 | 47.6\% |
| 13 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |

District 05: Voting Age Population 213,510

| 04 | 239 | 0.11\% | 14 | 5.9\% | 152 | 63.6\% | 8 | 3.35\% | 64 | 26.8\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 05 | 174,679 | 81.81\% | 14,497 | 8.3\% | 124,030 | 71.0\% | 5,825 | 3.33\% | 27,922 | 16.0\% |
| 06 | 65 | 0.03\% | 9 | 13.8\% | 44 | 67.7\% | 2 | 3.08\% | 9 | 13.8\% |
| 10 | 21,304 | 9.98\% | 7,375 | 34.6\% | 7,061 | 33.1\% | 2,738 | 12.85\% | 3,583 | 16.8\% |

## Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| Final Map District | Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | Total VAP of Population from Current District | $\%$ of the Final Map District VAP | Latino VAP of Population from Current District | \% Latino VAP of Population from Current District | White VAP of Population from Current District | \% White VAP of Population from Current District | Black VAP of Population from Current District | \% Black VAP of Population from Current District | Asian VAP of Population from Current District | \% Asian VAP of Population from Current District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 11 | 9,560 | 4.48\% | 2,406 | 25.2\% | 3,425 | 35.8\% | 804 | 8.41\% | 2,675 | 28.0\% |
|  | 12 | 7,663 | 3.59\% | 1,363 | 17.8\% | 5,106 | 66.6\% | 338 | 4.41\% | 745 | 9.7\% |
| District 06: Voting Age Population 187,114 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 02 | 185 | 0.10\% | 47 | 25.4\% | 123 | 66.5\% | 4 | 2.16\% | 7 | 3.8\% |
|  | 06 | 139,520 | 74.56\% | 90,675 | 65.0\% | 27,011 | 19.4\% | 5,357 | 3.84\% | 14,864 | 10.7\% |
|  | 07 | 40,623 | 21.71\% | 30,521 | 75.1\% | 3,004 | 7.4\% | 1,455 | 3.58\% | 5,275 | 13.0\% |
|  | 12 | 6,786 | 3.63\% | 2,423 | 35.7\% | 3,404 | 50.2\% | 214 | 3.15\% | 648 | 9.5\% |
| District 07: Voting Age Population 187,637 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 02 | 43,946 | 23.42\% | 9,878 | 22.5\% | 27,957 | 63.6\% | 836 | 1.90\% | 4,607 | 10.5\% |
|  | 06 | 7,523 | 4.01\% | 6,804 | 90.4\% | 299 | 4.0\% | 62 | 0.82\% | 308 | 4.1\% |
|  | 07 | 136,168 | 72.57\% | 103,741 | 76.2\% | 15,966 | 11.7\% | 6,469 | 4.75\% | 8,749 | 6.4\% |
| District 08: Voting Age Population 178,107 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 01 | 8,539 | 4.79\% | 6,001 | 70.3\% | 712 | 8.3\% | 583 | 6.83\% | 1,160 | 13.6\% |
|  | 08 | 133,108 | 74.73\% | 64,427 | 48.4\% | 2,979 | 2.2\% | 60,512 | 45.46\% | 2,689 | 2.0\% |
|  | 09 | 32,249 | 18.11\% | 22,885 | 71.0\% | 282 | 0.9\% | 8,434 | 26.15\% | 274 | 0.8\% |
|  | 11 | 4,211 | 2.36\% | 600 | 14.2\% | 990 | 23.5\% | 1,940 | 46.07\% | 563 | 13.4\% |
| District 09: Voting Age Population 167,978 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 08 | 41,016 | 24.42\% | 18,810 | 45.9\% | 6,144 | 15.0\% | 10,672 | 26.02\% | 4,828 | 11.8\% |
|  | 09 | 120,713 | 71.86\% | 99,292 | 82.3\% | 1,376 | 1.1\% | 18,268 | 15.13\% | 958 | 0.8\% |
|  | 15 | 6,249 | 3.72\% | 4,151 | 66.4\% | 40 | 0.6\% | 1,957 | 31.32\% | 16 | 0.3\% |
| District 10: Voting Age Population 192,651 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 01 | 5,230 | 2.71\% | 3,622 | 69.3\% | 118 | 2.3\% | 200 | 3.82\% | 1,268 | 24.2\% |
|  | 04 | 25,359 | 13.16\% | 9,221 | 36.4\% | 2,070 | 8.2\% | 1,472 | 5.80\% | 12,283 | 48.4\% |
|  | 08 | 14,225 | 7.38\% | 1,413 | 9.9\% | 790 | 5.6\% | 11,288 | 79.35\% | 398 | 2.8\% |
|  | 10 | 147,837 | 76.74\% | 67,774 | 45.8\% | 12,492 | 8.4\% | 42,727 | 28.90\% | 22,141 | 15.0\% |
| District 11: Voting Age Population 215,969 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Table 2: Total Voting Age Population - U.S. Census Bureau 2010 PL94, Table 4.

| Final Map District | Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | Total VAP of Population from Current District | $\%$ of the Final Map District VAP | Latino VAP of Population from Current District | \% Latino VAP of Population from Current District | White VAP of Population from Current District | \% White VAP of <br> Population from Current District | Black VAP of Population from Current District | \% Black VAP of Population from Current District | Asian VAP of Population from Current District | \% Asian VAP of Population from Current District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 05 | 7,171 | 3.32\% | 874 | 12.2\% | 3,574 | 49.8\% | 350 | 4.88\% | 2,243 | 31.3\% |
|  | 11 | 208,798 | 96.68\% | 35,596 | 17.0\% | 130,637 | 62.6\% | 9,519 | 4.56\% | 29,524 | 14.1\% |
| District 12: Voting Age Population 204,490 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 03 | 32,580 | 15.93\% | 6,654 | 20.4\% | 19,351 | 59.4\% | 1,061 | 3.26\% | 5,088 | 15.6\% |
|  | 12 | 171,910 | 84.07\% | 42,472 | 24.7\% | 84,669 | 49.3\% | 7,670 | 4.46\% | 34,532 | 20.1\% |
| District 13: Voting Age Population 199,570 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 01 | 4,623 | 2.32\% | 1,981 | 42.9\% | 225 | 4.9\% | 206 | 4.46\% | 2,170 | 46.9\% |
|  | 04 | 25,182 | 12.62\% | 6,694 | 26.6\% | 11,469 | 45.5\% | 1,367 | 5.43\% | 5,233 | 20.8\% |
|  | 13 | 169,765 | 85.07\% | 87,931 | 51.8\% | 40,611 | 23.9\% | 6,416 | 3.78\% | 32,575 | 19.2\% |
| District 14: Voting Age Population 191,465 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 01 | 4,311 | 2.25\% | 1,347 | 31.2\% | 1,006 | 23.3\% | 288 | 6.68\% | 1,584 | 36.7\% |
|  | 09 | 28,138 | 14.70\% | 6,379 | 22.7\% | 7,077 | 25.2\% | 6,104 | 21.69\% | 7,984 | 28.4\% |
|  | 13 | 6,617 | 3.46\% | 4,817 | 72.8\% | 578 | 8.7\% | 102 | 1.54\% | 1,079 | 16.3\% |
|  | 14 | 152,399 | 79.60\% | 104,199 | 68.4\% | 20,209 | 13.3\% | 7,595 | 4.98\% | 18,931 | 12.4\% |
| District 15: Voting Age Population 179,672 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 15 | 179,672 | 100.00\% | 102,947 | 57.3\% | 36,127 | 20.1\% | 23,200 | 12.91\% | 14,281 | 7.9\% |

## Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population - 2006-2010

| Final Map |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | Current <br> Districts <br> (2001) within <br> Final Map <br> District | Total CVAP of <br> Population from <br> Current District |  |
| District 01: Citizen Voting Age Population 101,997 |  |  |  |


| District 01: Citizen Voting Age Population 101,997 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 01 | 79,038 | 77.49\% | 42,745 | 54.1\% | 10,169 | 12.9\% | 4,307 | 5.45\% | 21,020 | 26.6\% |
|  | 10 | 2,070 | 2.03\% | 744 | 35.9\% | 137 | 6.6\% | 142 | 6.88\% | 1,035 | 50.0\% |
|  | 13 | 3,096 | 3.04\% | 1,552 | 50.1\% | 711 | 23.0\% | 54 | 1.73\% | 750 | 24.2\% |
|  | 14 | 17,793 | 17.44\% | 8,197 | 46.1\% | 5,485 | 30.8\% | 472 | 2.65\% | 3,430 | 19.3\% |
| District 02: Citizen Voting Age Population 148,807 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 02 | 95,519 | 64.19\% | 24,727 | 25.9\% | 56,436 | 59.1\% | 4,824 | 5.05\% | 8,188 | 8.6\% |
|  | 04 | 24,124 | 16.21\% | 6,228 | 25.8\% | 12,738 | 52.8\% | 2,632 | 10.91\% | 2,090 | 8.7\% |
|  | 05 | 11,496 | 7.73\% | 1,495 | 13.0\% | 8,525 | 74.2\% | 600 | 5.22\% | 671 | 5.8\% |
|  | 06 | 17,669 | 11.87\% | 9,779 | 55.3\% | 4,407 | 24.9\% | 886 | 5.01\% | 2,372 | 13.4\% |
| District 03: Citizen Voting Age Population 151,052 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 03 | 136,935 | 90.65\% | 29,074 | 21.2\% | 81,247 | 59.3\% | 7,269 | 5.31\% | 17,726 | 12.9\% |
|  | 05 | 201 | 0.13\% | 5 | 2.5\% | 181 | 89.7\% | 1 | 0.49\% | 13 | 6.5\% |
|  | 11 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | \#DIV/0! | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | 12 | 13,917 | 9.21\% | 4,709 | 33.8\% | 5,321 | 38.2\% | 1,136 | 8.17\% | 2,563 | 18.4\% |
| District 04: Citizen Voting Age Population 181,138 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 02 | 35,701 | 19.71\% | 4,516 | 12.7\% | 25,289 | 70.8\% | 2,543 | 7.12\% | 2,842 | 8.0\% |
|  | 04 | 107,712 | 59.46\% | 12,776 | 11.9\% | 71,914 | 66.8\% | 6,160 | 5.72\% | 15,241 | 14.1\% |
|  | 05 | 29,795 | 16.45\% | 2,101 | 7.1\% | 24,782 | 83.2\% | 1,057 | 3.55\% | 1,512 | 5.1\% |
|  | 10 | 7,931 | 4.38\% | 1,246 | 15.7\% | 1,896 | 23.9\% | 1,103 | 13.91\% | 3,596 | 45.3\% |
|  | 13 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | \#DIV/0! | 0 | 0.0\% |
| District 05: Citizen Voting Age Population 183,671 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 04 | 223 | 0.12\% | 10 | 4.4\% | 144 | 64.4\% | 8 | 3.59\% | 61 | 27.2\% |
|  | 05 | 154,366 | 84.04\% | 11,711 | 7.6\% | 114,054 | 73.9\% | 5,577 | 3.61\% | 21,073 | 13.7\% |
|  | 06 | 59 | 0.03\% | 5 | 9.1\% | 44 | 75.0\% | 2 | 3.34\% | 7 | 11.2\% |
|  | 10 | 15,712 | 8.55\% | 4,288 | 27.3\% | 6,195 | 39.4\% | 2,451 | 15.60\% | 2,392 | 15.2\% |

## Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| Final Map District | Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | Total CVAP of Population from Current District | \% of the Final Map District CVAP | Latino CVAP of Population from Current District | \% Latino CVAP of Population from Current District | White CVAP of Population from Current District | \% White CVAP of <br> Population from Current District | Black CVAP of Population from Current District | \% Black CVAP of <br> Population from Current District | Asian CVAP of Population from Current District | \% Asian CVAP of <br> Population from Current District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 11 | 6,773 | 3.69\% | 1,623 | 24.0\% | 2,985 | 44.1\% | 623 | 9.20\% | 1,362 | 20.1\% |
|  | 12 | 6,539 | 3.56\% | 1,006 | 15.4\% | 4,565 | 69.8\% | 337 | 5.16\% | 525 | 8.0\% |
| District 06: Citizen Voting Age Population 112,058 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 02 | 148 | 0.13\% | 18 | 12.1\% | 122 | 82.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 6 | 4.3\% |
|  | 06 | 87,416 | 78.01\% | 46,038 | 52.7\% | 24,736 | 28.3\% | 5,000 | 5.72\% | 10,538 | 12.1\% |
|  | 07 | 19,229 | 17.16\% | 10,942 | 56.9\% | 2,825 | 14.7\% | 1,375 | 7.15\% | 3,866 | 20.1\% |
|  | 12 | 5,267 | 4.70\% | 1,473 | 28.0\% | 2,995 | 56.9\% | 214 | 4.06\% | 512 | 9.7\% |
| District 07: Citizen Voting Age Population 132,292 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 02 | 36,891 | 27.89\% | 6,777 | 18.4\% | 25,173 | 68.2\% | 828 | 2.24\% | 3,559 | 9.6\% |
|  | 06 | 4,523 | 3.42\% | 3,820 | 84.5\% | 299 | 6.6\% | 62 | 1.36\% | 292 | 6.5\% |
|  | 07 | 90,879 | 68.70\% | 61,418 | 67.6\% | 15,234 | 16.8\% | 6,312 | 6.95\% | 6,898 | 7.6\% |
| District 08: Citizen Voting Age Population 119,263 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 01 | 4,381 | 3.67\% | 2,759 | 63.0\% | 619 | 14.1\% | 571 | 13.02\% | 383 | 8.7\% |
|  | 08 | 94,083 | 78.89\% | 27,889 | 29.6\% | 2,630 | 2.8\% | 59,837 | 63.60\% | 1,727 | 1.8\% |
|  | 09 | 17,294 | 14.50\% | 8,071 | 46.7\% | 275 | 1.6\% | 8,374 | 48.42\% | 252 | 1.5\% |
|  | 11 | 3,506 | 2.94\% | 393 | 11.2\% | 929 | 26.5\% | 1,860 | 53.04\% | 246 | 7.0\% |
| District 09: Citizen Voting Age Population 86,754 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 08 | 27,854 | 32.11\% | 8,001 | 28.7\% | 5,776 | 20.7\% | 10,640 | 38.20\% | 2,988 | 10.7\% |
|  | 09 | 55,144 | 63.56\% | 34,138 | 61.9\% | 1,249 | 2.3\% | 18,187 | 32.98\% | 803 | 1.5\% |
|  | 15 | 3,756 | 4.33\% | 1,663 | 44.3\% | 38 | 1.0\% | 1,957 | 52.11\% | 13 | 0.3\% |
| District 10: Citizen Voting Age Population 125,680 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 01 | 2,521 | 2.01\% | 1,613 | 64.0\% | 118 | 4.7\% | 189 | 7.51\% | 591 | 23.4\% |
|  | 04 | 12,401 | 9.87\% | 3,687 | 29.7\% | 1,795 | 14.5\% | 1,295 | 10.45\% | 5,478 | 44.2\% |
|  | 08 | 13,388 | 10.65\% | 955 | 7.1\% | 715 | 5.3\% | 11,068 | 82.67\% | 374 | 2.8\% |
|  | 10 | 97,371 | 77.48\% | 28,404 | 29.2\% | 11,331 | 11.6\% | 41,653 | 42.78\% | 14,023 | 14.4\% |

## Table 3: Total Citizen Voting Age Population-2006-2010

| Final Map District | Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | Total CVAP of Population from Current District | \% of the Final Map District CVAP | Latino CVAP of Population from Current District | \% Latino CVAP of Population from Current District | White CVAP of Population from Current District | \% White CVAP of Population from Current District | Black CVAP of Population from Current District | \% Black CVAP of Population from Current District | Asian CVAP of Population from Current District | \% Asian CVAP of <br> Population from Current District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 05 | 5,095 | 2.74\% | 791 | 15.5\% | 3,101 | 60.9\% | 121 | 2.37\% | 973 | 19.1\% |
|  | 11 | 180,839 | 97.26\% | 24,033 | 13.3\% | 122,273 | 67.6\% | 9,021 | 4.99\% | 22,635 | 12.5\% |
| District 12: Citizen Voting Age Population 173,488 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 03 | 28,617 | 16.50\% | 4,581 | 16.0\% | 18,444 | 64.5\% | 1,046 | 3.65\% | 4,189 | 14.6\% |
|  | 12 | 144,872 | 83.51\% | 30,021 | 20.7\% | 79,927 | 55.2\% | 7,365 | 5.08\% | 25,533 | 17.6\% |
| District 13: Citizen Voting Age Population 123,102 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 01 | 2,198 | 1.79\% | 849 | 38.6\% | 182 | 8.3\% | 176 | 8.00\% | 976 | 44.4\% |
|  | 04 | 18,289 | 14.86\% | 3,434 | 18.8\% | 10,209 | 55.8\% | 1,273 | 6.96\% | 3,076 | 16.8\% |
|  | 13 | 102,616 | 83.36\% | 37,096 | 36.2\% | 34,826 | 33.9\% | 6,170 | 6.01\% | 23,138 | 22.5\% |
| District 14: Citizen Voting Age Population 132,421 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 01 | 2,945 | 2.22\% | 603 | 20.5\% | 875 | 29.7\% | 283 | 9.61\% | 1,141 | 38.7\% |
|  | 09 | 22,142 | 16.72\% | 3,593 | 16.2\% | 6,451 | 29.1\% | 6,001 | 27.10\% | 5,661 | 25.6\% |
|  | 13 | 3,916 | 2.96\% | 2,426 | 62.0\% | 571 | 14.6\% | 98 | 2.51\% | 794 | 20.3\% |
|  | 14 | 103,419 | 78.10\% | 61,253 | 59.2\% | 18,956 | 18.3\% | 7,465 | 7.22\% | 14,562 | 14.1\% |
| District 15: Citizen Voting Age Population 129,669 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 15 | 129,670 | 100.00\% | 57,775 | 44.6\% | 34,921 | 26.9\% | 23,033 | 17.76\% | 11,261 | 8.7\% |

## Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| Final Map District | Current <br> Districts <br> (2001) <br> within <br> Final Map <br> District | Total <br> Registration of Population from Current District | \% of the Final Map District Voter Registration | Spanish <br> Surname Registration of Population from Current District | \%Spanish <br> Surname Registration of Population from Current District | African- <br> American Registration of Population from Current District | \%African- <br> American Registration of Population from Current District | Asian <br> Surname Registration of Population from Current District | \%Asian <br> Surname <br> Registration of <br> Population <br> from Current <br> District | Jewish <br> Surname Registration of Population from Current District | \%Jewish <br> Surname Registration of Population from Current District | Armenian <br> Surname Registration of Population from Current District | \%Armenian <br> Surname Registration of Population from Current District | No Ethnic Surname Registration of Population from Current District | \% No Ethnic Surname Registration of Population from Current District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

District 01: Total Registered Voters 74,163

|  | 01 | 55,169 | 74.39\% | 31,688 | 57.4\% | 3,763 | 6.8\% | 7,915 | 14.35\% | 389 | 0.7\% | 50 | 0.1\% | 11,255 | 20.4\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10 | 1,364 | 1.84\% | 585 | 42.9\% | 154 | 11.3\% | 428 | 31.38\% | 4 | 0.3\% | 2 | 0.1\% | 197 | 14.4\% |
|  | 13 | 1,981 | 2.67\% | 959 | 48.4\% | 47 | 2.4\% | 218 | 11.00\% | 34 | 1.7\% | 3 | 0.2\% | 756 | 38.2\% |
|  | 14 | 15,649 | 21.10\% | 6,906 | 44.1\% | 531 | 3.4\% | 1,607 | 10.27\% | 282 | 1.8\% | 39 | 0.2\% | 6,580 | 42.0\% |
| District 02: Total Registered Voters 111,376 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 02 | 72,609 | 65.19\% | 16,771 | 23.1\% | 3,765 | 5.2\% | 3,106 | 4.28\% | 4,600 | 6.3\% | 5,477 | 7.5\% | 48,658 | 67.0\% |
|  | 04 | 17,035 | 15.30\% | 3,950 | 23.2\% | 1,933 | 11.3\% | 683 | 4.01\% | 586 | 3.4\% | 355 | 2.1\% | 10,279 | 60.3\% |
|  | 05 | 9,498 | 8.53\% | 829 | 8.7\% | 506 | 5.3\% | 322 | 3.39\% | 1,170 | 12.3\% | 179 | 1.9\% | 7,835 | 82.5\% |
|  | 06 | 12,234 | 10.98\% | 6,807 | 55.6\% | 707 | 5.8\% | 771 | 6.30\% | 162 | 1.3\% | 569 | 4.7\% | 3,925 | 32.1\% |

District 03: Total Registered Voters 116,413

| 03 | 106,659 | 91.62\% | 19,539 | 18.3\% | 5,672 | 5.3\% | 7,392 | 6.93\% | 9,011 | 8.4\% | 2,386 | 2.2\% | 72,433 | 67.9\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 05 | 172 | 0.15\% | 1 | 0.6\% | 1 | 0.6\% | 4 | 2.33\% | 18 | 10.5\% | 20 | 11.6\% | 166 | 96.5\% |
| 11 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 12 | 9,582 | 8.23\% | 2,639 | 27.5\% | 962 | 10.0\% | 900 | 9.39\% | 286 | 3.0\% | 106 | 1.1\% | 5,077 | 53.0\% |

## District 04: Total Registered Voters 148,474

|  | 02 | 28,121 | 18.94\% | 2,793 | 9.9\% | 2,038 | 7.2\% | 1,191 | 4.24\% | 2,663 | 9.5\% | 598 | 2.1\% | 21,983 | 78.2\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 04 | 87,408 | 58.87\% | 8,824 | 10.1\% | 5,410 | 6.2\% | 7,034 | 8.05\% | 5,546 | 6.3\% | 2,386 | 2.7\% | 65,755 | 75.2\% |
|  | 05 | 27,076 | 18.24\% | 1,237 | 4.6\% | 945 | 3.5\% | 929 | 3.43\% | 4,080 | 15.1\% | 378 | 1.4\% | 23,679 | 87.5\% |
|  | 10 | 5,869 | 3.95\% | 1,017 | 17.3\% | 1,096 | 18.7\% | 1,635 | 27.86\% | 145 | 2.5\% | 9 | 0.2\% | 2,039 | 34.7\% |
|  | 13 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| District 05: Total Registered Voters 150,406 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 04 | 190 | 0.13\% | 5 | 2.6\% | 9 | 4.7\% | 35 | 18.42\% | 30 | 15.8\% | 5 | 2.6\% | 141 | 74.2\% |
|  | 05 | 127,546 | 84.80\% | 7,123 | 5.6\% | 4,600 | 3.6\% | 9,782 | 7.67\% | 20,535 | 16.1\% | 1,501 | 1.2\% | 103,821 | 81.4\% |

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| Final Map District | Current <br> Districts <br> (2001) <br> within <br> Final Map <br> District | Total <br> Registration of Population from Current District | \% of the Final <br> Map District Voter Registration | Spanish <br> Surname <br> Registration of Population from Current District | \%Spanish <br> Surname <br> Registration of <br> Population <br> from Current <br> District | African- <br> American <br> Registration of <br> Population <br> from Current <br> District | \%African- <br> American Registration of Population from Current District | Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | \%Asian <br> Surname <br> Registration of <br> Population <br> from Current <br> District | Jewish <br> Surname Registration of Population from Current District | \%Jewish <br> Surname Registration of Population from Current District | Armenian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | \%Armenian <br> Surname Registration of Population from Current District | No Ethnic Surname Registration of Population from Current District | \% No Ethnic <br> Surname Registration of Population from Current District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 06 | 43 | 0.03\% | 7 | 16.3\% | 2 | 4.7\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 2 | 4.7\% | 2 | 4.7\% | 34 | 79.1\% |
|  | 10 | 12,256 | 8.15\% | 2,626 | 21.4\% | 2,223 | 18.1\% | 1,033 | 8.43\% | 511 | 4.2\% | 27 | 0.2\% | 6,249 | 51.0\% |
|  | 11 | 5,041 | 3.35\% | 827 | 16.4\% | 591 | 11.7\% | 592 | 11.74\% | 208 | 4.1\% | 18 | 0.4\% | 3,015 | 59.8\% |
|  | 12 | 5,330 | 3.54\% | 706 | 13.2\% | 261 | 4.9\% | 237 | 4.45\% | 579 | 10.9\% | 127 | 2.4\% | 4,074 | 76.4\% |
| District 06: Total Registered Voters 78,894 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 02 | 170 | 0.22\% | 40 | 23.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 4 | 2.35\% | 2 | 1.2\% | 4 | 2.4\% | 105 | 61.8\% |
|  | 06 | 61,849 | 78.40\% | 31,351 | 50.7\% | 3,904 | 6.3\% | 3,756 | 6.07\% | 1,069 | 1.7\% | 1,886 | 3.0\% | 22,305 | 36.1\% |
|  | 07 | 12,224 | 15.49\% | 6,982 | 57.1\% | 1,221 | 10.0\% | 1,135 | 9.29\% | 94 | 0.8\% | 114 | 0.9\% | 2,865 | 23.4\% |
|  | 12 | 4,651 | 5.90\% | 1,144 | 24.6\% | 208 | 4.5\% | 219 | 4.71\% | 225 | 4.8\% | 180 | 3.9\% | 3,069 | 66.0\% |

District 07: Total Registered Voters 98,333

|  | 02 | 28,509 | 28.99\% | 4,619 | 16.2\% | 661 | 2.3\% | 1,349 | 4.73\% | 433 | 1.5\% | 3,151 | 11.1\% | 21,834 | 76.6\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 06 | 3,364 | 3.42\% | 2,739 | 81.4\% | 72 | 2.1\% | 112 | 3.33\% | 13 | 0.4\% | 3 | 0.1\% | 426 | 12.7\% |
|  | 07 | 66,460 | 67.59\% | 41,264 | 62.1\% | 6,154 | 9.3\% | 3,037 | 4.57\% | 527 | 0.8\% | 261 | 0.4\% | 15,586 | 23.5\% |
| District 08: Total Registered Voters 106,492 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 01 | 3,436 | 3.23\% | 2,203 | 64.1\% | 492 | 14.3\% | 153 | 4.45\% | 14 | 0.4\% | 2 | 0.1\% | 554 | 16.1\% |
|  | 08 | 84,803 | 79.63\% | 19,996 | 23.6\% | 57,722 | 68.1\% | 1,521 | 1.79\% | 399 | 0.5\% | 19 | 0.0\% | 4,229 | 5.0\% |
|  | 09 | 15,416 | 14.48\% | 6,214 | 40.3\% | 8,114 | 52.6\% | 294 | 1.91\% | 40 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 576 | 3.7\% |
|  | 11 | 2,837 | 2.66\% | 312 | 11.0\% | 1,579 | 55.7\% | 111 | 3.91\% | 44 | 1.6\% | 1 | 0.0\% | 835 | 29.4\% |
| District 09: Total Registered Voters 68,663 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 08 | 19,984 | 29.12\% | 5,308 | 26.6\% | 10,160 | 50.8\% | 932 | 4.66\% | 221 | 1.1\% | 10 | 0.1\% | 2,888 | 14.5\% |
|  | 09 | 45,349 | 66.07\% | 24,534 | 54.1\% | 17,558 | 38.7\% | 847 | 1.87\% | 100 | 0.2\% | 6 | 0.0\% | 1,684 | 3.7\% |
|  | 15 | 3,300 | 4.81\% | 1,213 | 36.8\% | 1,845 | 55.9\% | 38 | 1.15\% | 9 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 111 | 3.4\% |

District 10: Total Registered Voters 101,780

| 01 | 1,686 | $1.66 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 998 | $59.2 \%$ | 188 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| $11.2 \%$ | 322 | $19.10 \%$ | 2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$0.1 \%$
0
0.0\%

Table 4: 2011 Voter Registration

| Final Map District | Current Districts (2001) within Final Map District | Total Registration of Population from Current District | \% of the Final Map District Voter Registration | Spanish Surname Registration of Population from Current District | \%Spanish <br> Surname Registration of Population from Current District | African- American Registration of Population from Current District | \%African- <br> American Registration of Population from Current District | Asian <br> Surname <br> Registration of <br> Population <br> from Current <br> District | \%Asian Surname Registration of Population from Current District | Jewish <br> Surname <br> Registration of <br> Population <br> from Current <br> District | \%Jewish <br> Surname <br> Registration of <br> Population <br> from Current <br> District | Armenian <br> Surname <br> Registration of <br> Population <br> from Current <br> District | \%Armenian <br> Surname Registration of <br> Population from Current District | No Ethnic <br> Surname <br> Registration of <br> Population <br> from Current <br> District | \% No Ethnic <br> Surname <br> Registration of <br> Population <br> from Current <br> District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 04 | 7,682 | 7.55\% | 2,172 | 28.3\% | 1,368 | 17.8\% | 2,063 | 26.85\% | 60 | 0.8\% | 24 | 0.3\% | 2,079 | 27.1\% |
|  | 08 | 12,704 | 12.48\% | 640 | 5.0\% | 10,636 | 83.7\% | 242 | 1.90\% | 140 | 1.1\% | 18 | 0.1\% | 1,008 | 7.9\% |
|  | 10 | 79,708 | 78.31\% | 19,591 | 24.6\% | 39,347 | 49.4\% | 6,779 | 8.50\% | 974 | 1.2\% | 70 | 0.1\% | 13,337 | 16.7\% |

District 11: Total Registered Voters 156,364

|  | 05 | 4,419 | 2.83\% | 437 | 9.9\% | 123 | 2.8\% | 524 | 11.86\% | 341 | 7.7\% | 15 | 0.3\% | 3,332 | 75.4\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 11 | 151,945 | 97.17\% | 15,904 | 10.5\% | 7,240 | 4.8\% | 11,122 | 7.32\% | 12,383 | 8.1\% | 754 | 0.5\% | 115,122 | 75.8\% |
| District 12: Total Registered Voters 142,834 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 03 | 24,433 | 17.11\% | 3,384 | 13.9\% | 952 | 3.9\% | 1,928 | 7.89\% | 2,098 | 8.6\% | 442 | 1.8\% | 18,135 | 74.2\% |
|  | 12 | 118,401 | 82.89\% | 21,281 | 18.0\% | 6,290 | 5.3\% | 11,873 | 10.03\% | 6,662 | 5.6\% | 4,012 | 3.4\% | 78,194 | 66.0\% |

District 13: Total Registered Voters 93,768

|  | 01 | 1,309 | 1.40\% | 421 | 32.2\% | 237 | 18.1\% | 365 | 27.88\% | 5 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 286 | 21.8\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 04 | 13,872 | 14.79\% | 2,518 | 18.2\% | 1,071 | 7.7\% | 1,271 | 9.16\% | 484 | 3.5\% | 278 | 2.0\% | 8,917 | 64.3\% |
|  | 13 | 78,587 | 83.81\% | 30,986 | 39.4\% | 5,440 | 6.9\% | 8,067 | 10.27\% | 1,477 | 1.9\% | 2,089 | 2.7\% | 33,758 | 43.0\% |
| District 14: Total Registered Voters 95,229 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 01 | 1,510 | 1.59\% | 521 | 34.5\% | 177 | 11.7\% | 232 | 15.36\% | 18 | 1.2\% | 3 | 0.2\% | 473 | 31.3\% |
|  | 09 | 13,355 | 14.02\% | 1,818 | 13.6\% | 3,774 | 28.3\% | 2,697 | 20.19\% | 230 | 1.7\% | 39 | 0.3\% | 4,736 | 35.5\% |
|  | 13 | 2,910 | 3.06\% | 1,818 | 62.5\% | 100 | 3.4\% | 348 | 11.96\% | 24 | 0.8\% | 12 | 0.4\% | 634 | 21.8\% |
|  | 14 | 77,454 | 81.33\% | 47,882 | 61.8\% | 3,397 | 4.4\% | 6,478 | 8.36\% | 665 | 0.9\% | 298 | 0.4\% | 18,798 | 24.3\% |
| District 15: Total Registered Voters 100,072 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 15 | 100,072 | 100.00\% | 38,083 | 38.1\% | 22,250 | 22.2\% | 5,255 | 5.25\% | 744 | 0.7\% | 101 | 0.1\% | 33,071 | 33.0\% |

## Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registration

| Final <br> Map District | Current <br> Districts <br> (2001) <br> within <br> Final Map <br> District | Total Asian Surname Reg. of Population from Current District | \% of the Final <br> Map District Asian Surname Voter Reg. | Chinese Surname Reg. from Current District | \%Chinese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | Filipino Surname Reg. from Current District | \%Filipino Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | Indian Surname Reg. from Current District | \%Indian Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | Japanese <br> Surname <br> Reg. from <br> Current <br> District | \%Japanese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | Korean <br> Surname <br> Reg. from <br> Current <br> District | \% Korean <br> Surname <br> Reg. of Asian <br> Surname Reg. from Current District | Vietnamese Surname Reg. from Current District | \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District 01: Total Registered Voters 74,163, Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 10,168 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 01 | 7,915 | 77.8\% | 3,221 | 40.7\% | 930 | 11.7\% | 120 | 1.5\% | 180 | 2.3\% | 2,195 | 27.7\% | 1269 | 16.0\% |
|  | 10 | 428 | 4.2\% | 55 | 12.9\% | 34 | 7.9\% | 3 | 0.7\% | 6 | 1.4\% | 326 | 76.2\% | 4 | 0.9\% |
|  | 13 | 218 | 2.1\% | 80 | 36.7\% | 71 | 32.6\% | 3 | 1.4\% | 11 | 5.0\% | 11 | 5.0\% | 42 | 19.3\% |
|  | 14 | 1,607 | 15.8\% | 454 | 28.3\% | 738 | 45.9\% | 48 | 3.0\% | 160 | 10.0\% | 107 | 6.7\% | 100 | 6.2\% |
| District 02: Total Registered Voters 111,376, Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 4,882 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 02 | 3,106 | 63.6\% | 586 | 18.9\% | 1,053 | 33.9\% | 394 | 12.7\% | 356 | 11.5\% | 494 | 15.9\% | 223 | 7.2\% |
|  | 04 | 683 | 14.0\% | 118 | 17.3\% | 213 | 31.2\% | 111 | 16.3\% | 60 | 8.8\% | 113 | 16.5\% | 68 | 10.0\% |
|  | 05 | 322 | 6.6\% | 72 | 22.4\% | 94 | 29.2\% | 51 | 15.8\% | 50 | 15.5\% | 32 | 9.9\% | 23 | 7.1\% |
|  | 06 | 771 | 15.8\% | 83 | 10.8\% | 416 | 54.0\% | 61 | 7.9\% | 48 | 6.2\% | 77 | 10.0\% | 86 | 11.2\% |

District 03: Total Registered Voters 116,413, Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 8,296

| 03 | 7,392 | 89.1\% | 1,280 | 17.3\% | 1,783 | 24.1\% | 1,504 | 20.3\% | 537 | 7.3\% | 692 | 9.4\% | 1596 | 21.6\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 05 | 4 | 0.0\% | 2 | 50.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 2 | 50.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 11 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 12 | 900 | 10.8\% | 115 | 12.8\% | 221 | 24.6\% | 211 | 23.4\% | 45 | 5.0\% | 61 | 6.8\% | 247 | 27.4\% |

District 04: Total Registered Voters 148,474, Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 10,789

|  | 02 | 1,191 | 11.0\% | 295 | 24.8\% | 310 | 26.0\% | 179 | 15.0\% | 152 | 12.8\% | 172 | 14.4\% | 83 | 7.0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 04 | 7,034 | 65.2\% | 1,610 | 22.9\% | 1,143 | 16.2\% | 563 | 8.0\% | 702 | 10.0\% | 2,793 | 39.7\% | 223 | 3.2\% |
|  | 05 | 929 | 8.6\% | 289 | 31.1\% | 184 | 19.8\% | 168 | 18.1\% | 112 | 12.1\% | 125 | 13.5\% | 51 | 5.5\% |
|  | 10 | 1,635 | 15.2\% | 211 | 12.9\% | 87 | 5.3\% | 24 | 1.5\% | 74 | 4.5\% | 1,199 | 73.3\% | 40 | 2.4\% |
|  | 13 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| District 05: Total Registered Voters 150,406, Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 11,679 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 04 | 35 | 0.3\% | 9 | 25.7\% | 3 | 8.6\% | 1 | 2.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 19 | 54.3\% | 3 | 8.6\% |
|  | 05 | 9,782 | 83.8\% | 3,780 | 38.6\% | 1,039 | 10.6\% | 1,770 | 18.1\% | 954 | 9.8\% | 1,389 | 14.2\% | 850 | 8.7\% |

## Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registratior

| Final <br> Map <br> District | Current <br> Districts <br> (2001) <br> within <br> Final Map <br> District | Total Asian Surname Reg. of Population from Current District | \% of the Final <br> Map District <br> Asian <br> Surname <br> Voter Reg. | Chinese Surname Reg. from Current District | \%Chinese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | Filipino Surname Reg. from Current District | \%Filipino Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | Indian Surname Reg. from Current District | \%Indian Surname Reg of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | Japanese <br> Surname <br> Reg. from <br> Current <br> District | \%Japanese Surname Reg of Asian Surname Reg from Current District | Korean <br> Surname Reg. from Current District | \% Korean <br> Surname <br> Reg. of Asian <br> Surname Reg. from Current District | Vietnamese Surname Reg. from Current District | \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 06 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | 10 | 1,033 | 8.8\% | 239 | 23.1\% | 220 | 21.3\% | 252 | 24.4\% | 117 | 11.3\% | 136 | 13.2\% | 69 | 6.7\% |
|  | 11 | 592 | 5.1\% | 165 | 27.9\% | 73 | 12.3\% | 165 | 27.9\% | 67 | 11.3\% | 85 | 14.4\% | 37 | 6.3\% |
|  | 12 | 237 | 2.0\% | 45 | 19.0\% | 52 | 21.9\% | 58 | 24.5\% | 37 | 15.6\% | 28 | 11.8\% | 17 | 7.2\% |

District 06: Total Registered Voters 78,894, Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 5,114

| 02 | 4 | 0.1\% | 3 | 75.0\% | 1 | 25.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 06 | 3,756 | 73.4\% | 394 | 10.5\% | 1,917 | 51.0\% | 332 | 8.8\% | 310 | 8.3\% | 398 | 10.6\% | 405 | 10.8\% |
| 07 | 1,135 | 22.2\% | 109 | 9.6\% | 664 | 58.5\% | 95 | 8.4\% | 47 | 4.1\% | 63 | 5.6\% | 157 | 13.8\% |
| 12 | 219 | 4.3\% | 43 | 19.6\% | 75 | 34.2\% | 22 | 10.0\% | 24 | 11.0\% | 26 | 11.9\% | 29 | 13.2\% |

District 07: Total Registered Voters 98,333, Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 4,498

| 02 | 1,349 | 30.0\% | 185 | 13.7\% | 404 | 29.9\% | 119 | 8.8\% | 107 | 7.9\% | 485 | 36.0\% | 49 | 3.6\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 06 | 112 | 2.5\% | 19 | 17.0\% | 59 | 52.7\% | 10 | 8.9\% | 6 | 5.4\% | 15 | 13.4\% | 3 | 2.7\% |
| 07 | 3,037 | 67.5\% | 294 | 9.7\% | 1,618 | 53.3\% | 288 | 9.5\% | 280 | 9.2\% | 338 | 11.1\% | 219 | 7.2\% |

District 08: Total Registered Voters 106,492, Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 2,079

|  | 01 | 153 | 7.4\% | 30 | 19.6\% | 63 | 41.2\% | 28 | 18.3\% | 5 | 3.3\% | 16 | 10.5\% | 11 | 7.2\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 08 | 1,521 | 73.2\% | 289 | 19.0\% | 567 | 37.3\% | 252 | 16.6\% | 113 | 7.4\% | 232 | 15.3\% | 68 | 4.5\% |
|  | 09 | 294 | 14.1\% | 39 | 13.3\% | 167 | 56.8\% | 38 | 12.9\% | 8 | 2.7\% | 35 | 11.9\% | 7 | 2.4\% |
|  | 11 | 111 | 5.3\% | 26 | 23.4\% | 29 | 26.1\% | 21 | 18.9\% | 11 | 9.9\% | 14 | 12.6\% | 10 | 9.0\% |
| District 09: Total Registered Voters 68,663, Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 1,817 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 08 | 932 | 51.3\% | 342 | 36.7\% | 127 | 13.6\% | 142 | 15.2\% | 63 | 6.8\% | 197 | 21.1\% | 61 | 6.5\% |
|  | 09 | 847 | 46.6\% | 110 | 13.0\% | 519 | 61.3\% | 85 | 10.0\% | 29 | 3.4\% | 87 | 10.3\% | 17 | 2.0\% |
|  | 15 | 38 | 2.1\% | 2 | 5.3\% | 25 | 65.8\% | 9 | 23.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 2.6\% | 1 | 2.6\% |

District 10: Total Registered Voters 101,780, Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 9,406

| 01 | 322 | 3.4\% | 26 | 8.1\% | 54 | 16.8\% | 3 | 0.9\% | 17 | 5.3\% | 219 | 68.0\% | 3 | 0.9\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Table 5: 2011 Asian Surname Voter Registratior

| Final <br> Map <br> District | Current <br> Districts <br> (2001) <br> within <br> Final Map <br> District | Total Asian Surname Reg. of Population from Current District | \% of the Final Map District Asian Surname Voter Reg. | Chinese Surname Reg. from Current District | \%Chinese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | Filipino Surname Reg. from Current District | \%Filipino Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | Indian Surname Reg. from Current District | \%Indian Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | Japanese <br> Surname <br> Reg. from <br> Current <br> District | \%Japanese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | Korean <br> Surname <br> Reg. from <br> Current <br> District | \% Korean <br> Surname <br> Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District | Vietnamese Surname Reg. from Current District | \%Vietnamese Surname Reg. of Asian Surname Reg. from Current District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 04 | 2,063 |  | 202 | 9.8\% | 414 | 20.1\% | 154 | 7.5\% | 58 | 2.8\% | 1,208 | 58.6\% | 27 | 1.3\% |
|  | 08 | 242 |  | 66 | 27.3\% | 46 | 19.0\% | 33 | 13.6\% | 73 | 30.2\% | 20 | 8.3\% | 4 | 1.7\% |
|  | 10 | 6,779 |  | 845 | 12.5\% | 966 | 14.2\% | 365 | 5.4\% | 850 | 12.5\% | 3,586 | 52.9\% | 167 | 2.5\% |

District 11: Total Registered Voters 156,364, Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 11,646

| 05 | 524 | 180 | 34.4\% | 54 | 10.3\% | 99 | 18.9\% | 82 | 15.6\% | 90 | 17.2\% | 19 | 3.6\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 | 11,122 | 3,294 | 29.6\% | 1,445 | 13.0\% | 1,398 | 12.6\% | 2,968 | 26.7\% | 1,362 | 12.2\% | 655 | 5.9\% |

District 12: Total Registered Voters 142,834, Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 13,801

| 03 | 1,928 | 545 | 28.3\% | 358 | 18.6\% | 310 | 16.1\% | 157 | 8.1\% | 239 | 12.4\% | 319 | 16.5\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | 11,873 | 2,417 | 20.4\% | 2,458 | 20.7\% | 2,211 | 18.6\% | 985 | 8.3\% | 2,909 | 24.5\% | 893 | 7.5\% |

District 13: Total Registered Voters 93,768, Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 9,703

| 01 | 365 | 55 | 15.1\% | 56 | 15.3\% | 12 | 3.3\% | 10 | 2.7\% | 229 | 62.7\% | 3 | 0.8\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04 | 1,271 | 220 | 17.3\% | 274 | 21.6\% | 103 | 8.1\% | 142 | 11.2\% | 484 | 38.1\% | 48 | 3.8\% |
| 13 | 8,067 | 1,377 | 17.1\% | 3,631 | 45.0\% | 388 | 4.8\% | 525 | 6.5\% | 1,757 | 21.8\% | 389 | 4.8\% |

District 14: Total Registered Voters 95,229, Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 9,755

|  | 01 | 232 | 51 | 22.0\% | 27 | 11.6\% | 9 | 3.9\% | 6 | 2.6\% | 136 | 58.6\% | 3 | 1.3\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 09 | 2,697 | 771 | 28.6\% | 144 | 5.3\% | 104 | 3.9\% | 292 | 10.8\% | 1,307 | 48.5\% | 79 | 2.9\% |
|  | 13 | 348 | 80 | 23.0\% | 162 | 46.6\% | 4 | 1.1\% | 17 | 4.9\% | 25 | 7.2\% | 60 | 17.2\% |
|  | 14 | 6,478 | 1,916 | 29.6\% | 2,352 | 36.3\% | 226 | 3.5\% | 663 | 10.2\% | 838 | 12.9\% | 483 | 7.5\% |
| District 15: Total Registered Voters 100,072, Total Asian Surname Registered Voters 5,255 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 15 | 5,255 | 791 | 15.1\% | 1,663 | 31.6\% | 324 | 6.2\% | 1,429 | 27.2\% | 739 | 14.1\% | 309 | 5.9\% |

































































Appendix E: Metes and Bounds Descriptions of Recommended Districts

First District.
The region bounded and described as follows: Beginning at the point of intersection of S Normandie Ave and Unnamed (TLID:89330787), and proceeding northerly along S Normandie Ave to N Normandie Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Normandie Ave to S Normandie Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Normandie Ave to W Olympic Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Olympic Blvd to S Vermont Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Vermont Ave to W 7th St, and proceeding easterly along W 7th St to Wilshire Pl , and proceeding northerly along Wilshire Pl to Sunset Pl , and proceeding easterly along Sunset Pl to S Hoover St , and proceeding southerly along S Hoover St to S Lafayette Park Pl, and proceeding northerly along S Lafayette Park Pl to Unnamed (TLID:89500517), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89500517) to W 6th St, and proceeding easterly along W 6th St to S Rampart Blvd, and proceeding northerly along S Rampart Blvd to W 3rd St, and proceeding easterly along W 3rd St to Lucas Ave, and proceeding northerly along Lucas Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89553356), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89553356) to Glendale Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Glendale Blvd to W Temple St, and proceeding easterly along W Temple St to N Echo Park Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Echo Park Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89518988), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89518988) to N Echo Park Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Echo Park Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89519446), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89519446) to Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding easterly along Hollywood Fwy to Unnamed (TLID:89560488), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89560488) to Unnamed (TLID:89560478), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89560478) to Unnamed (TLID:89560519), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89560519) to Unnamed (TLID:89560526), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89560526) to N Echo Park Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Echo Park Ave to Echo Park Ave, and proceeding northerly along Echo Park Ave to Park Ave, and proceeding westerly along Park Ave to Logan St, and proceeding northerly along Logan St to W Sunset Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Sunset Blvd to Echo Park Ave, and proceeding northerly along Echo Park Ave to Scott Ave, and proceeding easterly along Scott Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89563966), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89563966) to Scott Ave, and proceeding easterly along Scott Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93481114), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93481114) to Sargent Ct , and proceeding northerly along Sargent Ct to Unnamed (TLID:93481130), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93481130) to Sargent Pl, and proceeding northerly along Sargent Pl to Park Dr, and proceeding northerly along Park Dr to Unnamed (TLID:93483950), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93483950) to Unnamed (TLID:93483956), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93483956) to Unnamed (TLID:93483969), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93483969) to Unnamed (TLID:93483975), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93483975) to Cerro Gordo St, and proceeding northerly along Cerro Gordo St to Vista Gordo Dr, and proceeding northerly along Vista Gordo Dr to Unnamed (TLID:93484120), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93484120) to Valley View Dr, and proceeding northerly along Valley View Dr to Unnamed (TLID:93484221), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93484221) to Unnamed (TLID:93498132), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93498132) to Stadium Way, and proceeding northerly along Stadium Way to Unnamed (TLID:93498104), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93498104) to I- 5, and proceeding southerly along I- 5 to Unnamed (TLID:93502051), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93502051) to I- 5, and proceeding easterly along I- 5 to Unnamed (TLID:93502093), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93502093) to Unnamed (TLID:93502127), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93502127) to Unnamed (TLID:93502530), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93502530) to Unnamed (TLID:93503800), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93503800) to Unnamed (TLID:93499437), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93499437) to Unnamed (TLID:93504740), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93504740) to Unnamed (TLID:93505240), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93505240) to Unnamed (TLID:93496791), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93496791) to Unnamed (TLID:93496166), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93496166) to Glendale Fwy, and proceeding northerly along Glendale Fwy to Unnamed (TLID:93496659), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93496659) to Glendale Fwy, and proceeding easterly along Glendale Fwy to Southern Pacific RR, and proceeding easterly along Southern Pacific RR to Glendale Fwy, and proceeding westerly along Glendale Fwy to I- 5 Bus, and proceeding southerly along I- 5 Bus to W San Fernando Rd, and proceeding southerly along W San Fernando Rd to Eagle Rock Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Eagle Rock Blvd to Verdugo Rd, and proceeding northerly along Verdugo Rd to W Ave 33, and proceeding westerly along W Ave 33 to Eagle Rock Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Eagle Rock Blvd to N Eagle Rock Blvd, and proceeding northerly along N Eagle Rock Blvd to Eagle Rock Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Eagle Rock Blvd to N Eagle Rock Blvd, and proceeding easterly along N Eagle Rock Blvd to York Blvd, and proceeding easterly along York Blvd to N Ave 49, and proceeding northerly along N Ave 49 to Meridian St, and proceeding
easterly along Meridian St to N Ave 50, and proceeding northerly along N Ave 50 to Range View Ave, and proceeding easterly along Range View Ave to N Ave 51, and proceeding northerly along N Ave 51 to Coringa Dr, and proceeding easterly along Coringa Dr to N Ave 52, and proceeding northerly along N Ave 52 to Unnamed (TLID:94508089), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94508089) to Unnamed (TLID:94508164), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94508164) to N Ave 56, and proceeding southerly along N Ave 56 to Raber St, and proceeding easterly along Raber St to Nolden St, and proceeding northerly along Nolden St to Unnamed (TLID:94554692), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:94554692) to Buena Vista Ter, and proceeding easterly along Buena Vista Ter to Tipton Ter, and proceeding southerly along Tipton Ter to Tipton Way, and proceeding easterly along Tipton Way to N Figueroa St, and proceeding southerly along N Figueroa St to Figueroa St, and proceeding southerly along Figueroa St to N Figueroa St, and proceeding southerly along N Figueroa St to Unnamed (TLID:94552353), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94552353) to N Figueroa St, and proceeding southerly along N Figueroa St to at and Sf Rlwy, and proceeding easterly along at and Sf Rlwy to Unnamed (TLID:94525682), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94525682) to Unnamed (TLID:94522379), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94522379) to Unnamed (TLID:94521819), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94521819) to Via Marisol, and proceeding easterly along Via Marisol to Unnamed (TLID:94521738), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94521738) to Unnamed (TLID:94519773), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94519773) to Unnamed (TLID:94519462), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94519462) to Pullman St, and proceeding easterly along Pullman St to Unnamed (TLID:94520001), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94520001) to Unnamed (TLID:94519817), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94519817) to Monterey Rd, and proceeding southerly along Monterey Rd to Huntington Dr N, and proceeding westerly along Huntington Dr N to N Soto St, and proceeding southerly along N Soto St to Huntington $\operatorname{DrS}$, and proceeding southerly along Huntington Dr S to Unnamed (TLID:91205335), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91205335) to N Soto St, and proceeding southerly along N Soto St to Valley Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Valley Blvd to N Mission Rd, and proceeding westerly along N Mission Rd to Alhambra Ave, and proceeding westerly along Alhambra Ave to N Alhambra Ave, and proceeding westerly along N Alhambra Ave to Unnamed (TLID:91139874), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91139874) to Unnamed (TLID:91139815), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91139815) to Unnamed (TLID:91139753), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91139753) to Unnamed (TLID:91136804), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:91136804) to Moulton Ave, and proceeding northerly along Moulton Ave to N Main St, and proceeding westerly along N Main St to Southern Pacific RR, and proceeding westerly along Southern Pacific RR to Unnamed (TLID:91135240), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91135240) to Unnamed (TLID:91135224), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91135224) to Unnamed (TLID:91135203), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91135203) to Unnamed (TLID:91135197), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91135197) to Unnamed (TLID:91135184), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91135184) to Alhambra Ave, and proceeding westerly along Alhambra Ave to N Main St, and proceeding southerly along N Main St to W Cesar E Chavez Ave, and proceeding westerly along W Cesar E Chavez Ave to N Hill St, and proceeding southerly along N Hill St to Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding westerly along Hollywood Fwy to S Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding northerly along S Hollywood Fwy to Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding northerly along Hollywood Fwy to Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way, and proceeding southerly along Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way to Unnamed (TLID:89564527), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89564527) to Unnamed (TLID:89564540), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89564540) to Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding northerly along Hollywood Fwy to N Beaudry Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Beaudry Ave to S Beaudry Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Beaudry Ave to Miramar St, and proceeding westerly along Miramar St to S Bixel St, and proceeding southerly along S Bixel St to W 6th St, and proceeding westerly along W 6th St to Witmer St , and proceeding southerly along Witmer St to W 7th St, and proceeding easterly along W 7th St to S Bixel St, and proceeding southerly along S Bixel St to W 8th St, and proceeding easterly along W 8th St to Unnamed (TLID:89509063), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89509063) to Unnamed (TLID:89508677), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89508677) to Unnamed (TLID:89508412), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89508412) to W 8th Pl, and proceeding southerly along W 8th Pl to Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way, and proceeding westerly along Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way to W 9th St, and proceeding easterly along W 9th St to Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way, and proceeding westerly along Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way to N Harbor Fwy, and proceeding southerly along N Harbor Fwy to Unnamed (TLID:89483702), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89483702) to Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way, and proceeding southerly along Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way to Unnamed (TLID:89483125), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89483125) to Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way, and proceeding southerly along Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way to I- 10, and proceeding
westerly along I- 10 to Unnamed (TLID:89467954), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89467954) to I- 10, and proceeding westerly along I- 10 to S Normandie Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Normandie Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89330787), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89330787) to the point of beginning.

## Second District.

The region bounded and described as follows: Beginning at the point of intersection of Van Nuys Blvd and Sherman Way, and proceeding northerly along Van Nuys Blvd to Southern Pacific RR, and proceeding easterly along Southern Pacific RR to Tujunga Wash, and proceeding northerly along Tujunga Wash to Roscoe Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Roscoe Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:93096944), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93096944) to Roscoe Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Roscoe Blvd to Laurel Canyon Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Laurel Canyon Blvd to Saticoy St, and proceeding easterly along Saticoy St to Vineland Ave, and proceeding northerly along Vineland Ave to Sunland Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Sunland Blvd to I-5, and proceeding easterly along I- 5 to Roscoe Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Roscoe Blvd to Glenoaks Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Glenoaks Blvd to Vinedale St, and proceeding easterly along Vinedale St to Unnamed (TLID:93132542), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93132542) to Unnamed (TLID:93650690), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93650690) to Unnamed (TLID:93651495), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93651495) to Unnamed (TLID:93650649), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93650649) to Unnamed (TLID:93656415), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93656415) to Unnamed (TLID:93656449), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93656449) to Unnamed (TLID:93656386), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93656386) to Unnamed (TLID:93650545), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93650545) to Unnamed (TLID:93649667), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93649667) to Unnamed (TLID:93649613), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93649613) to Unnamed (TLID:93649678), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93649678) to Unnamed (TLID:93654082), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93654082) to Unnamed (TLID:93654165), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93654165) to Unnamed (TLID:93654575), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93654575) to Unnamed (TLID:93655756), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93655756) to Unnamed (TLID:93655824), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93655824) to Unnamed (TLID:93656066), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93656066) to Unnamed (TLID:93656035), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93656035) to Unnamed (TLID:93655894), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93655894) to Unnamed (TLID:93655270), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93655270) to Unnamed (TLID:93654707), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93654707) to Unnamed (TLID:93653568), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93653568) to Unnamed (TLID:93653000), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93653000) to Unnamed (TLID:93652936), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93652936) to Unnamed (TLID:93652391), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93652391) to Unnamed (TLID:93367991), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93367991) to Unnamed (TLID:93367954), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93367954) to Cohasset St, and proceeding westerly along Cohasset St to Unnamed (TLID:93355115), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93355115) to Cohasset St, and proceeding westerly along Cohasset St to Unnamed (TLID:93355025), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93355025) to Unnamed (TLID:93354987), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93354987) to Unnamed (TLID:93353327), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93353327) to Unnamed (TLID:93353308), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93353308) to Unnamed (TLID:93353296), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93353296) to Cohasset St, and proceeding westerly along Cohasset St to Unnamed (TLID:93353200), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93353200) to Unnamed (TLID:93353169), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93353169) to Unnamed (TLID:93352835), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93352835) to Unnamed (TLID:93352829), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93352829) to Unnamed (TLID:92910592), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92910592) to Unnamed (TLID:92910293), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92910293) to Unnamed (TLID:92910273), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92910273) to Unnamed (TLID:92910267), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92910267) to Cohasset St, and proceeding westerly along Cohasset St to Clybourn Ave, and proceeding southerly along Clybourn Ave to Sherman Way, and proceeding westerly along Sherman Way to Vineland Ave, and proceeding southerly along Vineland Ave to Unnamed (TLID:92907786), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92907786) to Unnamed (TLID:92908880), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92908880) to Unnamed (TLID:92909341), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92909341) to Unnamed (TLID:92909379),
and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92909379) to Unnamed (TLID:92907128), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92907128) to Unnamed (TLID:92907115), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92907115) to Unnamed (TLID:92907007), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92907007) to Unnamed (TLID:92906541), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92906541) to Unnamed (TLID:92906563), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92906563) to Clybourn Ave, and proceeding southerly along Clybourn Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93324420), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93324420) to Clybourn Ave, and proceeding southerly along Clybourn Ave to Southern Pacific RR, and proceeding westerly along Southern Pacific RR to Unnamed (TLID:92893172), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92893172) to Cahuenga Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Cahuenga Blvd to Camarillo St, and proceeding westerly along Camarillo St to Denny Ave, and proceeding southerly along Denny Ave to Unnamed (TLID:92887964), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92887964) to Unnamed (TLID:92887923), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92887923) to Ventura Fwy, and proceeding westerly along Ventura Fwy to Vineland Ave, and proceeding northerly along Vineland Ave to Ventura Fwy, and proceeding westerly along Ventura Fwy to N Vineland Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Vineland Ave to Sarah St, and proceeding westerly along Sarah St to Vineland Pl, and proceeding northerly along Vineland Pl to Camarillo St, and proceeding westerly along Camarillo St to Riverside Dr, and proceeding westerly along Riverside Dr to Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding southerly along Hollywood Fwy to Vineland Ave, and proceeding northerly along Vineland Ave to Whipple St, and proceeding easterly along Whipple St to Lankershim Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Lankershim Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:92821829), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92821829) to Unnamed (TLID:92821806), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92821806) to Willowcrest Ave, and proceeding southerly along Willowcrest Ave to Valleyheart Dr, and proceeding easterly along Valleyheart Dr to Bluffside Dr, and proceeding southerly along Bluffside Dr to Willowcrest Ave, and proceeding southerly along Willowcrest Ave to Universal Pl, and proceeding easterly along Universal Pl to Lankershim Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Lankershim Blvd to Vineland Ave, and proceeding northerly along Vineland Ave to Unnamed (TLID:92818676), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92818676) to Unnamed (TLID:92818160), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92818160) to Mulholland Dr, and proceeding westerly along Mulholland Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92810502), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92810502) to Mulholland Dr, and proceeding southerly along Mulholland Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92741638), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92741638) to Mulholland Dr, and proceeding westerly along Mulholland Dr to N Split Rock Rd, and proceeding northerly along N Split Rock Rd to Unnamed (TLID:92739610), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92739610) to Blairwood Dr, and proceeding westerly along Blairwood Dr to Longridge Ave, and proceeding northerly along Longridge Ave to W Ventura Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W Ventura Blvd to Fulton Ave, and proceeding northerly along Fulton Ave to Valleyheart Dr, and proceeding southerly along Valleyheart Dr to Ethel Ave, and proceeding easterly along Ethel Ave to Sarah St, and proceeding easterly along Sarah St to Van Noord Ave, and proceeding northerly along Van Noord Ave to Kling St, and proceeding easterly along Kling St to Coldwater Canyon Ave, and proceeding northerly along Coldwater Canyon Ave to Unnamed (TLID:92827752), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92827752) to Coldwater Canyon Ave, and proceeding northerly along Coldwater Canyon Ave to Ventura Fwy, and proceeding easterly along Ventura Fwy to Unnamed (TLID:92836873), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92836873) to Whitsett Ave, and proceeding northerly along Whitsett Ave to Riverside Dr, and proceeding westerly along Riverside Dr to Tujunga Wash, and proceeding westerly along Tujunga Wash to Burbank Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Burbank Blvd to Hazeltine Ave, and proceeding northerly along Hazeltine Ave to Gilmore St, and proceeding westerly along Gilmore St to Sylmar Ave, and proceeding northerly along Sylmar Ave to Vanowen St, and proceeding easterly along Vanowen St to Hazeltine Ave, and proceeding northerly along Hazeltine Ave to Sherman Way, and proceeding westerly along Sherman Way to the point of beginning.

## Third District.

The region bounded and described as follows: Beginning at the point of intersection of Victory Blvd and Unnamed (TLID:82092329), and proceeding easterly along Victory Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:82093433), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82093433) to Victory Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Victory Blvd to Shoup Ave, and proceeding northerly along Shoup Ave to Roscoe Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Roscoe Blvd to Topanga Canyon Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Topanga Canyon Blvd to Santa Susana Crk, and proceeding easterly along Santa Susana Crk to Nordhoff St, and proceeding easterly along Nordhoff St to Winnetka Ave, and proceeding southerly along Winnetka Ave to Parthenia St, and proceeding easterly along Parthenia St to Corbin Ave, and proceeding southerly along Corbin Ave to Roscoe Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Roscoe Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:82706842), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82706842) to Unnamed
(TLID:82706545), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82706545) to Unnamed (TLID:82706491), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82706491) to Unnamed (TLID:82705798), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82705798) to Unnamed (TLID:82705920), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82705920) to Strathern St, and proceeding easterly along Strathern St to Yolanda Ave, and proceeding southerly along Yolanda Ave to Arminta St, and proceeding easterly along Arminta St to Reseda Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Reseda Blvd to Saticoy St, and proceeding easterly along Saticoy St to White Oak Ave, and proceeding southerly along White Oak Ave to Victory Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Victory Blvd to Lindley Ave, and proceeding southerly along Lindley Ave to Unnamed (TLID:82529621), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82529621) to Unnamed (TLID:82526865), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82526865) to Unnamed (TLID:82526774), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82526774) to Unnamed (TLID:82526660), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82526660) to Unnamed (TLID:82526542), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82526542) to Unnamed (TLID:82496821), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82496821) to Unnamed (TLID:82496220), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82496220) to Mulholland Dr, and proceeding easterly along Mulholland Dr to Farmer Fire Rd, and proceeding westerly along Farmer Fire Rd to Mulholland Dr, and proceeding westerly along Mulholland Dr to Unnamed (TLID:82394214), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82394214) to Owen Brown Rd, and proceeding southerly along Owen Brown Rd to Unnamed (TLID:82393884), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82393884) to Unnamed (TLID:82393878), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82393878) to Unnamed (TLID:82393868), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82393868) to Unnamed (TLID:82392433), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82392433) to Unnamed (TLID:82390748), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82390748) to Unnamed (TLID:82390913), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82390913) to Unnamed (TLID:82390759), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82390759) to Unnamed (TLID:82379186), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82379186) to Unnamed (TLID:82379094), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82379094) to Unnamed (TLID:82379192), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82379192) to Unnamed (TLID:82378510), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82378510) to Unnamed (TLID:82376835), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82376835) to Unnamed (TLID:82375944), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82375944) to Unnamed (TLID:82411896), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82411896) to Unnamed (TLID:82402241), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82402241) to Unnamed (TLID:82402224), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82402224) to Unnamed (TLID:82402155), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82402155) to Unnamed (TLID:82401802), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82401802) to Unnamed (TLID:82401796), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82401796) to Unnamed (TLID:82401302), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82401302) to Unnamed (TLID:82398294), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82398294) to Unnamed (TLID:82397540), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82397540) to Unnamed (TLID:82128787), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82128787) to Unnamed (TLID:82128633), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82128633) to Unnamed (TLID:82127753), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82127753) to Unnamed (TLID:82123830), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82123830) to Unnamed (TLID:82124910), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82124910) to Unnamed (TLID:82124897), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82124897) to Unnamed (TLID:82125009), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82125009) to Unnamed (TLID:82125000), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82125000) to Unnamed (TLID:82124965), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82124965) to Unnamed (TLID:82124955), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82124955) to Unnamed (TLID:82124532), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82124532) to Unnamed (TLID:82124467), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82124467) to Unnamed (TLID:82124422), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82124422) to Unnamed (TLID:82124416), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82124416) to Unnamed (TLID:82125583), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82125583) to Calabasas Rd, and proceeding westerly along Calabasas Rd to Unnamed (TLID:82110851), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82110851) to Unnamed (TLID:82110857), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82110857) to Unnamed (TLID:82110863), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82110863) to Unnamed (TLID:82110882), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82110882) to Unnamed (TLID:82110901), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82110901) to Unnamed (TLID:82110944), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82110944) to Unnamed (TLID:82112437), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82112437) to Unnamed (TLID:82112452), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82112452) to Long Valley Rd, and proceeding southerly along Long Valley Rd to Unnamed
(TLID:82112508), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82112508) to Unnamed (TLID:82112422), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82112422) to Unnamed (TLID:82111480), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82111480) to Unnamed (TLID:82118960), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82118960) to Unnamed (TLID:82118896), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82118896) to Unnamed (TLID:82118396), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82118396) to Unnamed (TLID:82115992), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82115992) to Unnamed (TLID:82116042), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82116042) to Unnamed (TLID:82115429), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82115429) to Unnamed (TLID:82114481), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82114481) to Unnamed (TLID:82086120), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82086120) to Unnamed (TLID:82086891), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82086891) to Unnamed (TLID:82086879), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82086879) to Unnamed (TLID:82086947), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82086947) to Unnamed (TLID:82086959), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82086959) to Unnamed (TLID:82086984), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82086984) to Unnamed (TLID:82087598), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82087598) to Unnamed (TLID:82087628), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82087628) to Unnamed (TLID:82088014), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82088014) to Unnamed (TLID:82088020), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82088020) to Unnamed (TLID:82087568), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82087568) to Unnamed (TLID:82083274), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82083274) to Unnamed (TLID:82083079), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82083079) to Unnamed (TLID:82081966), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82081966) to Unnamed (TLID:82081745), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82081745) to Unnamed (TLID:82091597), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82091597) to Unnamed (TLID:82092227), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82092227) to Unnamed (TLID:82092233), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82092233) to Unnamed (TLID:82092316), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82092316) to Unnamed (TLID:82092329), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82092329) to the point of beginning.

## Fourth District.

The region bounded and described as follows: 1. Beginning at the point of intersection of I- 405 and Mulholland Dr, and proceeding northerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:92639650), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92639650) to I- 405, and proceeding northerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:92641405), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92641405) to I- 405, and proceeding northerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:92648540), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92648540) to I- 405, and proceeding northerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:92649824), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92649824) to I- 405, and proceeding northerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:92660355), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92660355) to Unnamed (TLID:92660361), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92660361) to Oxnard St, and proceeding easterly along Oxnard St to Hazeltine Ave, and proceeding southerly along Hazeltine Ave to Burbank Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Burbank Blvd to Tujunga Wash, and proceeding southerly along Tujunga Wash to Riverside Dr, and proceeding easterly along Riverside Dr to Whitsett Ave, and proceeding southerly along Whitsett Ave to Unnamed (TLID:92836873), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92836873) to Ventura Fwy, and proceeding westerly along Ventura Fwy to Coldwater Canyon Ave, and proceeding southerly along Coldwater Canyon Ave to Unnamed (TLID:92827752), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92827752) to Coldwater Canyon Ave, and proceeding southerly along Coldwater Canyon Ave to Kling St, and proceeding westerly along Kling St to Van Noord Ave, and proceeding southerly along Van Noord Ave to Sarah St, and proceeding westerly along Sarah St to Ethel Ave, and proceeding southerly along Ethel Ave to Valleyheart Dr, and proceeding westerly along Valleyheart Dr to Fulton Ave, and proceeding southerly along Fulton Ave to W Ventura Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Ventura Blvd to Longridge Ave, and proceeding southerly along Longridge Ave to Blairwood Dr, and proceeding easterly along Blairwood Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92739610), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92739610) to N Split Rock Rd, and proceeding southerly along N Split Rock Rd to Unnamed (TLID:92740775), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92740775) to Mulholland Dr, and proceeding easterly along Mulholland Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92741638), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92741638) to Mulholland Dr, and proceeding southerly along Mulholland Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92745386), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92745386) to Mulholland Dr, and proceeding southerly along Mulholland Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92745561), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92745561) to Mulholland Dr, and proceeding southerly along Mulholland Dr to N Bowmont Dr, and proceeding southerly along N Bowmont Dr to Mulholland Dr, and proceeding easterly along

Mulholland Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92818160), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92818160) to Unnamed (TLID:92818676), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92818676) to Vineland Ave, and proceeding southerly along Vineland Ave to Lankershim Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Lankershim Blvd to Universal Pl, and proceeding westerly along Universal Pl to Willowcrest Ave, and proceeding northerly along Willowcrest Ave to Bluffside Dr, and proceeding northerly along Bluffside Dr to Valleyheart Dr, and proceeding westerly along Valleyheart Dr to Willowcrest Ave, and proceeding northerly along Willowcrest Ave to Unnamed (TLID:92821806), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92821806) to Unnamed (TLID:92821829), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92821829) to Lankershim Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Lankershim Blvd to Whipple St, and proceeding westerly along Whipple St to Vineland Ave, and proceeding southerly along Vineland Ave to Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding westerly along Hollywood Fwy to Riverside Dr, and proceeding easterly along Riverside Dr to Camarillo St, and proceeding easterly along Camarillo St to Vineland Pl, and proceeding southerly along Vineland Pl to Sarah St, and proceeding easterly along Sarah St to N Vineland Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Vineland Ave to Ventura Fwy, and proceeding easterly along Ventura Fwy to Vineland Ave, and proceeding southerly along Vineland Ave to Ventura Fwy, and proceeding easterly along Ventura Fwy to Unnamed (TLID:92887923), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92887923) to Unnamed (TLID:92887964), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92887964) to Denny Ave, and proceeding northerly along Denny Ave to Camarillo St, and proceeding easterly along Camarillo St to Cahuenga Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Cahuenga Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:92893172), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92893172) to Southern Pacific RR, and proceeding easterly along Southern Pacific RR to Clybourn Ave, and proceeding southerly along Clybourn Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93323211), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93323211) to Clybourn Ave, and proceeding southerly along Clybourn Ave to N Clybourn Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Clybourn Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93323258), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93323258) to Unnamed (TLID:93323234), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93323234) to N Ford St, and proceeding northerly along N Ford St to Magnolia Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Magnolia Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:93323051), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93323051) to Ledge Ave, and proceeding southerly along Ledge Ave to W Clark Ave, and proceeding easterly along W Clark Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93322993), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93322993) to Unnamed (TLID:93323679), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93323679) to Clybourn Ave, and proceeding southerly along Clybourn Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93316411), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93316411) to Clybourn Ave, and proceeding southerly along Clybourn Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93316684), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93316684) to Unnamed (TLID:93257189), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93257189) to Unnamed (TLID:93257177), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93257177) to Unnamed (TLID:93257216), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93257216) to Unnamed (TLID:93317891), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93317891) to Unnamed (TLID:93330671), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93330671) to Unnamed (TLID:93331036), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93331036) to Unnamed (TLID:93331092), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93331092) to Unnamed (TLID:93331148), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93331148) to Unnamed (TLID:93331155), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93331155) to Unnamed (TLID:93331167), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93331167) to Unnamed (TLID:93331619), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93331619) to Unnamed (TLID:93331613), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93331613) to Unnamed (TLID:93331651), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93331651) to Unnamed (TLID:93331712), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93331712) to Unnamed (TLID:93332390), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93332390) to Unnamed (TLID:93332406), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93332406) to Unnamed (TLID:93332441), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93332441) to Unnamed (TLID:93332871), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93332871) to Unnamed (TLID:93333028), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93333028) to Unnamed (TLID:93336453), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93336453) to Unnamed (TLID:93336466), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93336466) to Unnamed (TLID:93336503), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93336503) to Unnamed (TLID:93337111), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93337111) to Unnamed (TLID:93337174), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93337174) to Unnamed (TLID:93337306), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93337306) to Unnamed (TLID:93337325), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93337325) to Unnamed (TLID:93337832), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93337832) to Unnamed (TLID:93337867), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93337867) to Unnamed (TLID:93337991), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93337991) to Unnamed (TLID:93339120), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93339120) to Unnamed
(TLID:93339197), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93339197) to Unnamed (TLID:93339250), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93339250) to Unnamed (TLID:93339647), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93339647) to Unnamed (TLID:93373867), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93373867) to Unnamed (TLID:93373895), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93373895) to Unnamed (TLID:93373941), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93373941) to Unnamed (TLID:93374330), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93374330) to Unnamed (TLID:93374451), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93374451) to Unnamed (TLID:93375180), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93375180) to Unnamed (TLID:93375432), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93375432) to Unnamed (TLID:93376614), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93376614) to Unnamed (TLID:93376555), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93376555) to Unnamed (TLID:93376561), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93376561) to Unnamed (TLID:93376596), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93376596) to Unnamed (TLID:93376580), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93376580) to Unnamed (TLID:93376468), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93376468) to Unnamed (TLID:93377023), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93377023) to Unnamed (TLID:93377750), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93377750) to Unnamed (TLID:93377838), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93377838) to Unnamed (TLID:93377845), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93377845) to Unnamed (TLID:93377851), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93377851) to Unnamed (TLID:93377865), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93377865) to Unnamed (TLID:93377871), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93377871) to Unnamed (TLID:93378152), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93378152) to Unnamed (TLID:93382159), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93382159) to Unnamed (TLID:93388784), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93388784) to Unnamed (TLID:93388815), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93388815) to Unnamed (TLID:93385026), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93385026) to Unnamed (TLID:93385032), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93385032) to Unnamed (TLID:93385082), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93385082) to Unnamed (TLID:93385045), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93385045) to Unnamed (TLID:93385051), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93385051) to Unnamed (TLID:93385765), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93385765) to Unnamed (TLID:93385759), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93385759) to Rancho Ave, and proceeding easterly along Rancho Ave to Riverside Dr, and proceeding easterly along Riverside Dr to Unnamed (TLID:93387055), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93387055) to Unnamed (TLID:93387107), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93387107) to Unnamed (TLID:93387464), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93387464) to Unnamed (TLID:93388076), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93388076) to Unnamed (TLID:93388116), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93388116) to Garden St, and proceeding easterly along Garden St to Unnamed (TLID:93388267), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93388267) to Unnamed (TLID:93544823), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93544823) to Unnamed (TLID:93544835), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93544835) to Unnamed (TLID:93544890), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93544890) to Unnamed (TLID:93545021), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93545021) to Unnamed (TLID:93545126), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93545126) to Unnamed (TLID:93545886), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93545886) to Unnamed (TLID:93546538), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93546538) to Unnamed (TLID:93548565), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93548565) to Unnamed (TLID:93550127), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93550127) to Unnamed (TLID:93550106), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93550106) to Unnamed (TLID:93549600), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93549600) to Unnamed (TLID:93549606), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93549606) to Unnamed (TLID:93549655), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93549655) to Ventura Fwy, and proceeding easterly along Ventura Fwy to Unnamed (TLID:93550053), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93550053) to Unnamed (TLID:93550059), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93550059) to Unnamed (TLID:93550037), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93550037) to Unnamed (TLID:93549938), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93549938) to Unnamed (TLID:93548205), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93548205) to Unnamed (TLID:93547540), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93547540) to Unnamed (TLID:93462373), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93462373) to Unnamed (TLID:93462288), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93462288) to Unnamed (TLID:93462241), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93462241) to Unnamed (TLID:93471458), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93471458) to Unnamed (TLID:93471446), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93471446) to

Unnamed (TLID:93470708), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93470708) to Unnamed (TLID:93470685), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93470685) to Unnamed (TLID:93466150), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93466150) to Unnamed (TLID:93466011), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93466011) to Unnamed (TLID:93467969), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93467969) to Unnamed (TLID:93467703), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93467703) to Glendale Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Glendale Blvd to Hyperion Ave, and proceeding westerly along Hyperion Ave to Waverly Dr, and proceeding easterly along Waverly Dr to Glendale Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Glendale Blvd to Lakewood Ave, and proceeding westerly along Lakewood Ave to Armstrong Ave, and proceeding southerly along Armstrong Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93454905), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93454905) to Unnamed (TLID:93454423), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93454423) to Unnamed (TLID:93454104), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93454104) to Unnamed (TLID:93453897), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93453897) to Unnamed (TLID:93453872), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93453872) to Redesdale Ave, and proceeding westerly along Redesdale Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93453521), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93453521) to Landa St, and proceeding westerly along Landa St to Unnamed (TLID:93450622), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93450622) to Landa St, and proceeding westerly along Landa St to Maltman Ave, and proceeding westerly along Maltman Ave to Landa St, and proceeding westerly along Landa St to Griffith Park Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Griffith Park Blvd to Landa St, and proceeding westerly along Landa St to Fountain Ave, and proceeding westerly along Fountain Ave to Sunset Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Sunset Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:93435036), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93435036) to Hollywood Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Hollywood Blvd to N Normandie Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Normandie Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93288577), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93288577) to Unnamed (TLID:93288521), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93288521) to N Kingsley Dr, and proceeding northerly along N Kingsley Dr to Unnamed (TLID:93288500), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93288500) to Unnamed (TLID:93288046), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93288046) to Unnamed (TLID:93288002), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93288002) to N Western Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Western Ave to Franklin Ave, and proceeding westerly along Franklin Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93276514), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93276514) to Franklin Ave, and proceeding westerly along Franklin Ave to Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding westerly along Hollywood Fwy to N Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding westerly along N Hollywood Fwy to Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding westerly along Hollywood Fwy to Odin St, and proceeding westerly along Odin St to N Highland Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Highland Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93234632), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93234632) to N Highland Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Highland Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93234532), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93234532) to W Camrose Dr, and proceeding westerly along W Camrose Dr to Camrose Dr, and proceeding westerly along Camrose Dr to N Sycamore Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Sycamore Ave to Fitch Dr, and proceeding southerly along Fitch Dr to N Sycamore Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Sycamore Ave to Franklin Ave, and proceeding westerly along Franklin Ave to N la Brea Ave, and proceeding southerly along N la Brea Ave to Sunset Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Sunset Blvd to N Highland Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Highland Ave to de Longpre Ave, and proceeding easterly along de Longpre Ave to N McCadden Pl , and proceeding southerly along N McCadden Pl to Fountain Ave, and proceeding easterly along Fountain Ave to N Las Palmas Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Las Palmas Ave to Lexington Ave, and proceeding easterly along Lexington Ave to Wilcox Ave, and proceeding southerly along Wilcox Ave to Melrose Ave, and proceeding easterly along Melrose Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93270762), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93270762) to Melrose Ave, and proceeding easterly along Melrose Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93270781), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93270781) to Melrose Ave, and proceeding easterly along Melrose Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93271152), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93271152) to Melrose Ave, and proceeding easterly along Melrose Ave to N Western Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Western Ave to S Western Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Western Ave to W 6th St, and proceeding westerly along W 6th St to S Wilton Pl, and proceeding southerly along S Wilton Pl to Unnamed (TLID:89335937), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89335937) to S Wilton Pl, and proceeding southerly along S Wilton Pl to W 7th St, and proceeding easterly along W 7th St to S Western Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Western Ave to W Olympic Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W Olympic Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:89306482), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89306482) to W Olympic Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W Olympic Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:89295172), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89295172) to W Olympic Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W Olympic Blvd to S Cochran Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Cochran Ave to

San Vicente Blvd, and proceeding westerly along San Vicente Blvd to W Olympic Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W Olympic Blvd to S Fairfax Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Fairfax Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88640376), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88640376) to S Fairfax Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Fairfax Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88640466), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88640466) to S Fairfax Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Fairfax Ave to N Fairfax Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Fairfax Ave to Beverly Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Beverly Blvd to Genesee Ave, and proceeding southerly along Genesee Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89299123), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89299123) to Beverly Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Beverly Blvd to N Gardner St, and proceeding southerly along N Gardner St to S Gardner St, and proceeding southerly along S Gardner St to W 3rd St, and proceeding easterly along W 3rd St to la Brea Ave, and proceeding southerly along la Brea Ave to W 4th St, and proceeding easterly along W 4th St to S Highland Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Highland Ave to N Highland Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Highland Ave to Willoughby Ave, and proceeding westerly along Willoughby Ave to N la Brea Ave, and proceeding northerly along N la Brea Ave to Romaine St, and proceeding easterly along Romaine St to Unnamed (TLID:93220267), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93220267) to Unnamed (TLID:93220295), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93220295) to Unnamed (TLID:93220730), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93220730) to Unnamed (TLID:93220761), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93220761) to Fountain Ave, and proceeding westerly along Fountain Ave to N Fairfax Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Fairfax Ave to Unnamed (TLID:92790609), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92790609) to Unnamed (TLID:92789928), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92789928) to Unnamed (TLID:92789884), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92789884) to Unnamed (TLID:92789452), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92789452) to Unnamed (TLID:92785359), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92785359) to Unnamed (TLID:92785375), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92785375) to Unnamed (TLID:92785388), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92785388) to Unnamed (TLID:92784900), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92784900) to Unnamed (TLID:92784866), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92784866) to Unnamed (TLID:92784728), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92784728) to Unnamed (TLID:92783344), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92783344) to Unnamed (TLID:92782896), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92782896) to Unnamed (TLID:92782717), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92782717) to Unnamed (TLID:92782606), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92782606) to Unnamed (TLID:92764418), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92764418) to Unnamed (TLID:92764370), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92764370) to Unnamed (TLID:92764224), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92764224) to Unnamed (TLID:92763145), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92763145) to Unnamed (TLID:92763076), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92763076) to Unnamed (TLID:92762852), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92762852) to Unnamed (TLID:92759882), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92759882) to Unnamed (TLID:92759844), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92759844) to Larrabee St, and proceeding southerly along Larrabee St to Unnamed (TLID:92759430), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92759430) to Ozeta Ter, and proceeding southerly along Ozeta Ter to N Clark St, and proceeding northerly along N Clark St to Ozeta Ter, and proceeding southerly along Ozeta Ter to Unnamed (TLID:92759299), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92759299) to Unnamed (TLID:92759266), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92759266) to Unnamed (TLID:92758179), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92758179) to Unnamed (TLID:92757894), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92757894) to Unnamed (TLID:92757809), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92757809) to Unnamed (TLID:92726020), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92726020) to Unnamed (TLID:92725794), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92725794) to Unnamed (TLID:92724739), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92724739) to Unnamed (TLID:92724732), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92724732) to Unnamed (TLID:92725045), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92725045) to Unnamed (TLID:92725109), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92725109) to Unnamed (TLID:92725091), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92725091) to Unnamed (TLID:92725097), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92725097) to W Sierra Mar Dr, and proceeding westerly along W Sierra Mar Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92729910), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92729910) to Unnamed (TLID:92729944), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92729944) to Unnamed (TLID:92730195), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92730195) to Unnamed (TLID:92730211), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92730211) to Unnamed (TLID:92730996), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92730996) to Unnamed (TLID:92731381), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92731381) to Unnamed
(TLID:92731406), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92731406) to Unnamed (TLID:92731527), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92731527) to Unnamed (TLID:92732711), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92732711) to Unnamed (TLID:92732724), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92732724) to Crescent Dr, and proceeding northerly along Crescent Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92732754), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92732754) to Unnamed (TLID:92732760), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92732760) to Unnamed (TLID:92732947), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92732947) to Unnamed (TLID:92767099), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92767099) to Unnamed (TLID:92733062), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92733062) to Unnamed (TLID:92747798), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92747798) to Unnamed (TLID:92747375), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92747375) to Unnamed (TLID:92747369), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92747369) to Unnamed (TLID:92747156), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92747156) to Unnamed (TLID:92746912), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92746912) to Unnamed (TLID:92746870), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92746870) to W Cherokee Ln, and proceeding westerly along W Cherokee Ln to Loma Vista Dr, and proceeding westerly along Loma Vista Dr to Cherokee Ln, and proceeding westerly along Cherokee Ln to Unnamed (TLID:92729405), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92729405) to Unnamed (TLID:92729411), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92729411) to Unnamed (TLID:92729424), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92729424) to Unnamed (TLID:92729291), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92729291) to Unnamed (TLID:92729232), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92729232) to Unnamed (TLID:92729149), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92729149) to Unnamed (TLID:92728422), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92728422) to Unnamed (TLID:92728157), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92728157) to Unnamed (TLID:92728164), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92728164) to Unnamed (TLID:92728087), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92728087) to Ridgecrest Dr, and proceeding westerly along Ridgecrest Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92721950), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92721950) to Unnamed (TLID:92721944), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92721944) to Unnamed (TLID:92721931), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92721931) to Unnamed (TLID:92721632), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92721632) to Unnamed (TLID:92721198), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92721198) to Unnamed (TLID:92721043), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92721043) to Unnamed (TLID:92726711), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92726711) to Unnamed (TLID:92726692), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92726692) to Unnamed (TLID:92726591), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92726591) to Unnamed (TLID:92726598), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92726598) to Unnamed (TLID:92726669), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92726669) to Unnamed (TLID:92727201), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92727201) to Unnamed (TLID:92727255), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92727255) to Monte Cielo Dr, and proceeding westerly along Monte Cielo Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92718650), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92718650) to Unnamed (TLID:92718258), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92718258) to Unnamed (TLID:92718245), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92718245) to Unnamed (TLID:92718216), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92718216) to Unnamed (TLID:92718182), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92718182) to Unnamed (TLID:92718113), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92718113) to Unnamed (TLID:92718095), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92718095) to Lago Vista Dr, and proceeding southerly along Lago Vista Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92718030), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92718030) to Unnamed (TLID:92718012), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92718012) to Unnamed (TLID:92717935), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92717935) to Unnamed (TLID:92717866), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92717866) to Unnamed (TLID:92717840), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92717840) to Unnamed (TLID:92717825), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92717825) to Unnamed (TLID:92714331), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92714331) to Unnamed (TLID:92714074), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92714074) to Unnamed (TLID:92713963), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92713963) to Sutton Way, and proceeding southerly along Sutton Way to Unnamed (TLID:92713484), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92713484) to Unnamed (TLID:92713464), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92713464) to N Beverly Dr, and proceeding northerly along N Beverly Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92713296), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92713296) to Unnamed (TLID:92711177), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92711177) to Unnamed (TLID:92710832), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92710832) to Unnamed (TLID:92710567), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92710567) to

Unnamed (TLID:92709606), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92709606) to Unnamed (TLID:92709500), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92709500) to Unnamed (TLID:92709416), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92709416) to Tower Rd, and proceeding southerly along Tower Rd to Unnamed (TLID:92709054), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92709054) to Unnamed (TLID:92708920), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92708920) to Tower Rd, and proceeding westerly along Tower Rd to Unnamed (TLID:92708898), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92708898) to N Tower Rd, and proceeding westerly along N Tower Rd to Unnamed (TLID:92603059), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92603059) to Unnamed (TLID:92603031), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92603031) to Unnamed (TLID:92602481), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92602481) to Benedict Canon, and proceeding northerly along Benedict Canon to N Benedict Canon Dr, and proceeding northerly along N Benedict Canon Dr to Benedict Canon, and proceeding westerly along Benedict Canon to N Benedict Canon Dr, and proceeding northerly along N Benedict Canon Dr to Benedict Canon, and proceeding northerly along Benedict Canon to N Benedict Canyon Dr, and proceeding northerly along N Benedict Canyon Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92620643), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92620643) to N Benedict Canyon Dr, and proceeding northerly along N Benedict Canyon Dr to W Mulholland Dr, and proceeding westerly along W Mulholland Dr to W Mullholland Dr, and proceeding westerly along W Mullholland Dr to W Mulholland Dr, and proceeding westerly along W Mulholland Dr to Mulholland Dr, and proceeding westerly along Mulholland Dr to the point of beginning. 2. Except for beginning at the point of intersection of Unnamed (TLID:92820808) and Lankershim Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92820808) to Unnamed (TLID:93253446), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93253446) to Unnamed (TLID:93253225), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93253225) to Unnamed (TLID:93253371), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93253371) to Unnamed (TLID:93254737), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93254737) to Unnamed (TLID:93254750), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93254750) to Unnamed (TLID:93254884), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93254884) to Unnamed (TLID:93255050), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93255050) to Unnamed (TLID:93255989), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93255989) to Unnamed (TLID:93256936), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93256936) to Unnamed (TLID:93256986), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93256986) to Unnamed (TLID:93256992), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93256992) to Unnamed (TLID:93257146), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93257146) to Los Angeles Riv, and proceeding westerly along Los Angeles Riv to Unnamed (TLID:93253847), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93253847) to Los Angeles Riv, and proceeding westerly along Los Angeles Riv to Unnamed (TLID:92822362), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92822362) to Unnamed (TLID:92822316), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92822316) to Lankershim Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Lankershim Blvd to the point of beginning. 3. Except for beginning at the point of intersection of Franklin Canyon Dr and Unnamed (TLID:92716923), and proceeding southerly along Franklin Canyon Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92716987), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92716987) to Unnamed (TLID:92716993), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92716993) to Unnamed (TLID:92717033), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92717033) to Unnamed (TLID:92718677), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92718677) to Unnamed (TLID:92718709), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92718709) to Unnamed (TLID:92718861), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92718861) to Unnamed (TLID:92718837), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92718837) to Unnamed (TLID:92718780), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92718780) to Unnamed (TLID:92735615), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92735615) to Unnamed (TLID:92735561), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92735561) to Unnamed (TLID:92733921), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92733921) to Unnamed (TLID:92733886), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92733886) to Unnamed (TLID:92733895), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92733895) to Unnamed (TLID:92733871), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92733871) to Unnamed (TLID:92733831), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92733831) to Unnamed (TLID:92717099), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92717099) to Unnamed (TLID:92716923), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92716923) to the point of beginning.

Fifth District.
The region bounded and described as follows: Beginning at the point of intersection of Unnamed (TLID:82496821) and Unnamed (TLID:82496220), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82496821) to Unnamed (TLID:82526542), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82526542) to Unnamed (TLID:82526660), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82526660) to Unnamed (TLID:82526774), and proceeding
northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82526774) to Unnamed (TLID:82526865), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82526865) to Unnamed (TLID:82529621), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82529621) to Lindley Ave, and proceeding northerly along Lindley Ave to Victory Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Victory Blvd to White Oak Ave, and proceeding southerly along White Oak Ave to Unnamed (TLID:82579186), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82579186) to Unnamed (TLID:82579127), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82579127) to Unnamed (TLID:82579117), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82579117) to Oxnard St, and proceeding easterly along Oxnard St to Unnamed (TLID:82581513), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82581513) to Bullock St, and proceeding southerly along Bullock St to Wish Ave, and proceeding southerly along Wish Ave to Unnamed (TLID:82567796), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82567796) to Burbank Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Burbank Blvd to Hayvenhurst Ave, and proceeding southerly along Hayvenhurst Ave to Unnamed (TLID:82577243), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82577243) to Unnamed (TLID:82577323), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82577323) to Unnamed (TLID:82577374), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82577374) to Ventura Fwy, and proceeding easterly along Ventura Fwy to Unnamed (TLID:92636673), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92636673) to Ventura Fwy, and proceeding easterly along Ventura Fwy to Unnamed (TLID:92647026), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92647026) to Unnamed (TLID:92647058), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92647058) to Unnamed (TLID:92647871), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92647871) to Unnamed (TLID:92647903), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92647903) to Unnamed (TLID:92647924), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92647924) to Unnamed (TLID:92648024), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92648024) to Unnamed (TLID:92648002), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92648002) to Unnamed (TLID:92648449), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92648449) to Unnamed (TLID:92648434), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92648434) to I- 405, and proceeding southerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:92639650), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92639650) to I- 405, and proceeding southerly along I- 405 to Mulholland Dr, and proceeding easterly along Mulholland Dr to W Mulholland Dr, and proceeding easterly along W Mulholland Dr to W Mullholland Dr, and proceeding easterly along W Mullholland Dr to W Mulholland Dr, and proceeding easterly along W Mulholland Dr to N Benedict Canyon Dr, and proceeding southerly along N Benedict Canyon Dr to N Wallingford Dr, and proceeding northerly along N Wallingford Dr to N Benedict Canyon Dr, and proceeding westerly along N Benedict Canyon Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92620726), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92620726) to N Benedict Canyon Dr, and proceeding southerly along N Benedict Canyon Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92620605), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92620605) to N Benedict Canyon Dr, and proceeding southerly along N Benedict Canyon Dr to Benedict Canon, and proceeding southerly along Benedict Canon to N Benedict Canon Dr, and proceeding southerly along N Benedict Canon Dr to Benedict Canon, and proceeding easterly along Benedict Canon to N Benedict Canon Dr, and proceeding easterly along N Benedict Canon Dr to Benedict Canon, and proceeding southerly along Benedict Canon to Unnamed (TLID:92602452), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92602452) to Unnamed (TLID:92602439), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92602439) to Unnamed (TLID:92601297), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92601297) to Unnamed (TLID:92601221), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92601221) to Unnamed (TLID:92601234), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92601234) to Unnamed (TLID:92601272), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92601272) to Ridgedale Dr, and proceeding easterly along Ridgedale Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92601391), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92601391) to Unnamed (TLID:92601139), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92601139) to Unnamed (TLID:92707334), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92707334) to Ladera Dr, and proceeding westerly along Ladera Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92707315), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92707315) to Unnamed (TLID:92707287), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92707287) to Unnamed (TLID:92600758), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92600758) to Unnamed (TLID:88554330), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88554330) to Unnamed (TLID:88554252), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88554252) to Unnamed (TLID:88554246), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88554246) to Unnamed (TLID:88554278), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88554278) to Greenway Dr, and proceeding southerly along Greenway Dr to Unnamed (TLID:88553782), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88553782) to Walden Dr, and proceeding easterly along Walden Dr to Unnamed (TLID:88554554), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88554554) to Unnamed (TLID:88554560), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88554560) to Unnamed (TLID:88553677), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88553677) to Unnamed (TLID:88553661), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88553661) to Unnamed (TLID:88555662), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed
(TLID:88555662) to Unnamed (TLID:88555650), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88555650) to Unnamed (TLID:88555641), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88555641) to Unnamed (TLID:88555632), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88555632) to Moreno Dr, and proceeding southerly along Moreno Dr to Unnamed (TLID:88552256), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88552256) to Heath Ave, and proceeding southerly along Heath Ave to Hillgreen Dr, and proceeding southerly along Hillgreen Dr to Heath Ave, and proceeding southerly along Heath Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88559295), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88559295) to Unnamed (TLID:88559611), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88559611) to W Pico Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Pico Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88559655), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88559655) to Unnamed (TLID:88559677), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88559677) to Unnamed (TLID:88559689), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88559689) to Unnamed (TLID:88559698), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88559698) to Unnamed (TLID:88560793), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88560793) to Beverly Green Dr, and proceeding northerly along Beverly Green Dr to Unnamed (TLID:88560876), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88560876) to Unnamed (TLID:88560940), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88560940) to Unnamed (TLID:88561338), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88561338) to Unnamed (TLID:88561372), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88561372) to Unnamed (TLID:88561412), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88561412) to Unnamed (TLID:88561436), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88561436) to Peck Dr, and proceeding southerly along Peck Dr to Unnamed (TLID:88561483), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88561483) to Unnamed (TLID:88561508), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88561508) to Daniels Dr, and proceeding southerly along Daniels Dr to Unnamed (TLID:88562509), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88562509) to Unnamed (TLID:88562534), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88562534) to Unnamed (TLID:88562546), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88562546) to Unnamed (TLID:88562540), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88562540) to Unnamed (TLID:88562555), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88562555) to Unnamed (TLID:88562593), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88562593) to Unnamed (TLID:88562873), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88562873) to Unnamed (TLID:88562617), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88562617) to S Camden Dr, and proceeding southerly along S Camden Dr to Unnamed (TLID:88562891), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88562891) to Unnamed (TLID:88562998), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88562998) to Unnamed (TLID:88563011), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88563011) to Unnamed (TLID:88563023), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88563023) to S Rodeo Dr, and proceeding southerly along S Rodeo Dr to Unnamed (TLID:88563036), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88563036) to Unnamed (TLID:88563048), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88563048) to Unnamed (TLID:88563110), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88563110) to Unnamed (TLID:88563140), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88563140) to Unnamed (TLID:88563153), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88563153) to Beverwil Dr, and proceeding southerly along Beverwil Dr to Unnamed (TLID:88565998), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88565998) to Unnamed (TLID:88566032), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88566032) to Unnamed (TLID:88566051), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88566051) to Unnamed (TLID:88566101), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88566101) to Unnamed (TLID:88566201), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88566201) to Whitworth Dr, and proceeding easterly along Whitworth Dr to S Robertson Blvd, and proceeding northerly along S Robertson Blvd to Gregory Way, and proceeding easterly along Gregory Way to S Le Doux Rd, and proceeding southerly along S Le Doux Rd to W Olympic Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Olympic Blvd to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding northerly along S la Cienega Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88620297), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88620297) to Unnamed (TLID:88636595), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88636595) to Unnamed (TLID:88636735), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88636735) to Unnamed (TLID:88636657), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88636657) to San Vicente Blvd, and proceeding northerly along San Vicente Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88627928), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88627928) to Unnamed (TLID:88627969), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88627969) to San Vicente Blvd, and proceeding northerly along San Vicente Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88627848), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88627848) to San Vicente Blvd, and proceeding northerly along San Vicente Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88627897), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88627897) to Unnamed (TLID:88627870), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88627870) to Unnamed (TLID:88627833), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88627833) to Unnamed (TLID:88627820), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88627820) to Unnamed (TLID:88627814), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88627814) to

Unnamed (TLID:88627521), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88627521) to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding westerly along S la Cienega Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88627465), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88627465) to N la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding southerly along N la Cienega Blvd to Clifton Way, and proceeding westerly along Clifton Way to N Le Doux Rd, and proceeding northerly along N Le Doux Rd to Unnamed (TLID:88627366), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88627366) to Unnamed (TLID:88626860), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88626860) to Unnamed (TLID:88626829), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88626829) to Unnamed (TLID:88626784), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88626784) to Unnamed (TLID:88626753), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88626753) to Unnamed (TLID:88623032), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88623032) to Robertson Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Robertson Blvd to Burton Way, and proceeding westerly along Burton Way to Unnamed (TLID:88623579), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88623579) to Unnamed (TLID:88623613), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88623613) to Unnamed (TLID:88624195), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88624195) to Unnamed (TLID:88624217), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88624217) to Unnamed (TLID:88624550), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88624550) to Unnamed (TLID:88624640), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88624640) to Unnamed (TLID:88624665), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88624665) to Unnamed (TLID:88625698), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88625698) to Unnamed (TLID:88625726), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88625726) to Unnamed (TLID:88625815), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88625815) to Unnamed (TLID:88625834), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88625834) to Unnamed (TLID:88625855), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88625855) to N George Burns Rd, and proceeding northerly along N George Burns Rd to Unnamed (TLID:88628848), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88628848) to Unnamed (TLID:88629070), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88629070) to Unnamed (TLID:88629088), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88629088) to Unnamed (TLID:88629163), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88629163) to Unnamed (TLID:88629491), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88629491) to Unnamed (TLID:88629504), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88629504) to Beverly Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Beverly Blvd to Beverly Pl, and proceeding easterly along Beverly Pl to Unnamed (TLID:88630361), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88630361) to Unnamed (TLID:92761140), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92761140) to Westmount Dr, and proceeding southerly along Westmount Dr to Unnamed (TLID:92761180), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92761180) to Unnamed (TLID:92761195), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92761195) to Unnamed (TLID:92761208), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92761208) to Rosewood Ave, and proceeding easterly along Rosewood Ave to N Alfred St, and proceeding northerly along N Alfred St to Clinton St, and proceeding easterly along Clinton St to N Croft Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Croft Ave to Rosewood Ave, and proceeding easterly along Rosewood Ave to N Sweetzer Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Sweetzer Ave to Unnamed (TLID:92776787), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92776787) to Unnamed (TLID:92776756), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92776756) to Unnamed (TLID:92776397), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92776397) to Unnamed (TLID:92776344), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92776344) to Unnamed (TLID:92776325), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92776325) to Unnamed (TLID:92762150), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92762150) to N la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding northerly along N la Cienega Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:92761828), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92761828) to Unnamed (TLID:92763743), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92763743) to Unnamed (TLID:92764136), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92764136) to Unnamed (TLID:92777856), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92777856) to N Croft Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Croft Ave to Unnamed (TLID:92777894), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92777894) to Unnamed (TLID:92778240), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92778240) to Unnamed (TLID:92778285), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92778285) to Unnamed (TLID:92777838), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92777838) to Unnamed (TLID:92776731), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92776731) to Unnamed (TLID:92776719), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92776719) to Unnamed (TLID:92776806), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92776806) to Unnamed (TLID:92776837), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92776837) to Unnamed (TLID:92776871), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92776871) to Unnamed (TLID:92776884), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92776884) to Unnamed (TLID:92777379), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92777379) to N Sweetzer Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Sweetzer Ave to Willoughby Ave, and proceeding easterly along Willoughby Ave to Unnamed (TLID:92779062), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92779062) to Unnamed
(TLID:92780888), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92780888) to Unnamed (TLID:92780922), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92780922) to Unnamed (TLID:92780959), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92780959) to Unnamed (TLID:92781046), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92781046) to Romaine St, and proceeding easterly along Romaine St to N Hayworth Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Hayworth Ave to Willoughby Ave, and proceeding easterly along Willoughby Ave to W Willoughby Ave, and proceeding easterly along W Willoughby Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93217241), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93217241) to Unnamed (TLID:93217260), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93217260) to Unnamed (TLID:93217683), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93217683) to Romaine St, and proceeding easterly along Romaine St to N Fuller Ave, and proceeding easterly along N Fuller Ave to Romaine St, and proceeding easterly along Romaine St to N la Brea Ave, and proceeding southerly along N la Brea Ave to Willoughby Ave, and proceeding easterly along Willoughby Ave to N Highland Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Highland Ave to S Highland Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Highland Ave to W 4th St, and proceeding westerly along W 4th St to la Brea Ave, and proceeding northerly along la Brea Ave to W 3rd St, and proceeding westerly along W 3rd St to S Gardner St, and proceeding northerly along S Gardner St to N Gardner St, and proceeding northerly along N Gardner St to Beverly Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Beverly Blvd to N Fairfax Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Fairfax Ave to S Fairfax Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Fairfax Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88640466), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88640466) to S Fairfax Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Fairfax Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88640376), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88640376) to S Fairfax Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Fairfax Ave to W Pico Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W Pico Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88631249), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88631249) to W Pico Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W Pico Blvd to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding southerly along S la Cienega Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88597446), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88597446) to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding southerly along S la Cienega Blvd to E Santa Monica Fwy, and proceeding southerly along E Santa Monica Fwy to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding southerly along S la Cienega Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88596977), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88596977) to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding southerly along S la Cienega Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88596391), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88596391) to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding southerly along S la Cienega Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88596227), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88596227) to Unnamed (TLID:88596180), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88596180) to Unnamed (TLID:88596174), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88596174) to Unnamed (TLID:88595807), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88595807) to Unnamed (TLID:88595771), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88595771) to Unnamed (TLID:88595157), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88595157) to Unnamed (TLID:88595104), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88595104) to Unnamed (TLID:88593391), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88593391) to Unnamed (TLID:88593308), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88593308) to Unnamed (TLID:88592926), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88592926) to Unnamed (TLID:88592860), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88592860) to Unnamed (TLID:88590664), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88590664) to Unnamed (TLID:88590569), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88590569) to Unnamed (TLID:88590125), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88590125) to Unnamed (TLID:88583061), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88583061) to Unnamed (TLID:88583043), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88583043) to Unnamed (TLID:88582365), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88582365) to Unnamed (TLID:88582324), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88582324) to Unnamed (TLID:88581924), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88581924) to Unnamed (TLID:88581860), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88581860) to Unnamed (TLID:88581774), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88581774) to Unnamed (TLID:88540168), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88540168) to Unnamed (TLID:88540114), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88540114) to Unnamed (TLID:88539636), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88539636) to Unnamed (TLID:88539568), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88539568) to Unnamed (TLID:88539019), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88539019) to Unnamed (TLID:88538998), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88538998) to Unnamed (TLID:88539446), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88539446) to Unnamed (TLID:88538885), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88538885) to Unnamed (TLID:88537901), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88537901) to Unnamed (TLID:88537836), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88537836) to Unnamed (TLID:88537339), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88537339) to Unnamed (TLID:88537278), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88537278) to Hughes Ave, and proceeding southerly along Hughes

Ave to Washington Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Washington Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88536034), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88536034) to Unnamed (TLID:88536028), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88536028) to Unnamed (TLID:88534251), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88534251) to Unnamed (TLID:88533939), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88533939) to Jasmine Ave, and proceeding southerly along Jasmine Ave to Washington Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Washington Blvd to Overland Ave, and proceeding northerly along Overland Ave to Venice Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Venice Blvd to Westwood Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Westwood Blvd to Venice Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Venice Blvd to Midvale Ave, and proceeding westerly along Midvale Ave to Venice Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Venice Blvd to College Ave, and proceeding westerly along College Ave to Venice Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Venice Blvd to Huron Ave, and proceeding westerly along Huron Ave to Venice Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Venice Blvd to I- 405 , and proceeding northerly along I- 405 to Venice Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Venice Blvd to Tuller Ave, and proceeding northerly along Tuller Ave to Regent St, and proceeding easterly along Regent St to S Sepulveda Blvd, and proceeding northerly along S Sepulveda Blvd to Charnock Rd, and proceeding easterly along Charnock Rd to Unnamed (TLID:88521484), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88521484) to Charnock Rd, and proceeding easterly along Charnock Rd to Overland Ave, and proceeding northerly along Overland Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88526980), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88526980) to National Blvd, and proceeding westerly along National Blvd to I405, and proceeding northerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:88373512), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88373512) to I- 405, and proceeding northerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:88374334), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88374334) to San Diego Fwy, and proceeding northerly along San Diego Fwy to I- 405, and proceeding northerly along I- 405 to San Diego Fwy, and proceeding northerly along San Diego Fwy to Unnamed (TLID:88380333), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88380333) to S Sepulveda Blvd, and proceeding northerly along S Sepulveda Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88384610), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88384610) to Unnamed (TLID:88384918), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88384918) to Veteran Ave, and proceeding northerly along Veteran Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88386160), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88386160) to Unnamed (TLID:88346790), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88346790) to Unnamed (TLID:88346691), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88346691) to Unnamed (TLID:88346685), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88346685) to Unnamed (TLID:88346630), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88346630) to I405, and proceeding northerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:88344041), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88344041) to I- 405, and proceeding northerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:88343963), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88343963) to I- 405, and proceeding northerly along I- 405 to Getty Center Dr, and proceeding westerly along Getty Center Dr to I- 405 , and proceeding northerly along I- 405 to N Sepulveda Blvd, and proceeding westerly along N Sepulveda Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:92561036), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92561036) to N Sepulveda Blvd, and proceeding northerly along N Sepulveda Blvd to Sepulveda Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Sepulveda Blvd to Mulholland Dr, and proceeding westerly along Mulholland Dr to Unnamed (TLID:82496220), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82496220) to the point of beginning.

Sixth District.
The region bounded and described as follows: Beginning at the point of intersection of Saticoy St and White Oak Ave, and proceeding easterly along Saticoy St to Louise Ave, and proceeding northerly along Louise Ave to Roscoe Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Roscoe Blvd to Bull Crk, and proceeding northerly along Bull Crk to Southern Pacific RR, and proceeding easterly along Southern Pacific RR to Roscoe Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Roscoe Blvd to I- 405, and proceeding northerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:92917096), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92917096) to Rayen St, and proceeding easterly along Rayen St to Unnamed (TLID:92924067), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92924067) to Rayen St, and proceeding easterly along Rayen St to Noble Ave, and proceeding northerly along Noble Ave to Nordhoff St, and proceeding easterly along Nordhoff St to Unnamed (TLID:92927816), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92927816) to Unnamed (TLID:92927835), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92927835) to Unnamed (TLID:92928409), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92928409) to Unnamed (TLID:92971213), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92971213) to Unnamed (TLID:92971569), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92971569) to Unnamed (TLID:92971603), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92971603) to Unnamed (TLID:92971701), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92971701) to Unnamed (TLID:92971758), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92971758) to East Canyon Chnnl, and proceeding northerly along East Canyon Chnnl to Lassen St, and proceeding easterly along

Lassen St to W Lassen St, and proceeding easterly along W Lassen St to Woodman Ave, and proceeding northerly along Woodman Ave to East Canyon Chnnl, and proceeding northerly along East Canyon Chnnl to Pacoima Diversion Chnnl, and proceeding northerly along Pacoima Diversion Chnnl to Unnamed (TLID:92983168), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92983168) to Pacoima Wash, and proceeding northerly along Pacoima Wash to I- 5, and proceeding southerly along I- 5 to Unnamed (TLID:92985319), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92985319) to Unnamed (TLID:92982728), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92982728) to I- 5, and proceeding southerly along I- 5 to Branford St, and proceeding easterly along Branford St to Unnamed (TLID:93133473), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93133473) to Unnamed (TLID:93133793), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93133793) to Unnamed (TLID:93133799), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93133799) to Unnamed (TLID:93133853), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93133853) to Unnamed (TLID:93133865), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93133865) to Unnamed (TLID:93134092), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93134092) to Wentworth St, and proceeding southerly along Wentworth St to Sheldon St, and proceeding easterly along Sheldon St to Dronfield Ave, and proceeding southerly along Dronfield Ave to Art St, and proceeding easterly along Art St to Stonehurst Ave, and proceeding southerly along Stonehurst Ave to Peoria St, and proceeding westerly along Peoria St to Elinda Pl, and proceeding southerly along Elinda Pl to Elinda Way, and proceeding easterly along Elinda Way to Clybourn Ave, and proceeding southerly along Clybourn Ave to Hansen Heights Chnnl, and proceeding easterly along Hansen Heights Chnnl to Stonehurst Ave, and proceeding southerly along Stonehurst Ave to Sunland Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Sunland Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:93131151), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93131151) to Sunland Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Sunland Blvd to Glenoaks Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Glenoaks Blvd to Roscoe Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Roscoe Blvd to I-5, and proceeding westerly along I- 5 to Sunland Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Sunland Blvd to Vineland Ave, and proceeding southerly along Vineland Ave to Saticoy St, and proceeding westerly along Saticoy St to Laurel Canyon Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Laurel Canyon Blvd to Roscoe Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Roscoe Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:93096944), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93096944) to Roscoe Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Roscoe Blvd to Tujunga Wash, and proceeding southerly along Tujunga Wash to Southern Pacific RR, and proceeding westerly along Southern Pacific RR to Van Nuys Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Van Nuys Blvd to Sherman Way, and proceeding easterly along Sherman Way to Hazeltine Ave, and proceeding southerly along Hazeltine Ave to Vanowen St, and proceeding westerly along Vanowen St to Sylmar Ave, and proceeding southerly along Sylmar Ave to Gilmore St, and proceeding easterly along Gilmore St to Hazeltine Ave, and proceeding southerly along Hazeltine Ave to Oxnard St, and proceeding westerly along Oxnard St to Unnamed (TLID:92660361), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92660361) to Unnamed (TLID:92660355), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92660355) to I- 405, and proceeding southerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:92649950), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92649950) to I- 405, and proceeding southerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:92648540), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92648540) to I- 405, and proceeding southerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:92648449), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92648449) to I- 405, and proceeding westerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:92648024), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92648024) to Unnamed (TLID:92647924), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92647924) to Unnamed (TLID:92647903), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92647903) to Unnamed (TLID:92647871), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92647871) to Unnamed (TLID:92647058), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92647058) to Unnamed (TLID:92647026), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92647026) to Ventura Fwy, and proceeding westerly along Ventura Fwy to Unnamed (TLID:82577374), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82577374) to Unnamed (TLID:82577323), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82577323) to Unnamed (TLID:82577243), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82577243) to Hayvenhurst Ave, and proceeding northerly along Hayvenhurst Ave to Burbank Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Burbank Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:82567796), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82567796) to Wish Ave, and proceeding northerly along Wish Ave to Unnamed (TLID:82581513), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82581513) to Oxnard St, and proceeding westerly along Oxnard St to Unnamed (TLID:82579117), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82579117) to Unnamed (TLID:82579127), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82579127) to Unnamed (TLID:82579186), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82579186) to White Oak Ave, and proceeding northerly along White Oak Ave to the point of beginning.

Seventh District.

The region bounded and described as follows: 1. Beginning at the point of intersection of Unnamed (TLID:82842071) and I- 5, and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82842071) to Unnamed (TLID:82842138), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82842138) to Unnamed (TLID:82842175), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82842175) to Unnamed (TLID:82842212), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82842212) to Unnamed (TLID:82849856), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82849856) to Unnamed (TLID:82850008), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82850008) to Unnamed (TLID:82850094), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82850094) to Unnamed (TLID:82850155), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82850155) to Unnamed (TLID:82850193), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82850193) to Unnamed (TLID:82850623), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82850623) to Unnamed (TLID:93021041), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93021041) to Unnamed (TLID:93021318), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93021318) to Unnamed (TLID:93021325), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93021325) to Unnamed (TLID:93021347), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93021347) to Unnamed (TLID:93021877), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93021877) to Unnamed (TLID:93021901), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93021901) to Unnamed (TLID:93029623), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93029623) to Unnamed (TLID:93029664), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93029664) to Unnamed (TLID:93031024), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93031024) to Unnamed (TLID:93031939), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93031939) to Unnamed (TLID:93032164), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93032164) to Unnamed (TLID:93032215), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93032215) to Unnamed (TLID:93069284), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93069284) to Unnamed (TLID:93069609), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93069609) to Unnamed (TLID:93070287), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93070287) to Unnamed (TLID:93070738), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93070738) to Unnamed (TLID:93071091), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93071091) to Unnamed (TLID:93076307), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93076307) to Unnamed (TLID:93077926), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93077926) to Unnamed (TLID:93077974), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93077974) to Unnamed (TLID:93078041), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93078041) to Unnamed (TLID:93078838), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93078838) to Unnamed (TLID:93171263), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93171263) to Unnamed (TLID:93171269), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93171269) to Unnamed (TLID:93171275), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93171275) to Unnamed (TLID:93171294), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93171294) to Unnamed (TLID:93171752), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93171752) to Unnamed (TLID:93171726), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93171726) to Unnamed (TLID:93171389), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93171389) to May Canyon Tktr, and proceeding westerly along May Canyon Tktr to Unnamed (TLID:93171233), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93171233) to Unnamed (TLID:93171319), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93171319) to Unnamed (TLID:93171383), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93171383) to Unnamed (TLID:93172257), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93172257) to Unnamed (TLID:93172448), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93172448) to Unnamed (TLID:93172470), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93172470) to Unnamed (TLID:93172483), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93172483) to Unnamed (TLID:93172313), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93172313) to Unnamed (TLID:93172839), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93172839) to Unnamed (TLID:93172861), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93172861) to Unnamed (TLID:93172874), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93172874) to Unnamed (TLID:93172880), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93172880) to Unnamed (TLID:93173819), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93173819) to Unnamed (TLID:93182724), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93182724) to Unnamed (TLID:93182730), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93182730) to Unnamed (TLID:93182682), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93182682) to Unnamed (TLID:93182565), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93182565) to Unnamed (TLID:93178240), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93178240) to Unnamed (TLID:93178228), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93178228) to Unnamed (TLID:93178215), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93178215) to Unnamed (TLID:93178165), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93178165) to Unnamed (TLID:93179941), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93179941) to Unnamed (TLID:93178839), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93178839) to Unnamed (TLID:93179833), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93179833) to Unnamed (TLID:93179905), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93179905) to Unnamed (TLID:93179915), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed
(TLID:93179915) to Unnamed (TLID:93181725), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93181725) to Unnamed (TLID:93181832), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93181832) to Unnamed (TLID:93181797), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93181797) to Unnamed (TLID:93181311), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93181311) to Unnamed (TLID:93181305), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93181305) to Unnamed (TLID:93181283), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93181283) to Unnamed (TLID:93181191), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93181191) to Unnamed (TLID:93181112), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93181112) to Unnamed (TLID:93179360), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93179360) to Unnamed (TLID:93179226), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93179226) to Unnamed (TLID:93178889), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93178889) to Harding St, and proceeding southerly along Harding St to Unnamed (TLID:93178857), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93178857) to Harding St, and proceeding southerly along Harding St to Pacoima Canyon Rd, and proceeding southerly along Pacoima Canyon Rd to Unnamed (TLID:93176982), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93176982) to Unnamed (TLID:93176856), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93176856) to Unnamed (TLID:93176850), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93176850) to Boy Scout Lower Mtwy, and proceeding southerly along Boy Scout Lower Mtwy to Unnamed (TLID:93176216), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93176216) to Unnamed (TLID:93176197), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93176197) to Unnamed (TLID:93174990), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93174990) to Unnamed (TLID:93174984), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93174984) to Unnamed (TLID:93174963), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93174963) to Unnamed (TLID:93174957), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93174957) to Unnamed (TLID:93174840), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93174840) to Unnamed (TLID:93162998), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93162998) to Unnamed (TLID:93163005), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93163005) to Unnamed (TLID:93163059), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93163059) to Unnamed (TLID:93162434), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93162434) to Unnamed (TLID:93162310), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93162310) to Unnamed (TLID:93162246), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93162246) to Unnamed (TLID:93162200), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93162200) to Unnamed (TLID:93161684), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93161684) to Unnamed (TLID:93161046), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93161046) to Unnamed (TLID:93151739), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93151739) to Unnamed (TLID:93151630), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93151630) to Unnamed (TLID:93147947), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93147947) to Unnamed (TLID:93148018), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93148018) to Unnamed (TLID:93147971), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93147971) to Unnamed (TLID:93147953), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93147953) to Unnamed (TLID:93147579), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93147579) to Unnamed (TLID:93148062), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93148062) to Unnamed (TLID:93148133), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93148133) to Unnamed (TLID:93147505), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93147505) to Unnamed (TLID:93147511), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93147511) to Unnamed (TLID:93154980), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93154980) to Unnamed (TLID:93155002), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93155002) to Unnamed (TLID:93155091), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93155091) to Unnamed (TLID:93155367), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93155367) to Unnamed (TLID:93155379), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93155379) to Unnamed (TLID:93155956), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93155956) to Unnamed (TLID:93155962), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93155962) to Unnamed (TLID:93155998), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93155998) to Unnamed (TLID:93156069), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93156069) to Unnamed (TLID:93156103), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93156103) to Unnamed (TLID:93156877), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93156877) to Unnamed (TLID:93156978), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93156978) to Unnamed (TLID:93156993), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93156993) to Unnamed (TLID:93157065), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93157065) to Unnamed (TLID:93157682), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93157682) to Unnamed (TLID:93157807), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93157807) to Unnamed (TLID:93161741), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93161741) to Unnamed (TLID:93161773), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93161773) to Unnamed (TLID:93163831), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93163831) to Unnamed (TLID:93163937), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93163937) to Unnamed (TLID:93164309), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93164309) to Unnamed (TLID:93164651),
and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93164651) to Unnamed (TLID:93191141), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93191141) to Unnamed (TLID:93191190), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93191190) to Unnamed (TLID:93191226), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93191226) to Unnamed (TLID:93190967), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93190967) to Unnamed (TLID:93190940), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93190940) to Unnamed (TLID:93187296), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93187296) to Los Angeles City Dump Rd, and proceeding westerly along Los Angeles City Dump Rd to Unnamed (TLID:93187272), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93187272) to Unnamed (TLID:93187190), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93187190) to Unnamed (TLID:93187184), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93187184) to Unnamed (TLID:93187216), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93187216) to Unnamed (TLID:93187247), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93187247) to Unnamed (TLID:93188817), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93188817) to Unnamed (TLID:93188784), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93188784) to Unnamed (TLID:93195948), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93195948) to Unnamed (TLID:93196257), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93196257) to Unnamed (TLID:93196317), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93196317) to Unnamed (TLID:93196330), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93196330) to Unnamed (TLID:93197358), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93197358) to Unnamed (TLID:93197437), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93197437) to East Trl, and proceeding northerly along East Trl to Unnamed (TLID:93197823), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93197823) to Unnamed (TLID:93197909), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93197909) to Unnamed (TLID:93197916), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93197916) to Unnamed (TLID:93197972), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93197972) to Unnamed (TLID:93197978), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93197978) to Unnamed (TLID:93197832), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93197832) to Unnamed (TLID:93196677), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93196677) to Unnamed (TLID:93196697), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93196697) to Unnamed (TLID:93197089), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93197089) to Unnamed (TLID:93197176), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93197176) to Unnamed (TLID:93197185), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93197185) to Unnamed (TLID:93197201), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93197201) to Unnamed (TLID:93197253), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93197253) to Unnamed (TLID:93197238), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93197238) to Unnamed (TLID:93199257), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93199257) to Unnamed (TLID:93199274), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93199274) to Unnamed (TLID:93199478), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93199478) to Unnamed (TLID:93199493), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93199493) to Unnamed (TLID:93701529), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93701529) to Unnamed (TLID:93701843), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93701843) to Unnamed (TLID:93701980), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93701980) to Unnamed (TLID:93702173), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93702173) to Unnamed (TLID:93702208), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93702208) to Unnamed (TLID:93702400), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93702400) to Unnamed (TLID:93702410), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93702410) to Unnamed (TLID:93702475), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93702475) to Unnamed (TLID:93703302), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93703302) to Unnamed (TLID:93707857), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93707857) to Unnamed (TLID:93707950), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93707950) to Unnamed (TLID:93709556), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93709556) to Unnamed (TLID:93709755), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93709755) to Unnamed (TLID:93710429), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93710429) to Unnamed (TLID:93726027), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93726027) to Unnamed (TLID:93726238), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93726238) to Unnamed (TLID:93726639), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93726639) to Unnamed (TLID:93726698), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93726698) to Unnamed (TLID:93726773), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93726773) to Unnamed (TLID:93727988), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93727988) to Unnamed (TLID:93728078), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93728078) to Unnamed (TLID:93728412), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93728412) to Unnamed (TLID:93728496), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93728496) to Unnamed (TLID:93731181), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93731181) to Unnamed (TLID:93733804), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93733804) to Unnamed (TLID:93733926), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93733926) to Unnamed (TLID:93827631), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93827631) to Unnamed (TLID:93828479), and proceeding southerly along

Unnamed (TLID:93828479) to Unnamed (TLID:93828488), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93828488) to Unnamed (TLID:93826858), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93826858) to Unnamed (TLID:93826761), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93826761) to Unnamed (TLID:93826379), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93826379) to Unnamed (TLID:93826887), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93826887) to Unnamed (TLID:93827252), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93827252) to Unnamed (TLID:93830643), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93830643) to Unnamed (TLID:93831361), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93831361) to Unnamed (TLID:93840458), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93840458) to Unnamed (TLID:93841411), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93841411) to Unnamed (TLID:93843419), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93843419) to Unnamed (TLID:93843794), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93843794) to Unnamed (TLID:93824937), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93824937) to Unnamed (TLID:93824671), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93824671) to Unnamed (TLID:93824249), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93824249) to Unnamed (TLID:93824660), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93824660) to Unnamed (TLID:93821830), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93821830) to Unnamed (TLID:93820376), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93820376) to Unnamed (TLID:93820256), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93820256) to Unnamed (TLID:93820236), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93820236) to Unnamed (TLID:93817848), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93817848) to Unnamed (TLID:93817800), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93817800) to Unnamed (TLID:93817775), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93817775) to Unnamed (TLID:93778396), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93778396) to Unnamed (TLID:93777245), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93777245) to Unnamed (TLID:93775482), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93775482) to Unnamed (TLID:93775443), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93775443) to Unnamed (TLID:93775088), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93775088) to Unnamed (TLID:93775012), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93775012) to Unnamed (TLID:93775024), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93775024) to Unnamed (TLID:93775006), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93775006) to Lowell Ave, and proceeding southerly along Lowell Ave to el Caminito St, and proceeding southerly along el Caminito St to Lowell Ave, and proceeding southerly along Lowell Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93774462), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93774462) to Lowell Ave, and proceeding southerly along Lowell Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93758473), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93758473) to Lowell Ave, and proceeding southerly along Lowell Ave to Foothill Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Foothill Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:93758385), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93758385) to Unnamed (TLID:93758315), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93758315) to Unnamed (TLID:93757888), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93757888) to Unnamed (TLID:93757794), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93757794) to Unnamed (TLID:93757776), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93757776) to Unnamed (TLID:93755590), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93755590) to Unnamed (TLID:93755544), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93755544) to Unnamed (TLID:93755502), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93755502) to Unnamed (TLID:93755496), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93755496) to Unnamed (TLID:93755405), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93755405) to Unnamed (TLID:93755145), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93755145) to Unnamed (TLID:93754950), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93754950) to Unnamed (TLID:93751442), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93751442) to Unnamed (TLID:93751418), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93751418) to Unnamed (TLID:93750392), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93750392) to Unnamed (TLID:93745662), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93745662) to Unnamed (TLID:93745532), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93745532) to Unnamed (TLID:93744247), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93744247) to Unnamed (TLID:93744085), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93744085) to Unnamed (TLID:93744029), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93744029) to Unnamed (TLID:93743933), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93743933) to Unnamed (TLID:93743927), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93743927) to Unnamed (TLID:93679146), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93679146) to Unnamed (TLID:93678746), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93678746) to Unnamed (TLID:93678113), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93678113) to Unnamed (TLID:93678103), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93678103) to Unnamed (TLID:93677923), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93677923) to Unnamed (TLID:93675483), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93675483) to Unnamed (TLID:93675227), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93675227) to Unnamed
(TLID:93674716), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93674716) to Unnamed (TLID:93674581), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93674581) to Unnamed (TLID:93674277), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93674277) to Unnamed (TLID:93659002), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93659002) to Unnamed (TLID:93658909), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93658909) to Unnamed (TLID:93658736), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93658736) to Unnamed (TLID:93656554), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93656554) to Unnamed (TLID:93656496), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93656496) to Unnamed (TLID:93656458), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93656458) to Unnamed (TLID:93655756), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93655756) to Unnamed (TLID:93654575), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93654575) to Unnamed (TLID:93654165), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93654165) to Unnamed (TLID:93654082), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93654082) to Unnamed (TLID:93649678), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93649678) to Unnamed (TLID:93649613), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93649613) to Unnamed (TLID:93649667), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93649667) to Unnamed (TLID:93650545), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93650545) to Unnamed (TLID:93656386), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93656386) to Unnamed (TLID:93656449), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93656449) to Unnamed (TLID:93656415), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93656415) to Unnamed (TLID:93650649), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93650649) to Unnamed (TLID:93651495), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93651495) to Unnamed (TLID:93650690), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93650690) to Unnamed (TLID:93132542), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93132542) to Vinedale St, and proceeding westerly along Vinedale St to Glenoaks Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Glenoaks Blvd to Sunland Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Sunland Blvd to Hansen Heights Chnnl, and proceeding westerly along Hansen Heights Chnnl to Clybourn Ave, and proceeding northerly along Clybourn Ave to Elinda Way, and proceeding westerly along Elinda Way to Elinda Pl, and proceeding northerly along Elinda Pl to Peoria St, and proceeding easterly along Peoria St to Stonehurst Ave, and proceeding northerly along Stonehurst Ave to Art St, and proceeding westerly along Art St to Dronfield Ave, and proceeding northerly along Dronfield Ave to Sheldon St, and proceeding westerly along Sheldon St to Wentworth St, and proceeding northerly along Wentworth St to Unnamed (TLID:93134092), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93134092) to Unnamed (TLID:93133865), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93133865) to Unnamed (TLID:93133853), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93133853) to Unnamed (TLID:93133799), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93133799) to Unnamed (TLID:93133793), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93133793) to Unnamed (TLID:93133473), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93133473) to Branford St, and proceeding westerly along Branford St to I- 5 , and proceeding northerly along I- 5 to Unnamed (TLID:92982728), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92982728) to I- 5, and proceeding northerly along I- 5 to Pacoima Wash, and proceeding southerly along Pacoima Wash to Unnamed (TLID:92983168), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92983168) to Pacoima Diversion Chnnl, and proceeding southerly along Pacoima Diversion Chnnl to East Canyon Chnnl, and proceeding westerly along East Canyon Chnnl to Woodman Ave, and proceeding southerly along Woodman Ave to W Lassen St, and proceeding westerly along W Lassen St to Lassen St , and proceeding westerly along Lassen St to East Canyon Chnnl, and proceeding southerly along East Canyon Chnnl to Unnamed (TLID:92971701), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92971701) to Unnamed (TLID:92971603), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92971603) to Unnamed (TLID:92971569), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92971569) to Unnamed (TLID:92971213), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92971213) to Unnamed (TLID:92928409), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92928409) to Unnamed (TLID:92927835), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92927835) to Unnamed (TLID:92927816), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92927816) to Nordhoff St, and proceeding westerly along Nordhoff St to Noble Ave, and proceeding southerly along Noble Ave to Rayen St, and proceeding westerly along Rayen St to Unnamed (TLID:92924067), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92924067) to Rayen St, and proceeding westerly along Rayen St to Unnamed (TLID:92917096), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:92917096) to I- 405, and proceeding northerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:92947261), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:92947261) to I- 405, and proceeding northerly along I- 405 to I- 5 , and proceeding northerly along I- 5 to Unnamed (TLID:93014921), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93014921) to I-5, and proceeding northerly along I- 5 to Unnamed (TLID:82846162), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82846162) to I-5, and proceeding westerly along I- 5 to the point of beginning. 2. Except for beginning at the point of intersection of Unnamed (TLID:93036043) and Unnamed (TLID:93036287), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93036043) to Unnamed (TLID:93035989), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed
(TLID:93035989) to Pearwood Ave, and proceeding southerly along Pearwood Ave to Cork St, and proceeding easterly along Cork St to Unnamed (TLID:93034427), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93034427) to Unnamed (TLID:93034523), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93034523) to Unnamed (TLID:93034514), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93034514) to Unnamed (TLID:93034536), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93034536) to Unnamed (TLID:93035381), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93035381) to Unnamed (TLID:93035413), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93035413) to Unnamed (TLID:93035065), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93035065) to Unnamed (TLID:93038532), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93038532) to Unnamed (TLID:93038590), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93038590) to Unnamed (TLID:93038565), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93038565) to Unnamed (TLID:92987189), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92987189) to Unnamed (TLID:92987207), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92987207) to Fox St, and proceeding easterly along Fox St to Tiffany Ave, and proceeding northerly along Tiffany Ave to Fox St, and proceeding easterly along Fox St to Unnamed (TLID:93051291), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93051291) to Unnamed (TLID:93051392), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93051392) to Unnamed (TLID:93051425), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93051425) to 4th St, and proceeding northerly along 4th St to Unnamed (TLID:93054478), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93054478) to Unnamed (TLID:93054670), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93054670) to Unnamed (TLID:93056512), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93056512) to Unnamed (TLID:93056588), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93056588) to Unnamed (TLID:93056658), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93056658) to Unnamed (TLID:93143696), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93143696) to Unnamed (TLID:93144006), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93144006) to Unnamed (TLID:93144619), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93144619) to Unnamed (TLID:93144699), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93144699) to Unnamed (TLID:93144734), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93144734) to Unnamed (TLID:93148860), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93148860) to Unnamed (TLID:93148877), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93148877) to Unnamed (TLID:93149207), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93149207) to Unnamed (TLID:93149182), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93149182) to Unnamed (TLID:93148721), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93148721) to Unnamed (TLID:93061884), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93061884) to Unnamed (TLID:93061843), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93061843) to Unnamed (TLID:93062475), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93062475) to Unnamed (TLID:93062387), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93062387) to Unnamed (TLID:93062403), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93062403) to Unnamed (TLID:93062349), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93062349) to Unnamed (TLID:93062334), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93062334) to Unnamed (TLID:93060187), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93060187) to Unnamed (TLID:93060332), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93060332) to Unnamed (TLID:93060283), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93060283) to Unnamed (TLID:93059752), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93059752) to Unnamed (TLID:93059727), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93059727) to Unnamed (TLID:93059696), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93059696) to Unnamed (TLID:93059171), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93059171) to Unnamed (TLID:93059126), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93059126) to Unnamed (TLID:93057388), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93057388) to Unnamed (TLID:93057335), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93057335) to Unnamed (TLID:93048375), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93048375) to Unnamed (TLID:93047905), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93047905) to Unnamed (TLID:93047883), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93047883) to Unnamed (TLID:93047877), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93047877) to Unnamed (TLID:93047756), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93047756) to Unnamed (TLID:93047720), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93047720) to Unnamed (TLID:93047237), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93047237) to Unnamed (TLID:93047230), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93047230) to 4th St, and proceeding northerly along 4th St to Unnamed (TLID:93047023), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93047023) to Unnamed (TLID:93046611), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93046611) to Unnamed (TLID:93038234), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93038234) to Unnamed (TLID:93038216), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93038216) to Unnamed (TLID:93038169), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93038169) to Unnamed (TLID:93038096), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93038096) to Unnamed (TLID:93038090), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed
(TLID:93038090) to Unnamed (TLID:93038106), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93038106) to Meyer St, and proceeding westerly along Meyer St to S Meyer St, and proceeding westerly along S Meyer St to Jackman Ave, and proceeding southerly along Jackman Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93036287), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93036287) to the point of beginning.

Eighth District.
The region bounded and described as follows: Beginning at the point of intersection of Unnamed (TLID:88472844) and Centinela Crk, and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88472844) to W Centinela Ave, and proceeding easterly along W Centinela Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88490880), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88490880) to Unnamed (TLID:88490921), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88490921) to Unnamed (TLID:88510013), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88510013) to W 64th St, and proceeding easterly along W 64th St to Flight Ave, and proceeding northerly along Flight Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88510403), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88510403) to Unnamed (TLID:88510428), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88510428) to Unnamed (TLID:88510434), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88510434) to Unnamed (TLID:88510441), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88510441) to Unnamed (TLID:88511302), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88511302) to Unnamed (TLID:88511584), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88511584) to Unnamed (TLID:88511749), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88511749) to Unnamed (TLID:88511775), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88511775) to Unnamed (TLID:88513426), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88513426) to Unnamed (TLID:88513796), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88513796) to Unnamed (TLID:88513908), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88513908) to Unnamed (TLID:88513926), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88513926) to Unnamed (TLID:88515112), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88515112) to Unnamed (TLID:88515137), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88515137) to Unnamed (TLID:88515352), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88515352) to Unnamed (TLID:88515743), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88515743) to Unnamed (TLID:89198215), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89198215) to Unnamed (TLID:89198288), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89198288) to Unnamed (TLID:89198763), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89198763) to Unnamed (TLID:89198841), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89198841) to Unnamed (TLID:89199617), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89199617) to Unnamed (TLID:89199946), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89199946) to Unnamed (TLID:89200125), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89200125) to Unnamed (TLID:89200143), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89200143) to Unnamed (TLID:89200213), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89200213) to Unnamed (TLID:89200226), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89200226) to Unnamed (TLID:89200544), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89200544) to Unnamed (TLID:89201588), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89201588) to Unnamed (TLID:89202107), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89202107) to Unnamed (TLID:89203996), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89203996) to Unnamed (TLID:89204435), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89204435) to Unnamed (TLID:89204950), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89204950) to Unnamed (TLID:89205257), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89205257) to Unnamed (TLID:89205366), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89205366) to Unnamed (TLID:89205404), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89205404) to Unnamed (TLID:89205423), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89205423) to Unnamed (TLID:89203950), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89203950) to Unnamed (TLID:89213352), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89213352) to Unnamed (TLID:89213439), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89213439) to Unnamed (TLID:89213973), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89213973) to Unnamed (TLID:89215551), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89215551) to W Slauson Ave, and proceeding westerly along W Slauson Ave to Deane Ave, and proceeding northerly along Deane Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89215569), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89215569) to Unnamed (TLID:89215614), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89215614) to Unnamed (TLID:89215983), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89215983) to Unnamed (TLID:89216030), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89216030) to Unnamed (TLID:89216065), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89216065) to Unnamed (TLID:89216108), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89216108) to Unnamed (TLID:89216153), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89216153) to Unnamed (TLID:89217836), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89217836) to Unnamed (TLID:89222434), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89222434) to Unnamed (TLID:89222770), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89222770) to Unnamed
(TLID:89223367), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89223367) to Unnamed (TLID:89223417), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89223417) to Unnamed (TLID:89223631), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89223631) to W Vernon Ave, and proceeding easterly along W Vernon Ave to Arlington Ave, and proceeding northerly along Arlington Ave to W Jefferson Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Jefferson Blvd to S Western Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Western Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89315947), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89315947) to S Western Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Western Ave to I- 10, and proceeding easterly along I- 10 to E Santa Monica Fwy, and proceeding easterly along E Santa Monica Fwy to I- 10, and proceeding easterly along I- 10 to I-110, and proceeding southerly along I- 110 to S Figueroa St, and proceeding southerly along S Figueroa St to Unnamed (TLID:89477595), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89477595) to S Figueroa St, and proceeding southerly along S Figueroa St to W Adams Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W Adams Blvd to Ellendale Pl, and proceeding southerly along Ellendale Pl to W 29th St, and proceeding westerly along W 29th St to S Vermont Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Vermont Ave to Martin Luther King Jr Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Martin Luther King Jr Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:89382544), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89382544) to Martin Luther King Jr Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Martin Luther King Jr Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:89385919), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89385919) to Martin Luther King Jr Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Martin Luther King Jr Blvd to I- 110, and proceeding southerly along I- 110 to N Harbor Fwy, and proceeding southerly along N Harbor Fwy to I- 110, and proceeding southerly along I- 110 to Unnamed (TLID:89356310), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89356310) to I- 110, and proceeding southerly along I- 110 to W 92nd St, and proceeding westerly along W 92nd St to Orchard Ave, and proceeding northerly along Orchard Ave to W 91st St, and proceeding westerly along W 91st St to S Vermont Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Vermont Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89352694), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89352694) to Unnamed (TLID:89352651), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89352651) to Unnamed (TLID:89243474), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89243474) to Unnamed (TLID:89243403), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89243403) to Unnamed (TLID:89242814), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89242814) to Unnamed (TLID:89242725), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89242725) to S Normandie Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Normandie Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89242339), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89242339) to S Normandie Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Normandie Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89242218), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89242218) to S Normandie Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Normandie Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89241192), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89241192) to S Normandie Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Normandie Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89240545), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89240545) to Unnamed (TLID:89239024), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89239024) to Halldale Ave, and proceeding southerly along Halldale Ave to W Century Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W Century Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88909560), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88909560) to Unnamed (TLID:88909457), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88909457) to W 104th St, and proceeding westerly along W 104th St to S Western Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Western Ave to W 108th St, and proceeding westerly along W 108th St to S Gramercy Pl, and proceeding northerly along S Gramercy Pl to W Century Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W Century Blvd to S Van Ness Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Van Ness Ave to W 76th St, and proceeding westerly along W 76th St to S 5th Ave, and proceeding southerly along S 5th Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89232924), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89232924) to 5th Ave, and proceeding northerly along 5th Ave to W 76th St, and proceeding westerly along W 76th St to 8th Ave, and proceeding southerly along 8th Ave to W 79th St, and proceeding westerly along W 79th St to Unnamed (TLID:89195119), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89195119) to W 79th St, and proceeding westerly along W 79th St to S Victoria Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Victoria Ave to 74th St, and proceeding westerly along 74th St to Unnamed (TLID:89193385), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89193385) to Unnamed (TLID:89193444), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89193444) to West Blvd, and proceeding northerly along West Blvd to at and Sf Rlwy, and proceeding northerly along at and Sf Rlwy to West Blvd, and proceeding northerly along West Blvd to E 66th St, and proceeding northerly along E 66th St to West Blvd, and proceeding northerly along West Blvd to E 65th St , and proceeding northerly along E 65th St to West Blvd, and proceeding northerly along West Blvd to W 64th St, and proceeding westerly along W 64th St to Unnamed (TLID:89198117), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89198117) to Unnamed (TLID:88515336), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88515336) to Unnamed (TLID:88515318), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88515318) to Unnamed (TLID:88515233), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88515233) to Unnamed (TLID:88515076), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88515076) to Unnamed (TLID:88513901), and
proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88513901) to Unnamed (TLID:88513410), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88513410) to Unnamed (TLID:88511717), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88511717) to Unnamed (TLID:88511697), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88511697) to Unnamed (TLID:88511656), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88511656) to Unnamed (TLID:88511275), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88511275) to Unnamed (TLID:88511235), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88511235) to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding southerly along S la Cienega Blvd to la Tijera Blvd, and proceeding southerly along la Tijera Blvd to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding southerly along S la Cienega Blvd to Hill St, and proceeding southerly along Hill St to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding southerly along S la Cienega Blvd to Kew St, and proceeding southerly along Kew St to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding southerly along S la Cienega Blvd to Centinela Crk, and proceeding westerly along Centinela Crk to S la Tijera Blvd, and proceeding westerly along S la Tijera Blvd to Centinela Crk, and proceeding westerly along Centinela Crk to the point of beginning.

Ninth District.
The region bounded and described as follows: Beginning at the point of intersection of S Vermont Ave and W 110th St, and proceeding northerly along S Vermont Ave to W 91st St, and proceeding easterly along W 91st St to Orchard Ave, and proceeding southerly along Orchard Ave to W 92nd St, and proceeding easterly along W 92nd St to I- 110, and proceeding northerly along I- 110 to N Harbor Fwy, and proceeding northerly along N Harbor Fwy to I- 110, and proceeding northerly along I- 110 to Martin Luther King Jr Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Martin Luther King Jr Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:89385919), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89385919) to Martin Luther King Jr Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Martin Luther King Jr Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:89382544), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89382544) to Martin Luther King Jr Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Martin Luther King Jr Blvd to S Vermont Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Vermont Ave to W 29th St, and proceeding easterly along W 29th St to Ellendale Pl, and proceeding northerly along Ellendale Pl to W Adams Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Adams Blvd to S Figueroa St, and proceeding northerly along S Figueroa St to Unnamed (TLID:89477595), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89477595) to S Figueroa St, and proceeding northerly along S Figueroa St to I- 110, and proceeding northerly along I- 110 to Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way, and proceeding northerly along Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way to Unnamed (TLID:89483125), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89483125) to Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way, and proceeding northerly along Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way to Unnamed (TLID:89483702), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89483702) to Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way, and proceeding northerly along Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way to Unnamed (TLID:89505403), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89505403) to Unnamed (TLID:89505437), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89505437) to W Olympic Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Olympic Blvd to S Figueroa St, and proceeding southerly along S Figueroa St to Unnamed (TLID:89480469), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89480469) to S Figueroa St, and proceeding southerly along S Figueroa St to I- 10, and proceeding westerly along I- 10 to W Santa Monica Fwy, and proceeding easterly along W Santa Monica Fwy to S Figueroa St, and proceeding southerly along S Figueroa St to I- 10, and proceeding easterly along I- 10 to S Flower St, and proceeding southerly along S Flower St to Unnamed (TLID:89480494), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89480494) to S Flower St, and proceeding southerly along S Flower St to W Washington Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Washington Blvd to E Washington Blvd, and proceeding easterly along E Washington Blvd to S Alameda St, and proceeding southerly along S Alameda St to Unnamed (TLID:89446837), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89446837) to Unnamed (TLID:89445851), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89445851) to Unnamed (TLID:89445737), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89445737) to Unnamed (TLID:89445369), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89445369) to Unnamed (TLID:89445357), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89445357) to Unnamed (TLID:89436752), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89436752) to Unnamed (TLID:89436734), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89436734) to Unnamed (TLID:89436647), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89436647) to Unnamed (TLID:89436274), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89436274) to Unnamed (TLID:89435699), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89435699) to Unnamed (TLID:89435609), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89435609) to Unnamed (TLID:89432209), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89432209) to Unnamed (TLID:89431770), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89431770) to S Central Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Central Ave to at and Sf Rlwy, and proceeding southerly along at and Sf Rlwy to S Central Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Central Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89430524), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89430524) to S Central Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Central Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89430468), and proceeding southerly along

Unnamed (TLID:89430468) to S Central Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Central Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89430081), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89430081) to S Central Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Central Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89430060), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89430060) to S Central Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Central Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89407371), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89407371) to S Central Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Central Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89406141), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89406141) to S Central Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Central Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89406129), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89406129) to S Central Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Central Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89405787), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89405787) to S Central Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Central Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89405746), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89405746) to S Central Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Central Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89405683), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89405683) to S Central Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Central Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89405539), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89405539) to S Central Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Central Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89405135), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89405135) to S Central Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Central Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89405114), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89405114) to S Central Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Central Ave to Firestone Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Firestone Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:89398749), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89398749) to Unnamed (TLID:89398742), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89398742) to Unnamed (TLID:89398707), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89398707) to Unnamed (TLID:89398680), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89398680) to Unnamed (TLID:89398661), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89398661) to Unnamed (TLID:89398289), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89398289) to Unnamed (TLID:89398261), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89398261) to Unnamed (TLID:89396384), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89396384) to Unnamed (TLID:89396353), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89396353) to Unnamed (TLID:89395959), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89395959) to Unnamed (TLID:89396992), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89396992) to Unnamed (TLID:89396465), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89396465) to Hooper Ave, and proceeding northerly along Hooper Ave to E 94th St, and proceeding easterly along E 94th St to Unnamed (TLID:89396926), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89396926) to Unnamed (TLID:89396897), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89396897) to Unnamed (TLID:89396523), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89396523) to Unnamed (TLID:89140372), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89140372) to Unnamed (TLID:89140335), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89140335) to Unnamed (TLID:89140310), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89140310) to Unnamed (TLID:89140279), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89140279) to Unnamed (TLID:89140024), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89140024) to Unnamed (TLID:89140006), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89140006) to Unnamed (TLID:89139990), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89139990) to E 103rd St, and proceeding westerly along E 103rd St to S Central Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Central Ave to E 108th St, and proceeding westerly along E 108th St to Wadsworth Ave, and proceeding southerly along Wadsworth Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89137636), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89137636) to Unnamed (TLID:89138150), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89138150) to Unnamed (TLID:89138125), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89138125) to Unnamed (TLID:89138738), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89138738) to E Lanzit Ave, and proceeding westerly along E Lanzit Ave to Imperial Hwy, and proceeding westerly along Imperial Hwy to W Imperial Hwy, and proceeding westerly along W Imperial Hwy to Unnamed (TLID:89072475), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89072475) to W Imperial Hwy, and proceeding westerly along W Imperial Hwy to S Grand Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Grand Ave to W 110th St, and proceeding westerly along W 110th St to the point of beginning.

Tenth District.
The region bounded and described as follows: Beginning at the point of intersection of Unnamed (TLID:88584431) and Unnamed (TLID:88584438), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88584431) to Unnamed (TLID:88584457), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88584457) to Holdrege Ave, and proceeding northerly along Holdrege Ave to W Jefferson Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W Jefferson Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88585242), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88585242) to Unnamed (TLID:88586954), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88586954) to Unnamed (TLID:88587070), and proceeding
northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88587070) to Unnamed (TLID:88587135), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88587135) to Unnamed (TLID:88587629), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88587629) to W Jefferson Blvd, and proceeding northerly along W Jefferson Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88587822), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88587822) to Unnamed (TLID:88587849), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88587849) to Unnamed (TLID:88587843), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88587843) to Unnamed (TLID:88587831), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88587831) to Unnamed (TLID:88587813), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88587813) to Unnamed (TLID:88587898), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88587898) to Unnamed (TLID:88588170), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88588170) to Unnamed (TLID:88588285), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88588285) to Unnamed (TLID:88588343), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88588343) to Unnamed (TLID:88588787), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88588787) to Unnamed (TLID:88588793), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88588793) to Unnamed (TLID:88588842), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88588842) to Unnamed (TLID:88588880), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88588880) to Unnamed (TLID:88588968), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88588968) to Unnamed (TLID:88589292), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88589292) to Unnamed (TLID:88595646), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88595646) to Unnamed (TLID:88604687), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88604687) to Unnamed (TLID:88604793), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88604793) to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding easterly along S la Cienega Blvd to S Fairfax Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Fairfax Ave to Fairfax Ave, and proceeding northerly along Fairfax Ave to Smiley Dr, and proceeding northerly along Smiley Dr to Fairfax Ave, and proceeding northerly along Fairfax Ave to S Fairfax Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Fairfax Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88608100), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88608100) to Burchard Ave, and proceeding westerly along Burchard Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88606973), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88606973) to Unnamed (TLID:88605950), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88605950) to Unnamed (TLID:88604896), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88604896) to Unnamed (TLID:88604861), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88604861) to Unnamed (TLID:88596299), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88596299) to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding westerly along S la Cienega Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88596391), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88596391) to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding northerly along S la Cienega Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88596977), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88596977) to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding northerly along S la Cienega Blvd to E Santa Monica Fwy, and proceeding northerly along E Santa Monica Fwy to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding northerly along S la Cienega Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88597446), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88597446) to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding northerly along S la Cienega Blvd to W Pico Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Pico Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88631249), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88631249) to W Pico Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Pico Blvd to S Fairfax Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Fairfax Ave to W Olympic Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Olympic Blvd to San Vicente Blvd, and proceeding easterly along San Vicente Blvd to S Cochran Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Cochran Ave to W Olympic Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Olympic Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:89295172), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89295172) to W Olympic Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Olympic Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:89306482), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89306482) to W Olympic Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Olympic Blvd to S Western Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Western Ave to W 7th St, and proceeding westerly along W 7th St to S Wilton Pl , and proceeding northerly along S Wilton Pl to Unnamed (TLID:89335937), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89335937) to S Wilton Pl, and proceeding northerly along S Wilton Pl to W 6th St , and proceeding easterly along W 6th St to S Western Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Western Ave to N Western Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Western Ave to Beverly Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Beverly Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:89347815), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89347815) to Beverly Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Beverly Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:89348256), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89348256) to Beverly Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Beverly Blvd to N Normandie Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Normandie Ave to S Normandie Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Normandie Ave to W 3rd St, and proceeding easterly along W 3rd St to Unnamed (TLID:89349178), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89349178) to W 3rd St, and proceeding easterly along W 3rd St to S Vermont Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Vermont Ave to W 6th St, and proceeding easterly along W 6th St to S Lafayette Park Pl, and proceeding southerly along S Lafayette Park Pl to S Hoover St, and proceeding northerly along S Hoover St to Sunset Pl, and proceeding westerly along Sunset Pl to Wilshire Pl , and proceeding southerly along Wilshire Pl to W 7th St , and proceeding westerly along W 7th St to S

Vermont Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Vermont Ave to W Olympic Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W Olympic Blvd to S Normandie Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Normandie Ave to I-10, and proceeding westerly along I- 10 to S Western Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Western Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89315947), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89315947) to S Western Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Western Ave to W Jefferson Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W Jefferson Blvd to Arlington Ave, and proceeding southerly along Arlington Ave to W Vernon Ave, and proceeding westerly along W Vernon Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89223561), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89223561) to Unnamed (TLID:89223588), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89223588) to Unnamed (TLID:89220929), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89220929) to Unnamed (TLID:89221806), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89221806) to Unnamed (TLID:89221730), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89221730) to Stocker St, and proceeding westerly along Stocker St to Angeles Vista Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Angeles Vista Blvd to Stocker St, and proceeding southerly along Stocker St to la Brea Ave, and proceeding westerly along la Brea Ave to Stocker St, and proceeding northerly along Stocker St to la Brea Ave, and proceeding northerly along la Brea Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89208543), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89208543) to Unnamed (TLID:88520144), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88520144) to Unnamed (TLID:88520078), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88520078) to Unnamed (TLID:88519479), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88519479) to Unnamed (TLID:88519443), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88519443) to Unnamed (TLID:88519397), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88519397) to Unnamed (TLID:88519880), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88519880) to Unnamed (TLID:88600209), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88600209) to Unnamed (TLID:88600082), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88600082) to Unnamed (TLID:88599280), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88599280) to Unnamed (TLID:88518249), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88518249) to Unnamed (TLID:88518175), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88518175) to Unnamed (TLID:88518169), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88518169) to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding northerly along S la Cienega Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88599554), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88599554) to Unnamed (TLID:88599525), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88599525) to Unnamed (TLID:88585686), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88585686) to Unnamed (TLID:88585634), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88585634) to Lenawee Ave, and proceeding southerly along Lenawee Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88585298), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88585298) to Unnamed (TLID:88585282), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88585282) to Ivy Way, and proceeding westerly along Ivy Way to Unnamed (TLID:88585143), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88585143) to Unnamed (TLID:88585130), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88585130) to Unnamed (TLID:88584438), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88584438) to the point of beginning.

## Eleventh District.

The region bounded and described as follows: 1. Beginning at the point of intersection of Unnamed (TLID:80594896) and Unnamed (TLID:80594934), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:80594896) to Unnamed (TLID:80595031), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:80595031) to Unnamed (TLID:80595044), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:80595044) to Unnamed (TLID:80595386), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:80595386) to Unnamed (TLID:80595560), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:80595560) to Unnamed (TLID:82348421), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82348421) to Unnamed (TLID:82348480), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82348480) to Unnamed (TLID:82348500), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82348500) to Unnamed (TLID:82349157), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82349157) to Unnamed (TLID:82350966), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82350966) to Unnamed (TLID:82351089), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82351089) to Unnamed (TLID:82351283), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82351283) to Unnamed (TLID:82380462), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82380462) to Unnamed (TLID:82380494), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82380494) to Unnamed (TLID:82380579), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82380579) to Unnamed (TLID:82381058), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82381058) to Unnamed (TLID:82381791), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82381791) to Unnamed (TLID:82382025), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82382025) to Unnamed (TLID:82382454), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82382454) to Unnamed (TLID:82382492), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82382492) to Unnamed (TLID:82388530), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82388530) to Unnamed (TLID:82389145), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82389145) to

Unnamed (TLID:82389419), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82389419) to Unnamed (TLID:82393255), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82393255) to Unnamed (TLID:82393891), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82393891) to Owen Brown Rd, and proceeding northerly along Owen Brown Rd to Unnamed (TLID:82394214), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82394214) to Mulholland Dr, and proceeding easterly along Mulholland Dr to Unnamed (TLID:82493238), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82493238) to Mulholland Dr, and proceeding easterly along Mulholland Dr to Farmer Fire Rd, and proceeding easterly along Farmer Fire Rd to Mulholland Dr, and proceeding easterly along Mulholland Dr to Sepulveda Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Sepulveda Blvd to N Sepulveda Blvd, and proceeding southerly along N Sepulveda Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:92561036), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:92561036) to N Sepulveda Blvd, and proceeding easterly along N Sepulveda Blvd to I- 405, and proceeding southerly along I- 405 to Getty Center Dr, and proceeding easterly along Getty Center Dr to I- 405 , and proceeding southerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:88343963), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88343963) to I- 405, and proceeding southerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:88344041), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88344041) to I- 405, and proceeding southerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:88346630), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88346630) to Unnamed (TLID:88346685), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88346685) to S Sepulveda Blvd, and proceeding southerly along S Sepulveda Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88381105), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88381105) to Unnamed (TLID:88381098), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88381098) to Unnamed (TLID:88340641), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88340641) to Unnamed (TLID:88340628), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88340628) to Unnamed (TLID:88340573), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88340573) to Unnamed (TLID:88340503), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88340503) to Unnamed (TLID:88345291), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88345291) to Unnamed (TLID:88345285), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88345285) to Unnamed (TLID:88345337), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88345337) to Unnamed (TLID:88342548), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88342548) to Unnamed (TLID:88342377), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88342377) to Unnamed (TLID:88342285), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88342285) to Unnamed (TLID:88341598), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88341598) to Unnamed (TLID:88341592), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88341592) to Unnamed (TLID:88341214), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88341214) to Unnamed (TLID:88341935), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88341935) to Unnamed (TLID:88341914), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88341914) to Unnamed (TLID:88341895), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88341895) to Unnamed (TLID:88338707), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88338707) to Unnamed (TLID:88338651), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88338651) to Unnamed (TLID:88338740), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88338740) to Unnamed (TLID:88338558), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88338558) to Bringham Ave, and proceeding southerly along Bringham Ave to San Vicente Blvd, and proceeding southerly along San Vicente Blvd to Federal Ave, and proceeding southerly along Federal Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88379071), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88379071) to Dowlen Dr, and proceeding easterly along Dowlen Dr to Unnamed (TLID:88379140), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88379140) to Ohio Ave, and proceeding easterly along Ohio Ave to I- 405, and proceeding southerly along I- 405 to San Diego Fwy, and proceeding southerly along San Diego Fwy to I- 405, and proceeding southerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:88371224), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88371224) to I- 405, and proceeding easterly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:88373512), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88373512) to I- 405, and proceeding southerly along I- 405 to National Blvd, and proceeding easterly along National Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88526980), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88526980) to Overland Ave, and proceeding southerly along Overland Ave to Charnock Rd, and proceeding westerly along Charnock Rd to Unnamed (TLID:88521484), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88521484) to Charnock Rd, and proceeding westerly along Charnock Rd to S Sepulveda Blvd, and proceeding southerly along S Sepulveda Blvd to Regent St, and proceeding westerly along Regent St to Tuller Ave, and proceeding southerly along Tuller Ave to Venice Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Venice Blvd to I- 405 , and proceeding southerly along I- 405 to Venice Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Venice Blvd to Albright Ave, and proceeding westerly along Albright Ave to Venice Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Venice Blvd to Bledsoe Ave, and proceeding southerly along Bledsoe Ave to Matteson Ave, and proceeding easterly along Matteson Ave to Albright Ave, and proceeding southerly along Albright Ave to Washington Pl, and proceeding westerly along Washington Pl to McLaughlin Ave, and proceeding southerly along McLaughlin Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88429559), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88429559) to Unnamed (TLID:88429519), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88429519) to

Unnamed (TLID:88429208), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88429208) to Atlantic Ave, and proceeding westerly along Atlantic Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88428715), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88428715) to Unnamed (TLID:88428622), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88428622) to Unnamed (TLID:88280130), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88280130) to Unnamed (TLID:88280017), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88280017) to Grand View Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Grand View Blvd to Mitchell Ave, and proceeding westerly along Mitchell Ave to S Centinela Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Centinela Ave to Washington Pl, and proceeding westerly along Washington Pl to Zanja St, and proceeding westerly along Zanja St to Unnamed (TLID:88272153), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88272153) to Unnamed (TLID:88271786), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88271786) to Unnamed (TLID:88271764), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88271764) to Unnamed (TLID:88271679), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88271679) to Unnamed (TLID:88271629), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88271629) to Unnamed (TLID:88271598), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88271598) to Unnamed (TLID:88263905), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88263905) to Unnamed (TLID:88263859), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88263859) to Unnamed (TLID:88263443), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88263443) to Redwood Ave, and proceeding northerly along Redwood Ave to Zanja St, and proceeding westerly along Zanja St to Walnut Ave, and proceeding southerly along Walnut Ave to del Rey Ave, and proceeding southerly along del Rey Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88262970), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88262970) to Unnamed (TLID:88263361), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88263361) to Unnamed (TLID:88263415), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88263415) to Unnamed (TLID:88263481), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88263481) to Unnamed (TLID:88263871), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88263871) to Unnamed (TLID:88263912), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88263912) to Unnamed (TLID:88271289), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88271289) to Unnamed (TLID:88271592), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88271592) to Unnamed (TLID:88271720), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88271720) to Moore St, and proceeding southerly along Moore St to Short Ave, and proceeding easterly along Short Ave to McConnell Ave, and proceeding westerly along McConnell Ave to Neosho Ave, and proceeding northerly along Neosho Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88274589), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88274589) to Unnamed (TLID:88274648), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88274648) to Unnamed (TLID:88274985), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88274985) to Unnamed (TLID:88275016), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88275016) to Unnamed (TLID:88275613), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88275613) to Unnamed (TLID:88279988), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88279988) to Unnamed (TLID:88280111), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88280111) to Unnamed (TLID:88428537), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88428537) to Unnamed (TLID:88428706), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88428706) to Louise Ave, and proceeding easterly along Louise Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88429463), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88429463) to Unnamed (TLID:88429902), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88429902) to Unnamed (TLID:88430082), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88430082) to Unnamed (TLID:88430089), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88430089) to Unnamed (TLID:88430466), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88430466) to Unnamed (TLID:88430537), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88430537) to Unnamed (TLID:88430683), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88430683) to Unnamed (TLID:88434530), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88434530) to Unnamed (TLID:88434565), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88434565) to Unnamed (TLID:88435026), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88435026) to Unnamed (TLID:88435082), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88435082) to Unnamed (TLID:88435089), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88435089) to Unnamed (TLID:88435070), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88435070) to Unnamed (TLID:88436347), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88436347) to Unnamed (TLID:88435767), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88435767) to Unnamed (TLID:88437316), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88437316) to Unnamed (TLID:88437350), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88437350) to Unnamed (TLID:88436306), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88436306) to Unnamed (TLID:88454574), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88454574) to Unnamed (TLID:88454567), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88454567) to Havelock Ave, and proceeding northerly along Havelock Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88454661), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88454661) to Unnamed (TLID:88454723), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88454723) to Unnamed (TLID:88455162), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88455162) to Unnamed (TLID:88455181), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88455181) to Unnamed (TLID:88456862),
and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88456862) to Saint Nicholas Ave, and proceeding easterly along Saint Nicholas Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88457026), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88457026) to Unnamed (TLID:88457354), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88457354) to Unnamed (TLID:88457041), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88457041) to Unnamed (TLID:88457369), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88457369) to Unnamed (TLID:88457406), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88457406) to Unnamed (TLID:88457375), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88457375) to Unnamed (TLID:88457008), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88457008) to Unnamed (TLID:88456958), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88456958) to Unnamed (TLID:88456933), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88456933) to Unnamed (TLID:88456887), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88456887) to Unnamed (TLID:88456322), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88456322) to Unnamed (TLID:88456309), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88456309) to Unnamed (TLID:88456266), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88456266) to Sepulveda Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Sepulveda Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88456247), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88456247) to Unnamed (TLID:88455919), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88455919) to Unnamed (TLID:88456229), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88456229) to Unnamed (TLID:88456220), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88456220) to Unnamed (TLID:88455864), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88455864) to Unnamed (TLID:88455781), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88455781) to Unnamed (TLID:88455723), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88455723) to Unnamed (TLID:88447008), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88447008) to Unnamed (TLID:88445169), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88445169) to Unnamed (TLID:88445160), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88445160) to Unnamed (TLID:88445117), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88445117) to Unnamed (TLID:88445095), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88445095) to Unnamed (TLID:88445062), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88445062) to Unnamed (TLID:88444641), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88444641) to Unnamed (TLID:88444615), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88444615) to Unnamed (TLID:88444597), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88444597) to Unnamed (TLID:88444539), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88444539) to Unnamed (TLID:88444183), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88444183) to Unnamed (TLID:88443687), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88443687) to Unnamed (TLID:88427989), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88427989) to Unnamed (TLID:88427983), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88427983) to Unnamed (TLID:88427964), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88427964) to Unnamed (TLID:88427943), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88427943) to Unnamed (TLID:88427924), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88427924) to Unnamed (TLID:88427934), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88427934) to Unnamed (TLID:88427952), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88427952) to Emporia Ave, and proceeding easterly along Emporia Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88443638), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88443638) to Unnamed (TLID:88443597), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88443597) to Mesmer Ave, and proceeding easterly along Mesmer Ave to Jefferson Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Jefferson Blvd to Marina Fwy, and proceeding easterly along Marina Fwy to Jefferson Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Jefferson Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88448963), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88448963) to Unnamed (TLID:88449028), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88449028) to Unnamed (TLID:88448621), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88448621) to Unnamed (TLID:88449123), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88449123) to Unnamed (TLID:88449692), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88449692) to Unnamed (TLID:88449658), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88449658) to Unnamed (TLID:88449668), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88449668) to Unnamed (TLID:88449722), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88449722) to Unnamed (TLID:88448274), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88448274) to Unnamed (TLID:88448252), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88448252) to Unnamed (TLID:88448228), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88448228) to Unnamed (TLID:88447862), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88447862) to Unnamed (TLID:88447778), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88447778) to Unnamed (TLID:88447672), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88447672) to Unnamed (TLID:88447657), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88447657) to Unnamed (TLID:88447320), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88447320) to Unnamed (TLID:88447333), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88447333) to Unnamed (TLID:88447713), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88447713) to Unnamed (TLID:88447732), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88447732) to Unnamed (TLID:88418446), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88418446) to I-

405, and proceeding easterly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:88419520), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88419520) to Unnamed (TLID:88419603), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88419603) to Unnamed (TLID:88471586), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88471586) to Unnamed (TLID:88472826), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88472826) to Unnamed (TLID:88472081), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88472081) to Unnamed (TLID:88472810), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88472810) to Centinela Crk, and proceeding easterly along Centinela Crk to Unnamed (TLID:88489542), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88489542) to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding southerly along S la Cienega Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88488267), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88488267) to Unnamed (TLID:88488240), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88488240) to Unnamed (TLID:88488130), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88488130) to I405, and proceeding westerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:88487517), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88487517) to Midfield Ave, and proceeding southerly along Midfield Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88487510), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88487510) to Unnamed (TLID:88487529), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88487529) to Unnamed (TLID:88481020), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88481020) to Unnamed (TLID:88480505), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88480505) to Unnamed (TLID:88469284), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88469284) to Unnamed (TLID:88468793), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88468793) to Unnamed (TLID:88468654), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88468654) to Unnamed (TLID:88468633), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88468633) to Unnamed (TLID:88468197), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88468197) to Unnamed (TLID:88468153), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88468153) to Portal Ave, and proceeding southerly along Portal Ave to W Arbor Vitae St, and proceeding easterly along W Arbor Vitae St to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding southerly along S la Cienega Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88477935), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88477935) to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding southerly along S la Cienega Blvd to W 101st St, and proceeding southerly along W 101st St to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding southerly along S la Cienega Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88174354), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88174354) to S la Cienega Blvd, and proceeding southerly along S la Cienega Blvd to W Imperial Hwy, and proceeding easterly along W Imperial Hwy to Unnamed (TLID:88167738), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88167738) to Unnamed (TLID:88167713), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88167713) to Unnamed (TLID:88167695), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88167695) to Unnamed (TLID:88167275), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88167275) to Unnamed (TLID:88167262), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88167262) to Unnamed (TLID:88167120), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88167120) to Unnamed (TLID:88166839), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88166839) to Unnamed (TLID:88166086), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88166086) to Unnamed (TLID:88166064), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88166064) to Unnamed (TLID:88166036), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88166036) to Unnamed (TLID:88166024), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88166024) to Unnamed (TLID:88165631), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88165631) to Unnamed (TLID:88163822), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88163822) to Unnamed (TLID:88163219), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88163219) to Unnamed (TLID:88155942), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88155942) to W 116th St, and proceeding westerly along W 116th St to Unnamed (TLID:88153694), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88153694) to Unnamed (TLID:88153737), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88153737) to Unnamed (TLID:88153811), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88153811) to Unnamed (TLID:88153830), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88153830) to I- 105, and proceeding westerly along I- 105 to Imperial Hwy, and proceeding westerly along Imperial Hwy to Unnamed (TLID:88153768), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88153768) to E Imperial Hwy, and proceeding westerly along E Imperial Hwy to Unnamed (TLID:88121810), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88121810) to E Imperial Hwy, and proceeding westerly along E Imperial Hwy to W Imperial Hwy, and proceeding westerly along W Imperial Hwy to Unnamed (TLID:88003168), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88003168) to Unnamed (TLID:88003143), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88003143) to Unnamed (TLID:88002635), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88002635) to Unnamed (TLID:88003180), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88003180) to Unnamed (TLID:88002071), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88002071) to Unnamed (TLID:88111812), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88111812) to Unnamed (TLID:88111831), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88111831) to Unnamed (TLID:88111366), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88111366) to Unnamed (TLID:88111343), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88111343) to Unnamed (TLID:88002014), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88002014) to

Unnamed (TLID:88001776), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88001776) to Unnamed (TLID:88001749), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88001749) to Unnamed (TLID:88001699), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88001699) to Unnamed (TLID:88001688), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88001688) to Unnamed (TLID:88004213), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88004213) to Unnamed (TLID:88239399), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88239399) to Unnamed (TLID:88236848), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88236848) to Unnamed (TLID:88236867), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88236867) to Unnamed (TLID:88238034), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88238034) to Unnamed (TLID:88237276), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88237276) to Unnamed (TLID:88184843), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88184843) to Unnamed (TLID:88184852), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88184852) to Unnamed (TLID:88184776), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88184776) to Unnamed (TLID:88184709), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88184709) to Unnamed (TLID:88184676), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88184676) to Unnamed (TLID:88184683), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88184683) to Unnamed (TLID:88184670), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88184670) to Unnamed (TLID:88184611), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88184611) to Unnamed (TLID:88184139), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88184139) to Unnamed (TLID:88184133), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88184133) to Unnamed (TLID:88184153), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88184153) to Unnamed (TLID:88184961), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88184961) to Unnamed (TLID:88184991), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88184991) to Unnamed (TLID:88184120), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88184120) to Unnamed (TLID:88193553), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88193553) to Unnamed (TLID:88193303), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88193303) to Unnamed (TLID:88193022), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88193022) to Unnamed (TLID:88193309), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88193309) to Unnamed (TLID:88193374), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88193374) to Unnamed (TLID:88193457), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88193457) to Unnamed (TLID:88193488), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88193488) to Unnamed (TLID:88193504), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88193504) to Speedway, and proceeding southerly along Speedway to Marine Ct , and proceeding easterly along Marine Ct to Unnamed (TLID:88203453), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88203453) to Unnamed (TLID:88203524), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88203524) to Unnamed (TLID:88203598), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88203598) to Unnamed (TLID:88204010), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88204010) to Unnamed (TLID:88204069), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88204069) to Dewey St, and proceeding easterly along Dewey St to Unnamed (TLID:88205176), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88205176) to Unnamed (TLID:88205189), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88205189) to Unnamed (TLID:88205201), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88205201) to Dewey St, and proceeding easterly along Dewey St to Unnamed (TLID:88228436), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88228436) to Lincoln Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Lincoln Blvd to Dewey St, and proceeding easterly along Dewey St to Unnamed (TLID:88236786), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88236786) to Unnamed (TLID:88265965), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88265965) to Airport Ave, and proceeding easterly along Airport Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88353449), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88353449) to Unnamed (TLID:88354067), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88354067) to Unnamed (TLID:88353564), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88353564) to Unnamed (TLID:88353533), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88353533) to Unnamed (TLID:88354836), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88354836) to Unnamed (TLID:88352180), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88352180) to S Centinela Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Centinela Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88350962), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88350962) to Unnamed (TLID:88350956), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88350956) to I-10, and proceeding northerly along I- 10 to Unnamed (TLID:88351565), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88351565) to Unnamed (TLID:88351578), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88351578) to Unnamed (TLID:88351572), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88351572) to Unnamed (TLID:88351219), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88351219) to Unnamed (TLID:88351622), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88351622) to Unnamed (TLID:88351034), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88351034) to Unnamed (TLID:88350560), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88350560) to Unnamed (TLID:88350541), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88350541) to Unnamed (TLID:88350526), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88350526) to S Centinela Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Centinela Ave to W Olympic Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W Olympic Blvd to

Unnamed (TLID:88323256), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88323256) to Centinela Ave, and proceeding northerly along Centinela Ave to Wilshire Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Wilshire Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88304805), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88304805) to Unnamed (TLID:88304391), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88304391) to Unnamed (TLID:88327872), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88327872) to Montana Ave, and proceeding westerly along Montana Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88327144), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88327144) to Unnamed (TLID:88327137), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88327137) to Unnamed (TLID:88304029), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88304029) to Unnamed (TLID:88304013), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88304013) to Unnamed (TLID:88303606), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88303606) to Unnamed (TLID:88303573), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88303573) to Unnamed (TLID:88303555), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88303555) to Unnamed (TLID:88303519), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88303519) to Unnamed (TLID:88303432), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88303432) to Unnamed (TLID:88303426), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88303426) to Montana Ave, and proceeding easterly along Montana Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88298804), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88298804) to Montana Ave, and proceeding westerly along Montana Ave to 26th St, and proceeding northerly along 26th St to S 26th St, and proceeding westerly along S 26th St to Unnamed (TLID:80679430), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:80679430) to Allenford Ave, and proceeding northerly along Allenford Ave to Unnamed (TLID:80679975), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:80679975) to Unnamed (TLID:80679318), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:80679318) to Unnamed (TLID:80679116), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:80679116) to Unnamed (TLID:80676405), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:80676405) to Unnamed (TLID:80676382), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:80676382) to Unnamed (TLID:80665021), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:80665021) to Unnamed (TLID:80664168), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:80664168) to Unnamed (TLID:80664058), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:80664058) to Unnamed (TLID:80664051), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:80664051) to Unnamed (TLID:80664008), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:80664008) to Unnamed (TLID:80652599), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:80652599) to Unnamed (TLID:80651979), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:80651979) to Unnamed (TLID:80651937), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:80651937) to Unnamed (TLID:80650512), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:80650512) to Unnamed (TLID:80650493), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:80650493) to Unnamed (TLID:80650475), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:80650475) to Unnamed (TLID:80649834), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:80649834) to Entrada Dr, and proceeding southerly along Entrada Dr to Adelaide Dr, and proceeding westerly along Adelaide Dr to Ocean Ave, and proceeding southerly along Ocean Ave to Unnamed (TLID:80641384), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:80641384) to Unnamed (TLID:80641375), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:80641375) to Unnamed (TLID:80641189), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:80641189) to Unnamed (TLID:80641155), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:80641155) to Unnamed (TLID:80640658), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:80640658) to Unnamed (TLID:80640651), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:80640651) to Unnamed (TLID:80620153), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:80620153) to Unnamed (TLID:80616870), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:80616870) to Unnamed (TLID:80600373), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:80600373) to Unnamed (TLID:80598779), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:80598779) to Unnamed (TLID:80599106), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:80599106) to Unnamed (TLID:80599298), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:80599298) to Unnamed (TLID:80599311), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:80599311) to Unnamed (TLID:80605266), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:80605266) to Unnamed (TLID:80605339), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:80605339) to Unnamed (TLID:80605495), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:80605495) to Unnamed (TLID:80605930), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:80605930) to Unnamed (TLID:80607263), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:80607263) to Unnamed (TLID:80607722), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:80607722) to Unnamed (TLID:80605236), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:80605236) to Unnamed (TLID:80604888), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:80604888) to Unnamed (TLID:80595829), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:80595829) to Unnamed (TLID:80595768), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:80595768) to Unnamed (TLID:80594934), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:80594934) to the point of beginning. 2. Except for beginning at the point of intersection of Via Dolce and Washington Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Via Dolce to Unnamed (TLID:88191761), and
proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88191761) to Unnamed (TLID:88191748), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88191748) to Unnamed (TLID:88191683), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88191683) to Unnamed (TLID:88192874), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88192874) to Tahiti Way, and proceeding easterly along Tahiti Way to Via Marina, and proceeding southerly along Via Marina to Unnamed (TLID:88245375), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88245375) to Unnamed (TLID:88244730), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88244730) to Unnamed (TLID:88244752), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88244752) to Unnamed (TLID:88245845), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88245845) to Unnamed (TLID:88245829), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88245829) to Unnamed (TLID:88245835), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88245835) to Unnamed (TLID:88245820), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88245820) to Unnamed (TLID:88247071), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88247071) to Unnamed (TLID:88254380), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88254380) to Lincoln Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Lincoln Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88254871), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88254871) to Lincoln Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Lincoln Blvd to Culver Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Culver Blvd to Lincoln Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Lincoln Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88262295), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88262295) to Unnamed (TLID:88261939), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88261939) to Unnamed (TLID:88261743), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88261743) to Unnamed (TLID:88258895), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88258895) to Unnamed (TLID:88258218), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88258218) to Washington Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Washington Blvd to the point of beginning. 3. Except for beginning at the point of intersection of Unnamed (TLID:88423352) and Centinela Creek Chnnl, and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88423352) to Unnamed (TLID:88423346), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88423346) to Grosvenor Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Grosvenor Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:88425185), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88425185) to Unnamed (TLID:88425211), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88425211) to W Jefferson Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Jefferson Blvd to S Centinela Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Centinela Ave to Centinela Creek Chnnl, and proceeding westerly along Centinela Creek Chnnl to the point of beginning.

## Twelfth District.

The region bounded and described as follows: Beginning at the point of intersection of Unnamed (TLID:82094043) and Unnamed (TLID:82093552), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82094043) to Unnamed (TLID:82094049), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82094049) to Unnamed (TLID:82094062), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82094062) to Unnamed (TLID:82094078), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82094078) to Unnamed (TLID:82094230), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82094230) to Unnamed (TLID:82094243), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82094243) to Unnamed (TLID:82096730), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82096730) to Kittridge St, and proceeding easterly along Kittridge St to Unnamed (TLID:82097174), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82097174) to Valley Circle Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Valley Circle Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:82099732), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82099732) to Unnamed (TLID:82099695), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82099695) to Unnamed (TLID:82099453), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82099453) to Unnamed (TLID:82098189), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82098189) to Unnamed (TLID:82098150), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82098150) to Unnamed (TLID:82098156), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82098156) to Unnamed (TLID:82098166), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82098166) to Unnamed (TLID:82098172), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82098172) to Unnamed (TLID:82098182), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82098182) to Unnamed (TLID:82098327), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82098327) to Unnamed (TLID:82098341), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82098341) to Unnamed (TLID:82098347), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82098347) to Unnamed (TLID:82098591), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82098591) to Unnamed (TLID:82098597), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82098597) to Unnamed (TLID:82098612), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82098612) to Unnamed (TLID:82098631), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82098631) to Unnamed (TLID:82246472), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82246472) to Unnamed (TLID:82247133), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82247133) to Unnamed (TLID:82247379), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82247379) to Unnamed (TLID:82247477), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82247477) to Unnamed (TLID:82247501), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82247501) to Unnamed (TLID:82247511),
and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82247511) to Unnamed (TLID:82247487), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82247487) to Unnamed (TLID:82247518), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82247518) to Unnamed (TLID:82247874), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82247874) to Unnamed (TLID:82248078), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82248078) to Unnamed (TLID:82248562), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82248562) to Unnamed (TLID:82248568), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82248568) to Unnamed (TLID:82251239), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82251239) to Unnamed (TLID:82280712), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82280712) to Unnamed (TLID:82280724), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82280724) to Unnamed (TLID:82280864), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82280864) to Unnamed (TLID:82281052), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82281052) to Unnamed (TLID:82282250), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82282250) to Unnamed (TLID:82283314), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82283314) to Unnamed (TLID:82283332), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82283332) to Unnamed (TLID:82283357), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82283357) to Unnamed (TLID:82283518), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82283518) to Unnamed (TLID:82283544), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82283544) to Unnamed (TLID:82285085), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82285085) to Grundy Ln, and proceeding easterly along Grundy Ln to Unnamed (TLID:82285662), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82285662) to Lake Manor Dr, and proceeding easterly along Lake Manor Dr to Unnamed (TLID:82287247), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82287247) to Unnamed (TLID:82287348), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82287348) to Unnamed (TLID:82287373), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82287373) to Unnamed (TLID:82296149), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82296149) to Unnamed (TLID:82296187), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82296187) to Unnamed (TLID:82296412), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82296412) to Unnamed (TLID:82298514), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82298514) to Unnamed (TLID:82298520), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82298520) to Unnamed (TLID:82298712), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82298712) to Unnamed (TLID:82298626), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82298626) to Unnamed (TLID:82298620), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82298620) to Unnamed (TLID:82297928), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82297928) to Unnamed (TLID:82298013), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82298013) to Unnamed (TLID:82298022), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82298022) to Unnamed (TLID:82298062), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82298062) to Unnamed (TLID:82298093), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82298093) to Unnamed (TLID:82298134), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82298134) to Unnamed (TLID:82298140), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82298140) to Unnamed (TLID:82298147), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82298147) to Unnamed (TLID:82298156), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82298156) to Unnamed (TLID:82305582), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82305582) to Unnamed (TLID:82305854), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82305854) to Unnamed (TLID:82306236), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82306236) to Unnamed (TLID:82306327), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82306327) to Unnamed (TLID:82306333), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82306333) to Unnamed (TLID:82306352), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82306352) to Unnamed (TLID:82307982), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82307982) to Unnamed (TLID:82308007), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82308007) to Unnamed (TLID:82308115), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82308115) to Unnamed (TLID:82308121), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82308121) to Unnamed (TLID:82308138), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82308138) to Unnamed (TLID:82308151), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82308151) to Unnamed (TLID:82308625), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82308625) to Unnamed (TLID:82308636), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82308636) to Unnamed (TLID:82308849), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82308849) to Santa Susana Pass Rd, and proceeding northerly along Santa Susana Pass Rd to Unnamed (TLID:82308868), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82308868) to Unnamed (TLID:82308908), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82308908) to Unnamed (TLID:82308914), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82308914) to Unnamed (TLID:82308921), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82308921) to Unnamed (TLID:82308927), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82308927) to Unnamed (TLID:82308939), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82308939) to Ronald Reagan Fwy, and proceeding easterly along Ronald Reagan Fwy to Unnamed (TLID:82309509), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82309509) to Ronald Reagan Fwy, and proceeding easterly along Ronald Reagan Fwy to Canoga Ave, and proceeding northerly
along Canoga Ave to Unnamed (TLID:82679013), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82679013) to Unnamed (TLID:82679083), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82679083) to Unnamed (TLID:82679344), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82679344) to Unnamed (TLID:82679354), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82679354) to Unnamed (TLID:82679866), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82679866) to Unnamed (TLID:82679875), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82679875) to Unnamed (TLID:82679915), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82679915) to Unnamed (TLID:82679921), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82679921) to Unnamed (TLID:82679944), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82679944) to Unnamed (TLID:82680103), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82680103) to Unnamed (TLID:82680172), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82680172) to Unnamed (TLID:82680207), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82680207) to Unnamed (TLID:82680949), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82680949) to Unnamed (TLID:82680431), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82680431) to Unnamed (TLID:82680441), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82680441) to Unnamed (TLID:82680716), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82680716) to Unnamed (TLID:82680728), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82680728) to Unnamed (TLID:82680793), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82680793) to Unnamed (TLID:82681189), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82681189) to Unnamed (TLID:82682166), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82682166) to Unnamed (TLID:82682182), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82682182) to Unnamed (TLID:82682209), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82682209) to Unnamed (TLID:82682255), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82682255) to Unnamed (TLID:82689362), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82689362) to Unnamed (TLID:82689410), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82689410) to Unnamed (TLID:82691091), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82691091) to Unnamed (TLID:82691102), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82691102) to Unnamed (TLID:82690997), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82690997) to Unnamed (TLID:82697612), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82697612) to Unnamed (TLID:82697310), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82697310) to Sesnon Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Sesnon Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:82699416), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82699416) to Unnamed (TLID:82700434), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82700434) to Unnamed (TLID:82793750), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82793750) to Unnamed (TLID:82793792), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82793792) to Unnamed (TLID:82793841), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82793841) to Unnamed (TLID:82793915), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82793915) to Unnamed (TLID:82794564), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82794564) to Unnamed (TLID:82795522), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82795522) to Unnamed (TLID:82795984), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82795984) to Unnamed (TLID:82795990), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82795990) to Aliso Canyon Wash, and proceeding northerly along Aliso Canyon Wash to Unnamed (TLID:82796049), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82796049) to Unnamed (TLID:82796034), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82796034) to Unnamed (TLID:82796633), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82796633) to Unnamed (TLID:82796681), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82796681) to Unnamed (TLID:82796704), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82796704) to Unnamed (TLID:82796194), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82796194) to Unnamed (TLID:82796226), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82796226) to Unnamed (TLID:82796200), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82796200) to Unnamed (TLID:82796561), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82796561) to Unnamed (TLID:82796598), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82796598) to Unnamed (TLID:82796608), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82796608) to Unnamed (TLID:82796265), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82796265) to Unnamed (TLID:82806854), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82806854) to Unnamed (TLID:82807100), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82807100) to Unnamed (TLID:82807110), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82807110) to Unnamed (TLID:82806547), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82806547) to Unnamed (TLID:82806554), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82806554) to Unnamed (TLID:82806581), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82806581) to Unnamed (TLID:82807160), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82807160) to Aliso Canyon Wash, and proceeding northerly along Aliso Canyon Wash to Unnamed (TLID:82807222), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82807222) to Unnamed (TLID:82807234), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82807234) to Unnamed (TLID:82807256), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82807256) to Unnamed (TLID:82807364), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82807364) to Unnamed (TLID:82807197), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed
(TLID:82807197) to Unnamed (TLID:82809214), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82809214) to Unnamed (TLID:82809523), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82809523) to Unnamed (TLID:82809617), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82809617) to Unnamed (TLID:82833972), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82833972) to Unnamed (TLID:82835374), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82835374) to Unnamed (TLID:82835973), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82835973) to Unnamed (TLID:82837962), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82837962) to Unnamed (TLID:82839540), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82839540) to Unnamed (TLID:82839937), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82839937) to Unnamed (TLID:82840003), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82840003) to Unnamed (TLID:82840027), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82840027) to Unnamed (TLID:82841507), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82841507) to Unnamed (TLID:82841523), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82841523) to Unnamed (TLID:82841951), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82841951) to Unnamed (TLID:82842028), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82842028) to Unnamed (TLID:82842040), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:82842040) to I- 5, and proceeding southerly along I- 5 to I- 405 , and proceeding southerly along I- 405 to Unnamed (TLID:92947261), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:92947261) to I- 405, and proceeding southerly along I- 405 to Roscoe Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Roscoe Blvd to Roscoe Pl, and proceeding westerly along Roscoe Pl to Roscoe Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Roscoe Blvd to Southern Pacific RR, and proceeding westerly along Southern Pacific RR to Bull Crk, and proceeding southerly along Bull Crk to Roscoe Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Roscoe Blvd to Louise Ave, and proceeding southerly along Louise Ave to Saticoy St, and proceeding westerly along Saticoy St to Reseda Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Reseda Blvd to Arminta St, and proceeding westerly along Arminta St to Yolanda Ave, and proceeding northerly along Yolanda Ave to Strathern St, and proceeding westerly along Strathern St to Unnamed (TLID:82705920), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82705920) to Unnamed (TLID:82705798), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82705798) to Unnamed (TLID:82706491), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82706491) to Unnamed (TLID:82706545), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82706545) to Unnamed (TLID:82706842), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82706842) to Roscoe Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Roscoe Blvd to Corbin Ave, and proceeding northerly along Corbin Ave to Parthenia St, and proceeding westerly along Parthenia St to Winnetka Ave, and proceeding northerly along Winnetka Ave to Nordhoff St, and proceeding westerly along Nordhoff St to Santa Susana Crk, and proceeding westerly along Santa Susana Crk to Topanga Canyon Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Topanga Canyon Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:82598406), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:82598406) to Topanga Canyon Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Topanga Canyon Blvd to Roscoe Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Roscoe Blvd to Shoup Ave, and proceeding southerly along Shoup Ave to Victory Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Victory Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:82092537), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:82092537) to Victory Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Victory Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:82092344), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82092344) to Unnamed (TLID:82093528), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82093528) to Unnamed (TLID:82093539), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82093539) to Unnamed (TLID:82093552), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:82093552) to the point of beginning.

## Thirteenth District.

The region bounded and described as follows: Beginning at the point of intersection of Franklin Ave and N la Brea Ave, and proceeding easterly along Franklin Ave to N Sycamore Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Sycamore Ave to Fitch Dr, and proceeding northerly along Fitch Dr to N Sycamore Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Sycamore Ave to Camrose Dr, and proceeding northerly along Camrose Dr to W Camrose Dr, and proceeding easterly along W Camrose Dr to Unnamed (TLID:93234532), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93234532) to N Highland Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Highland Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93234632), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93234632) to N Highland Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Highland Ave to Odin St, and proceeding easterly along Odin St to Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding southerly along Hollywood Fwy to N Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding easterly along N Hollywood Fwy to Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding easterly along Hollywood Fwy to Franklin Ave, and proceeding easterly along Franklin Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93276514), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93276514) to Franklin Ave, and proceeding easterly along Franklin Ave to N Western Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Western Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93288002), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93288002) to Unnamed (TLID:93288046), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93288046) to Unnamed (TLID:93288500), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93288500) to N Kingsley Dr, and proceeding
southerly along N Kingsley Dr to Unnamed (TLID:93288521), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93288521) to Unnamed (TLID:93288577), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93288577) to N Normandie Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Normandie Ave to Hollywood Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Hollywood Blvd to Prospect Ave, and proceeding easterly along Prospect Ave to Hollywood Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Hollywood Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:93435036), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93435036) to Sunset Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Sunset Blvd to Fountain Ave, and proceeding easterly along Fountain Ave to Landa St, and proceeding easterly along Landa St to Griffith Park Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Griffith Park Blvd to Landa St, and proceeding easterly along Landa St to Unnamed (TLID:93450622), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93450622) to Landa St, and proceeding easterly along Landa St to Unnamed (TLID:93453521), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93453521) to Redesdale Ave, and proceeding easterly along Redesdale Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93453872), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93453872) to Unnamed (TLID:93453897), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93453897) to Unnamed (TLID:93454104), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93454104) to Unnamed (TLID:93454423), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93454423) to Unnamed (TLID:93454905), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93454905) to Armstrong Ave, and proceeding northerly along Armstrong Ave to Lakewood Ave, and proceeding northerly along Lakewood Ave to Glendale Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Glendale Blvd to Waverly Dr, and proceeding westerly along Waverly Dr to Hyperion Ave, and proceeding easterly along Hyperion Ave to Glendale Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Glendale Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:93467703), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93467703) to Unnamed (TLID:93467969), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93467969) to Unnamed (TLID:93466011), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93466011) to Unnamed (TLID:93466150), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93466150) to Unnamed (TLID:93470685), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93470685) to Unnamed (TLID:93470708), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93470708) to Unnamed (TLID:93471446), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93471446) to Unnamed (TLID:93471458), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93471458) to Unnamed (TLID:93462241), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93462241) to Unnamed (TLID:93462288), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93462288) to Unnamed (TLID:93462373), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93462373) to Unnamed (TLID:93547540), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93547540) to Unnamed (TLID:93548205), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93548205) to Unnamed (TLID:93549938), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93549938) to Unnamed (TLID:93550037), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93550037) to Unnamed (TLID:93550059), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93550059) to Unnamed (TLID:93550582), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93550582) to Unnamed (TLID:93550600), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93550600) to Unnamed (TLID:93550702), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93550702) to Unnamed (TLID:93560138), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93560138) to Unnamed (TLID:93560154), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93560154) to Unnamed (TLID:93559129), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93559129) to Unnamed (TLID:93559155), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93559155) to Unnamed (TLID:93559059), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93559059) to Unnamed (TLID:93559580), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93559580) to Unnamed (TLID:93472626), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93472626) to Unnamed (TLID:93473069), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93473069) to Unnamed (TLID:93472689), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93472689) to Unnamed (TLID:93472658), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93472658) to Unnamed (TLID:93472406), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93472406) to Unnamed (TLID:93472371), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93472371) to Unnamed (TLID:93474869), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93474869) to Unnamed (TLID:93473666), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93473666) to Unnamed (TLID:93473751), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93473751) to Unnamed (TLID:93473745), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93473745) to Unnamed (TLID:93473854), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93473854) to Unnamed (TLID:93470164), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93470164) to Unnamed (TLID:93470170), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93470170) to Unnamed (TLID:93512293), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93512293) to Unnamed (TLID:93511862), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93511862) to Unnamed (TLID:93511887), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93511887) to Unnamed (TLID:93511919), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93511919) to Tyburn St, and proceeding easterly along Tyburn St to Southern Pacific RR, and proceeding southerly along Southern Pacific RR to Glendale Fwy, and proceeding southerly along Glendale Fwy to Southern

Pacific RR, and proceeding southerly along Southern Pacific RR to Glendale Fwy, and proceeding easterly along Glendale Fwy to Southern Pacific RR, and proceeding westerly along Southern Pacific RR to Glendale Fwy, and proceeding westerly along Glendale Fwy to Unnamed (TLID:93496659), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93496659) to Glendale Fwy, and proceeding southerly along Glendale Fwy to Unnamed (TLID:93496166), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93496166) to Unnamed (TLID:93496791), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93496791) to Unnamed (TLID:93505240), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93505240) to Unnamed (TLID:93504740), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93504740) to Unnamed (TLID:93499437), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93499437) to Unnamed (TLID:93503800), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93503800) to Unnamed (TLID:93502530), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93502530) to Unnamed (TLID:93502127), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93502127) to Unnamed (TLID:93502093), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93502093) to I- 5, and proceeding westerly along I- 5 to Unnamed (TLID:93498104), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93498104) to Stadium Way, and proceeding southerly along Stadium Way to Unnamed (TLID:93498132), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93498132) to Unnamed (TLID:93484221), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93484221) to Valley View Dr, and proceeding southerly along Valley View Dr to Unnamed (TLID:93484120), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93484120) to Vista Gordo Dr, and proceeding southerly along Vista Gordo Dr to Cerro Gordo St, and proceeding easterly along Cerro Gordo St to Unnamed (TLID:93483975), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93483975) to Unnamed (TLID:93483969), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93483969) to Unnamed (TLID:93483956), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93483956) to Unnamed (TLID:93483950), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93483950) to Park Dr, and proceeding southerly along Park Dr to Sargent Pl, and proceeding southerly along Sargent Pl to Unnamed (TLID:93481130), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93481130) to Sargent Ct, and proceeding southerly along Sargent Ct to Unnamed (TLID:93481114), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:93481114) to Scott Ave, and proceeding westerly along Scott Ave to Echo Park Ave, and proceeding southerly along Echo Park Ave to W Sunset Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W Sunset Blvd to Logan St, and proceeding southerly along Logan St to Park Ave, and proceeding easterly along Park Ave to Echo Park Ave, and proceeding southerly along Echo Park Ave to N Echo Park Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Echo Park Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89560526), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89560526) to Unnamed (TLID:89560519), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89560519) to Unnamed (TLID:89560478), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89560478) to Unnamed (TLID:89560488), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89560488) to Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding westerly along Hollywood Fwy to Unnamed (TLID:89519446), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89519446) to N Echo Park Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Echo Park Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89518988), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89518988) to N Echo Park Ave, and proceeding southerly along N Echo Park Ave to W Temple St , and proceeding westerly along W Temple St to Glendale Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Glendale Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:89553356), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89553356) to Lucas Ave, and proceeding southerly along Lucas Ave to W 3rd St, and proceeding westerly along W 3rd St to S Rampart Blvd, and proceeding southerly along S Rampart Blvd to W 6th St, and proceeding westerly along W 6th St to Unnamed (TLID:89500517), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89500517) to W 6th St, and proceeding westerly along W 6th St to S Vermont Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Vermont Ave to W 3rd St, and proceeding westerly along W 3rd St to Unnamed (TLID:89349178), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89349178) to W 3rd St, and proceeding westerly along W 3rd St to S Normandie Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Normandie Ave to N Normandie Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Normandie Ave to Beverly Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Beverly Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:89348256), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89348256) to Beverly Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Beverly Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:89347815), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89347815) to Beverly Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Beverly Blvd to N Western Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Western Ave to Melrose Ave, and proceeding westerly along Melrose Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93271152), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93271152) to Melrose Ave, and proceeding westerly along Melrose Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93270781), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93270781) to Melrose Ave, and proceeding westerly along Melrose Ave to Unnamed (TLID:93270762), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93270762) to Melrose Ave, and proceeding westerly along Melrose Ave to Wilcox Ave, and proceeding northerly along Wilcox Ave to Lexington Ave, and proceeding westerly along Lexington Ave to N Las Palmas Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Las Palmas Ave to Fountain Ave, and proceeding westerly along Fountain Ave to N McCadden Pl , and proceeding northerly along N McCadden Pl to de Longpre Ave, and proceeding westerly along
de Longpre Ave to N Highland Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Highland Ave to Sunset Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Sunset Blvd to N la Brea Ave, and proceeding northerly along N la Brea Ave to the point of beginning.

## Fourteenth District.

The region bounded and described as follows: Beginning at the point of intersection of S Flower St and W Washington Blvd, and proceeding northerly along S Flower St to Unnamed (TLID:89480494), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89480494) to S Flower St, and proceeding northerly along S Flower St to I- 10, and proceeding northerly along I- 10 to S Figueroa St, and proceeding northerly along S Figueroa St to W Santa Monica Fwy, and proceeding westerly along W Santa Monica Fwy to I- 10, and proceeding easterly along I- 10 to S Figueroa St, and proceeding northerly along S Figueroa St to Unnamed (TLID:89480469), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89480469) to S Figueroa St, and proceeding northerly along S Figueroa St to W Olympic Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W Olympic Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:89505437), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89505437) to Unnamed (TLID:89505403), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89505403) to Unnamed (TLID:89486668), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89486668) to Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way, and proceeding easterly along Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way to W 9th St, and proceeding westerly along W 9th St to Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way, and proceeding easterly along Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way to W 8th Pl , and proceeding northerly along W 8th Pl to Unnamed (TLID:89508412), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89508412) to S Harbor Fwy, and proceeding easterly along S Harbor Fwy to Unnamed (TLID:89509063), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89509063) to W 8th St, and proceeding westerly along W 8th St to S Bixel St, and proceeding northerly along S Bixel St to W 7th St, and proceeding westerly along W 7th St to Witmer St, and proceeding northerly along Witmer St to W 6th St , and proceeding easterly along W 6th St to S Bixel St , and proceeding northerly along S Bixel St to Miramar St , and proceeding easterly along Miramar St to S Beaudry Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Beaudry Ave to N Beaudry Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Beaudry Ave to Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding southerly along Hollywood Fwy to Unnamed (TLID:89564540), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89564540) to Unnamed (TLID:89564527), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89564527) to Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way, and proceeding northerly along Harbor Frwy \& Transit Way to Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding southerly along Hollywood Fwy to S Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding southerly along S Hollywood Fwy to Hollywood Fwy, and proceeding southerly along Hollywood Fwy to N Hill St, and proceeding easterly along N Hill St to W Cesar E Chavez Ave, and proceeding easterly along W Cesar E Chavez Ave to N Main St, and proceeding northerly along N Main St to Alhambra Ave, and proceeding easterly along Alhambra Ave to Unnamed (TLID:91135184), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:91135184) to Unnamed (TLID:91135197), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:91135197) to Unnamed (TLID:91135203), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:91135203) to Unnamed (TLID:91135224), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:91135224) to Unnamed (TLID:91135240), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:91135240) to Southern Pacific RR, and proceeding northerly along Southern Pacific RR to N Main St, and proceeding easterly along N Main St to Moulton Ave, and proceeding southerly along Moulton Ave to Unnamed (TLID:91136804), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91136804) to Unnamed (TLID:91139753), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:91139753) to Unnamed (TLID:91139815), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:91139815) to Unnamed (TLID:91139874), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:91139874) to Unnamed (TLID:91140271), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:91140271) to Alhambra Ave, and proceeding easterly along Alhambra Ave to N Mission Rd, and proceeding easterly along N Mission Rd to Valley Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Valley Blvd to N Soto St, and proceeding northerly along N Soto St to Unnamed (TLID:91205335), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:91205335) to Huntington Dr S, and proceeding northerly along Huntington Dr S to N Soto St , and proceeding northerly along N Soto St to Huntington $\operatorname{Dr} \mathrm{N}$, and proceeding northerly along Huntington $\operatorname{Dr} \mathrm{N}$ to Monterey Rd, and proceeding northerly along Monterey Rd to Unnamed (TLID:94515146), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:94515146) to Monterey Rd, and proceeding westerly along Monterey Rd to Unnamed (TLID:94519817), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94519817) to Unnamed (TLID:94520001), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:94520001) to Pullman St, and proceeding westerly along Pullman St to Unnamed (TLID:94519462), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94519462) to Unnamed (TLID:94519773), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:94519773) to Unnamed (TLID:94521738), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:94521738) to Via Marisol, and proceeding westerly along Via Marisol to Unnamed (TLID:94521819), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94521819) to Unnamed (TLID:94522379), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:94522379) to Unnamed (TLID:94525682), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed
(TLID:94525682) to at and Sf Rlwy, and proceeding westerly along at and Sf Rlwy to N Figueroa St, and proceeding northerly along N Figueroa St to Unnamed (TLID:94552353), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:94552353) to N Figueroa St, and proceeding northerly along N Figueroa St to Figueroa St, and proceeding northerly along Figueroa St to N Figueroa St, and proceeding northerly along N Figueroa St to Tipton Way, and proceeding westerly along Tipton Way to Tipton Ter, and proceeding northerly along Tipton Ter to Buena Vista Ter, and proceeding westerly along Buena Vista Ter to Unnamed (TLID:94554692), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94554692) to Unnamed (TLID:94554680), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94554680) to Nolden St, and proceeding southerly along Nolden St to Raber St, and proceeding westerly along Raber St to N Ave 56, and proceeding northerly along N Ave 56 to Unnamed (TLID:94508164), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:94508164) to Unnamed (TLID:94508089), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94508089) to N Ave 52, and proceeding southerly along N Ave 52 to Coringa Dr, and proceeding westerly along Coringa Dr to N Ave 51, and proceeding southerly along N Ave 51 to Range View Ave, and proceeding westerly along Range View Ave to N Ave 50, and proceeding southerly along N Ave 50 to Meridian St, and proceeding westerly along Meridian St to N Ave 49, and proceeding southerly along N Ave 49 to York Blvd, and proceeding westerly along York Blvd to N Eagle Rock Blvd, and proceeding westerly along N Eagle Rock Blvd to Eagle Rock Blvd, and proceeding westerly along Eagle Rock Blvd to N Eagle Rock Blvd, and proceeding westerly along N Eagle Rock Blvd to Eagle Rock Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Eagle Rock Blvd to W Ave 33, and proceeding easterly along W Ave 33 to Verdugo Rd, and proceeding southerly along Verdugo Rd to Eagle Rock Blvd, and proceeding northerly along Eagle Rock Blvd to W San Fernando Rd, and proceeding westerly along W San Fernando Rd to I- 5 Bus, and proceeding northerly along I- 5 Bus to Glendale Fwy, and proceeding westerly along Glendale Fwy to Southern Pacific RR, and proceeding northerly along Southern Pacific RR to Glendale Fwy, and proceeding northerly along Glendale Fwy to Southern Pacific RR, and proceeding northerly along Southern Pacific RR to Tyburn St, and proceeding easterly along Tyburn St to Gardena Ave, and proceeding easterly along Gardena Ave to Tyburn St, and proceeding easterly along Tyburn St to Vassar St, and proceeding easterly along Vassar St to Tyburn St, and proceeding easterly along Tyburn St to Unnamed (TLID:93513237), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93513237) to Unnamed (TLID:93513253), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93513253) to Unnamed (TLID:93513617), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93513617) to Unnamed (TLID:93513589), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93513589) to Unnamed (TLID:93513595), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93513595) to Unnamed (TLID:93514139), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93514139) to Unnamed (TLID:93514166), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93514166) to Unnamed (TLID:93514191), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93514191) to Unnamed (TLID:93514307), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93514307) to Unnamed (TLID:93514367), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93514367) to Unnamed (TLID:93516800), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93516800) to Unnamed (TLID:93517271), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93517271) to Unnamed (TLID:93518035), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93518035) to Unnamed (TLID:93518096), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93518096) to Unnamed (TLID:93518331), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93518331) to Unnamed (TLID:93518343), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93518343) to Unnamed (TLID:93518356), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93518356) to Unnamed (TLID:93527795), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93527795) to Unnamed (TLID:93527855), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93527855) to Unnamed (TLID:93527943), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93527943) to Unnamed (TLID:93527960), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93527960) to Unnamed (TLID:93528595), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93528595) to Unnamed (TLID:93528654), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93528654) to Marion Dr, and proceeding easterly along Marion Dr to Unnamed (TLID:93528915), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93528915) to Unnamed (TLID:93529279), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93529279) to Unnamed (TLID:93529292), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93529292) to Unnamed (TLID:93536964), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93536964) to Unnamed (TLID:93537305), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93537305) to Vista Superba St, and proceeding northerly along Vista Superba St to Unnamed (TLID:93537939), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93537939) to Unnamed (TLID:93538022), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93538022) to Unnamed (TLID:93538040), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93538040) to Unnamed (TLID:93538452), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93538452) to Unnamed (TLID:93540232), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93540232) to S Verdugo Rd, and proceeding northerly along S Verdugo Rd to Plumas St, and proceeding easterly along Plumas St to Unnamed (TLID:93540871), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93540871) to Unnamed (TLID:93541786), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed
(TLID:93541786) to Unnamed (TLID:93541844), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93541844) to Unnamed (TLID:93541850), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93541850) to Unnamed (TLID:93541999), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93541999) to Unnamed (TLID:93542066), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93542066) to Unnamed (TLID:93543264), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93543264) to Unnamed (TLID:93543275), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93543275) to Unnamed (TLID:93543258), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93543258) to Unnamed (TLID:93543251), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93543251) to Unnamed (TLID:93543205), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93543205) to Unnamed (TLID:93543220), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93543220) to Unnamed (TLID:93543624), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93543624) to Unnamed (TLID:93543645), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93543645) to Unnamed (TLID:93543798), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93543798) to Unnamed (TLID:93544263), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93544263) to Unnamed (TLID:93544286), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93544286) to Unnamed (TLID:93611020), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93611020) to Unnamed (TLID:93611033), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93611033) to W Broadway, and proceeding easterly along W Broadway to Unnamed (TLID:93611299), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93611299) to Unnamed (TLID:93611481), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93611481) to Unnamed (TLID:93611490), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93611490) to Unnamed (TLID:93611413), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:93611413) to Unnamed (TLID:93611419), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93611419) to Unnamed (TLID:93611447), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93611447) to Unnamed (TLID:93611505), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93611505) to Unnamed (TLID:93611781), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:93611781) to Unnamed (TLID:93612293), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93612293) to Unnamed (TLID:93612309), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93612309) to Unnamed (TLID:93612421), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93612421) to Unnamed (TLID:93612440), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93612440) to Unnamed (TLID:93612841), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93612841) to Unnamed (TLID:93612884), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:93612884) to Unnamed (TLID:94585859), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:94585859) to Unnamed (TLID:94585898), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94585898) to Unnamed (TLID:94585904), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94585904) to Unnamed (TLID:94586248), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94586248) to Unnamed (TLID:94586273), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94586273) to Unnamed (TLID:94586341), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94586341) to Unnamed (TLID:94586812), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94586812) to Unnamed (TLID:94586822), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94586822) to Unnamed (TLID:94586936), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94586936) to Unnamed (TLID:94587646), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94587646) to Unnamed (TLID:94587636), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94587636) to Unnamed (TLID:94589780), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94589780) to Unnamed (TLID:94590489), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94590489) to Unnamed (TLID:94590464), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94590464) to Unnamed (TLID:94599145), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94599145) to Unnamed (TLID:94599164), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94599164) to Unnamed (TLID:94599170), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94599170) to Unnamed (TLID:94599358), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94599358) to Unnamed (TLID:94600339), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:94600339) to Unnamed (TLID:94600393), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94600393) to Unnamed (TLID:94600527), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:94600527) to Unnamed (TLID:94602097), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94602097) to Unnamed (TLID:94602136), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94602136) to Unnamed (TLID:94602214), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94602214) to Unnamed (TLID:94602319), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94602319) to Unnamed (TLID:94603100), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94603100) to Unnamed (TLID:94645341), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94645341) to Unnamed (TLID:94645353), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94645353) to N Figueroa St, and proceeding southerly along N Figueroa St to Unnamed (TLID:94646409), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94646409) to Unnamed (TLID:94645994), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94645994) to Unnamed (TLID:94645977), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94645977) to Unnamed (TLID:94645906), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94645906) to Unnamed (TLID:94645888), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94645888) to Unnamed (TLID:94645866), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94645866) to

Unnamed (TLID:94646038), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94646038) to Unnamed (TLID:94565573), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94565573) to Unnamed (TLID:94565603), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94565603) to Patrician Way, and proceeding southerly along Patrician Way to Unnamed (TLID:94567088), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94567088) to Unnamed (TLID:94566470), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94566470) to Unnamed (TLID:94567022), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94567022) to Unnamed (TLID:94567029), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94567029) to Unnamed (TLID:94567047), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94567047) to Unnamed (TLID:94567053), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94567053) to Unnamed (TLID:94566888), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94566888) to Unnamed (TLID:94566882), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94566882) to Unnamed (TLID:94566570), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94566570) to Unnamed (TLID:94566564), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94566564) to Unnamed (TLID:94566527), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94566527) to Unnamed (TLID:94566503), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94566503) to Unnamed (TLID:94566490), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94566490) to Unnamed (TLID:94566368), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94566368) to Unnamed (TLID:94566346), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94566346) to Unnamed (TLID:94566036), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94566036) to Unnamed (TLID:94565026), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94565026) to Unnamed (TLID:94565000), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94565000) to Unnamed (TLID:94564066), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94564066) to Unnamed (TLID:94563535), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94563535) to Unnamed (TLID:94563501), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94563501) to Colorado Aly, and proceeding westerly along Colorado Aly to Unnamed (TLID:94563445), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94563445) to Unnamed (TLID:94563333), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94563333) to Unnamed (TLID:94563304), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94563304) to Unnamed (TLID:94563288), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94563288) to Unnamed (TLID:94562931), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94562931) to Unnamed (TLID:94562921), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94562921) to Unnamed (TLID:94562857), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94562857) to Unnamed (TLID:94562836), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94562836) to Unnamed (TLID:94562790), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94562790) to Unnamed (TLID:94562784), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94562784) to Unnamed (TLID:94562824), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94562824) to la Loma Rd, and proceeding southerly along la Loma Rd to Unnamed (TLID:94560574), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94560574) to Unnamed (TLID:94556736), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94556736) to Unnamed (TLID:94560254), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94560254) to Unnamed (TLID:94560320), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94560320) to Unnamed (TLID:94560362), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94560362) to Unnamed (TLID:94560697), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94560697) to Unnamed (TLID:94560179), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94560179) to Unnamed (TLID:94560185), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94560185) to Unnamed (TLID:94560195), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94560195) to Unnamed (TLID:94559855), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94559855) to Unnamed (TLID:94561415), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94561415) to Unnamed (TLID:94554033), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94554033) to Unnamed (TLID:94554197), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94554197) to Unnamed (TLID:94554291), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94554291) to Unnamed (TLID:94571289), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94571289) to Unnamed (TLID:94571307), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:94571307) to Unnamed (TLID:94571318), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94571318) to Ave 64, and proceeding southerly along Ave 64 to N Ave 64, and proceeding southerly along N Ave 64 to Ave 64, and proceeding southerly along Ave 64 to Unnamed (TLID:94570749), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94570749) to Unnamed (TLID:94571383), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94571383) to Unnamed (TLID:94572176), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94572176) to Unnamed (TLID:94572208), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:94572208) to Unnamed (TLID:94572320), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94572320) to Unnamed (TLID:94572874), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94572874) to Unnamed (TLID:94577086), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94577086) to Unnamed (TLID:94578118), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94578118) to Unnamed (TLID:94578136), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94578136) to Unnamed (TLID:94577571), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94577571) to Unnamed (TLID:94577559), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94577559) to

Unnamed (TLID:94577461), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94577461) to Unnamed (TLID:94577431), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94577431) to Unnamed (TLID:94576962), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94576962) to Unnamed (TLID:94576931), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94576931) to Arroyo Seco Chnnl, and proceeding southerly along Arroyo Seco Chnnl to Unnamed (TLID:94576781), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94576781) to Unnamed (TLID:94576279), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94576279) to Unnamed (TLID:94576846), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94576846) to Unnamed (TLID:94576837), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94576837) to Unnamed (TLID:94576794), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94576794) to Unnamed (TLID:94576218), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94576218) to Unnamed (TLID:94576140), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94576140) to Unnamed (TLID:94575858), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94575858) to Unnamed (TLID:94575842), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94575842) to Unnamed (TLID:94573596), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94573596) to Unnamed (TLID:94573586), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94573586) to Unnamed (TLID:94573553), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94573553) to Unnamed (TLID:94573183), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94573183) to Unnamed (TLID:94573167), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94573167) to Unnamed (TLID:94570309), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94570309) to Unnamed (TLID:94570291), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94570291) to Unnamed (TLID:94570247), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94570247) to Unnamed (TLID:94570128), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94570128) to Arroyo Seco Chnnl, and proceeding southerly along Arroyo Seco Chnnl to Unnamed (TLID:94569493), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94569493) to Arroyo Seco Chnnl, and proceeding westerly along Arroyo Seco Chnnl to Unnamed (TLID:94569433), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94569433) to Unnamed (TLID:94568455), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94568455) to Unnamed (TLID:94568398), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94568398) to Unnamed (TLID:94568373), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94568373) to Unnamed (TLID:94568239), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94568239) to Unnamed (TLID:94568220), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94568220) to Unnamed (TLID:94567831), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94567831) to Unnamed (TLID:94567789), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94567789) to Unnamed (TLID:94567685), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94567685) to Unnamed (TLID:94539393), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94539393) to Marmion Way, and proceeding westerly along Marmion Way to Arroyo Dr, and proceeding westerly along Arroyo Dr to Unnamed (TLID:94539340), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94539340) to Unnamed (TLID:94539331), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94539331) to Unnamed (TLID:94527373), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94527373) to Unnamed (TLID:94527310), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94527310) to Unnamed (TLID:94527288), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94527288) to Unnamed (TLID:94526702), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94526702) to Unnamed (TLID:94526678), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94526678) to Unnamed (TLID:94526590), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94526590) to Unnamed (TLID:94524987), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94524987) to Unnamed (TLID:94524981), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94524981) to Unnamed (TLID:94524600), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94524600) to Unnamed (TLID:94524275), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94524275) to Unnamed (TLID:94536086), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94536086) to Unnamed (TLID:94536115), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94536115) to Unnamed (TLID:94536526), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94536526) to Unnamed (TLID:94536545), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94536545) to Unnamed (TLID:94537626), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94537626) to Unnamed (TLID:94537811), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94537811) to Unnamed (TLID:94537823), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94537823) to Unnamed (TLID:94540812), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94540812) to Unnamed (TLID:94540976), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94540976) to Unnamed (TLID:94541702), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94541702) to Unnamed (TLID:94541797), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94541797) to Unnamed (TLID:94541841), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94541841) to Unnamed (TLID:94541909), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94541909) to Unnamed (TLID:94707218), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94707218) to Alpha St, and proceeding northerly along Alpha St to Unnamed (TLID:94707549), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94707549) to Unnamed (TLID:94707646), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94707646) to Unnamed (TLID:94707706), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94707706) to Unnamed
(TLID:94707724), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94707724) to Unnamed (TLID:94708536), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94708536) to Unnamed (TLID:94708576), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:94708576) to N Huntington Dr, and proceeding southerly along N Huntington Dr to Unnamed (TLID:94703718), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:94703718) to Huntington Dr N, and proceeding westerly along Huntington $\operatorname{Dr} \mathrm{N}$ to Huntington $\operatorname{Dr} \mathrm{S}$, and proceeding westerly along Huntington Dr S to Unnamed (TLID:94703048), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94703048) to Unnamed (TLID:94703042), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94703042) to Unnamed (TLID:94703036), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94703036) to Unnamed (TLID:94703030), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94703030) to Unnamed (TLID:94702461), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94702461) to Unnamed (TLID:94702454), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94702454) to Unnamed (TLID:94702419), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94702419) to Unnamed (TLID:94702364), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94702364) to Unnamed (TLID:94701686), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94701686) to Unnamed (TLID:94701251), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94701251) to Unnamed (TLID:94701206), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94701206) to Unnamed (TLID:94701193), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94701193) to Unnamed (TLID:94701170), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:94701170) to Unnamed (TLID:91394046), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91394046) to Unnamed (TLID:91393673), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91393673) to Unnamed (TLID:91393585), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91393585) to Unnamed (TLID:91393564), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91393564) to Unnamed (TLID:91393528), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91393528) to Unnamed (TLID:91233231), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91233231) to Unnamed (TLID:91233025), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91233025) to Unnamed (TLID:91232605), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91232605) to Luguna Chnnl, and proceeding southerly along Luguna Chnnl to Unnamed (TLID:91230408), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:91230408) to Unnamed (TLID:91230415), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91230415) to Unnamed (TLID:91230387), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91230387) to Luguna Chnnl, and proceeding southerly along Luguna Chnnl to Unnamed (TLID:91229930), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91229930) to Unnamed (TLID:91229180), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91229180) to Unnamed (TLID:91228726), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91228726) to Unnamed (TLID:91228545), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91228545) to Unnamed (TLID:91228495), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91228495) to Unnamed (TLID:91228170), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91228170) to Unnamed (TLID:91228164), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91228164) to Unnamed (TLID:91228132), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91228132) to Unnamed (TLID:91228120), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91228120) to Unnamed (TLID:91220180), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91220180) to Unnamed (TLID:91219023), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91219023) to Unnamed (TLID:91218906), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91218906) to Unnamed (TLID:91218893), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91218893) to Unnamed (TLID:91218208), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91218208) to Unnamed (TLID:91218081), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91218081) to Unnamed (TLID:91215331), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91215331) to Unnamed (TLID:91215181), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91215181) to Unnamed (TLID:91215175), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91215175) to Unnamed (TLID:91215168), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91215168) to Unnamed (TLID:91215108), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91215108) to State University Dr, and proceeding westerly along State University Dr to Unnamed (TLID:91213851), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91213851) to Unnamed (TLID:91212166), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91212166) to Unnamed (TLID:91211516), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91211516) to Unnamed (TLID:91211157), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91211157) to Unnamed (TLID:91211097), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91211097) to Unnamed (TLID:91211054), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91211054) to Unnamed (TLID:91203508), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91203508) to Unnamed (TLID:91203447), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91203447) to Unnamed (TLID:91203405), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91203405) to Worth St, and proceeding westerly along Worth St to Unnamed (TLID:91201638), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91201638) to Worth St, and proceeding westerly along Worth St to Unnamed (TLID:91198196), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91198196) to Unnamed (TLID:91197346), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91197346) to Unnamed (TLID:91197308), and proceeding westerly along

Unnamed (TLID:91197308) to Unnamed (TLID:91196889), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91196889) to N Indiana St, and proceeding southerly along N Indiana St to Unnamed (TLID:91196314), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91196314) to Unnamed (TLID:91196308), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91196308) to Unnamed (TLID:91196229), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91196229) to Unnamed (TLID:91196207), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91196207) to Unnamed (TLID:91196201), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91196201) to Unnamed (TLID:91196176), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91196176) to Unnamed (TLID:91196130), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91196130) to Unnamed (TLID:91195828), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91195828) to Unnamed (TLID:91194082), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91194082) to Unnamed (TLID:91193908), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91193908) to Unnamed (TLID:91193883), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91193883) to Unnamed (TLID:91193315), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91193315) to Unnamed (TLID:91193258), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91193258) to Unnamed (TLID:91193236), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91193236) to Unnamed (TLID:91192951), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91192951) to Unnamed (TLID:91192907), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91192907) to Unnamed (TLID:91167930), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91167930) to Unnamed (TLID:91167902), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91167902) to Malabar St, and proceeding westerly along Malabar St to N Indiana St, and proceeding southerly along N Indiana St to S Indiana St, and proceeding southerly along S Indiana St to Unnamed (TLID:91166007), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:91166007) to Unnamed (TLID:91166013), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:91166013) to Unnamed (TLID:91166019), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:91166019) to Unnamed (TLID:91166035), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:91166035) to S Alma Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Alma Ave to E 3rd St, and proceeding westerly along E 3rd St to S Indiana St, and proceeding southerly along S Indiana St to Pomona Fwy, and proceeding southerly along Pomona Fwy to S Indiana St, and proceeding southerly along S Indiana St to Lanfranco St, and proceeding southerly along Lanfranco St to S Indiana St, and proceeding southerly along S Indiana St to Unnamed (TLID:91158274), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91158274) to Unnamed (TLID:91158268), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91158268) to Unnamed (TLID:91066145), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91066145) to Unnamed (TLID:91066126), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91066126) to Unnamed (TLID:91065706), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91065706) to Unnamed (TLID:91009637), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91009637) to Unnamed (TLID:91110993), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91110993) to Unnamed (TLID:91106822), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91106822) to Unnamed (TLID:91106394), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91106394) to Unnamed (TLID:91106382), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91106382) to Unnamed (TLID:91008013), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91008013) to Unnamed (TLID:91008007), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91008007) to Unnamed (TLID:91007960), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91007960) to Unnamed (TLID:91007976), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91007976) to Holabird Ave, and proceeding westerly along Holabird Ave to Downey Rd, and proceeding northerly along Downey Rd to S Grande Vista Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Grande Vista Ave to Unnamed (TLID:91105090), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91105090) to Unnamed (TLID:91104976), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91104976) to Unnamed (TLID:91089486), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91089486) to Unnamed (TLID:91089470), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91089470) to Unnamed (TLID:91089464), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91089464) to Unnamed (TLID:91089432), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91089432) to Unnamed (TLID:91089238), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91089238) to Unnamed (TLID:91089260), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91089260) to Unnamed (TLID:91089143), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91089143) to Unnamed (TLID:91088750), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91088750) to Unnamed (TLID:91088699), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91088699) to Unnamed (TLID:91085356), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91085356) to Unnamed (TLID:91085266), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91085266) to Unnamed (TLID:91085227), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91085227) to Unnamed (TLID:91085221), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91085221) to Unnamed (TLID:91084226), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91084226) to Unnamed (TLID:91084214), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:91084214) to Unnamed (TLID:91084270), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91084270) to Unnamed (TLID:91084189), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:91084189) to Unnamed (TLID:91084183), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91084183) to

Unnamed (TLID:91083796), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:91083796) to Harriet St, and proceeding northerly along Harriet St to E 25 th St, and proceeding westerly along E 25 th St to at and Sf Rlwy, and proceeding southerly along at and Sf Rlwy to Unnamed (TLID:89539457), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89539457) to Unnamed (TLID:89539036), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89539036) to E 25th St, and proceeding westerly along E 25th St to S Alameda St, and proceeding northerly along S Alameda St to E Washington Blvd, and proceeding westerly along E Washington Blvd to W Washington Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W Washington Blvd to the point of beginning.

Fifteenth District.
The region bounded and described as follows: 1. Beginning at the point of intersection of Unnamed (TLID:87711966) and Unnamed (TLID:87712690), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87711966) to Unnamed (TLID:87712009), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87712009) to Unnamed (TLID:87712245), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87712245) to Unnamed (TLID:87713935), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87713935) to Unnamed (TLID:87714058), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87714058) to Unnamed (TLID:87714187), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87714187) to Unnamed (TLID:87714610), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87714610) to Unnamed (TLID:87731001), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87731001) to Unnamed (TLID:87731522), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87731522) to Unnamed (TLID:87731742), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87731742) to Unnamed (TLID:87732274), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87732274) to Unnamed (TLID:87732334), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87732334) to Unnamed (TLID:87732531), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87732531) to Unnamed (TLID:87732544), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87732544) to Unnamed (TLID:87732550), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87732550) to Unnamed (TLID:87738977), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87738977) to Unnamed (TLID:87738941), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87738941) to Unnamed (TLID:87738993), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87738993) to Unnamed (TLID:87739022), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87739022) to Unnamed (TLID:87739044), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87739044) to Unnamed (TLID:87739174), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87739174) to Unnamed (TLID:87739579), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87739579) to Unnamed (TLID:87739644), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87739644) to Suana Dr, and proceeding northerly along Suana Dr to Chandeleur Dr, and proceeding northerly along Chandeleur Dr to Miraleste Dr, and proceeding northerly along Miraleste Dr to Unnamed (TLID:87740322), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87740322) to Unnamed (TLID:87740311), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87740311) to Unnamed (TLID:87740384), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87740384) to Unnamed (TLID:87740456), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87740456) to Unnamed (TLID:87741023), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87741023) to Unnamed (TLID:87742873), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87742873) to Unnamed (TLID:87742927), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87742927) to Unnamed (TLID:87742989), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87742989) to Unnamed (TLID:87742995), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87742995) to Summerland St, and proceeding easterly along Summerland St to Unnamed (TLID:87747442), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87747442) to Unnamed (TLID:87747825), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87747825) to Unnamed (TLID:87747984), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87747984) to N Western Ave, and proceeding northerly along N Western Ave to Western Ave, and proceeding northerly along Western Ave to Unnamed (TLID:87748131), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87748131) to Unnamed (TLID:87825937), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87825937) to Unnamed (TLID:87826030), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87826030) to Western Ave, and proceeding northerly along Western Ave to Unnamed (TLID:87826457), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87826457) to Unnamed (TLID:87826517), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87826517) to Unnamed (TLID:87827271), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87827271) to Unnamed (TLID:87838625), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87838625) to Unnamed (TLID:87839434), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87839434) to Unnamed (TLID:87840076), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87840076) to Unnamed (TLID:87841468), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87841468) to Unnamed (TLID:87841025), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87841025) to Unnamed (TLID:87840180), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87840180) to Unnamed (TLID:87829191), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87829191) to Unnamed (TLID:87829214), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87829214) to Westmont Dr, and proceeding westerly along Westmont Dr to Western Ave,
and proceeding northerly along Western Ave to Unnamed (TLID:87829404), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87829404) to Unnamed (TLID:87829469), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87829469) to Unnamed (TLID:87833924), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87833924) to Unnamed (TLID:87834010), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87834010) to Unnamed (TLID:87834035), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87834035) to Unnamed (TLID:87834719), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87834719) to Unnamed (TLID:87834966), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87834966) to Western Ave, and proceeding southerly along Western Ave to Unnamed (TLID:87845753), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87845753) to Unnamed (TLID:87845889), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87845889) to Unnamed (TLID:87846246), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87846246) to Unnamed (TLID:87846259), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87846259) to Unnamed (TLID:87846240), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87846240) to Unnamed (TLID:87846234), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87846234) to Unnamed (TLID:87837202), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87837202) to Western Ave, and proceeding northerly along Western Ave to Unnamed (TLID:87837801), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87837801) to Unnamed (TLID:87837813), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87837813) to Unnamed (TLID:87837826), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87837826) to Unnamed (TLID:87837842), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87837842) to Unnamed (TLID:87837861), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87837861) to Unnamed (TLID:87846545), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87846545) to Unnamed (TLID:87869372), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87869372) to Unnamed (TLID:87869403), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87869403) to Unnamed (TLID:87869753), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87869753) to Unnamed (TLID:87869771), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87869771) to Unnamed (TLID:87869790), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87869790) to Unnamed (TLID:87869827), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87869827) to W 260th St, and proceeding westerly along W 260th St to Market Pl, and proceeding northerly along Market Pl to Unnamed (TLID:87870406), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87870406) to Unnamed (TLID:87870422), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87870422) to Unnamed (TLID:87870447), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87870447) to Unnamed (TLID:87870495), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87870495) to Unnamed (TLID:87870507), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87870507) to Unnamed (TLID:87870843), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87870843) to Unnamed (TLID:87870862), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87870862) to Unnamed (TLID:87871885), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87871885) to Unnamed (TLID:87871903), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87871903) to Unnamed (TLID:87871916), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87871916) to Unnamed (TLID:87871928), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87871928) to Unnamed (TLID:87872017), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87872017) to Unnamed (TLID:87872056), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87872056) to Unnamed (TLID:87872068), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87872068) to Unnamed (TLID:87872436), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87872436) to Unnamed (TLID:87872448), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87872448) to Unnamed (TLID:87872485), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87872485) to Unnamed (TLID:87872566), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87872566) to Unnamed (TLID:87872907), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87872907) to Unnamed (TLID:87877240), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87877240) to Unnamed (TLID:87877551), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87877551) to Unnamed (TLID:87877567), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87877567) to Unnamed (TLID:87877701), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87877701) to Unnamed (TLID:87877714), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87877714) to Unnamed (TLID:87877733), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87877733) to Unnamed (TLID:87878090), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87878090) to Unnamed (TLID:87878109), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87878109) to Fulmar Ave, and proceeding northerly along Fulmar Ave to Unnamed (TLID:87868680), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87868680) to Unnamed (TLID:87868689), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87868689) to Unnamed (TLID:87879466), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87879466) to Unnamed (TLID:87879843), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87879843) to S Western Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Western Ave to 234th St, and proceeding northerly along 234th St to S Western Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Western Ave to W 221 st St , and proceeding easterly along W 221st St to Western Ave, and proceeding northerly along Western Ave to S Western Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Western Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88723961), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88723961) to Unnamed (TLID:88724676), and proceeding northerly along

Unnamed (TLID:88724676) to Unnamed (TLID:88725046), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88725046) to Unnamed (TLID:88725052), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88725052) to Unnamed (TLID:88725106), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88725106) to Unnamed (TLID:88725124), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88725124) to Unnamed (TLID:88725156), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88725156) to Unnamed (TLID:88725193), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88725193) to Unnamed (TLID:88726516), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88726516) to Unnamed (TLID:88726535), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88726535) to Unnamed (TLID:88726547), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88726547) to Unnamed (TLID:88726553), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88726553) to Unnamed (TLID:88726594), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88726594) to Unnamed (TLID:88726612), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88726612) to Unnamed (TLID:88726625), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88726625) to Unnamed (TLID:88726960), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88726960) to Unnamed (TLID:88727020), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88727020) to Unnamed (TLID:88727032), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88727032) to Unnamed (TLID:88727064), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88727064) to Unnamed (TLID:88727076), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88727076) to Unnamed (TLID:88727089), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88727089) to Unnamed (TLID:88744114), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88744114) to Unnamed (TLID:88744137), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88744137) to Unnamed (TLID:88744587), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88744587) to S Western Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Western Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88747106), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88747106) to Unnamed (TLID:88747125), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88747125) to Unnamed (TLID:88757338), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88757338) to Unnamed (TLID:88757361), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88757361) to Unnamed (TLID:88757404), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88757404) to Unnamed (TLID:88757444), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88757444) to Unnamed (TLID:88757821), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88757821) to Unnamed (TLID:88757840), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88757840) to Unnamed (TLID:88757871), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88757871) to Unnamed (TLID:88757896), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88757896) to Unnamed (TLID:88758456), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88758456) to Unnamed (TLID:88758474), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88758474) to Unnamed (TLID:88758528), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88758528) to Unnamed (TLID:88758547), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88758547) to Unnamed (TLID:88758988), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88758988) to Unnamed (TLID:88760468), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88760468) to Unnamed (TLID:88760806), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88760806) to Unnamed (TLID:88760877), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88760877) to Unnamed (TLID:88760908), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88760908) to Unnamed (TLID:88760915), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88760915) to Unnamed (TLID:88766898), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88766898) to Unnamed (TLID:88766929), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88766929) to Unnamed (TLID:88766994), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88766994) to Unnamed (TLID:88767401), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88767401) to W 177th St, and proceeding easterly along W 177th St to S Normandie Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Normandie Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88767586), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88767586) to Unnamed (TLID:88767943), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88767943) to Unnamed (TLID:88768631), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88768631) to Unnamed (TLID:88768656), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88768656) to W 177th St, and proceeding easterly along W 177th St to Budlong Ave, and proceeding southerly along Budlong Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88768096), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88768096) to Unnamed (TLID:88768058), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88768058) to Unnamed (TLID:88767379), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88767379) to Unnamed (TLID:88767327), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88767327) to Unnamed (TLID:88767042), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88767042) to Electric St, and proceeding easterly along Electric St to S Vermont Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Vermont Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88961012), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88961012) to Unnamed (TLID:88961018), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88961018) to Unnamed (TLID:88961044), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88961044) to S Vermont Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Vermont Ave to W Cassidy St, and proceeding northerly along W Cassidy St to S Vermont Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Vermont Ave to W Artesia Blvd, and proceeding northerly along W Artesia Blvd to S Vermont Ave, and proceeding northerly along S

Vermont Ave to W 164th St, and proceeding westerly along W 164th St to Unnamed (TLID:89030237), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89030237) to Southern Pacific RR, and proceeding northerly along Southern Pacific RR to Unnamed (TLID:89030750), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89030750) to Unnamed (TLID:89030895), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89030895) to Unnamed (TLID:89032534), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89032534) to Unnamed (TLID:89032617), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89032617) to Unnamed (TLID:89032648), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89032648) to Unnamed (TLID:89033039), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89033039) to Unnamed (TLID:89033123), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89033123) to Unnamed (TLID:89033155), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89033155) to Unnamed (TLID:89033552), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89033552) to Unnamed (TLID:89037457), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89037457) to Unnamed (TLID:89037482), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89037482) to Unnamed (TLID:89037538), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89037538) to Unnamed (TLID:89037880), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89037880) to Unnamed (TLID:89038109), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89038109) to Unnamed (TLID:89038530), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89038530) to Unnamed (TLID:89040294), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89040294) to Unnamed (TLID:89040391), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89040391) to S Vermont Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Vermont Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89060068), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89060068) to Unnamed (TLID:89060111), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89060111) to S Vermont Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Vermont Ave to W 110 th St , and proceeding easterly along W 110th St to S Grand Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Grand Ave to W Imperial Hwy, and proceeding easterly along W Imperial Hwy to Unnamed (TLID:89072475), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89072475) to W Imperial Hwy, and proceeding easterly along W Imperial Hwy to Imperial Hwy, and proceeding easterly along Imperial Hwy to E Lanzit Ave, and proceeding easterly along E Lanzit Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89138738), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89138738) to Unnamed (TLID:89138125), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89138125) to Unnamed (TLID:89138150), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89138150) to Unnamed (TLID:89137636), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89137636) to Wadsworth Ave, and proceeding northerly along Wadsworth Ave to E 108th St, and proceeding easterly along E 108th St to S Central Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Central Ave to E 103rd St, and proceeding easterly along E 103rd St to Success Ave, and proceeding northerly along Success Ave to E 96th St, and proceeding northerly along E 96th St to Success Ave, and proceeding northerly along Success Ave to E 92nd St, and proceeding easterly along E 92nd St to Compton Ave, and proceeding northerly along Compton Ave to E 91st St, and proceeding easterly along E 91st St to Maie Ave, and proceeding southerly along Maie Ave to E 92nd St, and proceeding easterly along E 92nd St to Croesus Ave, and proceeding southerly along Croesus Ave to E 97th St, and proceeding easterly along E 97th St to Unnamed (TLID:89418453), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89418453) to E 99th Pl, and proceeding westerly along E 99th Pl to Unnamed (TLID:89160499), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89160499) to Unnamed (TLID:89160512), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:89160512) to Unnamed (TLID:89160922), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89160922) to Mona Blvd, and proceeding southerly along Mona Blvd to Imperial Hwy, and proceeding westerly along Imperial Hwy to E Imperial Hwy, and proceeding westerly along E Imperial Hwy to Imperial Hwy, and proceeding westerly along Imperial Hwy to Unnamed (TLID:89132079), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89132079) to Compton Crk, and proceeding southerly along Compton Crk to Unnamed (TLID:89132471), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89132471) to Unnamed (TLID:89131913), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89131913) to Unnamed (TLID:89131869), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89131869) to Unnamed (TLID:89131863), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89131863) to Unnamed (TLID:89130444), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89130444) to Unnamed (TLID:89130947), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89130947) to Unnamed (TLID:89130359), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89130359) to Unnamed (TLID:89130338), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89130338) to Unnamed (TLID:89130314), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89130314) to Unnamed (TLID:89130283), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89130283) to Unnamed (TLID:89130256), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89130256) to Unnamed (TLID:89130225), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89130225) to Unnamed (TLID:89129895), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89129895) to Unnamed (TLID:89129111), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89129111) to Unnamed (TLID:89128977), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89128977) to Unnamed (TLID:89088530), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89088530) to Unnamed (TLID:89088059), and proceeding westerly
along Unnamed (TLID:89088059) to Unnamed (TLID:89086084), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89086084) to Unnamed (TLID:89084977), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89084977) to Unnamed (TLID:89084939), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89084939) to Unnamed (TLID:89070369), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89070369) to Unnamed (TLID:89065288), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89065288) to Unnamed (TLID:89065278), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89065278) to W 121st St, and proceeding westerly along W 121st St to S Broadway, and proceeding northerly along S Broadway to Unnamed (TLID:89070168), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89070168) to Unnamed (TLID:89070128), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89070128) to Unnamed (TLID:89065888), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89065888) to Unnamed (TLID:89065875), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89065875) to Unnamed (TLID:89065860), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89065860) to Unnamed (TLID:89065752), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89065752) to Unnamed (TLID:89065726), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89065726) to Unnamed (TLID:89065706), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89065706) to Unnamed (TLID:89064019), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89064019) to Unnamed (TLID:89063991), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89063991) to Unnamed (TLID:89063971), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89063971) to Unnamed (TLID:89063534), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89063534) to Unnamed (TLID:89063496), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89063496) to Unnamed (TLID:89063471), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89063471) to Unnamed (TLID:89063446), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89063446) to Unnamed (TLID:89062855), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89062855) to Unnamed (TLID:89062809), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89062809) to Unnamed (TLID:89062784), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89062784) to Unnamed (TLID:89062360), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89062360) to Unnamed (TLID:89043602), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89043602) to Unnamed (TLID:89043557), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89043557) to Unnamed (TLID:89043149), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89043149) to Unnamed (TLID:89043130), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89043130) to Unnamed (TLID:89043105), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89043105) to Unnamed (TLID:89042672), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89042672) to Unnamed (TLID:89042666), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89042666) to Unnamed (TLID:89042660), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89042660) to Unnamed (TLID:89042402), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89042402) to Unnamed (TLID:89041998), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89041998) to Unnamed (TLID:89041991), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89041991) to Unnamed (TLID:89041947), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89041947) to Unnamed (TLID:89036671), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89036671) to Southern Pacific RR, and proceeding westerly along Southern Pacific RR to S Figueroa St, and proceeding southerly along S Figueroa St to W 164th St, and proceeding southerly along W 164th St to S Figueroa St, and proceeding southerly along S Figueroa St to Unnamed (TLID:88967943), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88967943) to Unnamed (TLID:88967642), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88967642) to W Walnut St, and proceeding easterly along W Walnut St to Unnamed (TLID:88967648), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88967648) to Unnamed (TLID:88967968), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88967968) to Unnamed (TLID:88968001), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88968001) to Unnamed (TLID:88967601), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88967601) to Unnamed (TLID:88967595), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88967595) to Unnamed (TLID:88967576), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88967576) to S Figueroa St, and proceeding southerly along S Figueroa St to W 190th St, and proceeding westerly along W 190th St to Unnamed (TLID:88955603), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88955603) to Unnamed (TLID:88955591), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88955591) to Unnamed (TLID:88955474), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88955474) to Unnamed (TLID:88955575), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88955575) to Unnamed (TLID:88955516), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88955516) to Unnamed (TLID:88955459), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88955459) to W 190th St, and proceeding westerly along W 190th St to Unnamed (TLID:88954863), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88954863) to Unnamed (TLID:88954804), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88954804) to Unnamed (TLID:88954481), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88954481) to Unnamed (TLID:88954424), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:88954424) to S Vermont Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Vermont Ave to Knox St, and proceeding easterly along Knox St to Unnamed (TLID:88953658), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88953658) to Unnamed (TLID:88953315), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88953315) to

Hamilton Ave, and proceeding southerly along Hamilton Ave to W del Amo Blvd, and proceeding westerly along W del Amo Blvd to Normandie Ave, and proceeding southerly along Normandie Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88729635), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88729635) to Unnamed (TLID:88729623), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88729623) to Unnamed (TLID:88729166), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88729166) to Unnamed (TLID:88729144), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88729144) to Unnamed (TLID:88729110), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88729110) to Unnamed (TLID:88728727), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:88728727) to Unnamed (TLID:87885243), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87885243) to Unnamed (TLID:87885210), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87885210) to Unnamed (TLID:87885271), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87885271) to Sepulveda Blvd, and proceeding easterly along Sepulveda Blvd to Southern Pacific RR, and proceeding southerly along Southern Pacific RR to Unnamed (TLID:87882306), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87882306) to Unnamed (TLID:87882274), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87882274) to Frampton Ave, and proceeding southerly along Frampton Ave to W Lomita Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Lomita Blvd to Southern Pacific RR, and proceeding easterly along Southern Pacific RR to W Lomita Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Lomita Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:87938396), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87938396) to W Lomita Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Lomita Blvd to I- 110, and proceeding southerly along I- 110 to Unnamed (TLID:87939334), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87939334) to Figueroa St, and proceeding northerly along Figueroa St to W Lomita Blvd, and proceeding easterly along W Lomita Blvd to E Lomita Blvd, and proceeding easterly along E Lomita Blvd to Fries Ave, and proceeding easterly along Fries Ave to E Lomita Blvd, and proceeding easterly along E Lomita Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:87954099), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87954099) to Unnamed (TLID:87954130), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87954130) to Unnamed (TLID:87958712), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87958712) to Unnamed (TLID:87958759), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87958759) to Unnamed (TLID:87959153), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87959153) to Unnamed (TLID:87959749), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87959749) to Unnamed (TLID:87959768), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87959768) to Unnamed (TLID:87959789), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87959789) to Unnamed (TLID:87960512), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87960512) to Unnamed (TLID:87960542), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87960542) to Unnamed (TLID:87960576), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87960576) to at and Sf Rlwy, and proceeding easterly along at and Sf Rlwy to Unnamed (TLID:87961100), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87961100) to E Deloras Dr, and proceeding easterly along E Deloras Dr to Wilmington Ave, and proceeding southerly along Wilmington Ave to E Lomita Blvd, and proceeding easterly along E Lomita Blvd to Unnamed (TLID:87997530), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87997530) to Unnamed (TLID:87997555), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87997555) to Unnamed (TLID:87997574), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:87997574) to Alameda St, and proceeding easterly along Alameda St to Unnamed (TLID:87993704), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87993704) to Unnamed (TLID:87996054), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87996054) to Unnamed (TLID:87996079), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87996079) to Unnamed (TLID:87996095), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87996095) to Unnamed (TLID:87995989), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87995989) to Unnamed (TLID:87996029), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87996029) to Unnamed (TLID:87996621), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87996621) to Unnamed (TLID:87996627), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87996627) to Unnamed (TLID:87996692), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87996692) to Unnamed (TLID:89620599), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89620599) to Unnamed (TLID:89624522), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89624522) to Unnamed (TLID:89624545), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89624545) to Unnamed (TLID:89624570), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89624570) to Unnamed (TLID:89624675), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89624675) to Unnamed (TLID:89625798), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89625798) to Unnamed (TLID:89625734), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89625734) to Unnamed (TLID:89625707), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89625707) to Unnamed (TLID:89625713), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89625713) to Unnamed (TLID:89625741), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89625741) to Unnamed (TLID:89625939), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89625939) to Unnamed (TLID:89002326), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89002326) to Unnamed (TLID:89002464), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89002464) to Unnamed (TLID:89003215), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89003215) to Unnamed (TLID:89003509), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89003509) to

I- 405 , and proceeding westerly along I- 405 to S Alameda St, and proceeding northerly along S Alameda St to Unnamed (TLID:89003662), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89003662) to Unnamed (TLID:89003785), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:89003785) to S Alameda St, and proceeding northerly along S Alameda St to Unnamed (TLID:90441023), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:90441023) to Unnamed (TLID:90440937), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:90440937) to Unnamed (TLID:90440930), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:90440930) to Unnamed (TLID:90440921), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:90440921) to Unnamed (TLID:90439796), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:90439796) to Unnamed (TLID:90439786), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:90439786) to Unnamed (TLID:90439808), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:90439808) to E 223rd St, and proceeding westerly along E 223rd St to Hesperian Ave, and proceeding southerly along Hesperian Ave to Unnamed (TLID:90439545), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:90439545) to Unnamed (TLID:89626010), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89626010) to Unnamed (TLID:89626414), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89626414) to Unnamed (TLID:89626113), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89626113) to Unnamed (TLID:89625297), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89625297) to Unnamed (TLID:89625266), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89625266) to Unnamed (TLID:89625185), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89625185) to Unnamed (TLID:89624813), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89624813) to Unnamed (TLID:89624066), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89624066) to Unnamed (TLID:89620691), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89620691) to Unnamed (TLID:89620336), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89620336) to Unnamed (TLID:89619936), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89619936) to Unnamed (TLID:89619210), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89619210) to Unnamed (TLID:87995859), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87995859) to 1st St, and proceeding westerly along 1st St to Unnamed (TLID:87995823), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87995823) to Unnamed (TLID:87995794), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87995794) to Unnamed (TLID:89618720), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89618720) to Hobson Ave, and proceeding southerly along Hobson Ave to Unnamed (TLID:89618695), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89618695) to Unnamed (TLID:89618589), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89618589) to Unnamed (TLID:89618614), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89618614) to Unnamed (TLID:89618676), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89618676) to Unnamed (TLID:89618645), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89618645) to Unnamed (TLID:89618658), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89618658) to Unnamed (TLID:89619371), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89619371) to Unnamed (TLID:89597998), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89597998) to Unnamed (TLID:89598011), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89598011) to Unnamed (TLID:89598020), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89598020) to Unnamed (TLID:89597972), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:89597972) to Unnamed (TLID:89597966), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89597966) to Unnamed (TLID:89597487), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89597487) to Unnamed (TLID:89596971), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:89596971) to Unnamed (TLID:87982514), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87982514) to Unnamed (TLID:87981725), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87981725) to Unnamed (TLID:87978333), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87978333) to Unnamed (TLID:87977530), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87977530) to Unnamed (TLID:87977523), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87977523) to Unnamed (TLID:87977511), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87977511) to Unnamed (TLID:87976334), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87976334) to Unnamed (TLID:87976243), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87976243) to Unnamed (TLID:87969390), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87969390) to Unnamed (TLID:87969236), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87969236) to Unnamed (TLID:87969208), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87969208) to Unnamed (TLID:87975972), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87975972) to Unnamed (TLID:87975650), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87975650) to Unnamed (TLID:87968772), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87968772) to Unnamed (TLID:87968664), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87968664) to Unnamed (TLID:87968598), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87968598) to Unnamed (TLID:87968484), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87968484) to Unnamed (TLID:87968520), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87968520) to Unnamed (TLID:87968503), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87968503) to Unnamed (TLID:87968088), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87968088) to Unnamed (TLID:87968072), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87968072) to Unnamed (TLID:87968614), and proceeding
southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87968614) to Unnamed (TLID:87918068), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87918068) to Unnamed (TLID:87918546), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87918546) to Unnamed (TLID:87918561), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87918561) to Unnamed (TLID:87915522), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87915522) to Unnamed (TLID:87915500), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87915500) to Unnamed (TLID:87915466), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87915466) to Unnamed (TLID:87915460), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87915460) to Unnamed (TLID:87915438), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87915438) to Unnamed (TLID:87915271), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87915271) to Unnamed (TLID:87893861), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87893861) to Unnamed (TLID:87893851), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87893851) to Unnamed (TLID:87893842), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87893842) to Unnamed (TLID:87893823), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87893823) to Unnamed (TLID:87893805), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87893805) to Unnamed (TLID:87893792), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87893792) to Unnamed (TLID:87893762), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87893762) to Unnamed (TLID:87893641), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87893641) to Unnamed (TLID:87893605), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87893605) to Unnamed (TLID:87892817), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87892817) to Unnamed (TLID:87892749), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87892749) to Unnamed (TLID:87891391), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87891391) to Unnamed (TLID:87891376), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87891376) to Unnamed (TLID:87891199), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87891199) to Unnamed (TLID:87888523), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87888523) to Unnamed (TLID:87888424), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87888424) to Unnamed (TLID:87888278), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87888278) to Unnamed (TLID:87887357), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87887357) to Unnamed (TLID:87887295), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87887295) to Unnamed (TLID:87887288), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87887288) to Unnamed (TLID:87887203), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87887203) to Unnamed (TLID:87727251), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87727251) to Unnamed (TLID:87727285), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87727285) to Unnamed (TLID:87726482), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87726482) to Unnamed (TLID:87725791), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87725791) to Unnamed (TLID:87725126), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87725126) to Unnamed (TLID:87725096), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87725096) to Unnamed (TLID:87724550), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87724550) to Unnamed (TLID:87724204), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87724204) to Unnamed (TLID:87724190), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87724190) to Unnamed (TLID:87724440), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87724440) to Unnamed (TLID:87724483), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87724483) to Unnamed (TLID:87724260), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87724260) to Unnamed (TLID:87724393), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87724393) to Unnamed (TLID:87724178), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87724178) to Unnamed (TLID:87724141), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87724141) to Unnamed (TLID:87724135), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87724135) to Unnamed (TLID:87712690), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87712690) to the point of beginning. 2. Except for beginning at the point of intersection of W 7th St and Unnamed (TLID:87745388), and proceeding easterly along W 7th St to S Meyler St, and proceeding northerly along S Meyler St to Unnamed (TLID:87758118), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87758118) to S Meyler St, and proceeding northerly along S Meyler St to W 1st St, and proceeding westerly along W 1st St to Unnamed (TLID:87758780), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:87758780) to Unnamed (TLID:87759139), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87759139) to Unnamed (TLID:87758699), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87758699) to Unnamed (TLID:87758680), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87758680) to W 1st St, and proceeding westerly along W 1st St to Unnamed (TLID:87756579), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87756579) to Unnamed (TLID:87755844), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87755844) to W 3rd St, and proceeding westerly along W 3rd St to Unnamed (TLID:87755482), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87755482) to S Hamilton Ave, and proceeding southerly along S Hamilton Ave to Big Canyon Pl, and proceeding westerly along Big Canyon Pl to S Walker Ave, and proceeding westerly along S Walker Ave to W 3rd St, and proceeding westerly along W 3rd St to S Harbor View Ave, and proceeding northerly along S Harbor View Ave to Unnamed (TLID:87746088), and proceeding westerly along Unnamed (TLID:87746088) to Unnamed (TLID:87745622), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87745622) to Unnamed (TLID:87745388), and proceeding southerly along Unnamed (TLID:87745388) to
the point of beginning. 3. Except for beginning at the point of intersection of Normandie Ave and W 190th St, and proceeding southerly along Normandie Ave to Knox St, and proceeding southerly along Knox St to Normandie Ave, and proceeding southerly along Normandie Ave to Unnamed (TLID:88740523), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88740523) to Unnamed (TLID:88740620), and proceeding easterly along Unnamed (TLID:88740620) to Unnamed (TLID:88759090), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88759090) to Unnamed (TLID:88759601), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88759601) to Unnamed (TLID:88759607), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88759607) to Unnamed (TLID:88760256), and proceeding northerly along Unnamed (TLID:88760256) to W 190th St, and proceeding westerly along W 190th St to the point of beginning.

## Appendix F: List of Commission-Adopted Database Elements

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
Official Database
2011-12 Technical Documentation
Layers
Base Layers

```
ccblk Data Variables, by 2010 Census Block
cctract Data Variables, by }2010\mathrm{ Census Tract
```

Base Plans

| Existing Council Base | Base Plan for Use in Redistricting- Includes <br> Current City Council Districts <br> City Base |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Base Plan for Use in Redistricting- Does Not |
|  | Include Current City Council Districts |

Misc City Layers- City of Los Angeles
cdd_sites Community Development Department Sites, including
WorkSource centers,FamilySource centers, BusinessSource Centers. One Stop Centers
cdd zones Community Development Department Zones
cdbg tracts CDBG Eligible Census Tracts
lahd_nsp_zones LAHD NSP Zones
city_empower_zones City Empowerment Zones
ent_c34 Federal Enterprise Communities
ent zones State Empowerment Zones
facilities Facilities, including parks, recreation centers, hospitals, airports,
churches, fire stations, police stations, libraries, colleges,
cemeteries, etc.
fedempwr Federal Empowerment Zone
lafd_firstin_districts Fire Department Service Areas
lapd_areas Police Department Service Areas
nc_areas Neighborhood Council Areas
latimes_neigh LA Times Neighborhood Areas
zip Zip Codes
Planning Layers- City of Los Angeles

```
bids Business Improvement Districts
cpala Community Planning Areas
cpd_hpozs Historic Preservation Overlay Zones
cra Community Redevelopment Areas
Land Use Land Use/Zoning Areas
specplan Community Specific Plan Areas
```

ad11
cd11
sd11
sup11
Voter Reg Precincts
School Layers
attende 0102
attendh0102
attendm0102
minidist2010
new_site
schoolsall

Transportation Layers
mr_bl_1
mr_gl_1
mr_rl_1
mr_gl_1
mr_el_1
mr_cl_1
mtalines 2011
taz_la
ladot_dash

Base Layers Data
Totals

Census PL 94-171

## POP

UNIFSCHOOL
LATPOP_D
WHIPOP_D
BLAPOP_D
AMIPOP_D
ASIPOP_D
HPIPOP_D
OTHPOP_D
MMRPOP_D

VAP
LATVAP_D
WHIVAP_D

2011 State Assembly Districts
2011 Congressional Districts
2011 State Senate Districts
2011 County Supervisor Districts
2010 County Voter Registration Precincts

Elementary School Attendance Areas
High School Attendance Areas
Middle School Attendance Areas
LAUSD Mini Districts
New School Sites
All Schools and School Facilities

Metrorail Blue Line
Metrorail Green Line
Metrorail Red Line
Metrorail Gold Line
Metrorail Expo Line
Metrorail Crenshaw Line
Metro 2011 Bus Lines
Metro Transportation Attribute Zones
LADOT Dash Lines

## Population

LAUSD Student Population
Latino/Hispanic Origin Population - DOJ
White only Population - DOJ
Black only and Black+White Population - DOJ
American Indian only and American Indian+White Population -
DOJ
Asian only and Asian+White - DOJ
Hawaiian, Pacific Islander only and HPI+White Pop. - DOJ
Other Race only and Other Race + White Pop. - DOJ
Any Multi Minority Race Non-Hispanic Combination Pop. DOJ
Voting Age Population
Latino/Hispanic Origin VAP - DOJ
White only VAP - DOJ Category

BLAVAP_D
AMIVAP_D
ASIVAP_D
HPIVAP_D
OTHVAP_D
MMRVAP_D

## American Community Survey

TCVAP_095E
LCVAP_095E
WCVAP_095E
BCVAP_095E
ACVAP_095E
AOCVAP 095
TOTCVAP ${ }^{\text {E }}$ E
LATCVAP_E1
WHICVAP E1
BLACVAP_E1
ASICVAP_E1
AOCVAP_E10
Census SF1
AGE
age0_4
age5_17
age 18 _34
age35_64
age65plus
Household type
hhtot
hh1persn
hhm_kids
hhs_kids
hhm_nokd
hhs_nokd
hhnonfam
Group Quarters
GQI_CORR
GQI_JUVI
GQI_NURSE
GQI_OTHER
GQN_STUDENT
GQN_MILITARY
GQN_OTHER

Black only and Black+White VAP - DOJ
American Indian and American Indian+White VAP - DOJ
Asian only and Asian+White VAP - DOJ
Hawaiian, Pacific Islander only and HPI+White VAP- DOJ
Other Race only and Other Race + White VAP - DOJ
Any Multi Minority Race Combination VAP - DOJ

Citizen Voting Age Population - 2009
Latino/Hispanic Citizen Voting Age Population - 2009
White Citizen Voting Age Population - 2009
Black Citizen Voting Age Population - 2009
Asian Citizen Voting Age Population - 2009
All Other Citizen Voting Age Population - 2009
Citizen Voting Age Population - 2010
Latino/Hispanic Citizen Voting Age Population - 2010
White Citizen Voting Age Population - 2010
Black Citizen Voting Age Population - 2010
Asian Citizen Voting Age Population - 2010
All Other Citizen Voting Age Population - 2010

0-4 Years Old
5-17 Years Old
18-34 Years Old
35-64 Years Old
$65+$ Years Old

Total Households
1 Person Households
Married Households with Children
Single Households with Children
Married Households with no Children
Single Households with no Children
Non-Family Households

Correctional facilities for adults
Juvenile facilities
Nursing facilities/Skilled-nursing facilities
Other institutional facilities
College/University student housing
Military quarters
Other noninstitutional facilities

Tenure

| OCC_TOT | Total Occupancy |
| :--- | :--- |
| OCC_OWN_M | Owner Occupied with mortgage |
| OCC_OWN_C | Owner Occupied free and clear |
| OCC_RENT | Renter Occupied |

Household size

| HH_TOT | Total Households |
| :--- | :--- |
| HU_1P | 1 Person Households |
| HU_2P | 2 Person Households |
| HU_3P | 3 Person Households |
| HU_4P | 4 Person Households |
| HU_5P | 5 Person Households |
| HU_6P | 6 Person Households |
| HU_7P | 7 Person Households |

2011 Registration Data - Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk

| TOTREG11 | Voter Registration |
| :--- | :--- |
| LATREG | Latino/Hispanic - Spanish Surname Registration |
| AFAMREG | African-American Registration |
| CHIREG | Chinese Surname Registration |
| FILREG | Filipino Surname Registration |
| INDREG | Asian Indian Surname Registration |
| JPNREG | Japanese Surname Registration |
| KORREG | Korean Surname Registration |
| VEITREG | Vietnamese Surname Registration |
| ARMNREG | Armenian Surname Registration |
| JWSHREG | Jewish Surname Registration |
| MALE | Male |
| FEMALE | Female |
| DEM | Democratic |
| REP | Republican |
| DTS | Decline to State |
| AI | American Independent |
| PF | Peace and Freedom |
| GRN | Green |
| LIB | Libertarian |
| OTH | Other |

2010 Registration Data - Statewide Database

| TOTREG | Voter Registration |
| :--- | :--- |
| DEM | Democratic |
| REP | Republican |
| DCL | Decline to State |
| OTH | Other |
| AIP | American Independent |
| PAF | Peace and Freedom |
| MSC | Miscellaneous |
| LIB | Libertarian |


| NLP | Natural Law Party |
| :--- | :--- |
| GRN | Green |
| REF | Reform |
| MALE | Male |
| FEMALE | Female |
| LATREG | Latino/Hispanic - Spanish Surname Registration |
| LATDEM | Latino/Hispanic Democratic - Spanish Surname Registration |
| LATREP | Latino/Hispanic Republican - Spanish Surname Registration |
| LATDCL | Latino/Hispanic Decline to State - Spanish Surname Registration |
| LATOTH | Latino/Hispanic Other Party - Spanish Surname Registration |
| ASNREG | Asian Surname Registration |
| ASNDEM | Asian Democratic Surname Registration |
| ASNREP | Asian Republican Surname Registration |
| ASNDCL | Asian Decline to State Surname Registration |
| ASNOTH | Asian Other Party Surname Registration |
| KSNREG | Korean Surname Registration |
| JSNREG | Japanese Surname Registration |
| CSNREG | Chinese Surname Registration |
| ISNREG | Asian Indian Surname Registration |
| VSNREG | Vietnamese Surname Registration |
| FSNREG | Filipino Surname Registration |
| KORDEM | Korean Democratic Surname Registration |
| KORREP | Korean Republican Surname Registration |
| KORDCL | Korean Decline to State Surname Registration |
| KOROTH | Korean Other Party Surname Registration |
| JPNDEM | Japanese Democratic Surname Registration |
| JPNREP | Japanese Republican Surname Registration |
| JPNDCL | Japanese Decline to State Surname Registration |
| JPNOTH | Japanese Other Party Surname Registration |
| CHIDEM | Chinese Democratic Surname Registration |
| CHIREP | Chinese Republican Surname Registration |
| CHIDCL | Chinese Decline to State Surname Registration |
| CHIOTH | Chinese Other Party Surname Registration |
| INDDEM | Jewish Other Party Surname Registration |
| INDREP | Asian Indian Democratic Surname Registration |
| INDDCL | Asian Indian Republican Surname Registration |
| INDOTH | Asian Indian Decline to State Surname Registration |
| VIETDEM | Asian Indian Other Party Surname Registration |
| VIETREP | Vietnamese Democratic Surname Registration |
| VIETDCL | Vietnamese Republican Surname Registration |
| VIETOTH | Vietnamese Decline to State Surname Registration |
| FILDEM | Vietnamese Other Party Surname Registration |
| FILREP | Filipino Democratic Surname Registration |
| FILDCL | Filipino Republican Surname Registration |
| FILOTH | Filipino Decline to State Surname Registration |
| JEWDEM | Filipino Other Party Surname Registration |
| JEWREP | Jewish Democratic Surname Registration |
| JEWDCL | JEWOTH |

2010 General Election

TOTAL_V10G
TOTDEM_V10
TOTREP_V10
TOTDCL_V10
TOTOTH_V10
LATTOT_V10
LATDEM_V10
LATREP_V10
LATDCL_V10
LATOTH_V10
ASNTOT_V10
ASNDEM_V10
ASNREP_V10
ASNDCL_V10
ASNOTH_V10
KSNTOT_V10
JSNTOT_V10
CSNTOT V10
ISNTOT_V10
VSNTOT_V10
FSNTOT V10
GOVT $1 \overline{0} \mathrm{G}$
GOVD_10G
GOVR_10G
LTGT_10G
LTGD-10G
LTGR_10G
ATGT_10G
ATGD_10G
ATGR_10G
SOST_10G
SOSD_10G
SOSR_10G
TRST_10G
TRSD_10G
TRSR_10G
CONT_10G
COND_10G
CONR_10G
INST_10G
INSD_10G
INSR_10G
SENT_10G
SEND_10G
SENR_10G
ASMT_10G

Total Voter Turnout
Democratic Voter Turnout
Republican Voter Turnout
Decline to State Voter Turnout
Other Party Voter Turnout
Latino/Hispanic - Spanish Surname Voter Turnout
Latino/Hispanic Democratic - Spanish Surname Voter Turnout
Latino/Hispanic Republican - Spanish Surname Voter Turnout
Latino/Hispanic Decline to State - Spanish Surname Voter
Turnout
Latino/Hispanic Other Party - Spanish Surname Voter Turnout
Asian Surname Voter Turnout
Asian Democratic Surname Voter Turnout
Asian Republican Surname Voter Turnout
Asian Decline to State Surname Voter Turnout
Asian Other Party Surname Voter Turnout
Korean Surname Voter Turnout
Japanese Surname Voter Turnout
Chinese Surname Voter Turnout
Asian Indian Surname Voter Turnout
Vietnamese Surname Voter Turnout
Filipino Surname Voter Turnout
Governor, Total
Jerry Brown
Meg Whitman
Lieutenant Governor, Total
Gavin Newsom
Abel Maldonado
Attorney General, Total
Kamala Harris
Steve Cooley
Secretary of State, Total
Debra Bowen
Damon Dunn
Treasurer, Total
Bill Lockyer
Mimi Walters
Controller, Total
John Chiang
Tony Strickland
Insurance Commissioner, Total
Dave Jones
Mike Villines
State Senate, Total
State Senate Democratic Candidate
State Senate Republican Candidate
Assembly, Total

| ASMD_10G | Assembly Democratic Candidate |
| :--- | :--- |
| ASMR_10G | Assembly Republican Candidate |
| CNGT_10G | Congress, Total |
| CNGD_10G | Congress Democratic Candidate |
| CNGR_10G | Congress Republican Candidate |

2008 General Registration - Statewide Database

| TOTAL_R08G | Total Registration |
| :--- | :--- |
| TOTDEM_R08 | Democratic Registration |
| TOTREP_R08 | Repubican Registration |
| TOTDCL_R08 | Decline to State Registration |
| TOTOTH_R08 | Other Registration |
| LATTOT_R08 | Latino/Hispanic - Spanish Surname Registration |
| LATDEM_R08 | Latino/Hispanic Democratic - Spanish Surname Registration |
| LATREP_R08 | Latino/Hispanic Republican - Spanish Surname Registration |
| LATDCL_R08 | Latino/Hispanic Decline to State - Spanish Surname Registration |
| LATOTH_R08 | Latino/Hispanic Other Party - Spanish Surname Registration |
| ASNTOT_R08 | Asian Surname Registration |
| ASNDEM_R08 | Asian Democratic Surname Registration |
| ASNREP_R08 | Asian Republican Surname Registration |
| ASNDCL_R08 | Asian Decline to State Surname Registration |
| ASNOTH_R08 | Asian Other Party Surname Registration |
| KSNTOT_R08 | Korean Surname Registration |
| JSNTOT_R08 | Japanese Surname Registration |
| CSNTOT_R08 | Chinese Surname Registration |
| ISNTOT_R08 | Asian Indian Surname Registration |
| VSNTOT_R08 | Vietnamese Surname Registration |
| FSNTOT_R08 | Filipino Surname Registration |

2008 Statewide General Election - Statewide Database
TOTAL_V08G
TOTDEM_V08
TOTREP_V08
TOTDCL_V08
TOTOTH_V08
LATTOT_V08
LATDEM_V08
LATREP_V08
LATDCL_V08
LATOTH_V08
ASNTOT_V08
ASNDEM_V08
ASNREP_V08
ASNDCL_V08
ASNOTH_V08
KSNTOT_V08
JSNTOT_V08

Total Voter Turnout
Democratic Voter Turnout
Republican Voter Turnout
Decline to State Voter Turnout
Other Party Voter Turnout
Latino/Hispanic - Spanish Surname Voter Turnout
Latino/Hispanic Democratic - Spanish Surname Voter Turnout
Latino/Hispanic Republican - Spanish Surname Voter Turnout
Latino/Hispanic Decline to State - Spanish Surname Voter
Turnout
Latino/Hispanic Other Party - Spanish Surname Voter Turnout
Asian Surname Voter Turnout
Asian Democratic Surname Voter Turnout
Asian Republican Surname Voter Turnout
Asian Decline to State Surname Voter Turnout
Asian Other Party Surname Voter Turnout
Korean Surname Voter Turnout
Japanese Surname Voter Turnout

| CSNTOT_V08 | Chinese Surname Voter Turnout |
| :--- | :--- |
| ISNTOT_V08 | Asian Indian Surname Voter Turnout |
| VSNTOT_V08 | Vietnamese Surname Voter Turnout |
| FSNTOT_V08 | Filipino Surname Voter Turnout |
| PRST_08G | Total Presidential Voter Turnout |
| PRSD_08G | Presidential Democratic Voter Turnout - Barack Obama |
| PRSR_08G | Presidential Republican Voter Turnout - John McCain |

2006 Total Registration - Statewide Database

| TOTAL_R06G | Total Registration |
| :--- | :--- |
| TOTDEM_R06 | Democratic Registration |
| TOTREP_R06 | Republican Registration |
| TOTDCL_R06 | Decline to State Registration |
| TOTOTH_R06 | Other Party Registration |
| LATTOT_R06 | Latino/Hispanic - Spanish Surname Registration |
| LATDEM_R06 | Latino/Hispanic Democratic - Spanish Surname Registration |
| LATREP_R06 | Latino/Hispanic Republican - Spanish Surname Registration |
| LATDCL_R06 | Latino/Hispanic Decline to State - Spanish Surname Registration |
| LATOTH_R06 | Latino/Hispanic Other Party - Spanish Surname Registration |
| ASNTOT_R06 | Asian Surname Registration |
| ASNDEM_R06 | Asian Democratic Surname Registration |
| ASNREP_R06 | Asian Republican Surname Registration |
| ASNDCL_R06 | Asian Decline to State Surname Registration |
| ASNOTH_R06 | Asian Other Party Surname Registration |
| KSNTOT_R06 | Korean Surname Registration |
| JSNTOT_R06 | Japanese Surname Registration |
| CSNTOT_R06 | Chinese Surname Registration |
| ISNTOT_R06 | Asian Indian Surname Registration |
| VSNTOT_R06 | Vietnamese Surname Registration |
| FSNTOT_R06 | Filipino Surname Registration |

2006 Statewide General Election - Statewide Database
TOTAL_V06G
TOTDEM_V06
TOTREP_V06
TOTDCL_V06
TOTOTH_V06
LATTOT_V06
LATDEM_V06
LATREP_V06
LATDCL_V06
LATOTH_V06
ASNTOT_V06
ASNDEM_V06
ASNREP_V06
ASNDCL_V06
ASNOTH_V06
KSNTOT_V06

Total Voter Turnout
Democratic Voter Turnout
Republican Voter Turnout
Decline to State Voter Turnout
Other Party Voter Turnout
Latino/Hispanic - Spanish Surname Voter Turnout
Latino/Hispanic Democratic - Spanish Surname Voter Turnout
Latino/Hispanic Republican - Spanish Surname Voter Turnout
Latino/Hispanic Decline to State - Spanish Surname Voter
Turnout
Latino/Hispanic Other Party - Spanish Surname Voter Turnout
Asian Surname Voter Turnout
Asian Democratic Surname Voter Turnout
Asian Republican Surname Voter Turnout
Asian Decline to State Surname Voter Turnout
Asian Other Party Surname Voter Turnout
Korean Surname Voter Turnout

| JSNTOT_V06 | Japanese Surname Voter Turnout |
| :--- | :--- |
| CSNTOT_V06 | Chinese Surname Voter Turnout |
| ISNTOT_V06 | Asian Indian Surname Voter Turnout |
| VSNTOT_V06 | Vietnamese Surname Voter Turnout |
| FSNTOT_V06 | Filipino Surname Voter Turnout |
| GOVT_06G | Governor, Total |
| GOVD_06G | Phil Angelides |
| GOVR_06G | Arnold Schwarnegger |
| SOST_06G | Secretary of State, Total |
| SOSD_06G | Debra Bowen |
| SOSR_06G | Bruce McPherson |
| INST_06G | Insurance Commissioner, Total |
| INSD_06G | Cruz Bustamante |
| INSR_06G | Steve Poizner |
| LTGT_06G | Lieutenant Governor, Total |
| LTGD_06G | John Garamendi |
| LTGR_06G | Tom McClintock |
| ATGT_06G | Attorney General, Total |
| ATGD_06G | Jerry Brown |
| ATGR_06G | Chuck Poochigian |
| TRST_06G | Treasurer, Total |
| TRSD_06G | Bill Lockyer |
| TRSR_06G | Claude Parrish |
| CONT_06G | Controller, Total |
| COND_06G | John Chiang |
| CONR_06G | Tony Strickland |
| SENT_06G | State Senate, Total |
| SEND_06G | State Senate Democratic Candidate |
| SENR_06G | State Senate Republican Candidate |
| ASMT_06G | Assembly, Total |
| ASMD_06G | Assembly Democratic Candidate |
| ASMR_06G | Assembly Republican Candidate |
| CNGT_06G | Congress, Total |
| CNGD_06G | Congress Democratic Candidate |
| CNGR_06G | Congress Republican Candidate |
|  |  |

2003 Statewide Special Election - Statewide Database

| GOVT_03S | Replace Governor, Total |
| :--- | :--- |
| GOVS_03S | Arnold Shwarzenegger |
| GOVB_03S | Cruz Bustamante |
| RECT_03S | Recall Governor, Total |
| RECY_03S | Recall Governor, Yes |
| RECN_03S | Recall Governor, No |

1998 Statewide Primary Election - Statewide Database

| P227T_98P | Proposition 227, Total |
| :--- | :--- |
| P227Y_98P | Proposition 227, Yes |
| P227N_98P | Proposition 227, No |

1996 Statewide General Election - Statewide Database

| P209T_96G | Proposition 209, Total |
| :--- | :--- |
| P209Y_96G | Proposition 209, Yes |
| P209N_96G | Proposition 209, No |

1994 Statewide General Election - Statewide Database
P187T_94G
P187Y 94G
Proposition 187, Total
P187N_94G
Proposition 187, Yes
Proposition 187, No

Appendix G: Written Statements and Minority Reports Submitted by Commissioners

## MINORITY REPORT BY COMMISSIONER DOWNEY

## A. Needed Changes to the Commission's Recommended Map

When I was appointed to the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) by the City Attorney, I was told by my appointing authority only two things: make the proposed map legally defensible and do the right thing. Based on what I know, I believe the map is defensible but I don't think we have done the right thing in several respects, the most troublesome of which follow, and only the City Council can correct our missteps.

1. The overwhelming weight of the testimony we heard suggested that Koreatown should be kept whole or largely whole in CD 13 . At virtually every one of our 22 public hearings, we heard a repeated request from Korean Angelenos to be kept whole, almost always couched as whole in CD13. Even if it may not be feasible to keep the entire Wilshire Center/Koreatown Neighborhood Council of nearly 100,000 people in a single district, we should have deferred to the huge presence and common chorus of the Korean voices at every step in our process. Those residents want to be in CD13 where other Asian immigrants live and where their common social services needs can be better served.
2. We heard from hundreds of stakeholders from CD9, in writing and in person, on the several occasions we met in City Hall. The vast majority of voices spoke in favor of keeping the boundaries largely intact. In the last ten years downtown Los Angeles has enjoyed a remarkable and exciting renaissance. That has been due in large part to a synergy between private developers and the City. This public private partnership has brought us the boom in commercial and residential growth downtown we have witnessed in the last decade. It is the combination of energy from big business at the Staples Center together with the Bank District's loft conversions using the City's adaptive reuse program that explains the impressive success story of CD9. We heard from people as diverse as the leadership at the Music Center, the Museum of Contemporary Art, the LA Opera, The Bank District and homeless service providers- all asking for the same thing- "keep downtown in CD9." If it's not feasible to keep all of downtown together in CD9, at least make a more equitable and reasonable split between CD 9 to the south and CD14 to the northeast. Our proposed map moves virtually all of downtown to the northeast into CD 14 to the detriment of CD9. The turnaround in downtown under CD9 is one of our City's greatest success stories. Why alter a working formula?
3. The hearings at the Expo Center on January 10 and at West Angeles Church on February 11 gave a forum for hundreds of voices in CD8 to state their wishes about their district. The vast majority asked that CD8's boundaries be kept intact. That would not include USC, as proposed, but would include Leimert Park whole and the redeveloping Baldwin Hills Shopping Center. Even the current representative of CD9 objected to moving USC, as proposed, out of CD8 and into CD9. CD8 was badly disserved in this process, for no apparent reason.

It is clear that we could not draw a perfect map meeting all the demands of all the communities in our huge city and still complying with all requirements of law. But we could have drawn a better map and done the right thing more often than we did. We certainly could have drawn one that minimizes the risk of litigation, instead of increasing that risk. Of course, anyone can sue anytime, with or without likelihood of success. But even if the City can prevail in court, why provoke costly and wasteful litigation, especially in times when public funds are in such short supply? If we are more responsive to some of the most reasonable requests of the public, more compromising on contested boundaries and more equitable in distribution of assets, we might avert costly litigation.

## B. Needed Changes to the Redistricting Process

Redistricting has always been a purely political process under which elected officials worked with or against each other or horse traded with each other in the drawing of their own district lines. Reform of redistricting under section 204 of the Charter was intended to make the process driven less by the political self interest of incumbents, more openly and impartially for the benefit of the entire city.

Sad to say, but not surprisingly, when the vast majority of the "independent" Commission is appointed by sitting officials often with their own political futures at stake, the independence of the Commission is compromised. For this reason, The City should consider alternatives. One is the model used by the State of California in which we have a balanced and diverse group from different parts of town with no particular affiliation with local elected officials selected by a disinterested body. And that commission, most importantly, draws the final map. Of course one of the problems is finding such disinterested persons who are satisfactory to the affected parties and still willing and able to volunteer the hours to undertake the complex job of drawing the map. One of the issues from the outset of our process in hiring staff was that almost anyone with the knowledge and interest in the rather arcane exercise of local political mapping was already likely to be rooted in local politics

Alternatively, we could return to the previous City system and most jurisdictions nationwide of having the elected officials draw their own maps. The politicians would then answer directly to their constituents for their mapping decisions.

Other jurisdictions have tried other formats such as establishing a panel of judges or some other group to make the mapping decisions, presumably a group totally disinterested in the outcome of the mapping decision.

If by choice or inertia we retain something like the current hybrid "independent/politically appointed" system, we need to allow more time for public input and thoughtful deliberation than was given in this mad dash from September to February. We also need to do all our line drawing as a total group, in public under the Brown Act, so that we can see the citywide impacts on the whole of any proposed boundary in any one district. The work of the regional sub quorum groups had to be scrapped and largely redone. And, of course, we need a set of clear and binding principles and restrictions to inform our work.

Fortunately we have ten years to learn from our mistakes.

# Minority Report and Recommendations of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission 

Submitted by:
Commissioner Robert Ahn, Esq. Commissioner Bobbie Jean Anderson

Commissioner Helen B. Kim, Esq.
Commissioner David Roberts

The purpose of this Minority Report is to discuss issues that the City Council should consider in reviewing the Commission's Final Map Recommendation and Final Report. With very few exceptions, the universal request heard by the Commission throughout the redistricting process was to keep neighborhoods and communities intact and, where presently split, to unite them in single Council Districts. Although the Final Map Recommendation unites many communities of interest that were previously split under the boundaries drawn in 2001, we respectfully submit that the Final Map Recommendation does not respect substantial public input from certain communities of interest - communities which the Commission could have kept intact, in conformance with Section 204(d) of the Los Angeles City Charter.

This Minority Report also discusses the Commission's decision to draw the boundaries for numerous Council Districts on the basis of race, in possible violation of the Voting Rights Act and the Equal Protection Clause. We also discuss possible violations of the Brown Act and Section 204(c), the lack of guiding principles or other criteria to ensure a consistent reason or rationale for the Commission's decision-making, as well as other procedural irregularities and errors that marred the Commission's redistricting process.

While this Minority Report does not purport to include an exhaustive list, we believe that these material failures have exposed the City to a significant risk of litigation or other efforts to remedy the deficiencies of the Commission's Final Map. We therefore urge the City Council to consider amendments to the Final Map Recommendation that would minimize the substantial costs and burdens that litigation would impose on the City should the Council approve the Commission's Final Map.
I. With Respect to Certain Communities, the Final Map Recommendation Fails to Respect the Public Input It Received or to Keep Communities Intact, In Conformance with Section 204 of the Los Angeles City Charter
A. The Final Map Recommendation Fails to Respect Public Input from Five Neighborhood Councils, Which Easily Could Have Been Kept Intact, In Conformance with Section 204(d)

The Commission failed to respect or give appropriate weight to the public input it received from the Neighborhood Council of Westchester Playa, the three Neighborhood Councils in Hollywood and the Wilshire Center Koreatown Neighborhood Council, all of which asked the Commission to keep their respective Neighborhood Councils intact in single Council Districts:

- Hundreds of stakeholders from the Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa asked that the portion east of the 405 Fwy be united with the rest of Westchester/Playa in CD11; there was no contrary testimony requesting a split of Westchester/Playa.
- Hundreds of stakeholders from Wilshire Center Koreatown Neighborhood Council ("WCKNC") asked that their boundaries be kept intact in a single Council District and placed in CD13; there was no contrary testimony requesting a split of WCKNC. Only four individuals asked that Koreatown be placed in CD10 -
individuals who were given special access to the Council Chambers through the rear entrance in order to testify at the February 22 Commission meeting.
- Numerous stakeholders from San Fernando Valley, including the Valley Industry \& Commerce Association and the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association (SOHA), asked the Commission to include only one "cross-over" district or, alternatively, a sixth Council District that was more than $50 \%$ in the Valley. SOHA was so strongly in support of such a request that it was even willing to tolerate a small split of the Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council in order to create a sixth majority Valley Council District. Yet, on February 22, 2012, the Commission refused even to consider the merits of Amendment N, which would have moved the vast bulk of Sherman Oaks NC from CD04 to CD05 and thereby make CD05 a sixth Council District with a majority in the Valley.
- Numerous stakeholders from Hollywood asked that Hollywood not be "carved up"; yet, that is precisely what the Final Map Recommendation does. The Final Map Recommendation ignored this public input and splits three different Hollywood Neighborhood Councils between CD04 and CD13.

While we understand that it may not always be feasible to respect public input, stakeholders from the aforementioned communities came out in overwhelming numbers in favor of keeping their respective communities intact. Although the maps received by the Commission and proposed by various Commissioners demonstrated that it was, in fact, feasible to keep all of these communities intact, the Commission failed to unify these communities. The Commission failed to do so, even as it acknowledged keeping other communities of interest intact in conformance with Section 204(d).

Not only does the Final Map Recommendation fail to respect the input from these communities, the Final Report even distorts the record on the public input from these communities. For example, the Commission's February 23, 2012 Press Release and the Final Report proclaim that the Final Map Recommendation "makes Koreatown whole in CD10 for the first time in 40 years." (See Feb. 23, 2012 Press Release; Final Report at 17-18). This claim uses the most restrictive Koreatown boundaries used in the City's community renaming process and was seemingly made for the sole purpose of touting the so-called "unification of Koreatown" as one of the major achievements of this Commission and its Final Map Recommendation.

In truth, however, this Commission failed to unite WCKNC in a single Council District, despite the overwhelming testimony from the Korean-American community and stakeholders of WCKNC, requesting that the Commission honor the boundaries of WCKNC, which are also identical to the White House "Preserve America" boundaries for Koreatown. The community's request to keep WCKNC intact in CD13 was reflected in all of the map submissions by the Asian American community, including the Asian Pacific American Legal Center and the Korean American Coalition, maps submitted by Commissioners Ahn and Kim, as well as petitions submitted by 3056 residents and stakeholders of WCKNC. Moreover, as reported in numerous articles in the press, support for the Koreatown community's request for the WCKNC/Preserve America boundaries to be kept intact in CD13 was overwhelming and made not only by ethnic Koreans, but also ethnic Bangladeshis, Mongolians and Latinos in that community. E.g.,
http://www.labeez.org/2012/02/koreatown-activists-continue-fight-for-political-future.php http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2012/02/city-council-redistricting.html. Although the Final Report claims that the Bangladeshi and Latino communities requested WCKNC to be in CD10 (Final Report at 16), the record shows that the Bangladeshi community simply wanted to be kept intact regardless of Council District. See http://ens.lacity.org/cla/minutesrc/claminutesrc319775750 02112012.pdf at pp. 30-31 And one public speaker, who purported to speak on behalf of the entire Central American community in support of the draft boundaries for CD10, could not even identify the location of any Central American communities within the boundaries of CD10. Id. at pp. 77-80.

Even the closing comments by Commissioners at the Commission's February 22, 2012 meeting made clear that splitting WCKNC was not a "win" for the Korean-American community. As Commissioner David Roberti acknowledged, Koreatown "lost" in the Commission's Final Map Recommendation, because the Commission ignored the overwhelming input from that community to respect their Neighborhood Council and national "Preserve America" boundaries. See audio podcast of February 22, 2012 Commission meeting.

Although the Final Report attempts to justify the use of the most restrictive definition of Koreatown on the ground that the Commission "made a de facto policy decision to maintain and respect communities ... that had been identified by the City of Los Angeles' community renaming policy" (Final Report at 17), that statement is plainly false. As the Commission's treatment of Historic Filipinotown demonstrates, the Commission did not adopt any "de facto policy" to use the City's community renaming process to determine a community's boundaries. Indeed, with respect to Historic Filipinotown, the Final Map Recommendation adopted the community's testimony that its southern boundary is $3^{\text {rd }}$ Street, not Beverly, and kept intact the community's definition of Historic Filipinotown, even though the community's definition is approximately double the size of Historic Filipinotown using the City's community renaming process. See Amendment B adopted at Commission's February 22, 2012 meeting.

The Final Report also distorts the record with respect to the split of the Neighborhood Council of Westchester Playa. The Final Report states that such a split was necessary because the Commission made a "policy decision" to use the 405 Freeway as a "natural boundary" for CD11. (Final Report at 19-20). The Commission adopted no such policy. Indeed, CD 11 in the Final Map Recommendation includes Mar Vista Neighborhood Council, which extends east of the 405 Freeway. Moreover, as the audio podcast of the Commission meeting on February 15, 2012 demonstrates, the Commission merely agreed that CD11 must include the population west of the 405 Freeway. The Commission then "received and filed" other proposed adjustments that would have required portions east of the 405 Freeway to be in CD11, thereby tabling and preserving that issue for later discussion. See February 15, 2012 audio podcast, http://redistricting2011.lacity.org/LACITY/audioVideo.html at 2:33:50-2:40.

We note that, when some stakeholders of Neighborhood Councils made specific requests of the Commission, those requests were adopted in the Final Map Recommendation. For example, when Toluca Lake asked to be moved from CD02 to CD04, that request was adopted in the Final Map Recommendation. When Watts asked to be moved from CD09 to CD15, that request was adopted in the Final Map Recommendation. When the Sunland Tujunga and other foothill communities asked to be united with the communities of Shadow Hills, Lakeview

Terrace and Hansen Dam, that request was adopted in the Final Map Recommendation. When the Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa complained of being split from LAX, the Commission announced, without even a Commission vote, that that split was an "inadvertent error" and reunited the majority (but not all) of Westchester/Playa with LAX in CD11 in its Final Draft Map. When Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council asked to kept whole, the Commission placed them intact in CD05 in its initial draft map; but when they came back and complained that they didn't want to be whole in CD05, because their mission of preservation was incompatible with other voices in CD05, the Commission agreed to place the Orthodox Jewish community in CD05, and the rest of Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council in CD04.

Yet, when the stakeholders of Neighborhood Council of Westchester Playa, Hollywood Hills West NC, Central Hollywood NC, Hollywood United NC and the Wilshire Center Koreatown Neighborhood Council made similar requests to be kept intact in single Council Districts, the Commission did not implement those requests or keep those communities intact, in conformance with Section 204(d), even though it could easily have been accomplished.

Accordingly, we request that the Council consider and respect the public input from the stakeholders of Neighborhood Council of Westchester Playa, Hollywood Hills West NC, Central Hollywood NC, Hollywood United NC and the Wilshire Center Koreatown Neighborhood Council, and to make the adjustments necessary to the Final Map Recommendation to keep those communities intact, including but not limited to the changes suggested by Amendment N submitted to the Commission on February 22, 2012.

## B. The Final Map Recommendation Fails to Respect Public Input

 from the Vast Majority of Stakeholders in Council District 09The Commission also did not respect or give appropriate weight to the public input from the numerous communities and neighborhoods in Council District 09, which requested that the Commission keep their boundaries intact to the extent feasible.

Hundreds of stakeholders from CD09 asked that the 2001 boundaries of CD09 be kept intact, other than minor changes to account for slight population shifts. Stakeholders from Little Tokyo, Skid Row and senior executives from numerous major Downtown landmark institutions, including the Music Center, the Museum of Contemporary Art, the Cathedral of Our Lady of Angels were uniform not only in their request to remain in CD09, but the need to remain in CD09 in order to maintain the cultural, educational and economic partnerships between Downtown and South Los Angeles. The testimony included petitions and map submissions that demonstrated precisely how CD09 and CD14 could continue to share the Downtown territory and account for the population needs of CD14. .

Although there was significant public testimony requesting that Downtown be united in a single Council District, the vast majority of that testimony came from current residents of CD14, not from residents of CD09. We note that, under the 2001 boundaries, approximately $75 \%$ of the 40,000 residents living in Downtown now reside in CD09, while only $25 \%$ of the Downtown population resides in CD14.

The Commission's failure to give proper weight to public input can be attributable, in part, to the Commission Staff's failure and refusal to circulate or otherwise make readily available to Commissioners the written submissions of testimony and related evidence from the public. In sharp contrast to the publicly submitted maps, which were posted on the Commission's website, the public comment cards, community of interest forms and other written submissions received by Commission Staff were not posted on the Commission's website or made readily available to Commissioners. Commission Staff did not produce any significant analysis of the public's written and verbal testimony until it was too late. As a result, during key votes to amend the Commission's draft map on February 15, 2012, Commissioners were urged to rely primarily on their recollection of the public's verbal testimony. And when the Commission Staff finally prepared summaries of the public's written and verbal testimony, they were often inaccurate and did not fairly reflect the testimony received. For example, petitions submitted by hundreds of residents and stakeholders requesting that CD09's boundaries remain intact apparently were not included in Commission Staff's summaries and "fact sheets."

The Commission's apparent failure to respect the public input from CD09 stakeholders has not gone unnoticed. After the Commission released its Final Map Recommendation, even those who had initially called for a united Downtown have reversed their position. As the Downtown News summarized in its February 24, 2012 editorial:

We now believe Downtown should be divided more cleanly between the Ninth and 14th districts. It is not a decision we come to lightly or happily. Early in the redistricting process we called for a unified Downtown, noting that concentrating the community in a single district would be consistent with the letter and spirit of the requirement to keep communities of interest together. We still believe that, but it's not worth further harming poverty-stricken areas for our minimal gains - not only would the Ninth suffer in the current proposal, but Bernard Parks' Eighth District would also lose its economic engines . . . This proposal will not please everyone, but the mapmakers, and some of the politicians guiding them, have made this necessary with their back-door dealing, potential Brown Act violations, power grabbing and land grabbing.

See http://www.ladowntownnews.com/opinion/redistricting-solution-for-a-unified-city-dividedowntown/article 1f241058-5f3a-11e1-a680-0019bb2963f4.html

Accordingly, we urge the City Council to consider a more equitable division of
Downtown between CD09 and CD14.

## C. The Final Map Recommendation Fails to Respect Public Input from the Vast Majority of Stakeholders in Council District 8

Hundreds of stakeholders from CD08 asked that the 2001 boundaries of CD08 be kept intact, both at the pre-map hearings and the post-map hearings. As with CD 09, this district also required only minimal alterations in order to satisfy even the most stringent population deviation standards. The Commission received a submission showing precisely how this goal could be accomplished.

In fact, $74 \%$ of the public input received at the Commission's February 11, 2012 regional public hearing at West Angeles Church in South Central Los Angeles spoke in favor of keeping the current boundaries of CD08 intact. The review of the record shows that the written testimony regarding the communities of Baldwin Hills, Leimert Park and Westchester was split, which is contrary to the opinion offered by the Executive Director "that the strong weight of the testimony favored being kept whole and moved to CD 10, ," at the Commission meeting on February 22, 2012.

We note here that CD08 is the city's single African American majority CVAP district. The communities and neighborhoods that have formed the core of this district for more than four decades include the residential areas of Baldwin Hills, Baldwin Vista, Leimert Park, and a significant portion of the Crenshaw corridor. These areas represent an important component of the district's economic base; it also includes several landmark institutions including the Baldwin Hills Mall, USC, and First AME Church. No one doubts that CD08 serves as the main hub of activity of African American political and social activity in Los Angeles.

Notwithstanding the public testimony, the Commission stripped CD08 of USC, Exposition Park, the "Dons" portion of Baldwin Hills, and Leimert Park, most of which had been in CD08 under the 2001 boundaries.

The Commission's Final Map Recommendation failed to respect the substantial public input, requesting that CD08's boundaries remain intact. Accordingly, we urge the City Council to consider revisions to the Final Map Recommendation that would substantially restore CD08 to its 2001 boundaries, including Amendment M.

## II The Boundaries of Certain Council Districts May Have Been Illegally Drawn, Due to the Predominant Use of Race in Drawing Their Boundaries

As a preliminary matter, we note that Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act requires three specific findings in order to purposefully construct a majority non-white district: (1) a sufficiently large and geographically compact minority population, (2) that is politically cohesive community of voters, and (3) white voters vote sufficiently as a bloc so as to usually be able to defeat the minority group's preferred candidate. Without such findings, dividing voters into districts on the basis of race may run afoul of the Equal Protection Clause, which prohibits racial gerrymandering.

Without evidence of racially polarized voting, and without any analysis or consideration of polarized voting prepared by, or submitted to, the Commission, the Commission nevertheless set out to draw majority-minority districts in Council Districts 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 14, purportedly to comply with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. This threshold decision to draw district lines on the basis of race had significant adverse effects on keeping communities intact in, and boundaries for, Council Districts 8, 9, 11 and 13. Because the Commission did not have the benefit of any of the studies or analyses that would justify drawing districts on the basis of race, we have serious questions about the legality of the heavy reliance on race as a basis for drawing boundaries for those Council Districts, as demonstrated in the record.
A. The Boundaries of CD 10 May Have Been Improperly Drawn Due to the Improper Use of Race in Drawing Its Boundaries

The boundaries of CD10 were originally drawn by the West/South Ad Hoc Regional Line Drawing Committee on Friday, January 20, 2012. During that meeting, Commissioner Ellison, the appointee from CD10, announced that his goal was to increase African-American registered voters in CD10 to over $50 \%$ from its 2001 level of $43.2 \%$. Likewise, under the Final Map Recommendation, CD10's African-American CVAP has been increased from 36.8\% to 41.8\%.

After announcing that his goal was to increase African-American registered voters in CD10, he directed the Commission's Technical Director, Nicole Boyle, to show the AfricanAmerican demographics and then added every contiguous census tract with a majority AfricanAmerican population to CD10, including Leimert Park and other heavily-African-American neighborhoods and communities, until African-American registered voters represented over 50\% of CD10's voters.

Commissioner Ellison also acknowledged his goal of focusing on race in his written, post-meeting assessment of his proposed map. As Commissioner Ellison stated in an email to the members of the West/South Ad Hoc Line Drawing Committee:

Being a historical African American opportunity district, we found it necessary to increase the AA population. We attempted to protect the historical African American incumbents in this district by increasing the black voter registration percentage and CVAP \#s accordingly. As you can discern on the attachment, we were able to increase the numbers to $50.12 \%$ and $42.8 \%$, respectively. This was a significant increase in the black voters in CD 10 which would protect and assist in keeping CD 10 a predominantly African-American opportunity district.
(See email thread, dated Jan. 20-22, 2012, from Commissioner Ellison to Commissioners Anderson, Downey, Kadota, Kim, McKean, Roberti, Vargas, attached as Exhibit A, at p.6.)

The heavy emphasis on race in drawing the boundaries of CD10 is particularly problematic, because it appears to place a priority on bolstering the African-American population in CD10, a historically African-American influence district that has always relied on cross-racial alliances with other similarly-sized groups, with little apparent regard to the impact on CD08, the City's only Council District with a majority African-American CVAP. Moreover, the significant increase in CD10's African-American registered voters (from $43.2 \%$ to $50.6 \%$ ) and African American CVAP (from $36.8 \%$ to $43.1 \%$ ) was accomplished almost entirely by taking AfricanAmerican voters from CD08, possibly diluting African-American voting power in CD08 over the next decade.

## B. The Boundaries of CD08 and CD11 May Have Been Improperly Drawn Due to the Improper Use of Race

Another area in which race may have been improperly used in drawing Council District boundaries was the split of the Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa between CD08 and CD11. The testimony from hundreds of stakeholders of the Neighborhood Council of

Westchester/Playa was uniform in requesting that their Neighborhood Council remain intact and in CD11. There was no testimony requesting a split of that Neighborhood Council.

Notwithstanding that uniform testimony, however, the Commission nevertheless treated the section of Westchester/Playa east of the 405 Fwy different from the remainder of Westchester/Playa located west of the 405 Fwy. The different treatment appeared to be based on the fact that the portion of Westchester/Playa east of the 405 Fwy has a significant AfricanAmerican population and therefore could be used to bolster the African-American population in CD08 as remediation for other African-American communities that were moved from CD08 to CD10. Again, this raises troubling questions, which may needlessly expose the City of Los Angeles to the risk of significant and substantial litigation.

## C. The Boundaries Deprive Asian Americans of Any Reasonable Possibility of Representation on the City Council

Last but not least, although the Commission was presented with several alternative maps from the Asian Pacific American Legal Center, the Korean American Coalition and Commissioner Helen B. Kim, each of which created an Asian influence district with Asian CVAPs ranging from $31 \%$ to $36 \%$, the Final Map Recommendation adopts the opposite approach and effectively splits the densely-populated Korean-American community into three Council Districts (CD04, CD10 and CD13), and places the majority of Korean-Americans in CD10. The Final Map Recommendation's configuration of CD10 makes the Korean-American community a captive minority, with an Asian voter registration of only $9.2 \%$, as compared to an African-American voter registration of 50.6\%.

Given the significant increase of Asian Americans, as reflected in the 2010 Census, this raises troubling issues that may expose the City of Los Angeles to the risk of significant and substantial litigation.

## III Procedural Irregularities that Marred the Commission's Redistricting Process

A. The Initial Draft Map Was Drawn Behind Closed Doors And Without Public Input, Raising Concerns About Potential Violations Of The Brown Act and Section 204(c) of the City Charter

At the beginning of the Commission's work, and in conformance with Section 204(c), which requires the Commission to seek public input "throughout the redistricting process," the Commission promised in several public meetings and press conferences that the Commission would conduct "an open and transparent" redistricting process.

But on January 11, 2012, the Commission adopted procedures for developing a draft Council District Boundaries Map that affirmatively prevented public input in the drafting process for the Commission's initial draft map. Importantly, during the critical period of January 11, 2012 and January 25, 2012 - when the Commission drew the boundaries for its initial draft map - all decisions were made behind closed doors and without public input, resulting in numerous procedural irregularities and flaws that infected the Commission's initial draft map.

Specifically, under the January 11-adopted procedures, the Commission was divided into three Ad Hoc Regional Line Drawing Committees, each comprised of seven Commissioners. As confirmed by the City Attorney's Office at the Commission's January 11, 2012 meeting, this was done expressly to attempt to avoid triggering the Brown Act and thereby prevent the public from giving public input during the initial line-drawing process. Thus, all discussions among Commissioners regarding regional line drawing were held behind closed doors, and the Commission prevented public input in this phase of the redistricting process in apparent contravention of Section 204(c) of the City Charter.

To make matters worse, the Ad Hoc Regional Line Drawing Committees were prevented from communicating with each other - again, in order to attempt to avoid triggering the Brown Act and thereby prevent the public from giving public input during this phase of the redistricting process. Because Commission-wide discussion was not conducted, there were important decisions made and driven by one Regional Line Drawing Committee, that, in turn, tied the hands of the other Regional Line Drawing Committees who met subsequently. For example, the seven members of the Ad Hoc Valley Regional Line Drawing Committee met first and decided that the Valley would contain five whole Council Districts and only one cross-over district. Because they were scheduled by Commission Staff to meet first, that Regional Committee's decisions then bound the other two Regional Line Drawing Committees who met later.

Under the January 11-adopted procedures, after the three Line Drawing Committees made decisions about their own regions, there were two Dispute Resolution Committees - the Valley/West Resolution Committee and the East/West Resolution Committee - each comprised of 10 members, who were tasked with "stitching together" the various maps from the Ad Hoc Regional Line Drawing Committee. Again, the structure of the two Resolution Committees was designed to attempt to avoid triggering the Brown Act and to prevent public input during this phase of the redistricting process.

The Valley/West Resolution Committee met first. Because they met first and "locked in" their decisions, the East/West Resolution Committee could not touch the boundaries or decisions made by the Valley/West Resolution Committee. The Valley Regional Line Drawing Committee decided, among other things, to include all of South Robertson NC in CD05; that decision, alone, unilaterally cut through the area that had connected Palms to CD10 in the West/South Regional Line Drawing Committee's maps. As a result, in the East/West Resolution Committee meeting, CD11 had no choice but to take Palms and to shift most of Westchester/Playa out of CD11 in order for CD11 to comply with the Equal Population Principle. We understand this to be the "inadvertent error" referred to by Chair Vargas at the February 2, 2012 public hearing in Westchester; but, in fact, the split of Westchester/Playa was not "inadvertent." It was the direct result of the Commission's January 11-adopted procedures, which did not permit the two Resolution Committees to confer or meet or to allow public input during this phase of the redistricting process.

The errors produced by the closed-door line-drawing sessions were significant, because the opportunities to correct those errors were limited. At its meeting on February 15, 2012, the Commission was forced to address over 80 adjustments requested by various Commissioners in a marathon session lasting over 9 hours. Due to the large number of adjustments, discussion of each adjustment was limited to just 10 minutes, regardless of the size or impact of the adjustment
or the desire by Commissioners to continue discussion. Thus, the initial closed-door line drawing sessions had a significant adverse impact on the overall redistricting process.
B. The Lack of Guiding Principles or Other Criteria to Guide the Commission's Decision-Making Process

In sharp contrast to the redistricting process at the State level, the Commission never developed or adopted any guiding principles or other criteria to guide Commission decisionmaking. On January 11, 2012, the Chair and Co-Chairs proposed a set of Guiding Principles for discussion and approval by the Commission; those Guiding Principles were rejected.

At the January 11, 2012 Commission meeting, the Chair appointed an Ad Hoc Committee, comprised of the Chair, Co-Chairs Kadota and Dupont-Walker, and Commissioners Cornejo, Gaines and Kim, to revise the draft Guiding Principles. That Ad Hoc Committee was never convened. Commissioner Kim, at the request of Co-Chair Kadota, drafted a revised set of Guiding Principles, which were presented to the Commission for approval on February 4, 2012. But those revised Guiding Principles were never adopted by the Commission, nor were any other Guiding Principles prepared.

The Commission's failure to adopt or agree upon a set of Guiding Principles prevented the Commission from providing any consistent reason or rationale for its decisions or for any significant changes to the Commission's draft maps. As a result, public input from communities and neighborhoods was not treated consistently or in a fair or equal manner, and justifications for the Commission's decisions were developed post hoc.

## C. Suppression of the Kim Map.

In the West/South Ad Hoc Regional Committee, two maps were created: one by Commissioners Ellison and McKean and one by Commissioner Kim. The Ellison/McKean map split WCKNC and put the south half of WCKNC in CD10; the Kim map did not include any portion of WCKNC in CD10, thereby leaving WCKNC to be kept intact in CD13. Since both maps received votes of 3-4 and neither received a majority of votes, the Committee decided to put both maps forward for consideration by the Valley/West Resolution Committee. (See Exhibit A at p.1). But the Valley/West Resolution Committee was never informed of the Kim map and therefore it was never reviewed by that Committee. This was a significant procedural error, because at the January 25, 2012 Commission meeting, several Commissioners were under the impression that the Ellison/McKean map (Map 1) was the only map to have "gone through the proper process" and that the Kim map (Map 2) had "not gone through the process" when, in fact, the Kim map was improperly prevented from consideration by the Valley/West Resolution Committee.
D. Presentation of the Initial Draft Map for Public Release, Despite the Lack of Approval by the Dispute Resolution Committee

Yet another procedural irregularity was the decision to present the initial draft map (Map 1) to the Commission for public release on January 25, 2012, even though that initial draft map failed to obtain a majority of votes in committee. The Ellison/McKean map was considered by the East/West Resolution Committee, which was comprised of 10 members. But the

East/West Resolution Committee's vote on that map was 5-5, meaning that the Ellison/McKean map failed to obtain a majority of votes. Notwithstanding the failure to get a majority of votes, the Ellison/McKean map was placed on the agenda for the Commission meeting on January 25, 2012 for public release by the Commission. The public was never informed that the initial draft map had failed to obtain a majority of votes in the East/West Resolution Committee.

## E. Unequal Treatment of Written Public Submissions.

For the most part, only written submissions by public members who brought sufficient hard copies to the Commission meetings were circulated to the Commission. Most written public submissions were not circulated to the Commission electronically, even though various Commissioners repeatedly requested electronic circulation of written submissions. But when it came to Toluca Lake's emails requesting inclusion in CD04, not CD02, those email submissions were circulated electronically to every member of the Ad Hoc Line Drawing Committee responsible for drafting the initial boundaries for CD04. The Commission's Executive Director, Andrew• Westall, is President of the Greater Toluca Lake Neighborhood Council.

The foregoing does not attempt to be an exhaustive list of the problems, deficiencies and errors that marred the Commission's redistricting process. However, we raise some of the most significant issues that the City Council can and should address in reviewing the Commission's Final Map Recommendation and Report.

We urge the City Council to consider amendments to the Final Map Recommendation, including but not limited to, Amendments $\mathrm{K}, \mathrm{M}$ and N that were on the Commission's agenda for February 22, 2012, in order to minimize the likelihood of litigation and the substantial costs and burdens that such litigation would impose on the City.

## Exhibit A

Kim, Helen B.


Helen,
I generally agree with your e-mail presentation reflecting the Committee except (1) I feel that we left the meeting Friday with the agreement that the Committee present two maps as reflecting the Committee: The position that the vote was $3-4$ would seem that the Committee ended up with no map at all. Not so, we left with the understanding after the 3-4 votes that two maps be presented as the position of the Committee, one preferred by 3 Commisioners and the other preferred by the other three commissioners. The Committee did agree to do something and (2) the split in the Neighborhoods in South Robertson, Mid-City and Pico were designed to connect the 5th district so that the heart of the entire Jewish community be included in and connected to its traditional 5th district not only the Orthodox Jews. Only the split of the Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council between Highland and La Brea was accomplished to accomodate the Orthodox Jewish Community specifically. David Roberti
On Sun, Jan 22, 2012 at 9:25 AM, Kim, Helen B.
 wrote:

I agree with Bobbie Jean that she is entitled to put forward her map of CD8 to the Dispute Resolution Committee. I also apologize if my presentation on the pros and cons suggests that I think NC's are sacrosanct. I do not. I agree with Bobbie Jean that the public testimony and written comments regarding communities of interest should be respected. I also think that not all NC's are equal, because some are active and participated in our public hearing process, while others did not and apparently exist in name only. My reference to NC's in my "pros and cons" was simply a shorthand to refer to the communities in those areas, because our printouts from Thursday and Friday have NC boundaries on it.
helen

From:
Sent: Saturday, January 21, 2012 2:36 PM
To: Kim, Helen B.;

CC:
Subject: Re: Ad Hoc Re-districting-West and South Los Angeles Follow Up - KIM SUMMARY - CONFIDENTIAL

Commissioners:

My concern is that the common thread in both of these plans is that they award all of Baldwin Hills and Leimert Park to CD10. The descriptions seem to be discounting my input about the proposed map and dismissing my opinion in the debate between the two districts.

My position is that NEITHER of the plans addresses the fact that the borders between CD8 and 10 combine the neighborhoods that have expressly argued that they want to remain in the 8th. Unlike Chris' characterization, I did Not say that you should keep CD8 exactly the same ... the CFR (Coalition for Fair Redistricting) proposal DOES make changes to the CD8/10 border, though it does, not radically shift the lines as the other plans woufd suggest.

I agree with Helen that there is no legal requirement to radically shift the black cvap in CD 10 toward the $50 \%$ mark ... historically, CD10 has had black preferred candidates at levels less than that. CD 8, by contrast, has been a majority black district and radically reducing its population (despite its clear growth) raises serious questions about the long term effects on political power in this community.

But unlike Helen's approach, there is no requirement in the city charter or in the Commission's rules that states that lines for neighborhood councils are sacrosanct. It is therefore wrong to prioritize this consideration over others, such as hearing input and evidence. These lines can be instructive for the commission to consider conception of a community interest, but the expressed public statements of voters on the hearings about what their communities of interest are at least just as relevant to deciding how the commission should draw lines.

Since it appears that NO PLAN received the requisite number of votes, I feel the resolution committee should consider my plan as well.



Subject: RE: Ad Hoc Re-districting-West and South Los Angeles Follow Up - KIM SUMMARY CONFIDENTIAL

Commissioners,

Here are my "pros" and "cons" concerning the 2 maps. I have deleted Andrew Westall from the email distribution, because my understanding from the rules adopted at our January 11, 2012 Commission meeting is
that the only staff member permitted to participate in our Committee discussions is the line drawer, Nicole Boyle.

Both maps received 3-4 votes, even if we were to permit McKean to vote by proxy. Map 1, proposed by Commissioners Ellison and McKean, with input from the group on Thursday, got 3 yes votes (Ellison, McKean, Roberti); 4 no votes (Anderson, Downey, Kadota, Kim). Map 2, proposed by me, with input from the group on Friday got 3 yes votes (Downey, Kadota, Kim); 4 no votes (Anderson, Ellison, McKean, Röberti). Since each Committee member was permitted to take a printout of only 1 Council District, I don't have the entire regional map in my possession, so please forgive me if my memory is inaccurate regarding the details of the maps. There were so many changes made during both sessions; it's difficult to remember exactly where both maps ended up.

## Pros and Cons of Map 1 (Ellison/McKean):

CD5: Keeps the Orthodox Jewish community largely whole. Sen. Roberti agreed to give up the "flag" portion of Valley Village in the existing CD5, as it looked too much like a gerrymander. McKean agreed to give CD5 the Orthodox Jewish community in Hancock Park (Highland betw Romaine \& 3rd Street). This CD5 splits the Encino NC and Sherman Oaks NC at the 101 Fwy, but keeps Bel Air/Beverly Crest NC, Westwood NC, and Westside NC whole. It splits Palms NC, South Robertson NC, Pico NC, MidCity West NC and Greater Wilshire NC. Some of those splits were necessitated by the need to link the Orthodox Jewish communities together, while other splits were made to conform to the Equal Population principle.

CD4: Keeps Griffith Park. Keeps Studio City NC, Toluca Lake NC, Hollywood Hills West NC, Hollywood United NC, Greater Griffith Park NC and Los Felix NC whole, but splits Central Hollywood NC into 3 Council Districts. Also, North Hollywood NC, Silver Lake NC, Greater Wilshire NC and Mid City West NC are split.

CD11: Keeps LAX. Keeps Brentwood NC, Pacific Palisades NC, West Los Angeles NC, Mar Vista NC, Venice NC, Del Rey NC whole. Splits Palms NC and Westchester NC.

CD8: Retains USC/Exposition Park, but loses Leimert Park and most of Baldwin Hills (except for the sliver necessary to access Councilman Parks' home on Don Milagro), over Bobbie Jean's objections. This map also has CD8 dipping into Westchester NC, taking portions east of Airport Blvd, which Bobbie Jean did not want.

CD10: I was very uncomfortable with this portion of our meeting on Thursday. As Chris candidly acknowledges in his summary, his goal was to raise Black registered votes to over $50 \%$, even though the current CDI0 has a much lower Black registered voter percentage. During this section of the meeting, race was the sole factor in determining the boundaries of CD10, in possible violation of the Voting Rights Act. Chris asked

Nicole to show the black demographics to be shown and then "picked off" census tracts with high Black CVAP, without regard to neighborhood, NC or other community of interest boundaries. Chris stated that another goal of his was to ensure 3 African-American seats on the City Council, but I question whether Map 1 accomplishes that goal because it appears that, in pushing CD8 to take predominantly African-American communities away from CD9, Map 1 reduces the likelihood of CD9 remaining an African-American Council seat; however it was not possible for me to assess that because we were not allowed to view the impact on CD9, which is outside of our Committee's region. In addition, although Chris stated that his intent was to unify the NC's in this area, only Mid City, Arlington Hts, Jefferson Park and West Adams NC are kept whole. South Robertson NC, PICO NC, Olympic Park, Wilshire Center Koreatown NC, Empowerment Congress West and Empowerment Congress North are all split. Another significant problem with CDI0 in Map 1 is the inclusion of only $1 / 2$ of the Wilshire Center Koreatown Neighborhood Council (split at 3rd Street). During our discussions, I requested that WCKNC be kept whole, but Chris refused to take WCKNC whole in CD10. This portion of Map 1 is a clear gerrymander, because Map 1 cuts through Olympic Park NC just to access Wilshire Center Koreatown NC. Also, the inclusion of half of WCKNC was counterproductive to the goal of raising CD10's BCVAP, since WCKNC has a very low African-American population and therefore impedes the goal of raising BCVAP. Finally, another "con" of this proposed CD10 is that it attempts to link Koreatown with South Los Angeles, even though the 2 communities have little in common. WCKNC is a high immigrant, Limited English Proficiency community that shares common cultural and languages. South Los Angeles has no such traits.

## Pros and Cons of Map 2 (Kim):

CD5: Keeps the Orthodox Jewish community largely whole. This portion of the map is largely similar to Map 1. Thus, it excludes the "flag" portion of Valley Village in the existing CD5, as it looked too much like a gerrymander and includes the Orthodox Jewish community in Hancock Park (Highland betw Romaine \& 3rd Street). This CD5 splits the Encino NC and Sherman Oaks NC at Moorpark, but keeps Bel Air/Beverly Crest NC, Westwood NC, and Westside NC whole. It does not take any portion of Palms NC, as in Map 1. It splits South Robertson NC, Pico NC, MidCity West NC and Greater Wilshire NC. Some of those splits were necessitated by the need to link the Orthodox Jewish communities together, while other splits were made to conform to the Equal Population principle.

CD4: Retains many of the same neighborhoods in the metro and Valley area. Unifies the LBGT cominunity of interest in Studio City, Hollywood and Silver Lake (at least it did when we started our meeting on Friday; not sure where we ended up). Keeps Studio City NC, Toluca Lake NC, Hollywood Hills West NC, Hollywood United NC, Central Hollywood NC, Greater Griffith Park NC and Los Felix NC whole, but splits North Hollywood NC, Silver Lake NC, and Greater Wilshire NC.

CD11: Keeps LAX. Keeps Brentwood NC, Pacific Palisades NC, West Los Angeles NC, Mar Vista NC, Venice NC, Del Rey NC and Wcstchester NC whole. My recollection is that none of the NC's in CDI1 in Map 2 are split.

CD8: CD8 remains a majority African American CVAP district, reflecting historical population patterns. The initial draft of Map 2 gave USC/Exposition Park to CD10, but when Bobbie Jean objected, the group put USC/Exposition Park back into CD8. This map keeps Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza in CD8, but gives up Leimert Park and most of Baldwin Hills (except for the sliver necessary to access Councilman Parks' home on Don Milagro). This was done to meet enable CD10 to grow and meet the Equal Population principle. Retains many of the same communities as the current CD8, except Leimert Park and most of Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw, though it retains Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza.

CD10: This district includes the communities adjacent to the 10 Freeway, including the historically substantial African American population residing in this area. This district retains many of its neighborhoods but now includes Leimert Park, the cultural and political heart of the African-American community. Also acquires most of Baldwin Hills, except for the sliver necessary for Councilman Parks to access his home on Don Milagro). Mid City NC, Arlington Hts NC, Jefferson Park NC, West Adams NC, Harvard Heights NC, Mid-City NC, Olympic Park NC and Palms NC (and Adams Normandie?) are all kept whole. South Robertson NC and PICO NC were split to enable CD5 to keep the Orthodox Jewish community continuous. Empowerment Congress West is split solely to accommodate Councilman Parks' home on Don Milagro. Empowerment Congress North NC is split, but this NC is also split in Map 1. This map does not include any portion of Wilshire Center Koreatown Neighborhood Council. Although BCVAP isn't has high in this map, as compared to Map 1, it is several percentage points higher than the current CD10's BCVAP.

Overall, the biggest deficiency in Map 2 is the division of "jewels" in the South LA community. As I stated on Friday, I believe that CD8 and CD10 should agree between themselves on an equitable distribution of the African American communities in South Los Angeles, including the "jewels" of Leimert Park, USC/Exposition Park, Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza and any other significant cultural and community assets, while leaving a sufficient African-American community to maintain an African-American influence district in CD9. As I mentioned above, the initial draft of Map 2 put USC/Exposition Park to CD10, but it was moved back when Bobbie Jean objected; even with moving USC/Exposition Park back into CD8, however, Bobbie Jean still voted against Map 2.

The biggest strength of Map 2 is that it is better than Map 1 in maintaining the integrity of neighborhoods, Neighborhood Councils and communities of interest. There are few blatant gerrymanders, other than to connect the Orthodox Jewish communities in CD5 and to carve out Councilman Parks' home in Baldwin Hills, both of which exist in Map 1, as well.
helen

From: Christopher B, Ellison, Esq.
Sent: Friday, January 20, 2012 11:33 PM
To: 'Andrew Westall';
Cc:
Kim, Helen B.;

Commissioners

Pursuant to our meetings over the last two days, and at the request of Commissioner Kadota, I am submitting this email to express the pros and cons of the maps. However, I am only in possession of CD 10 portions of the map. We took into account the total population variances. All variances were well below $5 \%$, which the highest variance being approximately $3 \%$. We took into account all the laws, rule, and ethical considerations necessary when redistricting. I believe Map 1 is a fair and accurate representation of districts of West and South LA. Additionally, Map 1 was originally voted on by a 4-2 margin and then 3-3 when Commissioner Kadota voted for Map 2. Map 2 was voted on by a 3-4 margin, clearly making it the minority report map, and should be presented as such. See below.

Day 1-
Map 1, This Map was originated by Commissioner McKean, input from: Senator Roberti, Commissioner Kadota, Commissioner Anderson and Commissioner Ellison. Commissioner Downey was not present during the drafting of this map. I do not recall if Commissioner Kim had input regarding this map. Commissioner Anderson was not in agreement with most of the map (if l am correct). The vote for this map was 4-2 (proEllison, Roberti, McKean and Kadota) (con-Kim and Anderson). (On Day 2, Commissioner Kadota voted for Map 2, as such, Map 1 votes would be 3-3).

At the end of the day, Commissioner McKean expressly, and in front of all the commissioners (excluding commissioner Downey who was not present), gave Commissioner Ellison his proxy to cast his vote for Day 2. As such, Commissioner Ellison had authority to cast Commissioner McKean's vote in accordance with his own vote on Day 2. There were not protests to this at the end of Day 1.

## Re CD $10-$

CD 10 was deficient in population approximately 12,000 people. Obviously CD 10 needed to increase population. Being a historical African American opportunity district, we found it necessary to increase the AA population. We attempted to protect the historical African American incumbents in this district by increasing the black voter registration percentage and CVAP \#s accordingly. As you can discem on the attachment, we were able to increase the numbers to $50.12 \%$ and $42.8 \%$, respectively. This was a significant increase in the black voters in CD 10 which would protect and assist in keeping CD 10 a predominantly African-American opportunity district. In doing so, CD 10 was forced to push South into CD 8 . Specifically, CD 10 would take Baldwin Hills (the Dons, excluding Councilman Parks house), and Leimert Park. Moving 1-2blocks south of Vernon, l-2blocks East of Arlington. This area is densely populated with African-American citizens and voters. This move would split the southern-most portion of the Empowerment Congress West because councilman Parks lives in this area.

We agreed to move the western portion of CD 10 (Palms) into CD 5 and 11. This area is approximately $50 \%$ white voter registration or CVAP, 20\% Latino CVAP and approximately $11 \%$ AA Black voter registration. This move would allow CD 10 to divest itself of this diverse populated area, and increase the AA population to the South.

To the East the line would be very similar to the existing line with an increase to the East to include all of Harvard Heights. This move would split the Empowerment Congress North

The North East portion of CD 10 would still include Koreatown and move its Northern border to $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ street and Vermont to include the boundary of Koreatown which was agreed upon by City, including Grace Yoo, and other Korean activist and Latino activist. (Please see attached city document). Moreover, the Asian population North of $3^{\text {rd }}$ street is very little, with most of the population being Latino. Koreatown is kept together, as well as the Latinos in this community. Koreatown NC is split.

Additionally, CD 10 would decrease its Northern border and give this area to CD 4-this would remove the Greater Wilshire NC from CD 10 and make it whole, as requested.

Pico NC would be split between $10^{\text {th }}$ and $5^{\text {th }}$ to maintain link in CD 5 to Fairfax orthodox Jewish corridor.

Day 2
Map 2, This map was originated and drawn by Commissioner Kim. I had some major concerns with Map 2 and how it pertained to CD 10. First, it completely put Koreatown in CD 13. As such, there was no discussion regarding Koreatown borders. Next, it put the Crenshaw Mall in CD 8 (as it currently stands, as well as the Expo Center and USC). It also, kept Palms in CD 10. The vote for Map 2 was 3-4 (pro: Kim, Kadota, Downey) (con: Ellison, Roberti, Anderson and McKean-by proxy). (Although Commissioner Kim vehemently suggests that Commissioner McKean could not allow me vote is in proxy against Map 2). This clearly makes Map 2 the minority map and it should be presented as such.

Map 2 takes every economic producing area out of CD 10. CD 10 is merely left with the south side of Wilshire Blvd as an economic producing area for its community.

Map 2 does not increase the African American population enough to keep it a AA opportunity district (see Map 2 for percentages). As Map 2 stands there will be only 1 African-American opportunity council district.

Map 2 gives CD 10 the "scraps" from the rest of the council districts, which I feel is disrespectful to the council president.

Map 2 purports to keep certain NC councils intact while clearly not caring about other NC, which I find is arbitrary and self interested. Greater Wilshire NC is split into 3-districts. Empowerment Congress North is split in 2-districts. Empowerment Congress West is split in 2-districts. Pico NC is in 2-districts. But Palms NC is in 1 -district (10) and Koreatown NC is 1 -district.

We took into consideration neighborhood councils, however, the NC boundaries were not the only determining factor. I am of the opinion that NC are important however, NC do not take into consideration the renters who live in these areas, are gerrymandered and not necessarily a true representation of all the people who live in the entire area. Lastly, I don't think a NC should have control or dictate to council districts or council members. Therefore, splitting a NC into 2 -districts was ok with me.

I am sure I will have additional comments at later date, but this is what I can remember. Thank You

Chris

Christopher B. Ellison, Esq.
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February 29, 2012
David A. Roberti
3325 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 708
Los Angeles, CA 90010
Los Angeles City Citizens Redistricting Commission
200 North Spring Street, Rm. 275
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Colleagues:
With the filing of the Final Report of the Commission, I stand by my vote of February 22, 2012 in favor of the redistricting plan being submitted to the Los Angeles City Council today. However, the Final Report of the Commission deals with the criteria and processes used to arrive at the final redistricting maps. I believe those criteria and processes deserve some comment as to their efficacy and as to the manner they were enforced.

The Commission set forth criteria including that as much as possible the boundaries of Neighborhood Councils should be adhered to. This requirement alone sublimated other concerns which also should have guided us at least equally such as the proper concentration of renters in any one Council district. Neighborhood Council lines and Neighborhood Council concerns are not necessarily the same as those of renters.

Except for comment made by the representative of the Asian community at the Los Angeles City Hall hearing where the public presented its own proposals and one other defensive response to a query about the lack of renter participation in Neighborhood Councils, I do not recall any other instance where the word "renter" or the word "tenant" was uttered at any meeting or throughout this entire process especially from the representatives of Neighborhood Councils who presumably should be all inclusive in their representation. We heard about the size, beauty, property valuations, and exclusivity of home owning areas, but nary a word about renters or their concentrations.
Neighborhood Councils are very important, but they are city institutions that have developed as primarily advocates for homeowners. If Neighborhood Councils demand as they did plenary and primary consideration in the drafting of district lines, then they must show at a minimum some greater outreach to renters than their testimony during this redistricting process would have indicated.

However, there was one area where the Commission could have been consistent with its stated goal of giving special consideration to Neighborhood Council lines and yet consolidate its boundaries for maximum inclusion and participation of renters in the establishment of districts. This would have been in the Wilshire Center Koreatown Neighborhood Council area. This particular neighborhood has the greatest concentration of renters in the city. It is one of the densest populated areas in the nation. Concentration
and inclusion here would have assuaged the Korean community. Yet this did not happen, leaving the Korean community aggrieved.

I was a member of the Redistricting Commission ten years ago in 2002. The issue of Koreatown was raised then too. The issues were much the same. There was a strong push to consolidate the Asian community in general and the Korean population in particular better than had happened in 1992. The Koran population had been split in 1992 into four districts. The community in 2002 demanded more integration. But the Korean community after the 2002 redistricting yet remained badly split. Sadly, our result in 2012 is once again roughly the same as it was in 2002 . We are speaking here of thirty years of frustration for the Korean community 1992, 2002, 2012 and beyond until this redistricting is superseded by the next one. When does how long become too long?

We could have adhered to our goal of following Neighborhood Council lines, strengthened renter rights and protected the Korean population. We did not do this when we could have in the Wilshire Center Koreatown area.

Redistricting is never a popular exercise. Imperfect compromises must be made.
Divergent priorities are brought to the table. There are inevitably winners and losers. The Commission has passed a map in an open process that meets the bulk of the City's needs. The Final Report speaks for me where these needs have been met. But there are mistakes which I feel I must address here. We could have done better.

Sincerely,

David A. Roberti
Commissioner, $5^{\text {th }}$ District
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

Today, it is often said that we live in a time marked by dwindling civic engagement, rampant distrust and skepticism of government and increasingly greater cynicism about civic leaders and their motives.

Ironically, redistricting, arguably, the most political process aside from campaigning for office, has provided a new platform for the public to participate in the democratic process and hopefully, in the long-run, offers the first step towards regaining faith in civic leadership.

The redistricting process, where every 10 years political district boundaries are adjusted to reflect the changes captured in the U.S. Census, has rarely been transparent until last year. This time around, the process provided an opportunity for the public to have meaningful impact even before votes are cast at the ballot box.

At the State level, as part of two voter approved propositions, 11 and 20, for the first time in California's history, an independent Statewide citizens commission was assembled and tasked with redrawing the 177 political districts for the U.S. Congress, the State legislature, and the Board of Equalization. This process shut down the smoke-filled backrooms and displaced even legendary political negotiators.

Overnight, members of the public became major advocates for their communities. With oneninth of the U.S. Congressional delegation hailing from California, the potential for impact on the political process was more significant than ever before.

More recently, at a local level, the Los Angeles City Council's Redistricting Commission, comprised of 21 appointed community members, completed their map drawing process. In spite of negative articles in the press arguing the process was being controlled by insiders, the level of civic engagement demonstrated otherwise.

In the City of Los Angeles, one of the most richly diverse in the country, between December 2011 and March 2012, more than 4,500 Angelenos shared the story of their community with the Commission. In 10 weeks, more than 6,000 pieces of testimony were submitted in support of the neighborhoods and communities where the people live, work, and identify as home.

The report provides an outline of the Commission's community engagement strategies and programming and is divided into 15 sections concluding with recommendations for the next Commission.

## 2. COMMISSIONERS \& STAFF



## Arturo Vargas

Appointed by Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa

Commission Chair Arturo Vargas is a nationally recognized expert in Latino demographic trends, electoral participation, voting rights, the Census, and redistricting. He is the Executive Director of the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials also known as NALEO. He also serves as the Executive Director of the NALEO Educational Fund, and sits on the boards of Zero Divide, the Council on Foundations, the Independent Sector, the Alliance for a Better Community, and the United Way of Greater Los Angeles.


## Jacquelyn "Jackie" Dupont-Walker

Appointed by former Council President Eric Garcetti
Council District 13

Commission Vice-Chair Jackie Dupont-Walker possesses more than 40 years of professional work in the public and private sectors. She pioneered in the desegregating Florida State University in her hometown of Tallahassee, and has trail blazed on behalf of women, multicultural communities, and people of color in many arenas. Known for her tireless energy, firm allegiance, and integrity in the trenches, Ms. Dupont-Walker has received numerous honors, awards, and is sought nationally in community economic development.

Professionally, her commitment to Faith Centered \& Empowering Community Development has led to a career as founding president of Ward Economic Development Corp in 1987. She has served on the LA City Elected Charter Commission, the LA City Charter Review Commission, and the LA City Re-Districting Commission in 2000.


## Robert B. Kadota

Appointed by Councilman Bill Rosendahl
Council District 11

Robert B. Kadota holds a Bachelor of Science degree and a Graduate Studies degree from Illinois State University. His work at various universities throughout his career brings a unique perspective to the Redistricting Commission. Currently, Mr. Kadota serves as Assistant Director of the Office of Residential Life with the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). He is a dedicated public advocate having countless hours of community service with various agencies including: West Los Angeles CERT Leadership Council; FEMA; the LAPD, Pacific Division's Community Police Advisory Board; and the Mar Vista Community Council Board.

He currently serves as the Vice President of the Mar Vista Neighborhood Association, Board of Directors.

## Commissioners



## David Trujillo

Appointed by Councilman Ed Reyes Council District 1


## Craig R. Miller

Appointed by Councilman Paul Krekorian
Council District 2
Commissioner Craig Miller is President \& CEO of MZA Events, and the Founder and Producer of AIDS Walk Los Angeles and the other large AIDS Walks throughout the U.S. Growing up in the San Fernando Valley, at age 21 he was the youngest manager of local political campaigns. He earned the respect of veteran members of Congress, including U.S. Rep. Howard Berman and U.S. Rep. Anthony C. Beilenson (Ret.), the latter of whom he worked for as senior political aide from 1982 to 1994. He worked on Valley congressional redistricting issues in the 1980's and 90's.

Miller and MZA Events have produced, consulted on or contributed to hundreds of major campaigns confronting the HIV epidemic and LGBT equality events, breast cancer awareness, and humane treatment of animals. Miller is currently working on legislation with U.S. Rep. Linda Sanchez, the LA Gay \& Lesbian Center, and AIDS Community Action Foundation.


## David Ford

Appointed by Councilman Dennis Zine Council District 3

Commissioner David Ford is Region Manager with Southern California Edison, an Edison International company and one of the nation's largest investor-owned electric utilities. With more than 17 years experience in the utility industry, his current position in Local Public Affairs, he oversees its operational departments and its customers before local, regional, state and federal governments in LA County and LA City. Mr. Ford is also Co-Founder of SCE's nationally recognized Black History Month celebration, "Connecting the Evolution of Electricity to Black History" Mr. Ford was the 2009 recipient of Edison's Chairman's Award. His board affiliations include the American Red Cross, Board, American Association of Black in Energy, and the California African American Museum.


Grover L. McKean
Appointed by Councilman Tom LaBonge
Council District 4

Commissioner Grover L. McKean is President of McGinn, McKean \& O'Niell an investment firm headquartered in Alexandria, Virginia. He has extensive experience as an investment advisor and manager. Most notably, Mr. McKean served as Chief of Staff to California State Treasurer Jess Unruh. He's been a member of various boards and commissions including State Educational Facilities Authority, Housing and Finance Agency, Pollution Control Authority, and Housing Bond Credit Committee. He's been an active Los Angeles resident having done work with community based organizations promoting job training and education.


## David Roberti

Appointed by Councilman Paul Koretz
Council District 5
Commissioner David Roberti was President pro Tempore or leader of the California Legislature, in which he served for 27 years, its youngest member at the age of 26 when first elected to office in 1966. After retiring from elected office, Roberti became a member of the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) from 1998 to 2002. Roberti was the chief Senate negotiator for AB939, the governing legislation for waste management in California. He authored, among other pieces of environmental legislation, laws reducing the generation of hazardous waste in California and setting deadlines for their implementation. Mr. Roberti is currently practicing law in Los Angeles.


## Jose Cornejo

Appointed by Councilman Tony Cardenas
Council District 6
Commissioner Jose Cornejo has 19 years of experience working for various elected officials. He is a first generation American born to parents who emigrated from Mexico and an active community member of the San Fernando Valley. He has worked over 40 political campaigns throughout the state. Mr. Cornejo brings a unique understanding of the council rules and procedures; and knows the inner workings of the legislative process in the State Legislature. His knowledge and involvement has been instrumental in drafting and negotiating legislation for on juvenile crime prevention, securing funds for new school construction, before and after school programs, earmarking lottery funds for textbooks, and developing playgrounds for disabled children.


Michael Trujillo
Appointed by Councilman Richard Alarcon
Council District 7

Commissioner Michael Trujillo has worked on local, state and federal campaigns across the country. He has served as a campaign director, spokesperson and campaign manager for various causes and elected officials in the last twelve years. His first stint in politics was as the youngest City Commissioner in Los Angeles history, appointed by then Mayor Richard Riordan to the Commission on Children, Youth and their Families at the age of 18 . He has worked on 26 political campaigns in the last 12 years including three presidential races. Previously, he served as Senator Clinton's campaign director for California, Texas and North Carolina during her race for the presidency. It was during this campaign that MSNBC named him "Part of the Clinton Dream Team."

Currently, he is the national campaign manager for Parent Revolution's effort to pass their parent empowerment bill "Parent Trigger" across the nation.


## Bobbie Jean Anderson

Appointed by Councilman Bernard Parks
Council District 8

Bobbie Jean Whitehurst Anderson is a native of Shreveport, Lousianna. Her family migrated to California in 1951. She became a California Certified Shorthand Reporter. She later served as Field Representative for Assemblyman Mike Davis from 2006 to 2009. Ms. Anderson is a member of Black Women's Forum and has chaired the Criminal Justice Taskforce. She was later appointed to the LAPD Commission in 1993 by Mayor Bradley and reappointed by Mayor Riordan. In 2001, she was appointed to the Commission on the Status of Women by Mayor Hahn.

Ms. Anderson is a labor activist with SEIU and with the Democratic Party nationally and locally. She has been elected Delegate to the four Democratic National Conventions beginning in 1992 and ending in 2008 (Obama delegate). She currently serves as Vice Chair of the Los Angeles County Democratic Party.


David Roberts
Appointed by Councilmember Jan Perry
Council District 9

Commissioner David Roberts, a Los Angeles native, serves as the Associate Director at USC's Local Government Relations Office. His background includes working on issues dealing with capital construction, legislation, planning, public financing, urban design, transportation and workforce development. He served as a Senior Deputy from 1998-2009 for two members of the City's 8th Council District, where he guided projects totaling $\$ 1.5$ billion in South Los Angeles. The Los Angeles Neighborhood Initiative cited his leadership skills, expertise and passion when they honored him with their Outstanding City Partner Award in 2009. He was selected for the prestigious American Marshall Memorial Fellowship this past spring.


## Christopher Ellison

Appointed by Councilman Herb Wesson
Council District 10

Commissioner Christopher B. Ellison was born and raised in Inglewood, California. He earned his Juris Doctor from Pepperdine University School of Law in 2002. Mr. Ellison currently works as a sole practitioner at the law firm of Ellison \& Associates. His professional affiliations include the California Employment Law Association, Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Langston Bar Association, National Football Players Association, and the Pepperdine University School of Law Mentoring Program.


## Ken Sampson

Appointed by Councilman Mitchell Englander
Council District 12

Commissioner Ken Sampson is the managing partner of Coldwell Banker Quality Properties and Coldwell Banker Commercial Quality Properties. He is a member of the Council of Real Estate Brokers and Managers, along with numerous real estate designations.

He served on the Fire, Police and Public Safety Citizens Advisory Council, the Chatsworth Land Use Committee, and the Los Angeles County Commission on intergovernmental relations. He currently serves as a board member of Children at Risk, North Valley YMCA, After School All-Stars Los Angeles and Providence Holy Cross Hospital. He has been a member of the North Valley YMCA Booster Gala and a cochair of Providence Holy Cross Hospital golf classic.


## Robert Ahn

Appointed by former Council President Eric Garcetti
Council District 13

Commissioner Robert Ahn, born and raised in Los Angeles, is a real estate attorney specializing in acquisitions, dispositions, leasing, lending, foreclosures, workouts, and acquisition of distressed debt. He is a former associate of the national law firm Lock Lord Bissell \& Liddell LLP, where he worked in the Real Estate Transactions Practice Group. Mr. Ahn serves on the Board of Directors of the Pacific American Volunteer Association (PAVA) and the Koreatown Arts and Recreation Center Steering Committee. He is conversational in Spanish and fluent in Korean.


## Antonio Sanchez

Appointed by Councilman Jose Huizar
Council District 14
Commissioner Antonio Sanchez was raised and currently resides in the San Fernando Valley. He is a graduate of local public schools and is currently pursuing dual master's degrees in Urban Planning and Latin American Studies at UCLA, where he focuses his research on community and economic development, transportation, and increasing civic engagement in underrepresented communities. Mr. Sanchez previously worked as a staff member to Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa where he led neighborhood beautification projects in the Northeast San Fernando Valley. In addition, he was responsible for communicating the Mayor's legislative priorities and helping residents and Neighborhood Council members navigate City government.


## Jerry Gaines

Appointed by former Councilwoman Janice Hahn
Council District 15

Commissioner Jerry Gaines is a retired business and economics teacher. He received the Los Angeles County Board of Education's Year of the Educator Medallion Award in 1981-1982 for his work in education during his teaching career. His community volunteer activities include serving on various land use working groups such as the Los Angeles City Appointed Charter Reform Commission, the Los Angeles City Harbor Area Planning Commission, the White Point Citizens Advisory Committee, and the San Pedro Area Reuse Committee, among others. He received a Certificate of Special Congressional Recognition in 1996 from former Congresswoman Jane Harman for his leadership with the San Pedro Reuse Committee which focused on the reuse of former military property within the community. He currently serves on the Los Angeles County Workforce Investment Board.


## Mona Soo Hoo

Appointed by Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa
Commissioner Mona C. Soo Hoo, a Los Angeles resident for the past 30 years, is a sole practitioner in defense of the Constitution before the federal and California state trial courts. She has served on the Governor's Panel on Racial Profiling, the Standing Committee on Court Discipline, the Merit Selection and Screening Committees, and, as an Attorney Representative to the Ninth Circuit Judicial Conference for the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California; the State Bar Criminal Law Section Executive Committee, the CORO Foundation's Training for Leaders in the Asian Pacific Community, and the CRA Relocation Appeals Board. She previously served on the Los Angeles Asian Pacific American Bar Association, the Los Angeles Criminal Courts Bar Association, the Board of Governors of the Southern California Chinese Lawyers Association and the Board of Governors of the California Attorneys for Criminal Justice.

Born in Honolulu, Hawaii to a U.S. Naval combat photographer of Chinese descent and a third generation Japanese-American interned during WW II, Ms. Soo Hoo was raised in a family with an abiding commitment to community service, equality and due process under the law.


## Amber Martinez

Commissioner Amber Martinez is the National Director of Chapter and Corporate Development for ALPFA, an organization that is dedicated to creating opportunities for its members and expanding Latino leadership in the global workforce. She also currently leads the Young Nonprofit Professionals Network of Los Angeles, developing the next generation of leaders in the nonprofit sector - those who work and speak for the needs of our community. She has extensive volunteer and board experience with various nonprofit organizations and political campaigns, at the local, state and national levels, notably Torie Osborn for CA AD50, Downtown Democrats, Bringing Back Broadway, and Common Ground. Previously, she has worked in leadership roles within education and refugee resettlement community organizations.


## Julie Downey

Appointed by City Attorney Carmen Trutanich

Commissioner Julie Downey has lived in Los Angeles most of her life, having attended local schools from kindergarten through law school. Before becoming a lawyer, she taught high school and junior college English and ESL as a teaching assistant at UCLA. As a lawyer she worked for the Los Angeles City Attorney's Office, briefly in the criminal division, and for many years on the civil side in land use and then as Managing Assistant of the Housing and Economic Development Division.

Since retirement, Ms. Downey served on the Judicial Nominee Evaluation Commission for the State Bar, on the board of PATH (People Assisting the Homeless) and PATH Ventures and as a docent for the Los Angeles Conservancy, leading downtown walking tours highlighting the history and architecture of the City.


Helen B. Kim
Appointed by City Controller Wendy Greuel

Commissioner Helen B. Kim is a partner at Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP, representing public and private companies and their directors, officers and principal shareholders in complex commercial litigation, including the defense of securities and other class actions, shareholder derivative suits and regulatory investigations. Ms. Kim has been named by The Daily Journal as one of the Top Women Litigators in California for the past three years. She is past President of the National Asian Pacific American Bar Association and the Women Lawyers Association of Los Angeles, and currently serves on the Board of Governors of the Los Angeles County Bar Association. Ms. Kim has served as a Board member of the Korean American Coalition since 2000. Ms. Kim is a graduate of Harvard-Radcliffe College, Yale Law School and The Juilliard School.

## Commission Staff



## Andrew Westall

Executive Director

Andrew Westall, a recognized redistricting expert, previously worked for the State Assembly during their 2001 redistricting process under the leadership of former Speaker of the Assembly Robert M. Hertzberg. In 2001-02, he served as the Technical Director for the LAUSD Board of Education and Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commissions.

Most recently, Mr. Westall served as Assistant Chief Deputy to Los Angeles City Councilmember Herb J. Wesson, Jr. engaged in budget, housing, planning, transportation, and economic development issues. He is an Adjunct Professor in Political Science at Pasadena City College and President of the Greater Toluca Lake Neighborhood Council.

Mr. Westall received his Bachelor of Arts in Political Science-Public Service from the University of California, Davis, and Master of Arts degree in Urban Planning from UCLA where he wrote his master's thesis on redistricting.


## Rani Woods

Outreach Director

Rani Woods is an innovative and resourceful public affairs professional with a background in politics, coalition building, and project management, with an ability to leverage campaign, corporate, and union experience to provide creative solutions to complex political and policy issues. Prior to joining the Commission, Ms. Woods worked as Manager of Redistricting Strategy and Outreach for the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor AFL-CIO, a Vote 2010 Regional Campaign Field Organizer for the California Democratic Party, and as a Latino Outreach project lead for Equality California. She previously worked in the public affairs division of Warner Bros. Entertainment, where she managed the joint studio initiative to advance sustainability and energy efficiency industry-wide.

Ms. Woods is a graduate of Boston University and the Coro Center for Civic Leadership's Fellows Program in Public Affairs.


## Myriam Lopez

Executive Assistant

Myriam Lopez began her career with the City of Los Angeles over 15 years ago serving as a volunteer worker for Councilwoman Rita Walters and eventually was employed by her. Throughout her tenure with the City of Los Angeles, Ms. Lopez has worked for various Councilmembers lending her administrative support.

She grew up in Los Angeles after emigrating here with her parents and family, at the age of 2 from Mexico. She is currently finishing her business degree at Mount St. Mary's College located in Los Angeles.

## Nicole Frances Boyle <br> Technical Director

Nicole Boyle has been a GIS analyst at the Statewide Database, the State of California's redistricting database, for over fifteen years. Ms. Boyle has performed geographic analysis of electoral and census datasets, built longitudinal datasets that allow for pre/post redistricting analysis on the same unit of analysis, created custom maps and has conducted studies analyzing the potential impact of various redistricting criteria and processes. She also works as a consultant providing technical and GIS support on redistricting and voting rights act projects.

In 2011, Ms. Boyle worked as a mapping analyst for the State of California's first Citizens Redistricting Commission.


## Daniella Masterson

Media Director

Daniella Masterson has had a prolific career in communications, working in newspaper, television, radio and public relations. Today she applies her expertise to support various Los Angeles-based businesses and nonprofits in marketing and public relations.

Ms. Masterson is the former host of Radio One's Sunday morning show "It's A New Day" on V100 100.3 FM. But her diverse media career began as a general assignment reporter at the Los Angeles Herald Examiner. That position paved a way for her to become a staff writer in the Features Department at the Los Angeles Daily News and later a free-lance writer for the Los Angeles Times Editorial Department. She leveraged her newspaper experience to work for E!, NBC and BET. She has a B.A. in Broadcast Journalism from the University of Southern California's Annenberg School of Communications.


## Steven Wood

Outreach Specialist

Steven Wood is proud to call Los Angeles his home for the past 12 years. He currently lives in Los Feliz but grew up in the Inland Empire. Throughout his professional career, Mr. Wood has worked as a community organizer or communications specialist for non-profit organizations, statewide coalitions, and labor unions in the local LA area. He has worked on several grassroots and electoral campaigns, and he enjoys using print and social media to help mobilize and inform various audiences and constituency groups.


## Lawrence Joe

Outreach Specialist
Lawrence Joe is a recent graduate of UCLA School of Law. Prior to joining the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission staff, Lawrence worked with the Asian Pacific American Legal Center during its 2011 congressional and state redistricting process. He has also worked on various election-related matters with the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law in Washington, DC and at the Los Angeles City Attorney's Office. Mr. Joe has a Master's Degree from Harvard's Graduate School of Education. He received his B.A. in Political Science and Asian American Studies from UC-Berkeley.


## Rashad Rucker-Trapp

Outreach Specialist

Rashad Rucker-Trapp moved to Los Angeles from Bakersfield after graduating from Ridgeview High School in 2005. He first attended West Los Angeles City College then transferred to the University of Phoenix, where he is completing his Bachelor's Degree in Human Services. He previously worked for the LA Department of Recreation \& Parks where he helped develop programming for youth living in the West Adams, Jefferson Park \& Baldwin Hills Communities. He serves as the Vice President for West Adams Neighborhood Council and President for the JABAC- LA block club association.


## Paulina Velasco

## Outreach Specialist

Paulina Velasco specializes in public policy, civic engagement, fundraising, public affairs. Her professional life is a reflection her commitment for social justice. As a consultant for the World Bank in 2010, she provided outreach solutions in Southern China that would directly benefit the people and environment of the region. Locally, she collaborated with stakeholders in all levels of the advocacy process.

She is an avid advocate and volunteer in her community, where she collaborates with a broad range of organizations to achieve impactful public policy outcomes.

Ms. Velasco earned a Master's in Public Policy \& Management from the University of Southern California and her Bachelors in Political Science from Loyola Marymount University in 2009.


## Elsa Carrillo

Latino Outreach Specialist

Elsa Carrillo is a UCLA graduate with a degree in International Development Studies, and a minor in Global Studies. Previously, Ms. Carrillo served as a Rural Community Development consultant in Burkina Faso, West Africa, where she focused on girl's education and food security.

More recently, Ms. Carrillo was the Program Assistant to the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF) Redistricting Program where she conducted outreach efforts to the Latino community for both California State and Los Angeles County Redistricting processes. She is also an active volunteer for Catholic Charities' Refugee Resettlement Program and is a member of the Los Angeles World Affairs Council.

## 3. TIMELINE

| First Business Meeting (LAPD) | Sept. 2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Business Meeting (LAPD) | Sept. 27 |
| Business Meeting (DTLA) | Oct. 12 |
| Business Meeting (DTLA) | Oct. 26 |
| Business Meeting (DTLA) | Nov. 9 |
| Opening of Commission Office | Nov. 21 |
| Commission Meeting (DTLA) | Nov. 22 |
| Commission Meeting (DTLA) | Nov. 28 |
| Pre-Draft Map Public Hearings (First Round) | Dec. 5 to Jan. 10 |
| Council District 12: LAPD Devonshire Youth Center | Dec. 5 |
| Council District 15: Watts Labor Community Action Committee | Dec. 8 |
| Council District 7: Alicia Broadous-Duncan Senior Center | Dec. 10 |
| Council District 9: Santee Educational Complex | Dec. 10 |
| Council District 6: North Valley City Hall | Dec. 12 |
| Council District 14: Boyle Heights Senior Center | Dec. 13 |
| Council District 11: IMAN Cultural Center | Dec. 15 |
| Council District 3: West Valley Christian Church | Dec. 17 |
| Council District 10: Nate Holden Performing Arts Center | Jan. 3 |
| Council District 2: Van Nuys City Hall | Jan. 3 |
| Council District 4: Friendship Auditorium | Jan. 4 |

Council District 5: Fairfax High School Auditorium

Jan. 5Council District 1: St. Peter's Italian Catholic ChurchCouncil District 13: Los Angeles City College TheatreCouncil District 8: Expo Center

Jan. 7

Jan. 9

Jan. 10

Dec. 14

Dec. 16

Asian Pacific Islander Press Conference Jan. 4

Business Meeting (DTLA) Jan. 11
Commission Tour of the City of Los Angeles Jan. 14

Group Presentations to Commission (DTLA)

Presentation and Adoption of Draft Boundaries (DTLA)

Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Roundtable (SEIU Local 721)

Pre-Final Map Public Hearings (Second Round)

Central Region: Wilshire Ebell Theatre

Western Region: Westchester Recreation Center, Gym

West Valley Region: Pierce College, the Great Hall

East Region: Occidental College, Thorne Hall

Downtown Region: Los Angeles City Hall, Chambers

East Valley Region: Walter Reed Middle School, Auditorium

South Region: West Angeles Church of God in Christ, Sanctuary
Business Meeting (Van Nuys)

Jan. 18

Jan. 25

Jan. 31

Feb. 1 to Feb. 11

Feb. 1

Feb. 2

Feb. 4

Feb. 6

Feb. 8

Feb. 9

Feb. 11

| Latino Roundtable (La Opinion) | Feb. 3 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Business Meeting (Pierce College) | Feb. 4 |
| Business Meeting (DTLA) | Feb. 15 |
| Presentation and Adoption of Final Boundaries Map (DTLA) | Feb. 22 |
| Community Redistricting Roundtable (LA Chamber) | Feb. 27 |
| Presentation and Adoption of Final Commission Report (Van Nuys) | Feb. 29 |
| Final Commission Report Submitted to City Council | Mar. 1 |
| Commission Presentation on Final Report to Rules and Elections Committee | Mar. 2 |
| Closing of Commission Office | Mar. 31 |
| *DTLA refers to John Ferraro Chambers at Los Angeles City Council, Van Nuys refers to Van Nuys City Hall |  |

## 4. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON OUTREACH

The Outreach Director reported to and worked closely with Ad-Hoc Committee on Outreach Chair Jerry Gaines (appointed by former Councilwoman Janice Hahn, CD 15). The Outreach Director and the Executive Director regularly participated in 7:30AM Monday morning calls with the full Committee.

## Members of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Outreach

Chair Jerry Gaines (appointed by former Councilwoman Janice Hahn, CD 15)

- Chair Arturo Vargas (appointed by the Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa)
- Vice Chair "Jackie" Dupont-Walker (appointed by Councilman Eric Garcetti, CD 13)
- Vice Chair Rob Kadota (appointed by Councilman Bill Rosendahl, CD 11)
- Commissioner Chris Ellison (appointed by Council President Herb Wesson, CD 10)
- Commissioner Helen B. Kim (appointed by City Controller Wendy Gruel )
- Commissioner David Roberts (appointed by Councilwoman Jan Perry, CD 8)
- Commissioner Ken Sampson (appointed by Councilman Mitchell Englander, CD 12)
- Commissioner Antonio Sanchez (appointed by Councilman Jose Huizar, CD 14)
* Staff: Executive Director Andrew, Westall, Outreach Director Rani Woods, and Media Director Daniella Masterson

During these calls, the Outreach Director provided weekly reports on the work of the Staff as it related to outreach and media. The calls also provided an opportunity for the Commission leadership and the Committee to provide guidance on programming efforts. In partnership with Chair Gaines, an outreach plan which integrated Commissioners and the Ad-Hoc Committee on Outreach members was developed.

## Committee Reports

The Ad-Hoc Committee on Outreach provided reports to the full Commission at five business meetings between November 2011 and March 2012. The meeting dates and agenda items are listed below.

- November 9, 2011, Agenda item \#3
- November 28, 2011, Agenda item \#1
- December 14, 2011, Agenda item \#2
- January 11, 2011, Agenda item \#3
- February 29, 2011, Agenda item \#3


## 5. STRATEGY FOR OUTREACH

The Outreach Program was managed by the Outreach Director with leadership from a number of key staff including: five Outreach Specialists and a Media Director, collectively the Outreach Team. On average, the Outreach Team logged 80 hours weekly including weekends for public hearings and community events held throughout the City. Below is a list of the target Communities of Interest for public participation and the methodology behind relationship building.

## Target Communities of Interest

The guiding document for enhanced public participation was the 20 Key Areas of Outreach. This document was utilized to more effectively target key communities for turnout by the Outreach Team, community partners, and Council Staff.

The 20 key areas included (number of contacts):
Neighborhood Councils (95)
Homeowners and Tenants Associations (50)
Neighborhood Council Alliances (6) Labor Unions and Locals (36)

Chambers of Commerce and Business Alliances (72)Business Improvement Districts (20)

Higher Education Institutions (13)
Vocational Learning Centers (6)
Governmental Affairs and Relations (14)
Local Political Activists (73)
Senior Centers (29)
Community Service Centers (66)

High Schools (33)
Places of Worship (125)
Historical Societies (13)
Recreation Centers and Parks (43)
Youth and Family Centers (18)
Community-Based Organizations (130)

Organizations Exhibiting Leadership in the State Redistricting Process
Organizations Exhibiting Leadership in County Redistricting Process
The majority of participation came from members of the public with ties to community-based organizations which were either issues-based, partisan political, racial or ethnic and often had existing relationships with sitting Council Members. Public awareness of the redistricting process from the independent Statewide Citizens Commission and the Board of Supervisors Commission process also strengthened educational programming led by the Outreach Team.

## Methodology

The Outreach Team developed relationships with the community through in-person meetings and appearances as well as phone and email correspondence. Outreach Specialists frequently spent time in the field providing education on redistricting principles and training for community members interested in providing verbal or written testimony to the Commission. In preparation for the Second Round of hearings, a series of mapping trainings were held both at the Commission Office and the Healthy City location. Numerous workshops were also held throughout the community to increase public education about the draft map.

Additionally, each Outreach Specialist was assigned target Council Districts, and by design the districts were spread throughout the City to expand their understanding of the regional challenges and issues facing the community. The regional approach enabled Outreach Specialists to develop greater breadth of knowledge and better prepare for the Second Round of public hearings.

Efforts of the Outreach Team were supplemented by partnerships with community-based organizations, consultants, and local activists. Commissioners also took an active interest in attending community events in particular with local Neighborhood Councils and Neighborhood Council Alliances. An important note is that the 95 Neighborhood Councils and their respective Alliances were not in existence during the previous redistricting process in 2001-02.

In total, it is estimated, the Outreach Team and community partners participated in more than 300 community events between December 2011 and March 2012.

Senior centers, homeowners and tenants associations, and local political activists were most effective in mobilizing the community to participate in the process.

## 6. OUTREACH TOOLS

In partnership with the Ad-Hoc Outreach Committee, a number of tools were assembled for Commissioners, Council Staff and community partners to engage the public.

## Community of Interest Documentation

Two specific Community of Interest (COI) documents were created for the public to provide testimony. During the first round, an initial COI document was created to help prepare individuals to identify their COI. The later document in the Second Round is an updated collection document that allowed the public to better address their comments on the draft map with either verbal or written comment. Both documents are included on page 24.

## Mapping Resources: Maptitude, ReDrawLA

Providing access to mapping was a top priority for the Commission. To enhance the public's understanding of the mapping, two online platforms were promoted: Maptitude by Caliper and RedrawLA, a project of HealthyCity, a local community-based organization. Both programs enabled the public to draw their preferred district and overlay relevant data both social and economic. The Outreach Team held a series of trainings for the public and a specific hearing for map submissions was held on Jan $18^{\text {th }}$ where 26 maps were presented. More information on the mapping platforms is available on page 25.

## Everybody Counts Newsletter

Weekly newsletters were circulated to members of the public announcing upcoming hearings, community and media events, and deadlines of map submissions and public comment. Frequently briefs in the newsletters were re-circulated by community members and the online community of blogs and Patches as well as individuals posting to Facebook and Twitter. Newsletters are included between pages 26-31.

## Online Community Survey

An online survey was created with survey monkey to capture the public's response to the draft map proposals. A copy of this survey is included on page 32.

## Website

The website (http://www.redistricting2011.lacity.org/) served as the online portal for all Commission events, publications, and resources. The website included listing of all meetings with agendas, transcripts and videos when available, as well as business meetings and hearing documents. Maps of existing Council Districts and proposed districts were also made readily available. The full website is included on page 44.

## Public Service Announcements

PSAs were created in five languages (Spanish, Korean, Filipino, Armenian, and English) to reach the less civically engaged communities and were focused to specific public hearings. Rather than dubbing the English version of the PSA, the PSA included community members who could provide authentic representation. All PSAs were available on YouTube. The English language PSA ran on LA Cityview Channel 35 and the four others on KSCI Thai News, Horizon, The Wave radio, KMEX and TVK, respectively.

The Script for the 30 second PSA is included below.

TALENT: (On camera)
If you care about changes in your neighborhood, let your voice be heard.

Attend a LA City Council Redistricting Commission
Hearing.

You have the POWER to shape the future of your community.

Every 10 years, the boundaries of the City Council Districts must be redrawn. This Process is called REDISTRICTING.

The Commission needs your input on a new redistricting plan. Join us at our next meeting and help us SERVE YOU.

Redistricting - EVERYBODY COUNTS!
(Graphic: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org / facebook logo/ LACCRC)
A DVD is available with all five PSAs.

## Community of Interest (COI) Documents

Round 1 COI Questions
Date:
Email or phone number:
What is the neighborhood/zipcode where you reside:
Name your community (neighborhood, neighborhood council):
How do you describe your community to someone who hasn't visited?
What streets/boundaries define your community?
Do you have concerns about the current boundaries of your Council District?
What are the major cultural/recreational/educational/religious institutions in your community?
Does your community have major geographical boundaries/features (freeways, parks, lakes, mountains)?
What languages are spoken in your community?
Are there public services (e.g. bus/rail lines, libraries, public schools, police, fire) that help identify your community?
Landscape (coastal, inland, urban/suburban,/rural): Types of homes (houses, apartments):
What issues matter to your community?

## Round 2 COI Questions

| Email or phone number | I live/work in the community of |
| :--- | :--- |
| Existing Council District: | Preferred Council District: |
| Boundaries: North | Boundaries: South |
| Boundaries: East | Boundaries: West |

The Commission's draft maps positively or negatively affect the representation of my community in the following way:

The following communities share common socioeconomic \& demographics characteristics with my community (state neighborhoods \& characteristics.):

My recommendation is that the Commission removes the following communities from my district.

Please state why?

My recommendation is that the Commission adds following communities to my district.

Please state the commonalities if any.

Other comments:

My community is different from the following communities.
State Why? (i.e. Demographics and/or socioeconomic characteristics):

## Mapping Resources

Maptitude

The Commission website provided a link to Maptitude's Online Redistricting software for residents and stakeholders interested in creating maps for submission. For those who were unfamiliar with the online software, the website provided links to a number of short training videos as well as an online manual.


## ReDrawLA

The Outreach Team partnered with Healthy City, a program of the Advancement Project, to provide interested residents and stakeholders access to ReDrawLA.org, a free, user-friendly data and mapping website that allowed users to view and analyze existing and newly proposed city council districts and to create their own district proposals, which could then be shared with the Commission at a public hearing. The ReDrawLA website contained key demographic and socioeconomic data to help users draw their communities of interest.

## Training Sessions

From January $7-13$, 2012, the Outreach Team in coordination with the Advancement Project provided a series of mapping training sessions.

Training Dates:
Saturday, January $7^{\text {th }} \quad 10 \mathrm{am}-1 \mathrm{pm}$
Monday, January $9^{\text {th }} \quad 2 p m-5 p m$
Tuesday, January $10^{\text {th }} \quad 5 p m-8 p m$
Thursday, January $12^{\text {th }} 5 \mathrm{pm}-8 \mathrm{pm}$
Friday, January $13^{\text {th }} \quad 10 \mathrm{am}-1 \mathrm{pm}$

## Everybody Counts Newsletter



LACCRC NEWS: GROUP PRESENTATION GUIDELINES

DATE SENT: Friday, January 13, 2012

## Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission Group Presentation Guidelines

Date: Wednesday, January 18, 2012

Time: Begins at 4:00PM

Location: Downtown City Hall (200 North Spring, Los Angeles, CA 90012)
Thank you for your interest in making a group presentation before the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission.

This hearing is for organizations that want to present maps to the LACCRC of a new, altered, or existing City Council district with a total population of 252,841 ; this number reflects the ideal population for each City Council district based upon 2010 census data. The Commission also welcomes organizations to present maps on an individual, regional or citywide basis.

There will be a 10 minute time limit for organizations presenting individual or regional City Council district maps and a 20 minute time limit for organizations presenting citywide maps.

Please RSVP by emailing the Commission's Outreach Director, Rani Woods, at Rani.Woods@lacity.org to be scheduled for Wednesday. You will receive a RSVP confirmation via email within 24 hours. All organizations that do not RSVP will be scheduled on a first come first serve basis.

Make sure to bring copies of your maps and supporting documents with you. Organizations that wish to give a Power Point presentation, must submit files electronically to the Commission's Executive Director, Andrew Westall, at Andrew.Westall@lacity.org by 12:00PM on Tuesday, January 17.

For parking arrangements, please contact your City Councilmember's office directly.

Please note: A decision was made by the Commission at their most recent business meeting to cancel the group presentation hearing on Tuesday, January 17 at Van Nuys City Hall. We sincerely apologize for the inconvenience and short notice.

DATE SENT: Friday, January 24, 2012

## Draft Maps To Be Released

After hearing from nearly 2,000 Angelenos during the first round of public hearings, Commissioners are set to release draft maps for all 15 City Council districts tomorrow.

Be the first to see and comment on these preliminary maps by joining this special LACCRC meeting in person tomorrow at the Van Nuys City Hall. You can also join the Commission meeting via teleconference Downtown City Hall.

## LACCRC Meeting \& Release of Draft Maps Wednesday, January 25, 2012, 4:00PM

Van Nuys City Hall (In Person)
Second Floor Council Chambers
14410 Sylvan Street
Van Nuys, CA 91401

Downtown City Hall (Teleconference)
John Ferraro Council Chambers
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Draft maps will be available on our website - http://www.redistricting2011.lacity.org - by the end of the week. To make parking arrangements, please contact your Councilmember's office directly.

## Gearing Up for February!

After you review the preliminary draft maps, the Commission wants to hear what you think! We will be holding a second round of hearings across Los Angeles to get your feedback and listen to how these proposed districts affect you and your community.

Come to one of the 7 public hearings below to comment on the draft maps, make your voice heard, and share your vision for our great City!

Wednesday, February 1, 2012, 6:30PM
Wilshire Ebell Theatre
4401 West $8^{\text {th }}$ Street, Los Angeles, CA 90005
Thursday, February 2, 2012, 6:30PM
Loyola Marymount University, Ahmanson Auditorium,
1 Loyola Marymount University Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90045
Saturday, February 4, 2012, 11:00AM
Pierce College,
6201 Winnetka Avenue, Woodland Hills, CA 91367
Monday, February 6, 2012, 6:30PM
Occidental College, Thorne Hall
1600 Campus Road, Los Angeles, CA 90041
Wednesday, February 8, 6:30PM
Los Angeles City Hall, John Ferraro Council Chambers
200 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012
Thursday, February 9, 6:30PM
Walter Reed Middle School, Auditorium,
4525 Irvine Avenue, Studio City, CA 91602
Saturday, February 11, 11:00AM
West Angeles Church Of God In Christ
3045 South Crenshaw Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90016


## LACCRC NEWS: VIEW DRAFT MAP \& UPDATED HEARING SCHEDULE

DATE SENT: Friday, January 27, 2012

## Have You Seen The Draft Map?

Earlier this week, the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) voted to release a draft map of Los Angeles' 15 City Council districts. Click here to view the LACCRC draft map on our website, or open the set of maps attached to this email.

Commissioners carefully considered the testimony of residents and stakeholders throughout the City and attempted to create fair and representative new districts in their proposal. However, this is just a starting point, and the process is far from over. To make improvements to the draft map, we need your input and involvement.

## Updated February Hearing Schedule!

Now that you've seen the draft map, we want to know what you think! Do you like or dislike the new proposals? How do the draft district maps affect you and your community? What changes would you make to the proposed City Council boundaries?

Attend one of our upcoming 7 public hearings, and let the Commission know your vision for Los Angeles and the neighborhood you live in. This is the link to our updated February hearing schedule. A PDF of this flyer is also attached.
*Please note: the location was CHANGED for our hearing on Thursday, February 2. The new location is The Westchester Recreation Center.*

## Draw Your Own Districts Using ReDrawLA.org

ReDrawLA.org, is a free, user-friendly redistricting website for the people of Los Angeles. It was built by Healthy City, which is a program of the Advancement Project. The site is for anyone who wants to access citywide demographic and socioeconomic data, create their own district proposals, or draw the boundaries of their community of interest.

Click here to access the LACCRC draft map on ReDrawLA.org. Check out the website and register for an account to personally re-configure the draft districts and represent your community the way you want. Once there, you can publish the maps that you create, print copies, and take them to the next public hearing for the Commission to consider.

For assistance using ReDrawLA.org, please call the Redistricting Commission office at (213) 922-7740.


## LACCRC NEWS: FINAL PUBLIC HEARING \& LAST CHANCE FOR PUBLIC TESTIMONY

DATE SENT: Friday, February 10, 2012

## Join Us for Our Final Public Hearing!

We conclude our second round of redistricting hearings tomorrow (Saturday, February 11) at 11:00AM at West Angeles Church of God In Christ, and we want to hear from you!

Help us make adjustments to the draft map by letting the Commissioners know how the proposed City Council districts affect your neighborhood and community. We hope to see and hear from you tomorrow morning! Here are the details:

Saturday, February 11, 11:00AM
West Angeles Church of God In Christ
3045 South Crenshaw Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90016

## Last Chance for Written Testimony

Submit your written comments to the Redistricting Commission before it's too late! We will be accepting written testimony with your feedback on the draft City Council district boundaries until Monday, February 13, 2012 at 5:00PM.

To make sure your suggestions and concerns become part of the public record by this deadline, email your testimony to redistricting.LAcity@LAcity.org, or you can click here to complete the electronic form on our website.

DATE SENT: Friday, February 17, 2012

## Adjusted Draft Map Released

Click here for links to the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission Adjusted Draft Map Proposal. This new map reflects changes to the initial draft that received majority approval from the Redistricting Commission at their regular meeting on Wednesday, February 15, 2012.

The LACCRC will meet again on Wednesday, February 22 at 4:00PM at Downtown City Hall to discuss and vote on a Final Map Recommendation that will be forwarded to the LA City Council. This meeting is open to the public.

## LAUSD Redistricting Commission Community Meetings

Redistricting for the Los Angeles Unified School District is also underway, and the LAUSD Redistricting Commission invites you to attend their upcoming community meetings to provide input on how school district boundaries should be redrawn. Here's their upcoming community meeting schedule:

Monday, February 20, 2012 @ 1:00PM
Community Meeting for LAUSD Districts 2, 5 \& 7
Hollenbeck Middle School Auditorium

2510 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, CA 90023
Tuesday, February 21, 2012 @ 6:00PM
Community Meeting for LAUSD Districts 1\& 4
Hamilton High School Auditorium
2955 South Robertson Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90034
Tuesday, February 21, 2012 @ 6:00PM
Community Meeting for LAUSD Districts 3 \& 6
Sepulveda Middle School Auditorium
15330 Plummer Street, North Hills, CA 91343

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission

MONDAY: Community Redistricting Roundtable

Monday, February 27, 2012

6:30 PM - 8:30 PM

Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Bank of America Room

## 350 South Bixel Street, Los Angeles, CA 90017

As the work of the Commission winds down, we invite you to attend a special community roundtable this Monday.

Come discuss the challenges and considerations factored into drawing district boundaries, and find out what lies ahead for the residents and stakeholders of our great City.

This will be a final opportunity to share feedback with Commissioners about the redistricting process. You won't want to miss out.

A flyer for Monday's roundtable is attached to this email. Light refreshments will be provided.

Panel Includes:
Director Dan Schnur (Moderator),

Jesse M. Unruh Institute of Politics at University of Southern California
Director Fernando Guerra,

Thomas \& Dorothy Leavey Center for the Study of Los Angeles at Loyola Marymount University

Executive Director Raphael Sonenshein,

Pat Brown Institute of Public Affairs at Cal State University Los Angeles

Commissioner Maria Blanco,

California Citizens Redistricting Commission

Leadership of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
*The roundtable is cosponsored by Jesse M. Unruh Institute of Politics at USC, Los Angeles

Chamber of Commerce, \& Los Angeles County Federation of Labor.*

Online Community Survey

Name

Email or phone number
What is the neighborhood/zipcode where you reside:
Name your community (neighborhood, neighborhood council):
How do you describe your community to someone who hasn't visited?
What streets/boundaries define your community?
Do you have concerns about the current boundaries of your Council District?
What are the major cultural/recreational/educational/religious institutions in your community?

Does your community have major geographical boundaries/features?

What languages are spoken in your community?
What are the major race/ethnic groups in your community?
Are there public services that help identify your community?
Landscape (coastal, inland, urban/suburban,/rural):
Types of homes:
What issues matter to your community?
Other Comments:

Landscape (coastal, inland, urban/suburban,/rural):

## 7. PARTNERSHIPS

The Outreach Team relied heavily on relationship building with Council Offices, communitybased organizations, and local community activists.

## Council Office

The Outreach Director worked closely with Council Staff to develop shared strategy for engaging community members in the process.

- Regularly sent blast emails promoting hearings
- Listed hearings in social media outlets like Facebook and Twitter
- Council Members attended 21 of the 22 public hearings
- Distributed and Promoted Commission materials (flyers, online survey, etc.)
- Trained community members on Communities of Interest
- Staffed public hearings
- Encouraged community members to submit petitions, maps

A list of Council Staff liaisons is included on page 34. A comprehensive set of email blasts from Council Offices begins on page 75.

## Community E-Blasts

Additionally, more than 100 community organizations and local leaders circulated blast e-mails throughout their community promoting the 22 public hearings held by the Commission.

## Community Partners

To more effectively connect with the less civically engaged populations of the City a number of community-based organization and consultants were brought on to assist the Outreach Staff.

These community partners held community workshops, staffed public hearings and where needed, assisted in purchasing media buys both print and digital.

LACCRC partners included: Joy Atkinson, Armenian National Committee of America: Western Region (ANCA), Figueroa Media Group (FMG), Koreatown Youth \& Community Center, Instituto de Educacion Popular del Sur de California, Los Angeles Conservation Corps., Pacoima Beautiful, Social Impact Consulting, and Ten 31 Media.

A complete list of assignments for community partners is listed on page 35.

## Council Staff Liaisons on Redistricting Outreach

Council District 1: Jose Gardea (COS), George Magallenes (Field), Sonia Jimenez (Legislative)
Council District 2: Karo Torossian (Legislative)
Council District 3: Jimmy Blackman (COS)
Council District 4: Jeanne Min (COS), Stacy Marble (Asst. COS)
Council District 5: Richard Lleywn (COS), Josh Darnell (Field)
Council District 6: Jim Dantona (COS)
Council District 7: Becca Doten (COS)
Council District 8: Emiliano Hernandez (Legislative)
Council District 9: Kathy Godfrey (COS), Hugo Ortiz (Field)
Council District 10: Justin Wesson (Legislative)
Council District 11: Mike Bonin (COS)
Council District 12: John Lee (COS)
Council District 13: Eduardo Soriano-Hewitt (Field), Julie Wong (Communications)
Council District 14: Ana Cubas (COS)
Council District 15: Erika Velasquez (Field)
Mayor: Larry Frank (Deputy Mayor), Mike Fong (Area Director)
Please note: additional Council Staff and Mayoral Staff promoted, monitored, and attended Commission meetings. The names listed above indicate the primary contacts in each of the Council Offices for outreach strategy.

Following the hearings, Council Staff suggested greater lead time be made available for future public hearings as well as increased outreach staffing for logistical support at the hearings.

## Community Partners

Joy Atkinson

- Round 1: Hearings in Council Districts 8,9,10

Armenian National Committee of America: Western Region (ANCA): William Bairamian

- Round 1: Hearings in Council Districts 4, 13
- Round 2: West Valley

Figueroa Media Group (FMG): Dante Charleston

- Round 1: Hearing in Council Districts 8,10
- Round 2: Downtown

Korea Town Youth \& Community Center: Joe St. John

- Round 1: Hearings in Council Districts 1,4,10,13

Instituto de Educacion Popular del Sur de California: Marlom Portillo

- Round 1: Hearings in Council Districts $1,8,13$
- Round 2: Central, Eastern, Downtown, South

Los Angeles Conservation Corp.: Pablo Cardosa

- All hearings in First and Second Round (total 44,000 flyers)


## Pacoima Beautiful: Veronica Padilla

- Round 1: Hearings in Council Districts 6,7
- Round 2: East Valley

Social Impact Consulting: Filiberto Gonzalez

- Round 1: Hearings in Council Districts 1, 13, 14
- Round 2: Central

Ten 31 Media: Al Magallon

- Creation of five Public Service Announcements promoting the Second Round of public hearings


## 8. HEARINGS

Between December 5, 2011 and February 11, 2012, the Commission held 22 public hearings throughout the City of Los Angeles.

Prior to the release of a draft map, the Commission held 15 public hearings (First Round). The hearings were held in each of the 15 districts to encourage diverse public engagement. During the two-week period, more than 1800 attended public hearings with 500 providing verbal comment. On average, 122 community members were in attendance.

The later portion of public hearings began on February 1, 2012 following the release of the Commission's draft map. The seven post-map hearings were set in each of the seven regions of the City: Central, Western, West Valley, East, Downtown, East Valley and South. On average, 409 community members were in attendance.

Please note: totals in attendance were drawn from Commission sign-in sheets, therefore turnout numbers were likely to have been significantly higher than recorded.

Below is a complete listing of all 22 hearings including, time, date, and location.

## LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULE
(Final Version)

Pre-Draft Map Public Hearing Schedule by Council District

| Date | Time | Loeations | CD | Address |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Saturday, January 07, 2012 | 11am | St. Peter's Italian Catholic Church | 1 | 1039 N. Broadway 90012 |
| Monday, December 12, 2011 | 6:30pm | North Valley City Hall | 2 | 7747 Foothill Blvd. 91042 |
| Saturday, December 17, 2011 | 11am | West Valley Christian Church | 3 | 22450 Sherman Way 91307 |
| Wednesday, January 04, 2012 | 6:30pm | Friendship Auditorium | 4 | 3201 Riverside Drive 90027 |
| Thursday, January 05, 2012 | 6:30pm | Fairfax High School Auditorium | 5 | 7850 Melrose Avenue 90046 |
| Tuesday, January 03, 2012 | 6:30pm | Van Nuys City Hall | 6 | 14410 Sylvan Street 91401 |
| Saturday, December 10, 2011 | 11am | Alicia Broadous-Duncan Senior Center | 7 | 11300 Glenoaks Blvd 91331 |
| Tuesday, January 10, 2012 | 6:30pm | Expo Center | 8 | 3980 Bill Robertson Lane 90037 |
| Saturday, December 10, 2011 | 11am | Santee Educational Complex | 9 | 1921 South Maple Avenue 90011 |
| Tuesday, January 03, 2012 | 6:30pm | Nate Holden Performing Arts Center | 10 | 4718 W. Washington Blvd. 90016 |
| Thursday, December 15, 2011 | 6:30pm | IMAN Cultural Center | 11 | 3376 Motor Avenue 90034 |
| Monday, December 05, 2011 | 7pm | LAPD Devonshire Youth Center | 12 | 8721 Wilbur Avenue 91324 |
| Monday, January 09, 2012 | 6:30pm | Los Angeles City College Theatre | 13 | 855 N. Vemmont Avenue 90029 |
| Tuesday, December 13, 2011 | 6:30pm | Boyle Heights Senior Center | 14 | 2839 E. 3rd Street 90033 |
| Thursday, December 08, 2011 | 6:30pm | WLCAC Phoenix Hall | 15 | 10950 S. Central Avenue 90059 |

Post-Draft Map Public Hearing Schedule by Region

| Date | Time | Loeations | Region | Address |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wednesday, February 01, 2012 | $6: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ | Wilshire Ebell Theatre | Central | 4401 W. 8th St. 90005 |
| Thursday, February 02, 2012 | $6: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ | Westchester Recreation Center | Western | 7000 W. Manchester Ave. 90045 |
| Saturday, February 04, 2012 | 11 am | Pierce College, The Great Hall | West Valley | 6201 Winnetka Ave. 91387 |
| Monday, February 06, 2012 | $6: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ | Occidental College, Thome Hall | East | 1600 Campus Rd. 90041 |
| Wednesday, February 08, 2012 | $6: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ | L.A. City Hall, John Ferraro Chambers | Downtown | 200 N. Spring St. 90012 |
| Thursday, February 09, 2012 | $6: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ | Walter Reed Middle School, Auditorium | East Valley | 4525 Irvine Ave. 91602 |
| Saturday, February 11, 2012 | 11 am | West Angeles Church of God in Christ | South | 3045 S. Crenshaw Blvd. 90016 |

## Language Assistance

The Commission placed a strong emphasis on making the hearings accessible to English and non-English speakers alike. To enhance the engagement of the non-English speaking community flyers and hearing handouts were created in nine languages. Additionally, interpreters were also available upon request by the public and Council Offices.

Document translation included: Spanish, Tagalog, Japanese, Korean, Thai, Mandarin, Cantonese, Farsi, and Armenian.

Interpreters were made available in: Spanish, Korean, Armenian, Cantonese, and Mandarin.

## Hearing Materials

Flyers and press releases in all languages, hearing handouts for the Public as well as fact sheets hearing summaries, hearing fact sheet summary chart are available beginning on page 95.

## Channel 35 and Council Phone

All 22 hearings were captured by LA CityView Channel 35 and played shortly thereafter being taped. These files were also posted as podcasts to the Commission website.

Podcasts are available at: http://www.redistricting2011.lacity.org/LACITY/audioVideo.html

## 9. COMMUNITY EVENTS

Between December and March a series of community events were held to engage the public outside of traditional business meetings and public hearings. Below is a listing of the community events and our local partners.

- Korean Press Conference (December 17, 2011 at the Korean American Museum)

Co-sponsored by: Korea Town Youth \& Community Center
*Presentations by Chair Vargas, Commissioners Ahn and Kim

- API Conference (January 4, 2012 at the Japanese American Cultural and Community Center)

Co-sponsored by: New America Media, Sandy Close
*Presentations by Chair Vargas, Commissioners Ahn, Kim, and Roberts

- Bus Tour of the City of Los Angeles (January 14, 2012)
*Participation of the Full Commission
- Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Roundtable (January 31, 2012 at SEIU Local 721)

Co-sponsored by: Las Memorias Project, Richard Zaldivar
*Presentation by Chair Vargas

- Latino Roundtable (February 27, 2012 at La Opinion)

Co-sponsored by: La Opinion
*Presentations by Chair Vargas, Vice Chair Dupont-Walker, Commissioner Sanchez

- Community Redistricting Roundtable (February 27, 2012 at the LA Chamber)

Co-sponsored by: The Jesse Unruh Institute of Politics at USC, Dan Schnur
The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, P. Anthony Thomas
The Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, Rusty Hicks
*Presentations by Vice Chair Dupont-Walker, and Commissioners Kadota, Gaines
We have included promotional documents for the events such as press releases and flyers on page 343.

## 10. PUBLIC COMMENT

During the 10 week period between Monday, December 5, 2011 and Monday, February 13, 2012, the Commission received 6,067 pieces of public comment.

Public comment was submitted in a number of formats, including:

- verbal comment (at a public hearing)
- verbal comment (at a business meeting)
- written comment (handwritten letter)
- written comment (e-mail)
- written comment (Community of Interest document)
- written comment (online survey)
- written comment (petition)
- map comment (neighborhood, district(s), citywide submission)
- phone message


## Breakdown of Public Comment

- Verbal: 1,295
- Written: 970
- Petitions: 3,738
- Maps: 64

Total Public Comment: 6,067
*verbal comment includes: hearings, business meetings, and phone messages

## 11. MEDIA COVERAGE

Media coverage between September 2011 and March 2012 is included in the following pages. The 139 page report of media coverage includes news articles and editorials. This media appendix begins on page 354.

## Social Media

Both the Commission's Twitter and Facebook Account were open in December 2011 and managed by the Outreach Team. On Twitter, a total of 252 tweets were posted to inform followers about upcoming hearings, release important documents, recap Commission meetings, direct people to the LACCRC website, and share redistricting photos. The Commission had 279 followers.


On Facebook, a total of 74 posts were made by the Outreach Team. These posts included 26 photos and photo albums which were created with pictures taken at public hearings, community events, and the Commission's business meetings. This page was utilized to promote the public hearing schedule, disseminate information, and to publicize the release of the maps.

## Paid Media

A team of consultants were assembled to place advertisements in the print, radio, and digital media. These advertisements were placed in publications and outlets near to public hearing locations. Publications and outlets were also selected on the basis of circulation numbers and targeted markets and communities. Targets for media buys included, but were not limited to the following communities: the Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender, Latino, African-American, Asian Pacific Islander, and Armenian communities.

## 12. RECOMMENDATIONS

Below is a list of four areas for improvement for consideration by the next Commission.

## Public Comment

- Online Database for Public Comment- purchase of an online management database
- City Methodology for Coding- a system established by the City Attorney and Chief Legislative Analyst Office
- Full-time staff tasked with coding public comment


## Online Community-Building

- Online Media Center- purchase of an online system for e-blasts, public correspondence
- Twitter-emphasis on relationship-building with key political actors, institutions


## Media

- Larger-scale media list across platforms-print, digital, radio, broadcast, and social media
- Increased promotion of Public Service Announcements on local and non-English television
- Increased media buys targeting the Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender community
- Use of online banner ads on redistricting and Council websites promoting the hearings
- Targeted media buys in patches and blogs


## Community Engagement

- Regularly placed Op-Eds and Letters to the Editor from Commissioners
- Coffee with the Commissioners- offer sit down opportunities for Commissioners and the public


## 13. CONCLUSION

In the process of redistricting the City of Los Angeles, more than 4,500 members of the public became engaged in advocating for their communities and neighborhoods. In spite of strong media messaging characterizing this process as government as usual, an impassioned public emerged and mobilized at the 22 public hearings held by the Commission.

When the process began in early December attendance at public hearings was on average 122 people with testimony often vague in terms of the actions requested by the Commission. Once draft maps were released in late January, a better-informed and more deeply engaged public reappeared to make their case. In the Second Round, more than 2,800 members of the public attended hearings with on average 409 people in attendance. The majority of meetings spanned at least five hours in length.

The 20 key areas strategy combined with a pre and post-draft map regional approach supplemented by community partnerships and budding Council staff relationships accounted for the exceedingly high level of public participation.

More than 6,000 pieces of public testimony were provided to the Commission. The most effective mobilization was implemented by the community of Neighborhood Council members and leadership. In the Final Map Recommendation, more than two-thirds of the City's 95 Neighborhood Councils were kept whole. Additionally, these boundaries were used to delineate district lines and were frequently referenced by the Commissioners when discussing and voting on boundaries. The Neighborhood Councils also benefited from the growing number of advocates amongst Commissioners throughout the process.

Although some communities argued their voices went unheard, the vast majority of conflicts brought to the attention as part of public comment were addressed in the Final Map Recommendation. Two Council Members and a handful of community groups remained critical of the process itself, but the majority were pleased with the outcome.

The test of the redistricting process as a platform to improve public trust of government remains for the next Commission to validate and in the more immediate short-term, for the City Council as of March $1^{\text {st }}$.

## 14. COMMISSION APPENDIX

This section includes:
Website
Council Office E-Blasts

Community E-Blasts
Sample Outreach Emails
Public Hearing Flyers
Press Releases
Public Hearing Handouts
Hearing Summary (Round One)
Fact Sheets
Fact Sheet Summary Chart

## City of Los Angeles Redistricting 2011


L.A. City Council

Redistricting
Commission



| Contact Information <br> Phone: (213) 922-7740 <br> FAX: (213) 922-7707 <br> Email: redistricting.LACity@lacity.org <br> Subscribe to ENS <br> 1. Click ENS (Early Notification System) <br> 2. Enter your full name and email address. <br> 3. Scroll down the page to " CLA:Chief Legislative Analyst: City Council Redistricting Commission " Section <br> 4. Check box. <br> 5. Press SUBSCRIBE button. |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |



## Everybody Counts

The Los Angeles City Charter requires that the City be redistricted at least once every 10 years. It calls for creation of a twenty-one member Redistricting Commission, which has the authority to make recommendations on a redistricting plan to the City Council that sets boundaries for City Council districts. The testimony and input of Los Angeles residents is critical to creating a redistricting plan that provides fair and effective representation for all citizens of the City. Learn how to get involved.

| Quick Links |
| :--- |
| Draw the Districts: Online Mapping |
| Software LOGIN |
| Council File Management System |
| Redistricting Charter |
| Public Hearings Rules (PDF) |
| Working Budget (PDF) |
| Timeline (PDF) |
| $2001-02$ Commission Report |
| FAQ |

City Council Redistricting Commission Agendas

| Title | Date | The connection has timed out |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission | 02/22/2012 |  |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission | 02/15/2012 |  |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - South | 02/11/2012 | The server at lacity.granicus.com is taking too long to respond. |
| Region |  |  |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - East | 02/09/2012 | - The site could be temporarily unavailable or too busy. Try again in a few moments. |
| Valley |  | - If you are unable to load any pages, check your computer's network connection. |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) Downtown Region | 02/08/2012 | - If your computer or network is protected by a firewall or proxy, make sure that Firefox is permitted to access the Web. |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - East | 02/06/2012 |  |
| Region |  | Try Again |
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## David Trujillo

Appointed by Councilman Ed Reyes
Council District 1

## Craig R. Miller

Appointed by Councilman Paul Krekorian
Council District 2
Craig Miller is President \& CEO of MZA Events, and the Founder and Producer of AIDS Walk Los Angeles and the other large AIDS Walks throughout the U.S. Growing up in the San Fernando Valley, at age 21 he was the youngest manager of local political campaigns. He earned the respect of veteran members of Congress, including U.S. Rep. Howard Berman and U.S. Rep. Anthony C. Beilenson (Ret.), the later of whom he worked for as senior political aide from 1982 to 1994. In that capacity, Miller worked on Valley congressional redistricting issues in the 1980's and 90's. Since launching his company in 1985, Miller and MZA Events have produced, consulted on, or contributed to hundreds of major fundraising and awareness campaigns confronting the HIV epidemic, as well as events promoting LGBT equality, breast cancer awareness, and humane treatment of animals, among other issues. Miller remains active in Washington, D.C., where he is currently working on legislation with U.S. Rep. Linda Sanchez, the LA Gay \& Lesbian Center, and AIDS Community Action Foundation to provide equal Social Security benefits for LGBT Americans.
back to top

## David Ford

Appointed by Councilman Dennis Zine
Council District 3
Awaiting Bio Approval

## Grover L. McKean

Appointed by Councilman Tom LaBonge
Council District 4
Grover L. McKean is President of McGinn, McKean \& O'Niell an investment firm headquartered in Alexandria, Virginia. He has extensive experience as an investment advisor and manager. Most notably Mr. McKean
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| City Council Redistricting Commission Agendas |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Title | Date |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission | 02/22/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission | 02/15/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) South Region | 02/11/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - East Valley | 02/09/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) Downtown Region | 02/08/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) East Region | 02/06/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) West Valley | 02/04/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting Agenda | 02/04/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) Western Region | 02/02/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - Central Region | 02/01/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission | 01/25/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission | 01/18/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission (CANCELED) | 01/17/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Bus Tour Lunch Discussion) | 01/14/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Bus Tour Press Conference) | 01/14/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission | 01/11/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) CD 8 | 01/10/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) CD 13 | 01/09/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) CD 1 | 01/07/2012 |
|  | 01/05/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) CD 4 | 01/04/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) CD 6 | 01/03/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - CD 10 | 01/03/2012 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - CD 3 | 12/17/2011 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - CD 11 | 12/15/2011 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission | 12/14/2011 |
| LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - | 12/13/2011 |




## Quick Links

Draw the Districts: Online Mapping
Software $\triangle$ LOGIN
Council File Management System
Redistricting Charter
Public Hearings Rules (PDF)
Working Budget (PDF)
Timeline (PDF)
2001-02 Commission Report
FAQ

| Title | Date |
| :---: | :---: |
| February 22, 2012 Agenda Materials | 02/22/2012 |
| February 22, 2012 Agenda Materials Part Two | 02/22/2012 |
| February 22, 2012 Agenda Materials Part Three | 02/22/2012 |
| February 22, 2012 Agenda Materials Part Four | 02/22/2012 |
| February 22, 2012 Agenda Materials Part Five | 02/22/2012 |
| February 22, 2012 Agenda Materials Part Six | 02/22/2012 |
| February 15, 2012 Agenda Materials | 02/15/2012 |
| February 4, 2012 Agenda Materials | 02/04/2012 |
| January 25, 2012 Agenda Materials | 01/25/2012 |
| Lanuary 25, 2012 Agenda Materials - Draft Map Proposal Presentation | 01/25/2012 |
| January 25, 2012 Agenda Materials - Kim-Ahn Map Proposal Presentation | 01/25/2012 |
| Lanuary 14, 2012 Agenda Materials - Part Three | 01/14/2012 |
| January 14, 2012 Agenda Materials - Part Four | 01/14/2012 |
| Lanuary 14, 2012 Agenda Materials - Part Five | 01/14/2012 |
| January 14, 2012 Agenda Materials - Part Six | 01/14/2012 |
| Lanuary 14, 2012 Agenda Materials - Part Seven | 01/14/2012 |
| January 14, 2012 Agenda Materials - Part Eight | 01/14/2012 |
| Lanuary 14, 2012 Agenda Materials Part One | 01/14/2012 |
| January 14, 2012 Agenda Materials Part Two | 01/14/2012 |
| Lanuary 11, 2012 Agenda Materials | 01/11/2012 |
| December 14, 2011 Agenda Materials | 12/14/2011 |
| November 28, 2011 Agenda Materials | 11/28/2011 |
| November 9, 2011 Agenda Materials | 11/09/2011 |

## Title

February 22, 2012 Agenda Materials
February 22, 2012 Agenda Materials Part Two

February 22, 2012 Agenda Materials Part Four
February 22, 2012 Agenda Materials Part Five
February 22, 2012 Agenda Materials Part Six
February 15, 2012 Agenda Materials

February 4, 2012 Agenda Material

Lanuary 25, 2012 Agenda Materials - Draft Map Proposal Presentation
anuary 25, 2012 Agenda Materials - Kim-Ahn Map Proposal Presentation
anuary 14, 2012 Agenda Materials - Part Three

January 14, 2012 Agenda Materials - Part Five
12 Agenda Materials - Part Six

」anuary 14, 2012 Agenda Materials - Part Eight
Lanuary 14, 2012 Agenda Materials Part One
January 14, 2012 Agenda Materials Part Two
Lanuary 11, 2012 Agenda Materials

November 28, 2011 Agenda Materials
November 9, 2011 Agenda Materials

Agenda Material

Date
02/22/2012

02/22/2012

02/22/2012
02/22/2012
02/22/2012
02/15/2012
02/04/2012
1/25/2012
1/25/2012

01/14/2012
4/2012

01/14/2012
01/14/2012
01/14/2012
01/14/2012
01/14/2012
01/11/2012
12/14/2011

11/09/2011
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# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION 

## 2011-12 REGULAR MEETING SCHEDULE

(Updated 1-13-12)
All regular meetings of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission will take place at 4 pm in the afternoon, subject to change by the posting of a Special Meeting Agenda.

Los Angeles, CA 90012

Tues. November 22, 2011

Wed. December 14, 2011

Wed. January 11, 2012

Tues. January 17, 2012
Van Nuys City Hall

Wed. January 18, 2012
John Ferraro Council Chambers

Wed. January 25, 2012
Van Nuys City Hall

Wed. February 8, 2012 John Ferraro Council Chambers
(Meeting moved to 6:30pm for Special Public Hearing)
Wed. February 8, 2012
(Meeting moved to 6:30pm for Special Public Hearing)

Wed. February 22, 2012
John Ferraro Council Chambers

Wed. February 29, 2012

John Ferraro Council Chambers Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring Street, Room 340
John Ferraro Council Chambers

Van Nuys City Hall

John Ferraro Council Chambers

John Ferraro Council Chambers

Van Nuys City Hall

Van Nuys City Hall 14410 Sylvan Street, Second Floor Van Nuys, CA 91401

## Everybody Counts!

 Los Angeles City Council Redistricting CommissionDraft boundaries have been drawn for all 15 Los Angeles City Council districts. And we want to hear how these proposed districts affect your community!

Before new City Council maps are in place for the next 10 years, make your voice heard by attending an upcoming redistricting hearing! The future of Los Angeles is in your hands.


## Public Hearing Calendar

Wednesday, February 1 @ 6:30PM
Wilshire Ebell Theatre
4401 West $8^{\text {th }}$ Street
Los Angeles, CA 90005
Monday, February 6 @ 6:30PM Occidental College, Thorne Hall 1600 Campus Road Los Angeles, CA 90041

Thursday, February 2 @ 6:30PM LMU, Ahmanson Auditorium 1 Loyola Marymount University Dr. Los Angeles, CA 90045

Wednesday, February 8 @ 6:30PM LA City Hall, John Ferraro Chambers 200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Saturday, February 4 @ 11:00AM Pierce College, The Great Hall 6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
Thursday, February 9 @ 6:30PM Walter Reed Middle School, Auditorium 4525 Irvine Avenue
Studio City, CA 91602

Saturday, February 11 @ 11:00AM South Los Angeles (to be announced)
*Please call (213) 922-7740 with translation requests. All locations are wheelchair accessible. Hearings will be televised on Channel 35 via tape delay.

To learn more about the City's redistricting process, please visit:
Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707
Email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org Website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
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Public Hearing Transcript（South Region）2－11－12
Public Hearing Transcript（East Valley）2－9－12
Public Hearing Transcript（Downtown Region）2－8－12
Public Hearing Transcript（East Region）2－6－12
Public Hearing Transcript（West Valley）2－4－12
Minutes 2－4－12
Public Hearing Transcript（Western Region）2－2－12
Public Hearing Transcript（Central Region）2－1－12
Minutes 1－25－12
Minutes 1－18－12
Minutes 1－11－12
Public Hearing Transcript（CD 8）1－10－12
Public Hearing Transcript（CD 13）1－9－12
Public Hearing Transcript（CD 1）1－7－12
Public Hearing Transcript（CD 5）1－5－12
Public Hearing Transcript（CD 4）1－4－12
Public Hearing Transcript（CD 10）1－3－12
Public Hearing Transcript（CD 6）1－3－12
Public Hearing Transcript（CD 3）12－17－11
Public Hearing Transcript（CD 11）12－15－11
Minıtoc 1つ－1＾－11

Minutes／Transcripts
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01／09／2012
01／07／2012
01／05／2012
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01／03／2012
12／17／2011
12／15／2011
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## Legal Training

The City Attorney's Office provides the Commission with information on relevant laws, legal requirements, and key principles associated with redistricting. The presentations below were provided during Commission meetings.

Charter and Administrative Code Provisions

## Summary of Redistricting Law and Criteria (PDF)

Demographic Data for Council Districts - 2010 (PDF)
Citizen Voting Age Population Data for Council Districts - 2010 (PDF)

## U.S. Census Data

- Residence Rule And Residence Situations For The 2010 Census (U.S. Census Bureau) These Frequently Asked Questions explain how the U.S. Census Bureau assigns residence; for example, for military personnel or persons without a usual residence.
- Interactive: Mapping the 2010 U.S. Census Browse population growth and decline, changes in racial and ethnic concentrations, and patterns of housing development at the census tract level (content provided by the New York Times).

Neighborhood Council and Community Maps
Neighborhood Council Map with Council District Overlay - 2011 (PDF)
Los Angeles Times Communities/Neighborhoods Map - 2011 (PDF)

```
ABOUT
    Commissioners
    Staff
```


## MEETI NGS

Agendas
Agenda Materials
Public Hearing Flyers
Regular Meeting Schedule (PDF)
Public Hearing Schedule (PDF)
Video Audio Podcasts
Minutes/Transcripts

ADDI TI ONAL I NFO.

## Resources

FAQ
Website Tools

## DOCUMENTS

Important Documents
Committee Documents Supplement Documents Press Materials
GET I NVOLVED
How to
Draw the Districts
Submit Map (PDF)
Submit Comment
Join Us On

MAPS
Historic Maps
Current Map (PDF)
Public Submitted Maps Draft Maps



| Contact Information <br> Phone: (213) 922-7740 <br> FAX: (213) 922-7707 <br> Email: redistricting.LACity@lacity.org |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Subscribe to ENS $\boldsymbol{\square}$ |  |  |
| 1. Click ENS (Early Notification System) <br> 2. Enter your full name and email address. <br> 3. Scroll down the page to " CLA:Chief Legislative Analyst: City Council Redistricting Commission " Section <br> 4. Check box. |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 5. Press SUBSCRIBE button. |  |  |

Quick Links

Draw the Districts: Online Mapping
Software 8 LOGIN
Council File Management System
Redistricting Charter
Public Hearings Rules (PDF)
Working Budget (PDF)
Timeline (PDF)
2001-02 Commission Report

What is redistricting?
Every 10 years, City Council district boundaries are re-drawn to account for population changes. The Redistricting Commission makes recommendations to the City Council on adoption of the City's redistricting plan that sets the boundaries of City Council districts.

Why is it important?
How and where districts are drawn can shape communities' ability to elect the representatives of their choice. Districts must be made as equal in population as possible and practicable so that communities have equal access to political representation.

Who are the Commissioners and how were they selected?
Information on the twenty-one (21) Commissioners and their duties, appointment, and term can be found on our website.

How will the Commission encourage public input?
The Commission welcomes comments at any of our public meetings, as well as by telephone, letter, or email. In addition to regular meetings, at least 20 public hearings will be held throughout the redistricting process. At least one public hearing will be held in each current Council district. The public comment form for written comments can be found on our website.

When and where will public hearings be held?
Public hearings will be held November through December 2011 in anticipation of adopting a draft plan in January 2012. Public hearings will again be held January through February 2012 in anticipation of adopting a final plan by March 1, 2012. The current schedule is available on our website. Suggestions for facilities locations are welcomed and encouraged.

How can my community stay informed and get involved?
We encourage you to request a community presentation, attend a meeting, public hearing, submit comments, and contact us anytime throughout this process. More information on how to get involved is available on our website.
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Title
Adjusted Draft Map Proposal - District by District Maps - Street Level
Adjusted Draft Map Proposal - District by District Maps - Neighborhood Councils
Adjusted Draft Map Proposal - District by District Maps - L.A. Times Communities
Adjusted Draft Map Proposal - District by District Maps - Displacement from Current Districts
Draft Map Proposal - District by District Maps - Street Level
Draft Map Proposal - District by District Maps - L.A. Times Communities
Draft Map Proposal - District by District Maps - Neighborhood Councils
Commission FAQ Sheet
Commission FAQ Sheet in Spanish
Commission FAQ Sheet in Korean
Commission FAQ Sheet in Japanese
Commission FAQ Sheet in Armenian
Commission FAQ Sheet in Tagalog
Commission FAQ Sheet in Chinese
Commission FAQ Sheet in Vietnamese
Commission FAQ Sheet in Thai
Commission Public Comment Form
Commission Public Comment Form in Spanish
Commission Public Comment Form in Korean
Commission Public Comment Form in Japanese
Commission Public Comment Form in Armenian
Commission Public Comment Form in Tagalog
Commission Public Comment Form in Chinese
Commission Public Comment Form in Vietnamese
Commission Public Comment Form in Thai
Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process in Spanish
Presentation of the Commision Structure and Process in Korean
Presentation of the Commision Structure and Process in Japanese
Presentation of the Commision Structure and Process in Armenian
Presentation of the Commision Structure and Process in Tagalog
Presentation of the Commision Structure and Process in Chinese
Presentation of the Commision Structure and Process in Vietnamese
Presentation of the Commision Structure and Process in Thai
Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria
Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria in Spanish
Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria in Korean
Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria in Japanese
Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria in Armenian
Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria in Tagalog
Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria in Chinese
Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria in Vietnamese
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## Public Testimony on Your Community of Interest

Input from the public is critical to help inform the Commission about your Community of Interest. The Commission has prepared a Public Comment Form to provide the public with a way of submitting information on characteristics that may define your Community of Interest.. If you would like the Commission to consider a particular Community of Interest, we invite you to complete and submit a Public Comment Form, to speak at a Public Hearing or to submit your written comments to the Commission via our website, email, or fax. All personal information

## Submit a Map

Maps are another may for the public to provide their input to the Commission. We will accept any size map, small or large, in any format. Whether it's your neighborhood, community, Council District, region, or the entire City, these maps will be considered by the Commission. Maps submitted to the Redistricting Commission are considered part of the public record. In addition to being distributed to the Commission, maps submitted will be made available to the public upon request. If submitted in an electronic format, the maps may be uploaded to the Commission website. If you do not have the map available in an electronic format, Commission staff can scan it for uploading upon request. Submit A Map

## Online Redistricting Tool

The Commission is making available a free online tool for the public to develop, share, and submit maps. Access the tool: Draw the Districts

Note: You are not required to use the online software to submit input or a proposed map. The Commission will accept suggestions in any format of your choosing, such as an image or written description. For more information on ways to provide input, please visit Submit Map Form or Submit Public Comment Form or contact our office anytime.

## Map Presentations by Individuals or Organized Groups

The Commission has established rules and procedures for the presentation of maps by individuals or organized groups at the Tuesday January 17, 2012 and Wednesday January 18, 2012 regular Commission meetings.

## - Rules and Procedures

Commission meetings for the presentation of citywide and regional plans have been scheduled for Tuesday January 17, 2012 at Van Nuys City Hall and Wednesday January 18, 2012 at Los Angeles City Hall. While Individuals or groups may present plans at these Commission meetings, proposed maps, suggestions, and comments can be submitted to the Commission for its consideration without requiring the submitter to make an oral presentation. If an individual or group submits proposed maps that are smaller than a Council District (e.g. Neighborhood Council, neighborhood, other communities of interest), these proposals will not be considered for an oral presentation. Individuals or groups planning to offer highlights of their plans at one of the above-referenced Commission meetings should present a request to the Commission no later than seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meetings. The request should identify the name of the individual or group presenting the plan, the types of plans being submitted (citywide, regional, single district), and the amount of time requested to present highlights to the Commission, subject to the limitations set out below. Requests should be sent to: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

The Commission will provide one time slot per group or individual, with preference given to the Commission meeting closest to their place of residence or business. The Commission will provide no more than ten (10) minutes for regional plans and twenty (20) minutes for citywide plans for representatives to provide highlights of their proposed plans and to answer questions from the Commission and its staff and consultants. Depending on the number of submissions and requests to testify at the public hearings, this allocation of time may be reduced, but in no case will it be less than five (5) minutes. Presenters should provide key highlights of the plans and are urged to budget sufficient time within their total time allocation for questions and answers.

Presenters who wish to use PowerPoint or any other presentation software to highlight their plans should submit an electronic copy of their presentation at least 48 hours prior to the Commission meeting. Presentations should be sent to redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

## - Submission Format

The Commission strongly encourages developers of plans to submit copies of their plans well in advance of the January 17th and January 18th meetings. The following guidelines should be followed in submitting citywide or multiple district plans:

A version of the plan(s) should be submitted using the Maptitude for Redistricting online software package available on the Commission's website. As an alternative, an electronic version of the plan(s) contained on a CD, DVD, or USB drive should be submitted. Maps should be submitted in PDF format or in a commonly used graphics file format. Accompanying reports should be submitted in PDF or Microsoft Word format. Block equivalency files compatible with the Maptitude for Redistricting software package should be submitted along with the maps and accompanying reports. Equivalency files may be submitted in .dat, .dbf, or .txt format. Additional .shp files may also be included.

Printed copies of maps and accompanying reports are not required, but may be included in the submissions.
All materials should be sent to the following address:
ATTN: Citywide/Regional Plan Submissions
Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275
Los Angeles, CA 90012

## - General Map Criteria and Guidelines

It is suggested that maps submitted by the public for Citywide and multiple Council District plans should contain a map or set of maps accompanied by a report that provides a description of the proposed district boundaries and the justifications for those boundaries. The accompanying report should confirm that the proposed districts are consistent with the legal requirements of the Los Angeles City Charter, as well as applicable municipal, state, and federal law. Presentations of maps to the Commission and posting of maps on the Redistricting Commission website does not in any way imply endorsement or support by the Redistricting Commission. Posting is provided only as a service to the public to maximize access to Redistricting Commission proceedings.

These requirements include the following criteria:

1. Equal Population Principle - Council districts must contain, as nearly as practicable, equal portions of the total population of the City. This principle is established in the City Charter and also in the United State Supreme Court's "One-Person, One-Vote" decisions;
2. U.S. Constitution's Equal Protection Clause - The United States Supreme Court has held that race cannot be used as the predominant factor in drawing district lines such that traditional redistricting criteria are subordinated to considerations of race;
3. Voting Rights Act of 1965 - The Voting Rights Act prohibits voting practices which result in a denial or abridgement of the right to vote on account of race, color or language minority status. Redistricting plans must be analyzed under the Voting Rights Act to ensure they do not deprive minority voters of an equal opportunity to elect representatives of their choice in violation of the Act;
4. Traditional Redistricting Criteria - Federal, state and city law have established several traditional redistricting criteria all of which shall be considered to the extent feasible when drawing district lines:

- Contiguity - all parts of a district should connect
- Compactness - districts should be geographically compact
- Existing Boundaries - districts should consider boundaries such as geographic, street and political boundaries
- Communities of Interest - districts should preserve communities of people sharing common interests;

5. Council Districts should have an ideal population of 252,847; and,
6. If your proposal deviates from the ideal population a Council District as listed above, you must include a written explanation and justification of such deviations.
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## LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION MAP SUBMITTAL FORM

Maps submitted to the Redistricting Commission are considered part of the public record. In addition to being distributed to the Commission, maps submitted will be made available to the public upon request. Maps do not have to a complete map of the City, and can be partial maps or even a map of one Council District or neighborhood. If submitted in an electronic format, the maps may be uploaded to the Commission website. If you do not have the map available in an electronic format, Commission staff can scan it for uploading upon request.

NOTE: Posting of maps on the Redistricting Commission website does not in any way imply endorsement or support by the Redistricting Commission. Posting is provided only as a service to the public to maximize access to Redistricting Commission proceedings.

To submit a map for posting, please complete the information below and email to redistricting.lacity@lacity.org or via U.S. Mail to: Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission, 200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012, ATTN: MAP SUBMITTAL.

## Please note that the information provided below will become part of the public record and may be posted online, unless otherwise indicated below.

Name/version of map: $\qquad$
Name of individual submitting map: $\qquad$ Date submitted: $\qquad$
Council District of residence (or neighborhood/community) (*OPTIONAL):

If submitting on behalf of organization or as part of an organized group, name of organization:

Title/affiliation with organization:

Contact phone number and email address (required to submit but not required to post online):

Please indicate if you would like your contact information posted with map: $\square$ YES $\square$ NO If more than one attachment, please list order in which you would like documents to be posted:

Please initial that you understand the following disclaimer: I understand that submission of my map does not in any way imply endorsement or support by the Redistricting Commission.

The Commission reserves the right to make any map or other material submitted available to the public by means other than the Commission's website.


| Contact I nformation <br> Phone: (213) 922-7740 <br> FAX: (213) 922-7707 <br> Email: redistricting.LACity@lacity.org <br> Subscribe to ENS <br> 1. Click ENS (Early Notification System) <br> 2. Enter your full name and email address. <br> 3. Scroll down the page to "CLA:Chief Legislative Analyst: City Council Redistricting Commission " Section <br> 4. Check box. |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Quick Links
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Software LOGIN
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Working Budget (PDF)
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## Title

Council District 4 - Robby O'Donnell
Skid Row - Molly Rysman
Council District 4 - Wayne Johansson
Council District 10 - Brandie Gordon
Citywide Map - Neighborhood Councils Intact - Barry Johnson
Greater Wilshire Neighborhood - Monica Rogan
Council District 4 - John Welborne
Greater Wilshire Neighborhood - Judy and Ethan Gregory
Council District 13 - Korean American Coalition
Council District 1 - Susan Silvera
Council District 4 - Lorna Hennington
Council District 5 - Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council
Council Districts 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 12 - Valley Alliance of Neighborhood Councils
Council District 4 - Stephen Rebello
Historic Core Neighborhood - Patricia Berman
My One CD: Unifying Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council
Citywide Map - Asian Pacific American Legal Center
Citywide Map (without CDs 8, 9, and 10) - Dr. Tom Williams
Council Districts 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 12 - Glenn Bailey
Council Districts 8, 9, and 10 - Historic South Central - NAACP
Council District 4 - Peter White
Council Districts 2, 4, 5, 11, and 13 - Los Angeles/Valley Pride
Council Districts 8, 9, 10, 14, and 15 - Coalition for Fairness in Redistricting
Council Districts 13, 4, and 1 - Atwater Village NC and Atwater Village Chamber of Commerce
Historic Downtown LA Business Improvement District - Blair Besten
2011 Arts District Redistricting Map - Gabrielle Newmark
Citywide Map - Log Cabin Los Angeles
Council District 2 - Sun Valley Neighborhood Council
Arts District - Los Angeles River Artists Business Association
Council District 14 - Laura Velkei
Downtown Neighborhood - David Syner
Downtown Neighborhood - Jeremy Kasten
Downtown Neighborhood - Jerry McCarthy
Council District 10 or Council District 8 - United Community Associations
Windsor Village in CD 10 or CD 4 - R.J. Strotz
South LA-Westchester District - Damien Goodmon
Council District 14 - Eastern Columbia and 9th and Hill Street Park
Citywide Map - MALDEF
Council Districts 8, 9, 10, and 15 - South LA Redistricting Collaborative
Council District 4 - Toluca Lake Homeowner's Assoc./Toluca Lake Chamber/Greater Toluca Lake NC
Kim-Ahn Alternative Draft Map Proposal

Date
01/13/2012
01/13/2012
01/13/2012
01/13/2012
01/13/2012
01/17/2012
01/17/2012
01/17/2012
01/17/2012
01/17/2012
01/17/2012
01/17/2012
01/17/2012
01/17/2012
01/17/2012
01/17/2012
01/17/2012
01/17/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/18/2012
01/19/2012
01/19/2012
01/19/2012
02/06/2012
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On February 15th, the Commission made adjustments to its Draft Map proposal. The Commission will be meeting on Wednesday, February 22, 2012 in the John Ferraro Council Chambers of City Hall at 4 pm to vote on a Final Map Recommendation to the City Council. We are asking for the public to provide as much public comment as possible.

Below are maps and GIS information produced by the Commission.

Draft Map Proposal - Street Level (Date: February 15th)

| Citywide |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CD 1 | CD 2 | CD 3 | CD 4 | CD 5 |
| CD 6 | CD 7 | CD 8 | CD 9 | CD 10 |
| CD 11 | CD 12 | CD 13 | CD 14 | CD 15 |

Draft Map Proposal - Neighborhood Councils (Date: February 15th)
$\frac{\text { Citywide }}{\text { CD 1 }}$

| CD 6 |
| :--- |
| CD 11 |


$\frac{\frac{\text { CD 5 }}{\text { CD 10 }}}{\underline{\text { CD 15 }}}$
Draft Map Proposal - L.A. Times Communities (Date: February 15th)
Citywide

| CD 1 | CD 2 | CD 3 | CD 4 | CD 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CD 6 | CD 7 | CD 8 | CD 9 | CD 10 |
| CD 11 | CD 12 | CD 13 | CD 14 | CD 15 |

Draft Map Proposal - Current District Overlay (Date: February 15th)
$\frac{\frac{C D 1}{C D} 6}{\underline{C D ~ 11}}$
$\frac{\frac{\mathrm{CD} 2}{\mathrm{CD} \mathrm{7}}}{\underline{\mathrm{CD} \mathrm{12}}}$
$\frac{\frac{\mathrm{CD} \mathrm{3}}{\mathrm{CD} 8}}{\mathrm{CD} \mathrm{13}}$
$\frac{\frac{C D 4}{C D ~ 9}}{\underline{C D ~ 14}}$
$\frac{\text { CD 5 }}{C D ~ 10}$
$\underline{C D ~ 15}$

Statistics Table (Date: February 15th)
laccre adjusted draft map statistics 0217.pdf
laccrc adjusted draft map statistics 0217.xlsx

GIS Layers and Block Equivalency File (Date: February 15th)
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## Quick Links
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2011-12 Commission Report

On February 15th, the Commission made adjustments to its Draft Map proposal. The Commission will be meeting on Wednesday, February 22, 2012 in the John Ferraro Council Chambers of City Hall at 4 pm to vote on a Final Map Recommendation to the City Council. We are asking for the public to provide as much public comment as possible.

Below are maps and GIS information produced by the Commission.

Final Map Recommendation - Street Level

| CD 1 | CD 2 | CD 3 | CD 4 | CD 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CD 6 | CD 7 | CD 8 | CD 9 | CD 10 |
| CD 11 | CD 12 | CD 13 | CD 14 | CD 15 |

Final Map Recommendation - Neighborhood Councils

| Quick Links | Citywid |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CD 1 | CD 2 | CD 3 | CD 4 | CD 5 |
|  | CD 6 | CD 7 | CD 8 | CD 9 | CD 10 |
|  | CD 11 | CD 12 | CD 13 | CD 14 | CD 15 |
| Draw the Districts: Online Mapping | Final Map Recommendation - L.A. Times Communities |  |  |  |  |
| Software 8 LOGIN |  |  |  |  |  |
| Council File Management System | CD 1 | CD 2 | CD 3 | CD 4 | CD 5 |
|  | CD 6 | CD 7 | CD 8 | CD 9 | CD 10 |
| Redistricting Charter | CD 11 | CD 12 | CD 13 | CD 14 | CD 15 |
| Public Hearings Rules (PDF) Final Map Recommendation - Current District Overlay |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working Budget (PDF) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Timeline (PDF) | CD 1 | CD 2 | CD 3 | CD 4 | CD 5 |
|  | CD 6 | CD 7 | CD 8 | CD 9 | CD 10 |
| 2001-02 Commission Report | CD 11 | CD 12 | CD 13 | CD 14 | CD 15 |
| FAQ | Statistics Table |  |  |  |  |
| 2011-12 Commission Report | Stats (pdf) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Stats (x\|sx) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Comparison Stats with Current Districts (xIsx) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Comparison Stats with Current Districts (pdf) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Neighborhood Council Stats and Splits (pdf) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Neighborhood Council Stats and Splits (xls) |  |  |  |  |

Final Map Recommendation - L.A. Times Communities

| Quick Links | Citywid |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CD 1 | CD 2 | CD 3 | CD 4 | CD 5 |
|  | CD 6 | CD 7 | CD 8 | CD 9 | CD 10 |
|  | CD 11 | CD 12 | CD 13 | CD 14 | CD 15 |
| Draw the Districts: Online Mapping <br> Software $\square$ Login | Final Map Recommendation - L.A. Times Communities |  |  |  |  |
| Council File Management System | CD 1 | CD 2 | CD 3 | CD 4 | CD 5 |
|  | CD 6 | CD 7 | CD 8 | CD 9 | CD 10 |
| Redistricting Charter | CD 11 | CD 12 | CD 13 | CD 14 | CD 15 |
| Public Hearings Rules (PDF) Final Map Recommendation - Current District Overlay | Final Map Recommendation - Current District Overlay |  |  |  |  |
| Working Budget (PDF) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Timeline (PDF) | CD 1 | CD 2 | CD 3 | CD 4 | CD 5 |
|  | CD 6 | CD 7 | CD 8 | CD 9 | CD 10 |
| 2001-02 Commission Report | CD 11 | CD 12 | CD 13 | CD 14 | CD 15 |
| FAQ | Statistics Table |  |  |  |  |
| 2011-12 Commission Report |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Stats (x\|sx) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Comparison Stats with Current Districts (x\|sx) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Comparison Stats with Current Districts (pdf) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Neighborhood Council Stats and Splits (pdf) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Final Map Recommendation - Current District Overlay

| Quick Links | Citywid |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CD 1 | CD 2 | CD 3 | CD 4 | CD 5 |
|  | CD 6 | CD 7 | CD 8 | CD 9 | CD 10 |
|  | CD 11 | CD 12 | CD 13 | CD 14 | CD 15 |
| Draw the Districts: Online Mapping | Final Map Recommendation - L.A. Times Communities |  |  |  |  |
| Software Q login $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Council File Management System | CD 1 | CD 2 | CD 3 | CD 4 | CD 5 |
|  | CD 6 | CD 7 | CD 8 | CD 9 | CD 10 |
| Redistricting Charter | CD 11 | CD 12 | CD 13 | CD 14 | CD 15 |
| Public Hearings Rules (PDF) Final Map Recommendation - Current District Overlay |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working Budget (PDF) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Timeline (PDF) |  | CD 2 | CD 3 | CD 4 | CD 5 |
|  | CD 6 | CD 7 | CD 8 | CD 9 | CD 10 |
| 2001-02 Commission Report | CD 11 | CD 12 | CD 13 | CD 14 | CD 15 |
| FAQ Statistics Table |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011-12 Commission Report | Stats (pdf) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Stats (x\|sx) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Comparison Stats with Current Districts (x\|sx) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Comparison Stats with Current Districts (pdf) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Neighborhood Council Stats and Splits (pdf) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Neighborhood Council Stats and Splits (x\|s) |  |  |  |  |

## Statistics Table

Stats (pdf)
Stats (x|sx)
Comparison Stats with Current Districts (x|sx)
Comparison Stats with Current Districts (pdf)
Neighborhood Council Stats and Splits (pdf)
Neighborhood Council Stats and Splits (xls)

Final Map Recommendation

GIS Layers and Block Equivalency File (Date: February 15th)
Maptitude ESRI KMZ-KML Block Equivalency File
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## Fwd: Community Announcements

3 messages
Paulina Velasco [paulinavelrod@gmail.com](mailto:paulinavelrod@gmail.com)
Mon, Dec 12, 2011 at 3:12 PM
To: ljoe.laccrc@gmail.com
---------- Forwarded message --------
From: Angelica Ayala [angelica.ayala@lacity.org](mailto:angelica.ayala@lacity.org)
Date: Fri, Dec 9, 2011 at 4:12 PM
Subject: Community Announcements
To: Angelica Ayala [angelica.ayala@lacity.org](mailto:angelica.ayala@lacity.org)

Below you will find some pertinent updates from the San Fernando Valley office of Mayor Antonio R. Villaraigosa. You will find information on the following:
--- SHARE NIXLE WITH FRIENDS AND FAMILY
--- LA CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMUNITY MEETINGS
--- MAYOR VILLARAIGOSA, BUSINESS DELEGATION EMBARK ON ASIAN TRADE MISSION TO STRENGTHEN ECONOMY IN LA
--- MAYOR VILLARAIGOSA ANNOUNCES COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN LA-BASED ENTERTAINMENT GROUP AND LEADING CHINESE INVESTMENT GROUP
--- ENVIORNMENTAL AWARENESS FAMILY EVENT
--- LAS POSADAS PAGEANT
--- TRINITY CHURCH CHRISTMAS CELEBRATION
--- LUMINARIA FESTIVAL
--- SUN VALLEY MIDDLE SCHOOL LEADERSHIP NEEDS YOUR HELP
Please contact us with any questions.

## SHARE NIXLE WITH FRIENDS AND FAMILY

As of today, there are over 4,600 Public Safety agencies nationwide using Nixle to send notifications such as tornado warnings, storm alerts, missing child bulletins, road closures and other local information to their communities. Through the power of text messaging, you can receive this information immediately or choose to have it sent to your inbox via email. You decide!

Registration is free, secure and can be completed by visiting nixle.com, or by sending a text message with your zip code to 888777 . Not sure how to send a text message to 888777 ?

Lastly, if your local agencies are not yet utilizing the Nixle system, contact them today and let them know Nixle provides a FREE notification system to all public safety agencies!

## LA CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMUNITY MEETINGS

Help Shape Your Community On Monday, Dec. 12!
Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the fifteen L.A. City Council district boundaries.
If you care about public safety, transportation, city services, and parks in your neighborhood, come tell the Commission about where you live, work, and play.
Attend one of the fifteen hearings throughout the City of L.A. starting with the hearing nearest you.

## Public Hearing Near You

Council District 2
Date: Monday, December 12, 2011
Time: 6:30PM - 9:30PM
Location: North Valley City Hall
7747 Foothill Blvd. Tujunga, CA 91042
*Light Refreshments will be provided.
Council District 6
Date: Tuesday, January 3, 2012
Time: 6:30PM - 9:30PM
Location: Van Nuys City Hall
14410 Sylvan Street Van Nuys, CA 91401
Council District 7
Date: Saturday, December 10, 2011
Time: 11:00AM - 2:00PM
Location: Alicia Broadous-Duncan Senior Center
11300 Glenoaks Blvd.
Pacoima, CA 91331
phone: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

## Fw: Community Announcements

1 message
West Adams [westadamsnc@yahoo.com](mailto:westadamsnc@yahoo.com)
Fri, Feb 24, 2012 at 12:04 PM
Reply-To: West Adams [westadamsnc@yahoo.com](mailto:westadamsnc@yahoo.com)
To: "\"lawrence joel"" [lawrence.joe@lacity.org](mailto:lawrence.joe@lacity.org)
----- Forwarded Message -----
From: Barry Stone [barry.stone@lacity.org](mailto:barry.stone@lacity.org)
To: Barry Stone [barry.stone@lacity.org](mailto:barry.stone@lacity.org)
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2012 1:48 PM
Subject: Community Announcements

Below you will find some pertinent updates from the San Fernando Valley office of Mayor Antonio R. Villaraigosa. You will find information on the following:
--- Los Angeles City Council Redistricting
--- Community Budget Survey
--- African American Heritage Month 2012 Opening Celebration
--- Mayor's Office of Economic and Business Policy Newsletter
--- Statement on President Obama's State of the Union Address
--- Mayor Villaraiogosa announces reopening of six business source centers across Los Angeles
--- Mayor Villaraigosa attends launch of bipartisan Mayors for the Freedom to Marry
--- Statement on New Los Angeles Federal Courthouse
--- 2012 African American Heritage Month Poster Competition
--- LA Museums Free-For-All
--- 24/7 DAD
--- Cash for College, Mission College
--- Cash for College, California State University Northridge
--- Free Tax Return Preparation for Military Personnel
--- Free Tax preparation/Filing Services
--- Gregory Bodehnamer's Parent in Control Program
--- ICON-CDC Business Workshops
--- VEDC'S Women's Center Workshops
--- North Hills Community Clean Up
--- Free Recycling Event
Please contact us with any questions. Have a wonderful weekend!

## LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING

Nearly 2,000 Angelenos from across the City participated at the commission hearings, which took place in each of the $\mathbf{1 5}$ council districts throughout Los Angeles.

The Commission will be hosting 7 public hearings between February 1-11, 2012 to gather input regarding the Commission's preliminary draft map. The preliminary map will be posted on the Commission's website at http://redistricting2011.lacity,org by the end of this week. After the conclusion of this next round of hearings, the Commission will make any necessary changes to the map before adopting and a presenting a final proposed map to the City Council on March 1, 2012.

The Commission wants to hear your thoughts on the new preliminary draft map, and invites you and your community to participate in this important meeting. Below is information about the hearings nearest you.

## Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Hearings

Date: Saturday, February 4, 2012
Time: 11:00 AM
Location: Pierce College, The Great Hall
6201 Winnetka Avenue, Woodland Hills, CA 91367
Date: Thursday, February 09, 2012
Time: 6:30pm
Location: Walter Reed Middle School, Auditorium
4525 Irvine Avenue, Studio City, CA 91602
As with the last round of hearings, light refreshments and translation will be provided.

Attached is a FAQ about the City Redistricting process in addition to a flyer listing upcoming hearings.

You can also check out the Commission's Facebook page (www.facebook.com/laccrc) and its Twitter feed (www.twitter.com/LACCRC) for the most up-to-date information.


January 6, 2012
Help Shape Your Community
Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the 15 L.A. Council District boundaries. If you care about public safety, transportation, City services and neighborhood parks, come share your concerns with the L.A. City Redistricting Commission at a meeting tomorrow, Saturday, January 7, from 11 a.m.-2 p.m. at St. Peter's Italian Catholic Church, 1039 N. Broadway, in Chinatown. Light refreshments will be provided.

The public comments gathered at the meeting will be shared with the Redistricting Commission who will recommend changes on district maps to the City Council. The City's charter requires that Los Angeles be redistricted every 10 years to account for population changes. This process impacts how communities are represented on the Los Angeles City Council. For more information, please visit http://redistricting2011.lacity.org/.

Redistricting L.A.
More than 200 people packed St. Peter's Italian Catholic Church Saturday in Chinatown for the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission public hearing in the First District. Another hearing is scheduled for tonight, Monday, January 9, at 6:30 p.m. at Los Angeles City College theater, 855 N . Vermont Ave. The Redistricting Commission is gathering public comments to recommend changes on district maps to the City Council. The City's charter requires that Los Angeles be redistricted every 10 years to account for population changes. This process impacts how communities are represented on the Los Angeles City Council. For more information, please visit http://redistricting2011.lacity.org/.

Help shape L.A.
Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the 15 L.A. Council District boundaries. If you care about public safety, transportation, City services and neighborhood parks, come weigh in at the City Council Redistricting Workshop tonight Tuesday, Feb. 7, from 6:30-7:30 p.m. at the Los Angeles Police Department, Police Administration Building (PAB) - Ronald Deaton Auditorium, 100 West 1st St. Angeles, CA 90012 (Located across the street from City Hall). The workshop is designed to assist stakeholders residing in Council Districts 1 (Reyes), 9 (Perry) and 14 (Huizar) in reviewing the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission's Draft Map. Materials will be provided and facilitators available to help you consolidate your questions/concerns. A form will also be available that will assist in submitting your input to the Commission. Contact: Dante Charleston fmgsan@gmail.com or Nathan Freeman neffmg@aol.com. For more information, please visit http://redistricting2011.lacity.org/.

Do you have news, photos or an upcoming event that you think should be in Councilmember Reyes' E-newsletter? We want to hear about it! Email monica. valencia@lacity.org for consideration.


Redistricting Commission to Meet Monday


[^2]FYI...

## Your next

 opportunity to offer input to the Redistricting Commission in the Valley is Saturday, Dec. 17 at West Valley Christian Church, 22450 Sherman Way, West Hills at 11 a.m.charged with drawing new voting boundaries for the city's 15 Council districts, is in the midst of hosting a series of public hearings as they continue charting new maps.

If you care about public safety, transportation, city services, and parks in your neighborhood, you are encouraged to tell the Commission your thoughts about the future of your community.

Monday's meeting is the only one in Council District 2 - and the second to last of the five Valley meetings - but certainly not the final opportunity to lend your thoughts. The complete schedule for the seven remaining redistricting commission hearings is available on redistricting2011.lacity.org

Who: Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
When: Monday, December 12, from 6:30 to 9:30 p.m.
Where: Ilorth Valley City Hall, 7747 Foothill Blvd. Tujunga, CA 91042
More info: redistricting2011.lacity.org or call us at (213) 473-7002.

## Redistricting Meetings

VAIIIIUYS-Currently, the 21 -member citizens commission charged with drawing new boundaries for each of the city's 15 council districts is holding a series of meetings throughout Los Angeles eliciting your feedback on how the lines should be drawn.

The commission recently met in Van lluys, where stakeholders from throughout the district offered testimony. Some spoke of their desire to keep the boundaries of Council District 2 as they are currently outlined, while others said changes need to be made to ensure communities are kept intact. Currently, virtually every community in CD2, and the neighborhood council districts defining them, are spread across multiple council districts. Sherman Oaks, Ilorth Hollywood, Studio City, Van Iluys, Valley Village, Sun Valley, Lakeview Terrace and other portions of the district are parts of CD2 that are shared with other council districts.
"Whatever happens when the new lines are drawn," Councilmember Krekorian said, "it's important that residents, business owners and others are heard in the process."
"This is a rare opportunity we have to actually empower communitios," he said during the commission meeting Monday night. "Full participation of the public in this process is important to ensure that it is not overwhelmed by personal political considerations. I believe that our representative democracy depends on ensuring that voters select their elected officials instead of elected officials choosing their voters."

Public hearings were held from llovember to January in anticipation of adopting a draft plan toward the end of this month. Public hearings will again be held January through February 2012 in anticipation of adopting a final plan by March 1, 2012.

Read more about the process and draw your own maps at:
http://www.redistricting2011.lacity.org/LACITYgdefault.htm|

Redistricting Commission Submits Draft Map


LOS AIIGELES - The 21-member Redistricting Commission, charged with drawing new voting boundaries for the city's council districts, submitted its proposed maps for public consideration.

The maps follow the commission's receipt of testimony and input from Los Angeles residents during months of public hearings held across the city, and in every council district. Hundreds of public commenters provided feedback at the meetings, as well as by phone, email and letters to the commission.

Based on the current drafts, Council District 2 would swing south and east, based mostly on the 14 other council districts and a shifting population of millions of Angelenos.

The proposed map of CD2 (see the draft map here) includes the entire communities of Studio City, Valley Glen, Ilorth Hollywood, Toluca Lake and most of Valley Village. The draft map would leave the district without the north Valley communities of Sunland, Tujunga, Shadow Hills, Sun Valley and Lake View Terrace.
"I have great affection and concern for every block of my district, but population increases require that Council District 2 shrink," Councilmember Paul Krekorian said. "Under any scenario, I will be required to give up some neighborhoods that I care about very much.
"The Citizen's Commission still has more work to do and more public input will be required before the proposal is even considered by the City Council. Regardless of how the political lines are ultimately drawn, I will always stand with the residents from throughout the Foothills and the rest of the San Fernando Valley to fight for issues important to us, including protecting open space, preserving community character and quality of life, creating jobs and opportunity, and making our community stronger."

CD2 now includes portions of 11 different communities and only two are entirely within the district - all of the other communities are arbitrarily divided by the current political boundaries of the district. One of the clearest sentiments expressed during public comment was the strong desire by stakeholders to unite communities that had been arbitrarily divided. The proposed map for CD2 would unite four significant communities.

For some perspective, consider the historical boundaries of Council District 2:

The citys second council district first included parts of the San Femando Valley in 1944, when CD2 was extended north from Hollywood to include Studio City. In 1955, the district boundaries changed to include a chunk of the Valley generally south Ventura Boulevard and parts of Encino.

In the 60's and 70's, the second district boundaries moved north and west, losing Hollywood and including more of the Valley, including Sherman Oaks, Van Iluys and Ilorth Hollywood.

After the death of Councilmember Howard Finn in 1986, the First District that he represented moved from the northeast Valley to neighborhoods near Downtown, and Districts 2 and 7 took over greater portions of his former region.

In 2001, CD2 was gerrymandered to include its current communities of Sunland, Tujunga, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Sun Valley, Horth Hollywood, Lake View Terrace, Valley Village, Studio City and Van Iluys.

Public hearings of the Commission vill continue through February in anticipation of adopting a series of newly drawn maps by March 1 . The City Council is required to adopt the redistricting ordinance by July 1 and the new council districts become effective upon adoption of the ordinance describing those districts.
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Upcoming Events

Title of the Event This is there the details of the event will go. This is there the details of the event will go. Contact Patricia at 213-555-5555.


City Hall Office 200 N. Spring Street, Rm. 455 Los Angeles. CA 90012 (213) 473-7006 Phone (213) 847-0549 Fax


Van Nuys District Office 14410 Sylvan Street, Rm. 215 Van Nuys CA 91401
(818) $778-4999$ Phone (818) $778-4998$ Fax


## Sun Valley District Office

 9300 Laurel Canyon Boulevard Second Floor Sun Valley. CA 91331 (818)771-0236 Phone (818) 758-8155 FaxWednesday February 7, 2012
Dear Neighbor,
Draft boundaries have been drawn for all 15 Los Angeles City Council districts. You may view the draft maps here: http://redistricting2011. lacity.org/LACITY/draftMap.html

The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission is holding seven public input hearings prior to releasing the final maps. FIVE of these hearings have already taken place. Before new City Council maps are finalized for the next 10 years, make your voice heard by attending one of this week's hearings.

## FINAL PUBLIC INPUT HEARING IN THE SAN FERNANDO VALLEY

Thursday February 9 at 6:30PM
Walter Reed Middle School, Auditorium
4525 Irvine Avenue
Studio City, CA 91602

## FINAL PUBLIC INPUT HEARING

Saturday, February 11 at 11:00 AM
West Angeles Church Of God In Christ

## 3045 South Crenshaw Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90016

All locations are wheelchair accessible. Heanings will be televised on Channel 35 via tape delay.

The Los Angeles City Charter requires that the City be redistricted every ten years. 21 members are appointed to a Redistricting Commission which has the authority to recommend a redistricting plan to the City Council that sets boundaries for City Council districts. The testimony and input of Los Angeles residents is critical to creating a redistricting plan that provides effective and fair representation for all citizens of the City.

I hope you will take advantage of the opportunity to participate in this very important process.

Sincerely,
TONY CÁRDENAS
Sixth District

BERNARD C. PARKS
Counclmember

Committee/Commlssion/
Authority/Board
Assignments:

## Chair

Budges B Finance
Vice Chalr
Transportation
Member

Board of Referred Powers
Executive Employee Relations
Committee
Jobs \& Business Developmert Puble Works
Personnel
Colseum Commission
Expostion Line Authorty Southern Calfornis Assocation of Governments Natonal League of Cties Board

Farmers' Markets in the 8th District

Crenshaw Farmers Market
(formerly located in Lemert Park Vlage) Baldwin Hils Crenshaw Plaza, (located in

8TH DISTRICT E-NEWS \#1/2012

-Dear Constituent,

As many of you know, every 10 years, the city charter requires the 18 elected officials of Los Angeles (Mayor, 15 Councilmembers, City Attorney and City Controller) to appoint a redistricting commission to advise the Council on drawing of Council district lines.

The districts must contain "equal portions of the total population of the City as shown by the Federal Census immediately preceding the formation of districts"

In addition "all districts shall be drawn in conformance with requirements of state and federal law and, to the extent feasible, shall keep neighborhoods and communities intact, utilize natural boundaries or street lines, and be geographically compact."

Although this may seem like a pretty straightforward task, there are always many special interests that try to influence the process and attempt to gain power and control over elections and public policy, usually at the expense of YOU, the resident. Its often said that there is "strength in numbers" and the special interests know this, which is why they will try to "divide and conquer."

The USC / Annenberg School has put together a very informative website BedistrictingGame.org - to help the public understand the process and its importance.

If you care about parks, police, fire and rescue, transportation, jobs, and the overall quality of your neighborhood and community, come let the Redistricting Commission know what's important to you.
the parking lot between of Wels Farpo Eanik and Sears) Open All Year Ran or Shne
A Certred Fammers Marioet.

## Saturdays

10:00am-3:00pm
St Agnes Catholic Church 1432 W. Adams Bivd (Adarns EVVermont Ave)

Wednesdays
2:00pm - 5:00pm
Exposition Park Farmers Market
700 Exposition Park Drve (in Expo Park on the South Lawn an frant of Natural History
Museum)
Saturdays
11:00am - 4:00pm
*Certhed Farmers' Market
*Artkans
*Live Musc
*Eco-education
"Kids' fun zone
*Petting Zoo
Nww.expostionpark.org
Expo-Center/CSU Produce Stand
3980 Menk Ave
(Martin Luther King Ir Bivd)
Thursdays
3:00pm - 5:00pm

Shrine Farmer's Market
Royal Street \& Jefferson
Tuesdays
9:00am-3:00pm
Trojan Fresh Market: Alumnel Park, USC
Thursdays
11:00am - 4:00pm
Hoover Pedestrian Mal Unwersty Avenue Detween Jefferson and 30 th Stroet Tuesdays
11:00am -7:00pm
The FAME B. Freah Produce Market
FAME Renaksance parking lot (comer of Western and Adams).
Saturdays B Sundays 9:00am - 4:00pm

FAME Assstance Corporation www.famerenaksance org

Mrs. Dentse Hunter
FAME Assestance Corporation COO
(323) 730-7727 Derisd 1 Pampocrporations.org

## Harambee Farmer's

 Market5730 Crershaw Bivd.
Saturdays
10:00am - 4:00pm

## Watts Healthy Farmers

Market
Ted Watkins Memorial Park,

On Tuesday, Jan 10th, from 6-8:30 PM, the Commission will hold a public hearing in the Eighth District at the Expo Center - 3980 Bill Robertson Lane - to get your input. Come and show your support for keeping your community intact, to ensure that for the next decade, youll have a councilmember that fights for you and your neighbors!

Make sure you stay up to date with all the latest developments on my webpage www.bernardparks.com or twitter @BernardCParks and on Facebook at Facebook.com/CouncilmemberParks and Facebook com/BernardCParks.

Thank you for your continued interest in the Great Eighth!
Respectiully,
BERNARD C. PARKS Councilmember

* denotes a new entry

COLUMN ONE

## *IT'S YOUR CALL

## How will YOU be Represented at City Hall?



Bernard C．PARKS
Counclmember Committee／Commission／
Authorky／Board
Assignments：
Chat
Educaton A．Neighbortionds vice Chair

Jobs a Bushess Deviopment

## Membar

Trancportation
Colbeum Commsaion Expostion the Authorty Sauthem Caltamia Association of Goverrments National League of Cties Board

Farmers ${ }^{\text { }}$ Markets in the 8th District

Crenshaw Farmers Market
（formerly located in Leimert Park Vlage）Baldwin Hits Crenshaw Plaza，（located in the parking bt between of Wek，Fargo Bank and Sears）Open Al Year Ram or Shine
A Certined Farmers Market．

## Saturdays

10：00am－3：00pm
St Agnes Catholic Church

8TH DISTRICT E－NEWS \＃8／2012

## Sharn直化直

## Dear Constituent，

I＇m pissed，and，you should be to．
I＇m sure many of you have never heard me use such strong language， as Fox 11＇s Hal Eisner noted when I spoke to him last night outside of the Redistricting Commission meeting，but sometimes if＇s necessary in order to corvey the magnitude and seriousness of a situation．

The City of Los Angeles has a population of 3.8 million，who are represented on a City Council of only 15 members．That means each member represents and advocates for about 250,000 people，or a population roughly equivalent to Orlando，FL，Norfolk，VA or Baton Rouge，LA．Los Angeles is also one of the most diverse cities in the world with a population containing numerous races，ethnicities， nationalities，languages，religions，and income levels．This makes it even more imperative that the once－a－decade process of drawing the geographic boundaries for the city council districts be inclusive，fair， transparent and in compliance with the law．

Unfortunately，it has been just the opposite．
From the failure to select an impartial Executive Director，to holding secret sub－committee meetings where maps were drawn outside the public＇s view，to blatant gerrymandering of districts based solely on race （and in violation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965），to an arrogant disregard for wishes of residents expressed during public comment，this process has been a farce from day one，intended only to give the illusion that the public has any say in the outcome．

Of course，I＇m not exactly unbiased，since I represent，along with Councilwoman Jan Perry，one of the two districts the Commission

1432 W. Adams Bhad
(Adars ByVermont Ave)
Wednesdays
2:00pm - 5:00pm
Exposition Park Farmers Market
700 Exposition Park Drve (in Expo Parkon the South Lawn
in tront of Natural Hestory
Museum)

## Saturdays

11:00am - 4:00pm
*Certhed Farmers' Market
*Artikans
*Live Music
*Eco-education
*Kds' fun zone
*Petting Zno
wweremxoostionnark ort
Expo-Center/CSU Produce
Stand
3980 Menio Ave
(Martin Luther King Jr Etvd)
Thursdays
$3: 00 \mathrm{pm}-5: 00 \mathrm{pm}$
Shrine Farmer's Market Royal Street \& lefferson
Tunsdays
9:00 am-3:00pm
Trojan Fresh Mariket
Alumni Fark, USC

## Thursdays

11:00am - 4:00pm
Hoover Pedestrian Mall
Universty Avenue between Jefferson and 30th street

## Tuesdays

11:00am -7:00pm
The FAME \& Fresh Produce
Market
FAME Renatssance pariong bt
(corner of Western and
Adams).
Saturdays a Sundays
9:00am - 4:00pm
FAME Assistance Corporation
www.famerenaksance.arg
Mrs. Denise Hunter
FAME Assktance Corporation
COO
(323) 730-7727

Derisahy Namocorponfions.ong
Harambee Farmer's
Market
5730 Crenahaw Bind.
Saturdays
10:00am - 4:00pm
Watts Healthy Farmers Market
Ted Watbons Memonal Park,
103 re St- \& Central Ave
Saturdays
$10 \mathrm{am}-2 \mathrm{pm}$

## 8TH DISTRICT

 BUSINESSESVermont Slauson Economic Development Corporation Bushess Enterprise Certer

6109 S. Westem Ave., Los
Angeles, CA 90047
323.789 .4515
wwwivkedc.om 7M-F: 9a-6p, 5at.: 9a-1p
strategically drew to include only the poorest of the poor, and exclude any thriving business centers or economic engines that a Councilmember could leverage to improve the plight of those that live in desperation.

## I encourage you to read what the Los Angeles Times, Downtown News, LA Weekly, KCET, former Daily News editor Ron Kave, have written about the process.

The final meeting of the redistricting commission will take place next Wednesday, February 29th - 4PM, at Van Nuys City Hall, 14410 Sylvan Street, Var Nuys, CA 9140 . I encourage you to attend, even though the Commission has shown you - the public - such disregard and demonstrated an unwillingness to listen. It will help bolseter the case of any future lawsuits that challenge this obviously flawed process.

After the Commission finalizes their proposal next week, their recommendations will then be sent to the City Council for modfication and or approval.

While the Commissioners were appointed, Councilmembers were elected, and it's up to you the voter to hold them accountable. Each councilmember will have to go on record and show - through their vote - where they stand, and whether or not they are willing to rubber-stamp the Commission's actions, condemning South LA - in the words of my colleague Counciwoman Jan Perry - to "economic apartheid.'

Make sure you stay up to date with all the latest developments on my webpage www.bernardparks.com or twitter @BemardCParks and on Facebook at Facebook.com/CouncilmemberParks and Facebook corm/BernardCParks.
Thank you for your continued interest in the Great Eighth!
Respectully.
BERNARD C. PARKS
Councilmember

- denotes a new entry


## COLUMN ONE

*Parks Speaks Out on Secrecy, Backroom Deals, Racial Politics of Redistricting Commission
"I'm Pissed!"


## NINTH DISTRICT COUNCILWOMAN

WHAT AMI DOINGP FOLLOW ME ON IWITE:


Name
Jan Ferty
Nenvarks
Qty of Los Angele: Los Angeles, CA

## URGENT: Keep the Ninth District United!

Dear Friends,

Last Friday, the Los Angeles Redistricting Commission released their latest draft map of the proposed new city council districts.

The new proposed maps further disenfranchise the people of the Great 9th District. They do not reflect public testimony nor do they respect historic boundaries, coalition building, or common sense. Instead, specific plans have been cut in half, the fashion district has been severed from the manufacturing sector along the Alameda Corridor, the Figueroa corridor has been bisected, and the people of South Los Angeles have been left isolated and removed from the very economic engine that has helped to attract investment for the revitalization of South Los Angeles communities.

With the new map released Friday, there is no doubt that the Commission is ignoring the will of the people, and also violating the principles that they adopted to incorporate public testimony, respect communities of interest, and do no harm.
I encourage you to stand up for honest and open

## respect your wishes.

TOMORROW, February 22nd, the Redistricting Commission will hold what could be their final meeting, and they are expected to vote on the proposed maps. This may be your last chance to let them know what you think.

We want to keep Council District 9 united.
Please attend!

Wednesday, February 22-4 PM
Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring St.
Council Chamber - Room 340
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Comments can also be emailed to the commission at redistricting.LACity@lacity.org

Sincerely,


Councilwoman Jan Perry


Dear Friends,
If you're proud of the sense of community we have on the Westside, and don't want anyone to mess with that, we need to mobilize and stop an outrageous case of gerrymandering that threatens our council district!

Later today, the Los Angeles City Redistricting Commission is poised to publish a draft proposal for redrawing of council district lines, lopping most of Westchester and part of Playa Vista from the Eleventh District and putting it in another council district.

I won't stand for that - and I hope you won't either.
Please join me in urging the Redistricting Commission to reject that plan and keep our Westside, coastal district whole. Please sign this petition now, and attend a public hearing 6:30 p.m., Thursday, February 2, at Westchester Senior Citizen Center, 8740 Lincoln Blvd., Westchester, CA 90045 to let your woice be heard.

Here is the background: Every ten years, following the decennial census, the City needs to redraw its City Council boundaries so that the districts have equal population. Our district has 10,000 or so too many residents, so we need to trim a little and redistribute some our territory.

That seems fair enough. And it should be easy enough, given that we are a coastal district, with natural or sensible boundaries (the Santa Monica Mountains to the north, the City limits to the south, and the 405 Freeway on the east.)

But instead of trimming along the edges, the commission is considering amputating the bulk of Westchester and part of Playa Vista from the rest of our district. Doing so would divide communities that share a neiqhborhood council, a chamber of commerce, and a community plan area. And it makes no sense to tear Westchester from Los Angeles International Airport, which dramatically impacts its quality of life and economic activity. Moreover, the proposed boundaries would shatter the wonderful partnership we have forged over the past seven years with the wonderful communities and organizations in CD11.

Don't let that happen. Sign the petition and agree to attend next week's hearing.
If you want to see the map being considered by the commission, you can take a look right here.
How do we stop them from dividing our community? Let your voice be heard. Stand up for our neighborhoods. Defend the 11th District. Sign this petition and attend the public hearing next week. Also, please be sure to share this message with your friends and neighbors. Every voice counts.

We need to stop this proposal in its tracks. Thanks for your support.

Dear Friends,

I want to thank you for sending a strong and clear message to the Los Angeles City Redistricting Commission: Don't Divide the 11th Council District!

Because of you, we have gathered more than 1300 signatures for our petition, urging the commission to keep Westchester in the 11th District. In addition to signing the petition, I urge you to attend the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission meeting which will take place in our district on Thursday, February 2nd, 6:30 p.m., at the Westchester Recreation Center, 7000 West Manchester Avenue, Los Angeles, 90045 (directions).

Why is this important?

The 11th City Council District of Los Angeles is a unified, compact district with natural and sensible boundaries. It makes no sense to divide its communities, rip apart neighborhoods, and destroy the strong partnerships shared by the Westside and coastal communities.

If you believe in the sense of community in our coastal district, then sign the petition.

It is particularly disturbing to tear Westchester and Playa Vista, dividing them from Los Angeles International Airport and Playa del Rey. Westchester, Playa del Rey, Playa Vista, and LAXare inextricably linked, sharing a neighborhood council, a community plan area, and a chamber of commerce. We need to keep the 11th District whole and intact! If you feel strongly about the sense of community in our district, then please sign the petition.

We are in this together, and I want to continue to fight for our district and represent you on the issues that are important to our Westside community: easing gridlock on our roads, modemizing the airport, and advocating for a transparent govemment.

Bill

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE<br>CONTACT:<br>Tony Arranaga/Rosendahl<br>213-304-3880<br>Dennis Gleason/Parks<br>213-631-1447

# PARKS, ROSENDAHL RALLY CONSTITUENTS TO OBJECT TO FLAWED REDISTRICTING PROPOSAL <br> Councilmembers Call for Westchester to Stay in the II th District 

WESTCHESTER- Today(February 2, 2012), Councilmembers Bernard C. Parks and Bill Rosendahl and hundreds of residents from both of their districts are calling on the Los Angeles Redistricting Commission to scuttle a flawed plan that divides Westchester between the 8 th and 11th Council Districts.

In a moming news conference at the Westchester Recreation Center, the two councilmembers insisted that redistricting officials not amputate $80 \%$ of Westchester from LAX and Loyola Marymount University in Rosendahl's Westside district and place it in Parks' Baldwin Hills-South Los Angeles district.
"The first mandate of the commission should be to honor existing communities of interest," Rosendahl said. "Westchester should not be divided into two districts. It is a solid, compact unified community that is inextricably linked to LAX, LMU, Playa del Rey, Playa Vista and the rest of the Westside."
"The Commission's decision to separate Westchester from LAX and other coastal communities of the 11th District makes as little sense as splitting up the Baldwin Hills and Leimert Park communities in the Eighth District," said Parks. "I don't see how this
is anything but a blatant violation of the City Charter requirement to 'keep neighborhoods and communities intact

Last week, in a surpise move, the Los Angeles Redistricting Commission made dramatic changes to the districts represented by Parks and Rosendahl. In Council District 8, the Baldwin Vista and Village Green neighborhoods were split off from the rest of Baldwin Hills, and placed in the 10th District, and the residential portions of Leimert Park were separated from the businesses and park, and also placed in the 10th Distirct.

The proposed changes caused a huge uproar in both districts. More than 2000 people have signed a Change.org petition circulated by Rosendahl, calling for Westchester to stay in CD11. On Saturday, hundreds of angry residents packed a meeting of the Baldwin Hills Estates Homeowners Association to protest the proposed split between the 8 th and 10 th Districts.

Residents of both districts noted that census figures do not dictate dramatic changes in either district. Parks' district grew by only $1.5 \%$, which would usually call for relatively small changes to his boundaries as opposed to the drastic neighborhood grabs proposed by the commission.

Parks and Rosendahl plan to testify along with their constituents at a public hearing being held at 6:30 p.m. February 2nd, at the Westchester Recreation Center, 7000 Manchester Avenue, Los Angeles, 90045.


COUNCILMEMBER ENGLANDER＇S E－NEWS
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Re－Districting Commission to Hold Public Meetings in the San Fernando Valley．．．


The L．A．City Council＇s Redistricting Commission is holding a series of public meetings as part of the process of drafting new Council District boundaries．Every 10 years， following the U．S．Census，districts are redrawn at all different levels of government，including the Los Angeles City Council Districts．

The Redistricting Commission is holding a number of public meetings in the San Fernando Valley．The Commission wants public input about the shape of the new Districts in advance of creating the early drafts．

Monday，Dec． 5
7：00 pm
LAPD Devonshire Youth Center 8721 Wilbur Ave．，Northridge

Wednesday，Dec． 7
6：30 pm
Van Nuys City Hall
14410 Sylvan St．，Van Nuys
Saturday，Dec． 17
11：00 am
West Valley Christian Church
22450 Sherman Way，West Hills
To learn more about the process，visit the Redistricting Commission＇s website． There you can also find meeting agendas and minutes，documents and district maps dating back to the 1970 ．
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## GARCETTI ADDRESSES REDISTRICTING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING

Los Angeles City Councilmember Eric Garcetti addressed a public hearing held in Council District 13 by the City Redistricting Commission.
"Your input is crucial to ensuring we get the best outcome," Councilmember Garcetti told the more than 100 attendees. "District boundaries can impact how our voices are heard, what resources our neighborhoods get, and more."

The City Redistricting Commission held public hearings in each of the 15 city council districts to gather public input before it drafts any maps. The commission is expected to review maps and vote on a first draft on January 25. It expects to submit a map to the City Council for review by the end of February.

The commission will meet next Tuesday, January 17,
 to hear presentations from community organizations. If your organization is interested in presenting a draft map to the commission, please contact Redistricting Commission Outreach Director Rani Woods at rani.woods@gmail.com.


## Help Shape Your Community On Saturday, Jan. 7!

Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the fifteen L.A. City Council district boundaries.

If you care about public safety, transportation, city services, and parks in your neighborhood, come tell the Commission about where you live, work, and play.

Attend one of the fifteen hearings throughout the City of L.A. starting with the hearing nearest you.


## Public Hearing Near You Council District 1

Date: Saturday, January 07, 2012 Time: 11:00AM-2:00PM
Location: St. Peter's Italian Catholic Church 1039 N. Broadway Los Angeles, CA 90012
*Light Refreshments will be provided.

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012


Los Angeles 市居民每 10 年有一次機會規劃 15 個 Los Angeles 市市議會選區的邊界。

如果您關心您所在居民區的公共安全，交通，市政服務及公園事務，請告訴專員委員會您居住，工作和休閒的地點。

您可在您家附近參加在 Los Angeles 市內各地點舉行的 15 個公聽會之一。


200 N．Spring Street，Room 275，Los Angeles，CA 90012
phone：（213）922－7740 fax：（213）922－7707
website：www．redistricting2011．lacity．org redistricting．lacity＠lacity．org

Los Angeles 市市議會重劃選區委員會
Estela Lopez（CD1）＊Craig Miller（CD2）＊David Ford（CD3）＊Grover McKean（CD4）＊David Roberti（CD5）＊Jose Cornejo（CD6）＊Michael Trujillo（CD7）＊ Tunua Thrash（CD8）＊David Roberts（CD9）＊Chris Ellison（CD10）＊Rob Kadota（CD11）＊Ken Sampson（CD12）＊Jackie Dupont－Walker（CD13）＊Robert Ahn（CD13）＊Antonio Sanchez（CD14）＊Jerry Gaines（CD15）＊Arturo Vargas（Mayor）＊LeRoy Chase（Mayor）＊Kent Wong（Mayor）＊ Helen Kim（Controller）＊Julie Downey（City Attorney）


## 1月7日土曜日に，あなたのコミュ ニティの形成にご協力ください！

Los Angeles 市民は10年ごとにL．A．市の 15 の市議会区の境界を形成する機会を与えられ ます。

もしあなたが近隣地域の公共安全，交通，市 のサービス，および公園を大切に思らのなら ば，あなたの住んでいる地域，就業している地域，そして遊びの場について委員会に話し てください。

L．A．市中には15の公聴会があります。まず は，最寄りの公聴会にご参加ください。


200 N．Spring Street，Room 275，Los Angeles，CA 900012
電話：（213）922－7740
ファックス：（213）922－7707
ヴェブサイト：www．redistricting2011．lacity．org redistricting．lacity＠lacity．org
Los Angeles 市市議会再区画委員会
Estela Lopez（CD1）＊Craig Miller（CD2）＊David Ford（CD3）＊Grover McKean（CD4）＊David Roberti（CD5）＊Jose Cornejo（CD6）＊Michael Trujillo（CD7）＊ Tunua Thrash（CD8）＊David Roberts（CD9）＊Chris Ellison（CD10）＊Rob Kadota（CD11）＊Ken Sampson（CD12）＊Jackie Dupont－Walker（CD13）＊Robert Ahn（CD13）＊Antonio Sanchez（CD14）＊Jerry Gaines（CD15）＊Arturo Vargas（Mayor）＊LeRoy Chase（Mayor）＊Kent Wong（Mayor）＊

Helen Kim（Controller）＊Julie Downey（City Attorney）


# 지역사회 형성을 위해 오는 1 월 7 일 토요일에 열리는 공청회에 여러분의 참여가 필요합니다! 

매 10 년마다 로스앤젤레스 시민들은 15 개의 L.A. 시의회 선거구역을 정하는 기회가 있습니다.

여러분이 살고 있는 지역의 치안, 교통, 각종 시 서비스 및 공원 조성에 관심이 있다면 이날 오셔서 여러분이 생활하고 있는 거주 지역에 대한 의견을 위원회에 알려 주십시오.
L.A. 시내에서 열리는 15 개 공청회 중에서 여러분의 거주지에서 가장 가까운 곳에 참석하여 우리의 의견을 관철시킬 수 있도록 지속적인 협조와 관심을 부탁합니다.



200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 900012

> 전화: (213) 922-7740
> 팩스: (213) 922-7707

웹사이트: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

Los Angeles 시의회 지구 재설정 위원
Estela Lopez (CD1) * Craig Miller (CD2) * David Ford (CD3) * Grover McKean (CD4) * David Roberti (CD5) * Jose Cornejo (CD6) * Michael Trujillo (CD7) * Tunua Thrash (CD8) * David Roberts (CD9) * Chris Ellison (CD10) * Rob Kadota (CD11) * Ken Sampson (CD12) * Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13) *Robert Ahn (CD13) * Antonio Sanchez (CD14) * Jerry Gaines (CD15) * Arturo Vargas (Mayor) * LeRoy Chase (Mayor) * Kent Wong (Mayor) * Helen Kim (Controller) * Julie Downey (City Attorney)


## ¡Ayude a Formar su Comunidad el sábado, 7 de diciembre!

Cada diez años, cada persona que vive en Los Ángeles tiene la oportunidad a dar su opinión de como formar los límites de los quince distritos del concilio de la ciudad de Los Ángeles.

Si se preocupa por la seguridad pública, el transporte, servicios de la ciudad, y parques en su vecindad, venga y participe en la reunión donde vive, trabaja, y juega.

Asiste una de las quince reuniones públicas a lo largo de la ciudad de Los Ángeles, comenzando con la audiencia más cercana a usted.


## Audiencia Para Tomar Testimonio Público Concejo del Distrito 1

Fecha: $\quad$ Sábado, 7 de enero de 2012
Hora: 11:00AM-2:00PM
Ubicación: St. Peter's Italian Catholic Church 1039 N. Broadway
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Habrá interpretación en español
Se proporcionarán refrescos
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
teléfono: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
sitio web: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
Comisión para Redistribución de Distritos Políticos de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles


## Tumulong Na Hubugin Ang Inyong Komunidad Sa Sabado, ika-7 ng Enero!

Tuwing 10 taon ang mga mamamayan ng Los Angeles ay may pagkakataong hubugin ang labinlimang hangganan ng distrito ng Konseho ng Lunsod ng L.A.

Kung nagmamalasakit kayo tungkol sa pampublikong kaligtasan, transportasyon, mga serbisyo ng lunsod, at mga parke sa inyong kapitbahayan, pumunta at sabihin sa Komisyon ang tungkol sa lugar kung saan kayo nakatira, namamasukan, at lugar ng inyong laruan.

Dumalo sa isa sa labinlimang pagdinig sa buong Lunsod ng L.A. simula sa pagdinig na pinakamalapit
 sa inyo.

| Pampublikong Pagdinig Na Malapit Sa Inyo |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Distrito 1 ng Konseho |  |
| Petsa: $\quad$Sabado, ika-7 ng Enero, 2012 <br> Oras: <br> Luga-11 ng umaga - Ika-2 ng hapon <br> Lug. Peter's Italian Catholic Church <br> 1039 N. Broadway <br> Los Angeles, CA 90012 |  |
|  | *Pamawing-gutom ay ipagkakaloob. |
|  |  |

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 900012
telepono: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
lugar sa web: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

# Hãy Giúp Sắp Xếp Lại Cộng Đồng Của Quý Vị Vào thứ Bảy, ngày 7 tháng Giêng! 

Mỗi 10 năm người dân của Los Angeles được có cơ hội để sắp xếp lại ranh giới mười lăm khu Hội Đồng Thành Phố L.A.

Nếu quý vị quan tâm đến an toàn công cộng, phương tiện di chuyển, các dịch vụ của thành phố, và những công viên trong khu phố của quý vị, hãy đến nói cho Ủy Ban biết về nơi quý vị sinh sống, làm việc, và vui chơi.

Tham dự một trong mười lăm buổi họp trong toàn Thành Phố L.A. hãy bắt đầu với buổi họp gần nhà quý vị nhất.


## Hop Trưng Cầu Dân Ý Gần Nhà Quý Vi Hội Đồng Khu 1

Ngày: Thứ Bảy, 7 Tháng Giêng, 2012
Giờ: $\quad$ Từ 11 giờ sáng đến 2 giờ trưa
Địa Điểm: Nhà Thò̀ Công Giáo St. Peter's Italian 1039 N. Broadway Los Angeles, CA 90012
*Sẽ có Nước cùng thức ăn nhẹ.

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012 phone: (213) 922-7740<br>fax: (213) 922-7707<br>website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org redistricting.lacity@lacity.org



## Help Shape Your Community On Monday, Dec. 12!

Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the fifteen L.A. City Council district boundaries.

If you care about public safety, transportation, city services, and parks in your neighborhood, come tell the Commission about where you live, work, and play.

Attend one of the fifteen hearings throughout the City of L.A. starting with the hearing nearest you.


## Public Hearing Near You Council District 2

Date: Monday, December 12, 2011
Time: 6:30PM-9:30PM
Location: North Valley City Hall 7747 Foothill Blvd. Tujunga, CA 91042
*Light Refreshments will be provided.

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
phone: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org


## Oqutp athıuulnplilditp huưujupn 
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200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
phone: (213) 922-7740 fax: (213) 922-7707
website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org



## 12 월 12 일 월요일 여러분의

 지역사회 형성에 협조해주십시오!매 10 년마다 Los Angeles 주민들은 15 개의 L.A. 시의회 지구 경계를 정하는 기회를 갖게됩니다.

만일 여러분께서 여러분 이웃에서의 공공
안전, 교통, 시 서비스 및 공원에 관심을
갖고 계시면, 오셔서 위원회에게 여러분이
살고, 일하고, 여가를 보내는 지역에 대해 말씀하십시오.

여러분에게 가장 가까운 곳부터 시작하여 L.A. 시 전역 15 개 청문회중 하나에
 참석하십시오.

여러분에게 가까운 청문회 시의회 제 2 지구

날짜: $\quad 2011$ 년 12 월 $\mathbf{5}$ 일, 월요일
시간: 저녁 $\mathbf{6}$ 시 $\mathbf{3 0}$ 분 $\mathbf{-}$ 저녁 $\mathbf{9}$ 시 $\mathbf{3 0}$ 분
장소: North Valley 시청
7747 Foothill Blvd.
Tujunga, CA 91042
*가벼운 간식이 제공됩니다.

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012.
phone: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

Los Angeles 시의회 지구 재설정 위원
Estela Lopez (CD1) * Craig Miller (CD2) * David Ford (CD3) * Grover McKean (CD4) * David Roberti (CD5) * Jose Cornejo (CD6) * Michael Trujillo (CD7) * Tunua Thrash (CD8) * David Roberts (CD9) * Chris Ellison (CD10) * Rob Kadota (CD11) * Ken Sampson (CD12) * Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13) *Robert Ahn (CD13) * Antonio Sanchez (CD14) * Jerry Gaines (CD15) * Arturo Vargas (Mayor) * LeRoy Chase (Mayor) * Kent Wong (Mayor) *

Helen Kim (Controller) * Julie Downey (City Attorney)


## ¡Ayude a Formar su Comunidad el lunes, 12 de diciembre!

Cada diez años, cada persona que vive en Los Ángeles tiene la oportunidad a dar su opinión de como formar los límites de los quince distritos del concilio de la ciudad de Los Ángeles.

Si se preocupa por la seguridad pública, el transporte, servicios de la ciudad, y parques en su vecindad, venga y participe en la reunión donde vive, trabaja, y juega.

Asiste una de las quince reuniones públicas a lo largo de la ciudad de Los Ángeles, comenzando con la audiencia más cercana a usted.


## Audiencia Para Tomar Testimonio Público Concejo del Distrito 2

Fecha: Lunes, 12 de diciembre de 2011
Hora: $\quad$ 6:30PM-9:30PM
Ubicación: North Valley City Hall 7747 Foothill Blvd.
Tujunga, CA 91042
Habrá interpretación en español
Se proporcionarán refrescos
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
teléfono: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
sitio web: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
Comisión para Redistribución de Distritos Políticos de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles


## Help Shape Your Community On Saturday, Dec. 17!

Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the fifteen L.A. City Council district boundaries.

If you care about public safety, transportation, city services, and parks in your neighborhood, come tell the Commission about where you live, work, and play.

Attend one of the fifteen hearings throughout the City of L.A. starting with the hearing nearest you.


200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
phone: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org redistricting.lacity@lacity.org


## ¡Ayude a Formar su Comunidad el sábado, 17 de diciembre!

Cada diez años, cada persona que vive en Los Ángeles tiene la oportunidad a dar su opinión de como formar los límites de los quince distritos del concilio de la ciudad de Los Ángeles.

Si se preocupa por la seguridad pública, el transporte, servicios de la ciudad, y parques en su vecindad, venga y participe en la reunión donde vive, trabaja, y juega.

Asiste una de las quince reuniones públicas a lo largo de la ciudad de Los Ángeles, comenzando con la audiencia más cercana a usted.


## Audiencia Para Tomar Testimonio Público Concejo del Distrito 3

Fecha: Sábado, 17 de diciembre de 2011
Hora: 11:00AM-2:00PM
Ubicación: West Valley Christian Church 22450 Sherman Way West Hills, CA 91307

Habrá interpretación en español
Se proporcionarán refrescos
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
teléfono: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
sitio web: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
Comisión para Redistribución de Distritos Políticos de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles


## Help Shape Your Community On Wednesday, Jan. 4!

Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the fifteen L.A. City Council district boundaries.

If you care about public safety, transportation, city services, and parks in your neighborhood, come tell the Commission about where you live, work, and play.

Attend one of the fifteen hearings throughout the City of L.A. starting with the hearing nearest you.


## Public Hearing Near You Council District 4

Date: Wednesday, January 04, 2012
Time: 6:30PM-9:30PM
Location: Friendship Auditorium 3201 Riverside Drive Los Angeles, CA 90027
*Light Refreshments will be provided.

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
phone: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org


##  とnntepzurfoh，hnı\｛uluph 4hí



 u uhưuaukinn：

Ept htiumppppulnuu tip huinuujhi

 qpnumughtitnny＇2tn puquưuunnu，tilitp funutl
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| Zuiknughi Lunuu 2kn Unun funlunnhpıh 4－рң 2ряuí |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| Dryuruxu <br> よuर्u <br> Чüß | 2nptip2urpか， 4 hnı\｛uyuph 2012 Eptilunuuf 6：30hg uhteztı 9：30 |
|  |  3201 Riverside Drive Los Angeles，CA 90027 |
|  | ＊Yuuunnıgutiu qnupugnıghさiutp： |

200 N．Spring Street，Room 275，Los Angeles，CA 90012
phone：（213）922－7740
fax：（213）922－7707
website：www．redistricting2011．lacity．org redistricting．lacity＠lacity．org


# 지역사회 형성을 위해 오는 1 월 4 일 수요일에 열리는 공청회에 여러분의 참여가 필요합니다! 

매 10 년마다 로스앤젤레스 시민들은 15 개의 L.A. 시의회 선거구역을 정하는 기회가 있습니다.

여러분이 살고 있는 지역의 치안, 교통, 각종 시 서비스 및 공원 조성에 관심이 있다면 이날 오셔서 여러분이 생활하고 있는 거주 지역에 대한 의견을 위원회에 알려 주십시오.
L.A. 시내에서 열리는 15 개 공청회 중에서 여러분의 거주지에서 가장 가까운 곳에 참석하여 우리의 의견을 관철시킬 수 있도록 지속적인 협조와 관심을 부탁합니다.


|  | 4 지구 시의회 공청회 일정 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 날扨: | 2012 년 1 월 4 일, 수요일 |
| 시간: | 저녁 6시 30분 - 저녁 9시 30분 |
| 장소: | 프렌즈십 강당 |
|  | (Friendship Auditorium) |
|  | 3201 Riverside Drive |
|  | Los Angeles, CA 90027 |
|  | *간단한 다과가 제공됩니다. |

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 900012

> 전화: (213) 922-7740
> 팩스: (213) 922-7707

웹사이트: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

Los Angeles 시의회 지구 재설정 위원
Estela Lopez (CD1) * Craig Miller (CD2) * David Ford (CD3) * Grover McKean (CD4) * David Roberti (CD5) * Jose Cornejo (CD6) * Michael Trujillo (CD7) * Tunua Thrash (CD8) * David Roberts (CD9) * Chris Ellison (CD10) * Rob Kadota (CD11) * Ken Sampson (CD12) * Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13) *Robert Ahn (CD13) * Antonio Sanchez (CD14) * Jerry Gaines (CD15) * Arturo Vargas (Mayor) * LeRoy Chase (Mayor) * Kent Wong (Mayor) * Helen Kim (Controller) * Julie Downey (City Attorney)


## ¡Ayude a Formar su Comunidad el miércoles, 4 de enero!

Cada diez años, cada persona que vive en Los Ángeles tiene la oportunidad a dar su opinión de como formar los límites de los quince distritos del concilio de la ciudad de Los Ángeles.

Si se preocupa por la seguridad pública, el transporte, servicios de la ciudad, y parques en su vecindad, venga y participe en la reunión donde vive, trabaja, y juega.

Asiste una de las quince reuniones públicas a lo largo de la ciudad de Los Ángeles, comenzando con la audiencia más cercana a usted.


## Audiencia Para Tomar Testimonio Público Concejo del Distrito 4

Fecha: Miércoles, 4 de enero de 2012
Hora: 6:30PM-9:30PM
Ubicación: Friendship Auditorium 3201 Riverside Drive Los Angeles, CA 90027

Habrá interpretación en español
Se proporcionarán refrescos
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
teléfono: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
sitio web: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
Comisión para Redistribución de Distritos Políticos de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles


ร่ วมกันชวยสร้
างชุมชนของค๕ณ
ได้ ในว้นพธธทะ่ 4 มกราคมน้!

ทกกๆ 10 ปี
ชาวเมืองนครลอสแองเจลลิสมรีโอกาสทธ่จะ ช่ วยกัน กำหนดเขตสภาเมืองแอลเอสิบห ้ าเขตด้ วยกัน

หากคณณสนใจทธ่จะปรับปรงด้
านความปลอดภะย สาธารณะ การคมนาคม การบรกการของเมือง
และสวนสาธารณะในละแวกบ้ านของคฺณ มาช วยกันแจ้ งให้ คณะกรรมาธิการทราบถึ่งสถานท®่

ทธ่พ่กผ่ อนหย่ อนใจกันเถอะ


โดยการเข้ าร่ วมประชาพิจารณ์ ครั้งใดครั้งหนธंงใน สิบห้
าครังท
ประชาพิจารณ์ (Public
Hearing) ที่จัดข๔้นใกล้ บ้
านคณณ สภาเขต 4
ว้นที่: วันพธทย์ 4 มกราคม 2555
เวลา: เวลา 18:30 น. -21:30 น.
สถานท ทถ่ Friendship Auditorium
چ่ं 3201 Riverside Drive Los Angeles, CA 90027
*มรีอาหารว่
างให้


## Help Shape Your Community On Thursday, Jan. 5!

Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the fifteen L.A. City Council district boundaries.

If you care about public safety, transportation, city services, and parks in your neighborhood, come tell the Commission about where you live, work, and play.

Attend one of the fifteen hearings throughout the City of L.A. starting with the hearing nearest you.


## Public Hearing Near You Council District 5

Date: $\quad$ Thursday, January 5, 2012 Time: 6:30PM-9:30PM Location: Fairfax High School Auditorium 7850 Melrose Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90046
*Light Refreshments will be provided.

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org redistricting.lacity@lacity.org


## ¡Ayude a Formar su Comunidad el jueves, 5 de enero!

Cada diez años, cada persona que vive en Los Ángeles tiene la oportunidad a dar su opinión de como formar los límites de los quince distritos del concilio de la ciudad de Los Ángeles.

Si se preocupa por la seguridad pública, el transporte, servicios de la ciudad, y parques en su vecindad, venga y participe en la reunión donde vive, trabaja, y juega.

Asiste una de las quince reuniones públicas a lo largo de la ciudad de Los Ángeles, comenzando con la audiencia más cercana a usted.


## Audiencia Para Tomar Testimonio Público Concejo del Distrito 5

Fecha: Jueves, 5 de enero de 2012
Hora: $\quad$ 6:30PM-9:30PM
Ubicación: Fairfax high School Auditorium 7850 Melrose Ave Los Angeles, CA 90046

Habrá interpretación en español
Se proporcionarán refrescos
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
teléfono: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
sitio web: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
Comisión para Redistribución de Distritos Políticos de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles


## Help Shape Your Community On Tuesday, Jan. 3!

Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the fifteen L.A. City Council district boundaries.

If you care about public safety, transportation, city services, and parks in your neighborhood, come tell the Commission about where you live, work, and play.

Attend one of the fifteen hearings throughout the City of L.A. starting with the hearing nearest you.


## Public Hearing Near You Council District 6

Date: Tuesday, January 3, 2012
Time: 6:30PM-9:30PM
Location: Van Nuys City Hall 14410 Sylvan Street Van Nuys, CA 91401
*Light Refreshments will be provided.

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org redistricting.lacity@lacity.org


## ¡Ayude a Formar su Comunidad el martes, 3 de enero!

Cada diez años, cada persona que vive en Los Ángeles tiene la oportunidad a dar su opinión de como formar los límites de los quince distritos del concilio de la ciudad de Los Ángeles.

Si se preocupa por la seguridad pública, el transporte, servicios de la ciudad, y parques en su vecindad, venga y participe en la reunión donde vive, trabaja, y juega.

Asiste una de las quince reuniones públicas a lo largo de la ciudad de Los Ángeles, comenzando con la audiencia más cercana a usted.


## Audiencia Para Tomar Testimonio Público Concejo del Distrito 6

Fecha: $\quad$ Martes, 3 de enero de 2012
Hora: 6:30PM-9:30PM
Ubicación: Van Nuys City Hall
14410 Sylvan Street
Van Nuys, CA 91401
Habrá interpretación en español
Se proporcionarán refrescos
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
teléfono: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
sitio web: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
Comisión para Redistribución de Distritos Políticos de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles

# Hãy Giúp Sắp Xếp Lại Cộng Đồng Của Quý Vị Vào thứ Ba, ngày 3 tháng Giêng! 

Mỗi 10 năm người dân của Los Angeles được có cơ hội để sắp xếp lại ranh giới mười lăm khu Hội Đồng Thành Phố L.A.

Nếu quý vị quan tâm đến an toàn công cộng, phương tiện di chuyển, các dịch vụ của thành phố, và những công viên trong khu phố của quý vị, hãy đến nói cho Ủy Ban biết về nơi quý vị sinh sống, làm việc, và vui chơi.

Tham dự một trong mười lăm buổi họp trong toàn Thành Phố L.A. hãy bắt đầu với buổi họp gần nhà quý vị nhất.


## Hop Trưng Cầu Dân Ý Gần Nhà Quý Vi <br> Hội Đồng Khu 6

Ngày: Thứ Ba, 3 Tháng Giêng, 2012
Giờ: $\quad$ Từ 6 giờ 30 chiều đến 9 giờ 30 tối
Địa Điểm: Tòa Thị Chánh Van Nuys
14410 Sylvan Street
Van Nuys, CA 91401
*Sẽ có Nước cùng thức ăn nhẹ.

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>phone: (213) 922-7740<br>fax: (213) 922-7707<br>website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

Ủy Viên Tái Phân Chia Khu Hội Đồng Thành Phố Los Angeles
Estela Lopez (CD1) * Craig Miller (CD2) * David Ford (CD3) * Grover McKean (CD4) * David Roberti (CD5) * Jose Cornejo (CD6) * Michael Trujillo (CD7) * Tunua Thrash (CD8) * David Roberts (CD9) * Chris Ellison (CD10) * Rob Kadota (CD11) * Ken Sampson (CD12) * Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13) * Robert Ahn (CD13) * Antonio Sanchez (CD14) * Jerry Gaines (CD15) * Arturo Vargas (Mayor) * LeRoy Chase (Mayor) * Kent Wong (Mayor) *

Helen Kim (Controller) * Julie Downey (City Attorney)

## Help Shape Your Community On Saturday, Dec. 10!

Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the fifteen L.A. City Council district boundaries.

If you care about public safety, transportation, city services, and parks in your neighborhood, come tell the Commission about where you live, work, and play.

Attend one of the fifteen hearings throughout the City of L.A. starting with the hearing nearest you.


|  | Public Hearing Near You |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| Date: | Saturday, December 10, 2011 |
| Time: | 11:00AM - 2:00PM |
| Location: | Alicia Broadous-Duncan Senior Center |
|  | 11300 Glenoaks Blvd., |
|  | Pacoima, CA 91331 |
|  | *Light Refreshments will be provided. |
|  |  |

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
phone: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org


## ¡Ayude a Formar su Comunidad el sábado, 10 de diciembre!

Cada diez años, cada persona que vive en Los Ángeles tiene la oportunidad a dar su opinión de como formar los límites de los quince distritos del concilio de la ciudad de Los Ángeles.

Si se preocupa por la seguridad pública, el transporte, servicios de la ciudad, y parques en su vecindad, venga y participe en la reunión donde vive, trabaja, y juega.

Asiste una de las quince reuniones públicas a lo largo de la ciudad de Los Ángeles, comenzando con la audiencia más cercana a usted.


## Audiencia Para Tomar Testimonio Público Concejo del Distrito 7

Fecha: Sábado, 10 de diciembre de 2011
Hora: 11:00AM-2:00PM
Ubicación: Alicia Broadous-Duncan Senior Center 11300 Glenoaks Blvd.
Pacoima, CA 91331
Habrá interpretación en español
Se proporcionarán refrescos
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
teléfono: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
sitio web: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
Comisión para Redistribución de Distritos Políticos de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles


# Tumulong Na Hubugin Ang Inyong Komunidad Sa Sabado, ika-10 ng Disyembre! 

Tuwing 10 taon ang mga mamamayan ng Los Angeles ay may pagkakataong hubugin ang labinlimang hangganan ng distrito ng Konseho ng Lunsod ng L.A.

Kung nagmamalasakit kayo tungkol sa pampublikong kaligtasan, transportasyon, mga serbisyo ng lunsod, at mga parke sa inyong kapitbahayan, pumunta at sabihin sa Komisyon ang tungkol sa lugar kung saan kayo nakatira, namamasukan, at lugar ng inyong laruan.

Dumalo sa isa sa labinlimang pagdinig sa buong Lunsod ng L.A. simula sa pagdinig na pinakamalapit
 sa inyo.

| $\frac{\text { Pampublikong Pagdinig Na Malapit Sa Inyo }}{\text { Distrito } 7 \mathrm{ng} \text { Konseho }}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Petsa: $\quad$Sabado, ika-10 ng Disyembre, 2011 <br> Oras: <br> Lka-11 ng umaga - Ika-2 ng hapon |  |
| Alicia Broadous-Duncan Senior Center |  |
|  | 11300 Glenoaks Blvd., |
| Pacoima, CA 91331 |  |
|  | *Pamawing-gutom ay ipagkakaloob. |

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 900012
telepono: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
lugar sa web: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org redistricting.lacity@lacity.org


## Help Shape Your Community On Tuesday, Jan. 10!

Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the fifteen L.A. City Council district boundaries.

If you care about public safety, transportation, city services, and parks in your neighborhood, come tell the Commission about where you live, work, and play.

Attend one of the fifteen hearings throughout the City of L.A. starting with the hearing nearest you.


## Public Hearing Near You Council District 8

Date: Tuesday, January 10, 2012
Time: 6:30PM - 9:30PM
Location: Expo Center
3980 Bill Robertson Lane, Los Angeles, CA 90037
*Light Refreshments will be provided.

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
phone: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
website: www.redistricting2011 lacity.org redistrictinglacity@lacity.org

## ¡Ayude a Formar su Comunidad! El 10 de enero de 2012

Cada diez años, cada persona que vive en Los Ángeles tiene la oportunidad a dar su opinión de como formar los quince distritos políticos de la ciudad de Los Ángeles.

Si Ud. se preocupa por la seguridad pública, el transporte, servicios de la ciudad, y parques en su vecindad, venga y participe en la reunión donde vive, trabaja, y juega.

Asiste a una de las quince reuniones públicas a lo largo de la ciudad de Los Ángeles, comenzando con la audiencia más
 cercana a Usted.

## Audiencia Para Tomar Testimonio Público <br> Distrito 8 del Concejo Municipal

Fecha: Martes, 10 de enero de 2012
Hora: 6:30PM-9:30PM
Ubicación: Expo Center
3980 Bill Robertson Lane Los Ángeles, CA 90037

Habrá interpretación en español
Se proporcionarán refrescos

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
phone: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
Comisión para Redistribución de Distritos Políticos de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles


## Help Shape Your Community On Saturday, Dec. 10!

Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the fifteen L.A. City Council district boundaries.

If you care about public safety, transportation, city services, and parks in your neighborhood, come tell the Commission about where you live, work, and play.

Attend one of the fifteen hearings throughout the City of L.A. starting with the hearing nearest you.


## Public Hearing Near You <br> Council District 09

Date: $\quad$ Saturday, December 10, 2011
Time: 11:00AM-2:00PM
Location: Santee Educational Complex 1921 S. Maple Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90011
*Light Refreshments will be provided.

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org redistricting.lacity@lacity.org


## 12月10日月曜日に，あなたのコミュ ニティの形成にご協力ください！

Los Angeles 市民は10年ごとにL．A．市の 15 の市議会区の境界を形成する機会を与えられ ます。

もしあなたが近隣地域の公共安全，交通，市 のサービス，および公園を大切に思うのなら ば，あなたの住んでいる地域，就業している地域，そして遊びの場について委員会に話し てください。

L．A．市中には15の公聴会があります。まず は，最寄りの公聴会にご参加ください。


200 N．Spring Street，Room 275，Los Angeles，CA 900012
電話：（213）922－7740
ファックス：（213）922－7707
ヴェブサイト：www．redistricting2011．lacity．org redistricting．lacity＠lacity．org


# 지역사회 형성을 위해 <br> 오는 12 월 10 일 토요일에 열리는 공청회에 여러분의 참여가 필요합니다! 

매 10 년마다 로스앤젤레스 시민들은 15 개의 L.A. 시의회 선거구역을 정하는 기회가 있습니다.

여러분이 살고 있는 지역의 치안, 교통, 각종 시 서비스 및 공원 조성에 관심이 있다면 이날 오셔서 여러분이 생활하고 있는 거주 지역에 대한 의견을 위원회에 알려 주십시오.
L.A. 시내에서 열리는 15 개 공청회 중에서 여러분의 거주지에서 가장 가까운 곳에 참석하여 우리의 의견을 관철시킬 수 있도록 지속적인 협조와 관심을 부탁합니다.


|  | 9지구 시의회 공청회 일정 |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| 날짜: | 2011 년 12 월 10 일, 토요일 |
| 시간: | 오전 11 시 - 오후 2 시 |
| 장소: | 산티 교육 단지 |
|  | (Santee Education Complex) |
|  | 1921 S. Maple Avenue |
|  | Los Angeles, CA 90011 |
|  | *간단한 다과가 제공됩니다. |
|  |  |

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 900012

> 전화: (213) 922-7740
> 팩스: (213) 922-7707

웬사이트: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

Los Angeles 시의회 지구 재설정 위원
Estela Lopez (CD1) * Craig Miller (CD2) * David Ford (CD3) * Grover McKean (CD4) * David Roberti (CD5) * Jose Cornejo (CD6) * Michael Trujillo (CD7) * Tunua Thrash (CD8) * David Roberts (CD9) * Chris Ellison (CD10) * Rob Kadota (CD11) * Ken Sampson (CD12) * Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13) *Robert Ahn (CD13) * Antonio Sanchez (CD14) * Jerry Gaines (CD15) * Arturo Vargas (Mayor) * LeRoy Chase (Mayor) *Kent Wong (Mayor) * Helen Kim (Controller) * Julie Downey (City Attorney)


## ¡Ayude a Formar su Comunidad el sábado, 10 de diciembre!

Cada diez años, cada persona que vive en Los Ángeles tiene la oportunidad a dar su opinión de como formar los límites de los quince distritos del concilio de la ciudad de Los Ángeles.

Si se preocupa por la seguridad pública, el transporte, servicios de la ciudad, y parques en su vecindad, venga y participe en la reunión donde vive, trabaja, y juega.

Asiste una de las quince reuniones públicas a lo largo de la ciudad de Los Ángeles, comenzando con la audiencia más cercana a usted.


## Audiencia Para Tomar Testimonio Público Concejo del Distrito 9

> Fecha: Sábado, 10 de diciembre de 2011
> Hora: 11:00AM-2:00PM
> Ubicación: Santee Educational Complex 1921 S. Maple Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90011

> Habrá interpretación en español

Se proporcionarán refrescos
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
teléfono: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
sitio web: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
Comisión para Redistribución de Distritos Políticos de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles


## Help Shape Your Community On Tuesday, Jan. 3!

Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the fifteen L.A. City Council district boundaries.

If you care about public safety, transportation, city services, and parks in your neighborhood, come tell the Commission about where you live, work, and play.

Attend one of the fifteen hearings throughout the City of L.A. starting with the hearing nearest you.


## Public Hearing Near You <br> Council District 10

Date: Tuesday, January 03, 2012
Time: 6:30PM-9:30PM Location: Nate Holden Performing Arts Ctr. 4718 W. Washington Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90016
*Light Refreshments will be provided.

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org redistricting.lacity@lacity.org


# 지역사회 형성을 위해 <br> 오는 1 월 3 일 화요일에 열리는 공청회에 여러분의 참여가 필요합니다! 

매 10 년마다 로스앤젤레스 시민들은 15 개의 L.A. 시의회 선거구역을 정하는 기회가 있습니다.

여러분이 살고 있는 지역의 치안, 교통, 각종 시 서비스 및 공원 조성에 관심이 있다면 이날 오셔서 여러분이 생활하고 있는 거주 지역에 대한 의견을 위원회에 알려 주십시오.
L.A. 시내에서 열리는 15 개 공청회 중에서 여러분의 거주지에서 가장 가까운 곳에 참석하여 우리의 의견을 관철시킬 수 있도록 지속적인 협조와 관심을 부탁합니다.


|  | 10 지구 시의회 공청회 일정 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 날짜: } \\ & \text { 시간: } \\ & \text { 장소: } \end{aligned}$ | 2012 년 1 월 3 일, 화요일 |
|  | 저녁 6 시 30 분 - 저녁 9 시 30 분 |
|  | 네잇 홀든 퍼포밍 아츠 센터 |
|  | (Nate Holden Performing Arts Ctr.) |
|  | 4718 W. Washington Blvd. |
|  | Los Angeles, CA 90016 |
|  | *간단한 다과가 제공됩니다. |

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 900012

> 전화: (213) 922-7740
> 팩스: (213) 922-7707

웹사이트: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

Los Angeles 시의회 지구 재설정 위원
Estela Lopez (CD1) * Craig Miller (CD2) * David Ford (CD3) * Grover McKean (CD4) * David Roberti (CD5) * Jose Cornejo (CD6) * Michael Trujillo (CD7) * Tunua Thrash (CD8) * David Roberts (CD9) * Chris Ellison (CD10) * Rob Kadota (CD11) * Ken Sampson (CD12) * Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13) *Robert Ahn (CD13) * Antonio Sanchez (CD14) * Jerry Gaines (CD15) * Arturo Vargas (Mayor) * LeRoy Chase (Mayor) * Kent Wong (Mayor) * Helen Kim (Controller) * Julie Downey (City Attorney)


## ¡Ayude a Formar su Comunidad el martes, 3 de enero!

Cada diez años, cada persona que vive en Los Ángeles tiene la oportunidad a dar su opinión de como formar los límites de los quince distritos del concilio de la ciudad de Los Ángeles.

Si se preocupa por la seguridad pública, el transporte, servicios de la ciudad, y parques en su vecindad, venga y participe en la reunión donde vive, trabaja, y juega.

Asiste una de las quince reuniones públicas a lo largo de la ciudad de Los Ángeles, comenzando con la audiencia más cercana a usted.


## Audiencia Para Tomar Testimonio Público Concejo del Distrito 10

Fecha: $\quad$ Martes, 3 de enero de 2012
Hora: $\quad 6: 30 \mathrm{PM}-9: 30 \mathrm{PM}$
Ubicación: Nate Holden Performing Arts Ctr. 4718 W. Washington Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90016

Habrá interpretación en español
Se proporcionarán refrescos
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
teléfono: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
sitio web: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
Comisión para Redistribución de Distritos Políticos de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles


## Help Shape Your Community On Thursday, Dec. 15!

Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the fifteen L.A. City Council district boundaries.

If you care about public safety, transportation, city services, and parks in your neighborhood, come tell the Commission about where you live, work, and play.

Attend one of the fifteen hearings throughout the City of L.A. starting with the hearing nearest you.


## Public Hearing Near You <br> Council District 11

Date: Thursday, December 15, 2011
Time: 6:30PM-9:30PM
Location: IMAN Cultural Center
3376 Motor Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90034
*Light Refreshments will be provided.

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
phone: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org


## 12月15日木曜日に，あなたのコミュニ ティの形成にご協力ください！

Los Angeles 市民は 10 年ごとに L．A．市の 15 の市議会区の境界を形成する機会を与えられ ます。

近隣地域の公共安全，交通，市のサービス，公園を大切に思うのならば，住んでいる地域，就業している地域，遊びの場について委員会に話してください。

L．A．市中には15の公聴会があります。まず は，最寄りの公聴会にご参加ください。


200 N．Spring Street，Room 275，Los Angeles，CA 90012
phone：（213）922－7740
fax：（213）922－7707
website：www．redistricting2011．lacity．org
redistricting．lacity＠lacity．org

## Los Angeles 市市議会再区画委員会

Estela Lopez（CD1）＊Craig Miller（CD2）＊David Ford（CD3）＊Grover McKean（CD4）＊David Roberti（CD5）＊Jose Cornejo（CD6）＊Michael Trujillo（CD7）＊ Tunua Thrash（CD8）＊David Roberts（CD9）＊Chris Ellison（CD10）＊Rob Kadota（CD11）＊Ken Sampson（CD12）＊Jackie Dupont－Walker（CD13）＊Robert Ahn（CD13）＊Antonio Sanchez（CD14）＊Jerry Gaines（CD15）＊Arturo Vargas（Mayor）＊LeRoy Chase（Mayor）＊Kent Wong（Mayor）＊

Helen Kim（Controller）＊Julie Downey（City Attorney）


## ¡Ayude a Formar su Comunidad el jueves, 15 de diciembre!

Cada diez años, cada persona que vive en Los Ángeles tiene la oportunidad a dar su opinión de como formar los límites de los quince distritos del concilio de la ciudad de Los Ángeles.

Si se preocupa por la seguridad pública, el transporte, servicios de la ciudad, y parques en su vecindad, venga y participe en la reunión donde vive, trabaja, y juega.

Asiste una de las quince reuniones públicas a lo largo de la ciudad de Los Ángeles, comenzando con la audiencia más cercana a usted.


## Audiencia Para Tomar Testimonio Público Concejo del Distrito 11

Fecha: Jueves, 15 de diciembre de 2011
Hora: 6:30PM-9:30PM
Ubicación: IMAN Cultural Center 3376 Motor Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90034
Habrá interpretación en español
Se proporcionarán refrescos
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
teléfono: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
sitio web: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
Comisión para Redistribución de Distritos Políticos de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles


## Help Shape Your Community On Monday, Dec. 5!

Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the fifteen L.A. City Council district boundaries.

If you care about public safety, transportation, city services, and parks in your neighborhood, come tell the Commission about where you live, work, and play.

Attend one of the fifteen hearings throughout the City of L.A. starting with the hearing nearest you.


## Public Hearing Near You <br> Council District 12

Date: Monday, December 5, 2011
Time: 7:00PM-10:00PM
Location: LAPD Devonshire Youth Center 8721 Wilbur Avenue Northridge, CA 91324
*Light Refreshments will be provided.

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012


## ¡Ayude a Formar su Comunidad el lunes, 5 de diciembre!

Cada diez años, cada persona que vive en Los Ángeles tiene la oportunidad a dar su opinión de como formar los límites de los quince distritos del concilio de la ciudad de Los Ángeles.

Si se preocupa por la seguridad pública, el transporte, servicios de la ciudad, y parques en su vecindad, venga y participe en la reunión donde vive, trabaja, y juega.

Asiste una de las quince reuniones públicas a lo largo de la ciudad de Los Ángeles, comenzando con la audiencia más cercana a usted.


## Audiencia Para Tomar Testimonio Público Concejo del Distrito 12

Fecha: Lunes, 5 de diciembre de 2011
Hora: 7:00PM - 10:00PM
Ubicación: LAPD Devonshire Youth Center 8721 Wilbur Avenue Northridge, CA 91324

Habrá interpretación en español
Se proporcionarán refrescos
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
teléfono: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
sitio web: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
Comisión para Redistribución de Distritos Políticos de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles


## Help Shape Your Community On Monday, Jan. 9!

Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the fifteen L.A. City Council district boundaries.

If you care about public safety, transportation, city services, and parks in your neighborhood, come tell the Commission about where you live, work, and play.

Attend one of the fifteen hearings throughout the City of L.A. starting with the hearing nearest you.


## Public Hearing Near You Council District 13

Date: Monday, January 9, 2012
Time: 6:30PM-9:30PM
Location: Los Angeles City College Theater 855 N. Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90029
*Light Refreshments will be provided.

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
phone: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
website: www.redistricting2011 lacity.org redistrictinglacity@lacity.org
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200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
phone: (213) 922-7740 fax: (213) 922-7707
website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org redistricting.lacity@lacity.org


# 지역사회 형성을 위해 오는 1 월 9 일 월요일에 열리는 공청회에 여러분의 참여가 필요합니다! 

매 10 년마다 로스앤젤레스 시민들은 15 개의 L.A. 시의회 선거구역을 정하는 기회가 있습니다.

여러분이 살고 있는 지역의 치안, 교통, 각종 시 서비스 및 공원 조성에 관심이 있다면 이날 오셔서 여러분이 생활하고 있는 거주 지역에 대한 의견을 위원회에 알려 주십시오.
L.A. 시내에서 열리는 15 개 공청회 중에서 여러분의 거주지에서 가장 가까운 곳에 참석하여 우리의 의견을 관철시킬 수 있도록 지속적인 협조와 관심을 부탁합니다.


|  | 13 지구 시의회 공청회 일정 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 날짜: | 2012 년 1 월 9 일, 월요일 |
| 시간: | 저녁 6 시 30 분 - 저녁 9 人시 30 분 |
| 장소: | 로스앤젤레스 시티 칼리지 극장 |
|  | (Los Angeles City College Theater) |
|  | 855 N. Vermont Avenue, |
|  | Los Angeles, CA 90029 |
|  | *간단한 다과가 제공됩니다. |

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 900012

> 전화: (213) 922-7740
> 팩스: (213) 922-7707

웹사이트: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

Los Angeles 시의회 지구 재설정 위원
Estela Lopez (CD1) * Craig Miller (CD2) * David Ford (CD3) * Grover McKean (CD4) * David Roberti (CD5) * Jose Cornejo (CD6) * Michael Trujillo (CD7) * Tunua Thrash (CD8) * David Roberts (CD9) * Chris Ellison (CD10) * Rob Kadota (CD11) * Ken Sampson (CD12) * Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13) *Robert Ahn (CD13) * Antonio Sanchez (CD14) * Jerry Gaines (CD15) * Arturo Vargas (Mayor) * LeRoy Chase (Mayor) * Kent Wong (Mayor) * Helen Kim (Controller) * Julie Downey (City Attorney)


## ¡Ayude a Formar su Comunidad el lunes, 9 de enero!

Cada diez años, cada persona que vive en Los Ángeles tiene la oportunidad a dar su opinión de como formar los límites de los quince distritos del concilio de la ciudad de Los Ángeles.

Si se preocupa por la seguridad pública, el transporte, servicios de la ciudad, y parques en su vecindad, venga y participe en la reunión donde vive, trabaja, y juega.

Asiste una de las quince reuniones públicas a lo largo de la ciudad de Los Ángeles, comenzando con la audiencia más cercana a usted.


## Audiencia Para Tomar Testimonio Público Concejo del Distrito 13

Fecha: Lunes, 9 de enero de 2012
Hora: $\quad$ 6:30PM-9:30PM
Ubicación: Los Angeles City College Theater 855 N. Vermont Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90029
Habrá interpretación en español
Se proporcionarán refrescos
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
teléfono: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
sitio web: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
Comisión para Redistribución de Distritos Políticos de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles


## Tumulong Na Hubugin Ang Inyong Komunidad Sa Lunes, ika-9 ng Enero!

Tuwing 10 taon ang mga mamamayan ng Los Angeles ay may pagkakataong hubugin ang labinlimang hangganan ng distrito ng Konseho ng Lunsod ng L.A.

Kung nagmamalasakit kayo tungkol sa pampublikong kaligtasan, transportasyon, mga serbisyo ng lunsod, at mga parke sa inyong kapitbahayan, pumunta at sabihin sa Komisyon ang tungkol sa lugar kung saan kayo nakatira, namamasukan, at lugar ng inyong laruan.

Dumalo sa isa sa labinlimang pagdinig sa buong Lunsod ng L.A. simula sa pagdinig na pinakamalapit
 sa inyo.

| $\frac{\text { Pampublikong Pagdinig Na Malapit Sa Inyo }}{\text { Distrito } 13 \mathrm{ng} \text { Konseho }}$ |
| :---: |
| Petsa: Lunes, ika-9 ng Enero, 2012 |
| Oras: Ika-6:30 ng gabi - Ika-9:30 ng gabi |
| Lugar: Los Angeles City College Theater |
| 855 N. Vermont Avenue, |
| Los Angeles, CA 90029 |
| *Pamawing-gutom ay ipagkakaloob |
|  |

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 900012
telepono: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
lugar sa web: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org redistricting.lacity@lacity.org


ร่ วมกันชวยส้้
างชูมชนของคูณ
ได้
ในวันจันทร์
ที่ 9
มกราคมน้ะ

ทฺกๆ 10 ปี
ชาวเมืองนครลอสแองเจลลิสมรีโอกาสทธ่จะ ช่ วยกัน กำหนดเขตสภาเมืองแอลเอสิบห ้ าเขตด้ วยกัน

หากคฯณสนใจทธ่จะปรับปรงด้
านความปลอดภะย สาธารณะ การคมนาคม การบรการของเมือง
และสวนสาธารณะในละแวกบ้ านของคฺณ มาช วยกันแจ้ งให้ คณะกรรมาธิการทราบถึงสถานที்่

ทถ่พักักผ่ อนหย่ อนใจกันเถอะ


โดยการเข้ าร่ วมประชาพิจารณ์
ครังใดครั้งหนซ่งใน สิบห้


> ประชาพิิจารณ์ (Public
> Hearing) ที่จัดข์้นใกล้ บ้ านคณณ สภาเขต 13
> วันทถ์: วันจันทร์ ทธ์่ 9 มกราคม 2555
> เวลา: เวลา 18:30 น.-21:30 น.
> สถานท ทธ่ Los Angeles City College Theater
> 855 N. Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90029

เ่
*มีอาหารว่

> างให้

## Help Shape Your Community

 On Tuesday, Dec. 13!Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the fifteen L.A. City Council district boundaries.

If you care about public safety, transportation, city services, and parks in your neighborhood, come tell the Commission about where you live, work, and play.

Attend one of the fifteen hearings throughout the City of L.A. starting with the hearing nearest you.

$\square$
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
phone: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org


## ¡Ayude a Formar su Comunidad el martes, 13 de diciembre!

Cada diez años, cada persona que vive en Los Ángeles tiene la oportunidad a dar su opinión de como formar los límites de los quince distritos del concilio de la ciudad de Los Ángeles.

Si se preocupa por la seguridad pública, el transporte, servicios de la ciudad, y parques en su vecindad, venga y participe en la reunión donde vive, trabaja, y juega.

Asiste una de las quince reuniones públicas a lo largo de la ciudad de Los Ángeles, comenzando con la audiencia más cercana a usted.


## Audiencia Para Tomar Testimonio Público Concejo del Distrito 14

Fecha: Martes, 13 de diciembre de 2011
Hora: 6:30PM-9:30PM
Ubicación: Boyle Heights Senior Center 2839 E. $3^{\text {ra }}$ Street
Los Angeles, CA 90033
Habrá interpretación en español
Se proporcionarán refrescos
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
teléfono: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
sitio web: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
Comisión para Redistribución de Distritos Políticos de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles


## Help Shape Your Community On Thursday, Dec. 8!

Every 10 years the people of Los Angeles have an opportunity to shape the fifteen L.A. City Council district boundaries.

If you care about public safety, transportation, city services, and parks in your neighborhood, come tell the Commission about where you live, work, and play.

Attend one of the fifteen hearings throughout the City of L.A. starting with the hearing nearest you.


## Public Hearing Near You

 Council District 15Date: Thursday, December 8, 2011
Time: 6:30PM-9:30PM
Location: Watts Labor Community Alliance Committee, Phoenix Hall 10950 S. Central Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90059
*Light Refreshments will be provided.
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275, Los Angeles, CA 90012
phone: (213) 922-7740
fax: (213) 922-7707
website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org redistricting.lacity@lacity.org


## ¡Ayude a Formar su Comunidad el jueves, 8 de diciembre!

Cada diez años, cada persona que vive en Los Ángeles tiene la oportunidad a dar su opinión de como formar los límites de los quince distritos del concilio de la ciudad de Los Ángeles.

Si se preocupa por la seguridad pública, el transporte, servicios de la ciudad, y parques en su vecindad, venga y participe en la reunión donde vive, trabaja, y juega.

Asiste una de las quince reuniones públicas a lo largo de la ciudad de Los Ángeles, comenzando con la audiencia más cercana a usted.


## Audiencia Para Tomar Testimonio Público Concejo del Distrito 15

Fecha: Jueves, 8 de diciembre de 2011
Hora: 6:30PM-9:30PM
Ubicación: Watts Labor Community Alliance Committee
Phoenix Hall
10950 S. Central
Los Angeles, CA 90059
Habrá interpretación en español
Se proporcionarán refrescos


## February Hearing Calendar

Wednesday, February 1 @ 6:30PM
Wilshire Ebell Theatre
4401 West $8^{\text {th }}$ Street
Los Angeles, CA 90005
Monday, February 6 @ 6:30PM Occidental College, Thorne Hall 1600 Campus Road Los Angeles, CA 90041

Thursday, February 2 @ 6:30PM Westchester Recreation Center, Gym 7000 West Manchester Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90045

Wednesday, February 8 @ 6:30PM LA City Hall, John Ferraro Chambers 200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Saturday, February 4 @ 11:00AM Pierce College, The Great Hall 6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
Thursday, February 9 @ 6:30PM
Walter Reed Middle School, Auditorium 4525 Irvine Avenue
Studio City, CA 91602

Saturday, February 11 @ 11:00AM West Angeles Church Of God In Christ 3045 South Crenshaw Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90016
*Please call (213) 922-7740 with translation requests. All locations are wheelchair accessible. Hearings will be televised on Channel 35 via tape delay.

To learn more about the City's redistricting process, please visit:
Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission


## Фtunpluph junıufitiph duufuidulqugnıg

2nptip2upph, htiunpluph 1, द.t. 6:30

4401 West 8th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90005
Eplqnı2urph, ఝtunpulunh 6, l.t. 6:30
Opuphtianul linkie, Onpí upuh
1600 Campus Road
Los Angeles, CA 90041
Tupup, భhtinnuluph 11, द.w. 11:00
 tultntigh
3045 South Crenshaw Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90016

Zhaq2urph, htinnuluph 2, 4.t. 6:30
 7000 West Manchester Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90045

2nntip2upph, ழtunpuluph 8, l.t. 6:30 LU puqupujhi upuh, Sní Stipnupo utijululutip
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Фhpu lintiq, UHठ upuh
6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

 4525 Irvine Avenue
Studio City, CA 91602


200 N. Spring Street, Room 275
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Ztnulunu' (213) 922-7740 / Supu (213) 922-7707
$\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{L}}-\mathrm{Y}$ nuun redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
Yuup ${ }^{\text {www.redistricting2011.lacity.org }}$


二月份聽證會日程安排

2 月 1 日週三，晚上 6：30
Wilshire Ebell 劇場
4401 West $8^{\text {th }}$ Street
Los Angeles，CA 90005
2 月 6 日週一，晚上 6：30
Occidental 學院，Thorne 大廳
1600 Campus Road
Los Angeles，CA 90041
2 月 11 日週六，上午 11：00M
West Angeles 基督神教會
3045 South Crenshaw Blvd．
Los Angeles，CA 90016

2 月 2 日週四，晚上6：30
Westchester 康樂中心，體育館
7000 West Manchester Avenue
Los Angeles，CA 90045
2 月 8 日週三，晚上 6：30
Los Angeles 市市政聽，John Ferraro 會館 200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles，CA 90012

2 月 4 日週六，上午 11：00M
Pierce 學院，大禮堂
6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills，CA 91367
2 月 9 日週四，晚上6：30
Walter Reed 中學，禮堂
4525 Irvine Avenue
Studio City，CA 91602
＊若需翻譯服務，請致電（213）922－7740。所有地點都方便輪椅出入。將透過第 35 電視頻道播放聽證會錄影內容。

若需瞭解關於本市重劃選區程序的詳盡資訊，請訪問：
Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
200 N．Spring Street，Room 275
Los Angeles，CA 90012
電話號碼：（213）922－7740／傳真號碼：（213）922－7707
電郵地址：redistricting．lacity＠lacity．org
網址：www．redistricting2011．lacity．org

##  <br> Los Angeles 市市議会再区画委員会 <br> Los Angeles 市の 15 の市議会区の境界線の草案が出来上がりました。 この提案された区画が皆様のコミュニティにどのように影響するか，是非ご意見をお聞かせくだ さい。

次の10年間の新しい市議会地図を作成する前に公聴会に参加して皆様の声を届けましょう！Los Angeles の将来は皆様の手のうちにあります。


## 2月公聴会カレンダー

2 月 1 日水曜日，午後 6 時半
Wilshire Ebell シアター
4401 West $8^{\text {th }}$ Street
Los Angeles，CA 90005

2 月 6 日月曜日，午後 6 時半 Occidental カレッジ，Thorne ホール 1600 Campus Road Los Angeles，CA 90041

2 月 2 日木曜日，午後 6 時半
Westchester レクリエーションセンター，体育館
7000 West Manchester Avenue Los Angeles，CA 90045

2 月 8 日水曜日，午後 6 時半 LA 市庁舎，John Ferraro 室
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles，CA 90012

2月4日土曜日，午前11時
Pierce カレッジ，グレートホール
6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills，CA 91367

2月9日木曜日，午後 6 時半
Walter Reed 中学校，講堂
4525 Irvine Avenue
Studio City，CA 91602

2 月 11 日土曜日，午前 11 時

God in Christ West Angeles 教会
3045 South Crenshaw Blvd．
Los Angeles，CA 90016
＊通訳をご希望の場合は（213）922－7740にお電話ください。公聴会場はどこも車椅子アクセスがあります。チャンネル 35 で公聴会の録画を見ることが できます。

## 모든 사람이 다 중요합니다! <br> Los Angeles 시의회 지구 재설정 위원회

총 15 개 Los Angeles 시의회 지구의 경계에 대한 초안이 작성되었습니다. 그리고 저희는 제안된 본 경계가 여러분의 커뮤니티에 어떤 영향을 미치는지 여러분께서 들어보시기를 바라고 있습니다!

앞으로 10 년간의 시의회 지도가 확정되기 전에, 다가오는 청문회에 참석하셔서 여러분의 의견이 반영되게 하십시오! Los Angeles 의 미래는 여러분의 손 안에 있습니다.


## 청문회 2 월 일정

2 월 1 일 수요일 저녁 6:30
Wilshire Ebell 극장
4401 West $8^{\text {th }}$ Street Los Angeles, CA 90005

2 월 6 일 월요일 저녁 6:30 Occidental 칼리지, Thorne Hall 1600 Campus Road Los Angeles, CA 90041

2 월 2 일 목요일 저녁 6:30
Westchester 레크리에이션 센터, 체육관
7000 West Manchester Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90045
2 월 8 일 수요일 저녁 6:30
LA 시청, John Ferraro 회의실 200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

2 월 4 일 토요일 오전 11:00 Pierce 칼리지, The Great Hall 6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
2 월 9 일 목요일 저녁 6:30
Walter Reed 중학교, 강당 4525 Irvine Avenue Studio City, CA 91602

2 월 11 일 토요일 오전 11:00

West Angeles Church Of God In Christ 3045 South Crenshaw Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90016
*통역을 요청하시려면 (213) 922-7740 으로 전화하십시오. 청문회 장소는 모두 휠체어 출입이 가능합니다. 청문회 진행은 테이프로 녹화되어 추후 채널 35 에서 방영될 것입니다.

시의 지구 재설정 절차에 대해 더 알고 싶으시면, 아래 적힌 곳을 방문하십시오:
Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275
Los Angeles, CA 90012
전화: (213) 922-7740 / 팩스: (213) 922-7707
이메일: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
웹사이트: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org


## Calendario de audiencias de febrero

Miércoles, 1 de febrero a las 6:30PM
Wilshire Ebell Theatre
4401 West $8^{\text {th }}$ Street
Los Angeles, CA 90005
Lunes, 6 de febrero a las 6:30PM
Occidental College, Thorne Hall 1600 Campus Road Los Angeles, CA 90041

Sábado, 11 de febrero a las 11:00AM West Angeles Church Of God In Christ 3045 South Crenshaw Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90016

Jueves, 2 de febrero a las 6:30PM Westchester Recreation Center, Gym
7000 West Manchester Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Miércoles, 8 de febrero a las 6:30PM
LA City Hall, John Ferraro Chambers
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Sábado, 4 de febrero a las 11:00AM Pierce College, The Great Hall 6201 Winnetka Avenue Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Jueves, 9 de febrero a las 6:30PM Walter Reed Middle School, Auditorium 4525 Irvine Avenue
Studio City, CA 91602

> *Por favor llame al (213) 922-7740 por solicitudes de traducción. Todos los lugares son accesibles para sillas de ruedas. Las audiencias serán televisadas en el Canal 35 por diferido.

Para saber más sobre el proceso de reestructuración de distritos de la Ciudad, por favor visite:
Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275


## Kalendaryo ng Pagdinig sa Pebrero

Miyerkules, ika-1 ng Pebrero sa 6:30 ng gabi
Wilshire Ebell Theatre 4401 West $8^{\text {th }}$ Street Los Angeles, CA 90005

Lunes, ika-6 ng Pebrero sa 6:30 ng gabi
Occidental College, Thorne Hall 1600 Campus Road Los Angeles, CA 90041

Huwebes, ika-2 ng Pebrero sa 6:30 ng gabi
Westchester Recreation Center, Gym 7000 West Manchester Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Miyerkules, ika-8 ng Pebrero sa 6:30 ng gabi
LA City Hall, John Ferraro Chambers 200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

## Sabado, ika-4 ng Pebrero

 sa 11:00 ng umagaPierce College, The Great Hall
6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
Huwebes, ika-9 ng Pebrero sa 6:30 ng gabi
Walter Reed Middle School, Auditorium 4525 Irvine Avenue
Studio City, CA 91602

Sabado, ika-11 ng Pebrero sa 11:00 ng umaga

West Angeles Church Of God In Christ 3045 South Crenshaw Blvd Los Angeles, CA 90016
*Mangyaring tumawag sa (213) 922-7740 kung may mga kahilingan para sa pagsasalin. Lahat ng lugar ay mapupuntahan sa pamamagitan ng silyang may gulong. Ang mga pagdinig ay ipapalabas sa telebisyon sa Channel 35 sa pamamagitan ng may-inaantalang teyp.

Upang makakuha ng karagdagang kaalaman tungkol sa proseso ng muling pagdistrito ng Lunsod, mangyaring bisitahin ang:
Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275 Los Angeles, CA 90012
Telepono: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707
Email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
Lugar ng Web: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org

## ทุกคนสำคัญ! คณะกรรมาธิการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ของสภา เทศบาลนครลอสแองเจลลิส

ฉบับร่าง ได้มีการจัดแบ่งเขตดินแดนสำหรับสภาเทศบาลนครลอสแองเจลลิสทั้ง 15 เขต และเราต้องการรับฟังเกี่ยวกับเขตที่ได้เสนอไว้เหล่านื้ว่ามีผลกระทบต่อชุมชนของคุณอย่างไร!
ก่อนที่จะมีการจัดทำแผนที่สภาเทศบาลฉบับใหม่ขั้นสำหรับใช้งานตลอด 10 ปีข้างหน้า คุณสามารณแจ้ง ให้เราทราบได้โดยเข้าร่วมในประชาพิจารณ์ที่จะมีขึ้นในเร็วๆ นี้! อนาคตของนครลอสแองเจลลิสอยู่ในมือ ของคุณ


## ตารางปฏิทินประชาพิจารณ์สำหรับเดือนกุมภาพันธ์

วันพุธที่ 1 กุมภาพันธ์ เวลา $18: 30$ น. ที่ Wilshire Ebell Theatre 4401 West $8^{\text {th }}$ Street Los Angeles, CA 90005

วันจันทร์ที่ 6 กุมภาพันธ์ เวลา18:30 น. ที่ Occidental College,
Thorne Hall 1600 Campus Road Los Angeles, CA 90041

วันพฤหัสบดีที่ 2 กุมภาพันธ์ เวลา $18: 30$ น. ที่ Westchester Recreation Center, Gym 7000 West Manchester Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90045

วันพุธที่ 8 กุมภาพันธ์ เวลา 18:30 น.
ที่ LA City Hall, John
Ferraro Chambers
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

วันเสาร์ที่ 4 กุมภาพันธ์ เวลา 11:00 น. ที่ Pierce College, The Great Hall 6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
วันพฤหัสบดีที่ 9 กุมภาพันธ์ เวลา 18:30 น. ที่ Walter Reed Middle School,
Auditorium
4525 Irvine Avenue
Studio City, CA 91602

วันเสาร์ที่ 11 กุมภาพันธ์ เวลา 11:00 น. West Angeles Church Of God In Christ 3045 South Crenshaw Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90016
*กรุณาโทรไปที่ (213) 922-7740 พร้อมคำขอให้มีการแปล สถานที่ทุกแห่งนั้น มีทางที่ให้รถเข็นคนพิการเข้าถึงได้ จะมีการออกอากาศประชาพิจารณ์ทางโทรทัศน์ช่อง 35 ผ่านเทปดีเลย์


## Lịch Trình Họp Tháng Hai

Thứ Tư, ngày 1 tháng Hai
@ 6 giờ 30 tối
Wilshire Ebell Theatre 4401 West $8^{\text {th }}$ Street Los Angeles, CA 90005

Thứ Hai, ngày 6 tháng Hai @ 6 giờ 30 tối
Trường Đại Học Occidental, Thorne Hall 1600 Campus Road
Los Angeles, CA 90041

Thứ Năm, ngày 2 tháng Hai @ 6 giờ 30 tối
Trung Tâm Giải Trí Westchester, Phòng Thể Thao
7000 West Manchester Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90045

Thứ Tư, ngày 8 tháng Hai @ 6 giờ 30 tối
Tòa Thị Chánh LA, John Ferraro Chambers 200 North Spring Street Los Angeles, CA 90012

## Thứ Bảy, ngày 4 tháng Hai

 @ 11 giờ sangTrường Đại Học Pierce, The Great Hall 6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Thứ Năm, ngày 9 tháng Hai @ 6 giò 30 tối
Trường Trung Học Cấp Hai Walter
Reed, Thính Đường
4525 Irvine Avenue
Studio City, CA 91602

## Thứ Bảy, ngày 11 tháng Hai @ 11 giờ sáng

West Angeles Church Of God In Christ 3045 South Crenshaw Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90016

* Xin gọi số (213) 922-7740 nếu muốn yêu cầu bản dịch. Tất cả mọi địa điểm đều có lối ra vào cho xe lăn. Các buổi họp sẽ được phát hình lại trên Đài 35 .

Để tìm hiểu thêm về tiến trình tái phân chia khu của Thành Phố, xin liên lạc:

For Immediate Release
Contact: Daniella Masterson 323-791-9227 Media.lacityredistricting@gmail.com

# MEDIA ADVISORY 

## Chair

# Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission Seeks Input From The Koreatown Community 

Arturo Vargas

## Vice Chairs

"Jackie" Dupont-Walker
Robert Kadota

## Commissioners

Robert Ahn
LeRoy Chase
Jose Cornejo
Julie Downey
David Ford
Christopher Ellison
Jerry Gaines
Helen B. Kim
Estela Lopez
Grover McKean
Craig Miller
David Roberti
David Roberts
Ken Sampson
Antonio Sanchez
Tunua Thrash
Michael Trujillo
Kent Wong

## Executive Director

Andrew Westall
Outreach Director
Rani Woods

## Media Director

Daniella Masterson

Who: Commission Chair Arturo Vargas, Commissioner Helen Kim, Commissioner Robert Ahn and Executive Director Andrew Westall

What: The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission will hold a press conference to encourage input from local residents, businesses and community activists regarding the redistricting plan to draw new boundaries in Koreatown. Public Hearings have been held throughout city to give the communities an opportunity to deliver testimonies, submit comments and provide public input directly to Commissioners about the neighborhoods they reside in.

Where: Korean American Museum
3727 West $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, $4^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90027
When: Friday, December $16^{\text {th }}, 2011$ 1:30 pm

## About the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission:

The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission is comprised of 21 appointed individuals representing constituencies citywide. Commissioners are charged with advising the Los Angeles City Council on drawing lines as mandated every 10 years by the Los Angeles City Charter. For additional information visit:
http://redistricting2011.lacity.or

For Immediate Release
Contact: Daniella Masterson 323-791-9227 Media.lacityredistricting@gmail.com

## MEDIA ADVISORY

## Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission Public Input Hearing Council District 3

## Chair

Arturo Vargas

## Vice Chairs

"Jackie" Dupont-Walker
Robert Kadota

## Commissioners

Robert Ahn
LeRoy Chase
Jose Cornejo
Julie Downey
David Ford
Christopher Ellison
Jerry Gaines
Helen B. Kim
Estela Lopez
Grover McKean
Craig Miller
David Roberti
David Roberts
Ken Sampson
Antonio Sanchez
Michael Trujillo
Kent Wong

Who: Commission Chair Arturo Vargas, Commissioners and Community Members

What: Every 10 years the City Council district boundaries are redrawn to account for population changes. The Redistricting Commission makes recommendations to the City Council on adoption of the City's redistricting plan that will establish new boundaries for the City Council districts.

Public Hearings are an opportunity for community members to deliver testimonies, submit comments and provide public input directly to Commissioners about the neighborhoods they reside in.

## Executive Director

Where: West Valley Christian Church 22450 Sherman Way West Hills, CA 91307

When: Saturday, December 17th 11:00 am
Andrew Westall
Outreach Director
Rani Woods
Media Director
Daniella Masterson

About the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission:
The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission is comprised of 21 appointed individuals representing constituencies citywide. Commissioners are charged with advising the Los Angeles City Council on drawing lines as mandated every 10 years by the Los Angeles City Charter. For additional information visit:
http://redistricting2011.lacity.org

For Immediate Release
Contact: Daniella Masterson 323-791-9227 Media.lacityredistricting@gmail.com

## MEDIA ADVISORY

## Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission Seeks Input From the Asian Pacific Islander Communities

## Chair

Arturo Vargas

## Vice Chairs

"Jackie" Dupont-Walker
Robert Kadota

## Commissioners

Robert Ahn
LeRoy Chase
Jose Cornejo
Julie Downey
David Ford
Christopher Ellison
Jerry Gaines
Helen B. Kim
Estela Lopez
Grover McKean
Craig Miller
David Roberti
David Roberts
Ken Sampson
Antonio Sanchez
Bobbie Jean Anderson
Michael Trujillo
Kent Wong

## Executive Director

Who: Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commissioners Sandy Close, Executive Director of New America Media Asian community stakeholders

What: The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission will hold a press conference to encourage input from local residents, businesses and community activists regarding the redistricting plan to draw new boundaries in Little Tokyo, Chinatown, Koreatown and the Thai, Filipino and Vietnamese' communities. Public Hearings have been held citywide to give the community an opportunity to submit comments and provide public input directly to the Commissioners about the neighborhoods they reside and or work in.

This series of hearings will be held in Council Districts 6, 10, 4, 5, 1, 13 and 8 between January $3^{\text {rd }}-10^{\text {th }} 2012$.

Where: Japanese American Cultural and Community Center 244 South San Pedro Street Los Angeles, CA 90012

When: January $4^{\text {th }}, 2012$
Andrew Westall

## Outreach Director

Rani Woods
Media Director
Daniella Masterson

## About the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission:

The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission is comprised of 21 appointed individuals representing constituencies citywide. Commissioners are charged with advising the Los Angeles City Council on drawing lines as mandated every 10 years by the Los Angeles City Charter. For additional information visit:
http://redistricting2011.lacity.org

For Immediate Release
Contact: Daniella Masterson 323-791-9227 Media.lacityredistricting@gmail.com

## MEDIA ADVISORY

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission Holds Last Pre-map Hearing in Council District 8

## Chair

Arturo Vargas

## Vice Chairs

"Jackie" Dupont-Walker
Robert Kadota
Who: Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commissioners
Community Stakeholders

## Commissioners

Robert Ahn
LeRoy Chase
Jose Cornejo
Julie Downey
David Ford
Christopher Ellison
Jerry Gaines
Helen B. Kim
Estela Lopez
Grover McKean
Craig Miller
David Roberti
David Roberts
Ken Sampson
Antonio Sanchez
Bobbie Jean Anderson
Michael Trujillo
Kent Wong

## Executive Director

What: The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission will hold their last Public Hearing in CD 8 to encourage input from local residents and community activists regarding the redistricting plan to draw new boundaries. Public Hearings have been held in each council district to give the community an opportunity to submit comments and provide public input directly to the Commissioners about the neighborhoods they reside and work in.

The CD 8 Public Hearing will be the last pre-map forum before the Commissioners present a draft of a new Council District Boundaries Map. The Commission will resume the last round of Public Hearings between Jan 29 - Feb. 11 to seek public input about the draft map.

## Where: The Expo Center

3980 Bill Robertson Lane
Los Angeles, CA 90037

When: January 10, 2012
6:30 pm
Andrew Westall
Outreach Director
Rani Woods
Media Director
Daniella Masterson

About the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission:
The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission is comprised of 21 appointed individuals representing constituencies citywide. Commissioners are charged with advising the Los Angeles City Council on drawing lines as mandated every 10 years by the Los Angeles City Charter. For additional information visit:
http://redistricting2011.lacity.org

## For Immediate Release

Contact: Daniella Masterson 323-791-9227 Media.lacityredistricting@gmail.com

## MEDIA ADVISORY

## The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission Conducts A City Tour of Heavily Split Communities in Council Districts

Who: Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commissioners
What: The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission will hold a press conference before embarking on a city bus tour to visit 14 of the 15 Los Angeles City Council Districts. The purpose of the tour is to allow the Commissioners to see various communities' district lines and to explore what changes, if any, are feasible after hearing public testimony in all 15 City Council Districts since December 2011.

Members of the media and the community are welcomed to join the Commissioners for a lunchtime roundtable discussion at La Costa Azul restaurant in Pacoima later that afternoon.

Where: Press Conference<br>City Hall<br>Spring Street Steps<br>200 North Spring Street<br>Los Angeles, 90012

When: Saturday, January 14, 2012
9 am
Where: Lunch Roundtable Discussion
La Costa Azul
9771 Laurel Canyon Blvd
Pacoima, 91331
When: Saturday, January 14, 2012
12:30 pm
Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission:
Estella Lopez (CD1),Craig Miller (CD2), David Ford (CD3), Grover McKean (CD4), David Roberti (CD5), Jose Cornejo (CD6), Michael Trujillo (CD7), Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8), David Roberts (CD9), Chris Ellison (CD10), Rob Kadota (CD11), Ken Sampson (CD12), Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13) Robert Ahn (CD13), Antonio Sanchez (CD14), Jerry Gaines (CD 15), Arturo Vargas (Mayor), LeRoy Chase (Mayor), Mona Soo Hoo (Mayor), Helen Kim (Controller), Julie Downey (City Attorney)


For Immediate Release
Contact: Daniella Masterson 323-791-9227 Media.lacityredistricting@gmail.com

## Redistricting Commission Releases Draft Map For All 15 Los Angeles City Council Districts

Los Angeles (January 27, 2012) - The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) has released a new draft map of the 15 council districts that include street details and Neighborhood Council boundaries. The new draft is available for review on the LACCRC website www.redistricting2011.lacity.org.

The first draft of a new map was released Wednesday. The Commission had voted to approve the draft at a meeting held at Van Nuys City Hall. While the Commissioners voted to adopt the map for public input, they cited that this initial map is a "rough draft."

The LACCRC will hold seven additional public hearings from February 1-11 to obtain feedback on the new draft map. At the conclusion of the public hearings, the LACCRC will make changes required by redistricting law and based on public input before forwarding their final map recommendation to the Los Angeles City Council on March 1, 2012. The City Council will have until July 2012 to make a final map.

More than 2,000 members of the public, including residents, business owners, community activists and other stakeholders, gave testimony at public hearings held in each of the 15 council districts between December 5 and January 11. The Commission utilized this information to draw maps that were responsive to the public and upheld traditional Redistricting criteria including the Voting Rights Act.
"The LACCRC also made proposed changes that reflected the legal criteria governed by the redistricting process of the Equal Population Principle, the 1965 Voting Rights Act and the U.S. Constitution's Equal Protection Clause," said Arturo Vargas, the LACCRC chair
"The Commission was charged with developing district maps that reflect the city," said Vargas. "With careful review of new trends in the voting age population, we knew that our draft map would require significant changes to the 15 council districts; however, this is a very rough draft of the map and the Commission will have time to fine-tune the final map."

The LACCRC will hold two media roundtables, one for the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender (LGBT) community and one for the Latino community next week. Space is limited. RSVP required. Please contact the LACCRC Media Director Daniella Masterson at (213) 922-7740 or email media.lacityredistricting@gmail.com.

Every 10 years, the City Council District boundaries are redrawn to account for population changes. The Redistricting Commission makes recommendations to the City Council on adoption of the city's redistricting plan that will establish new boundaries for the Council Districts. For more information, contact the LACCRC office at 213-922-7740 or visit the website at www.redistricting2011.lacity.org

Estella Lopez (CD1),Craig Miller (CD2), David Ford (CD3), Grover McKean (CD4), David Roberti (CD5), Jose Cornejo (CD6), Michael Trujillo (CD7), Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8), David Roberts (CD9), Chris Ellison (CD10), Rob Kadota (CD11), Ken Sampson (CD12), Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13), Robert Ahn (CD13), Antonio Sanchez (CD14), Jerry Gaines (CD 15), Arturo Vargas (Mayor), LeRoy Chase (Mayor),
Mona Soo Hoo (Mayor), Helen Kim (Controller), Julie Downey (City Attorney)

For Immediate Release
Contact: Daniella Masterson 323-791-9227 Media.lacityredistricting@gmail.com

## MEDI A ALERT

## Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission to Hold LGBT Roundtable, J an. 31

WHO: Arturo Vargas, chair, Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) Andrew Westall, Executive Director, LACCRC Richard Zaldivar, Executive Director of The Wall, Las Memorias Project and (SEUI) Local 721

WHAT: LACCRC will hold a Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Media Roundtable to discuss the city's redistricting process, the new map drafts and LGBT community engagement. The meeting is being facilitated by Las Memorias, a nonprofit dedicated to promoting wellness and preventing illness among Latino populations affected by HIV/AIDS (see http://www.thewalllasmemorias.org)

WHEN: Tuesday, Jan. 31, 2012
6:30 p.m.
Space is limited. Please RSVP at 323-791-9227
WHERE: Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 721
1545 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Every 10 years, the City Council District boundaries are redrawn to account for population changes. The Redistricting Commission makes recommendations to the City Council on adoption of the city's redistricting plan that will establish new boundaries for the Council Districts (CD). For more information, contact the LACCRC office at 213-922-7740 or visit the website at www.redistricting2011.lacity.org.

## Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission:

Estella Lopez (CD1),Craig Miller (CD2), David Ford (CD3), Grover McKean (CD4), David Roberti (CD5), Jose Cornejo (CD6),
Michael Trujillo (CD7), Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8), David Roberts (CD9), Chris Ellison (CD10), Rob Kadota (CD11), Ken Sampson (CD12), Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13), Robert Ahn (CD13), Antonio Sanchez (CD14), Jerry Gaines (CD 15), Arturo Vargas (Mayor), LeRoy Chase (Mayor), Mona Soo Hoo (Mayor), Helen Kim (Controller), Julie Downey (City Attorney)

For I mmediate Release
Contact: Daniella Masterson 323-791-9227 Media.lacityredistricting@gmail.com

## MEDI A ALERT

## Announces Updated Public Hearing Schedule

Los Angeles, Ca (February 1, 2012) - Anyone wanting to comment on the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission's recently released draft maps of the 15 council districts should attend one of the prefinal map public hearings. This is the community's last opportunity to offer public input directly to the Commissioners before the LACCRC submits a final map to City Council on March 1 and the new districts are in place for the next 10 years.

Since the release of the LACCRC's map, more than a thousand residents have contacted the Commission office regarding electoral district boundary changes. The LACCRC expects no less than 500 attendees at these last public hearings. Below is the public hearing schedule. All locations are wheelchair accessible and will be televised on Channel 35 via tape delay.

| DATE |  | TI ME | LOCATI ON |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wednesday | Feb. 1 | $6: 30$ pm | Wilshire Ebell Theatre, 743 S. Lucerne Blvd, LA 90005 |

The Commission welcomes comments by letter, email, and telephone. For more information, contact the LACCRC office at 213-922-7740 or visit the website at www.redistricting2011.lacity.org.Every 10 years, the City Council District boundaries are redrawn to account for population changes. The Redistricting Commission makes recommendations to the City Council on adoption of the city's redistricting plan that will establish new boundaries for the Council Districts.

Estella Lopez (CD1),Craig Miller (CD2), David Ford (CD3), Grover McKean (CD4), David Roberti (CD5), Jose Cornejo (CD6), Michael Trujillo (CD7), Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8), David Roberts (CD9), Chris Ellison (CD10), Rob Kadota (CD11), Ken Sampson (CD12), Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13), Robert Ahn (CD13), Antonio Sanchez (CD14), Jerry Gaines (CD 15), Arturo Vargas (Mayor), LeRoy Chase (Mayor),
Mona Soo Hoo (Mayor), Helen Kim (Controller), Julie Downey (City Attorney)

For I mmediate Release
Contact: Daniella Masterson 323-791-9227 Media.lacityredistricting@gmail.com

# MEDI A ALERT <br> Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission to Hold A Latino Media Roundtable At La Opinion Friday, Feb. 3 

| WHO: $\quad$LACCRC Chair Arturo Vargas <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> LACCRC Chair Jack Dupont-Walker Commission <br> LACCRC Commissioner Antonio Sanchez <br> Redistricting Expert Fernando Guerra |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Latinos now represent one of the fastest growing populations in Los <br> Angeles. To reflect Los Angeles' significant Latino population growth <br> from the 2010 US Census data, the LACCRC's draft map increases the |
|  | number of Voting Rights Act majority-minority council districts from |
| four to five. Latinos have been significantly absent from the public |  |
| hearing process. LACCRC's encourages them to participate in the last |  |
| series of public hearings and to learn what's at stake in their |  |
| communities. |  |

WHEN: Friday, February 3, 2012
11:00 a.m. - 12:30 pm
Space is limited. Please RSVP at 323-791-9227
WHERE: LA Opinion Newspaper
700 S. Flower St. Ste 3100
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Every 10 years, the City Council District boundaries are redrawn to account for population changes. The Redistricting Commission makes recommendations to the City Council on adoption of the city's redistricting plan that will establish new boundaries for the Council Districts (CD). For more information, contact the LACCRC office at 213-922-7740 or visit the website www.redistricting2011.lacity.org. Get up-to-date information by checking the Facebook.com/Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission and on twitter.com @ LACCRC.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission:
David Trujillo (CD1),Craig Miller (CD2), David Ford (CD3), Grover McKean (CD4), David Roberti (CD5), Jose Cornejo (CD6), Michael Trujillo (CD7), Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8), David Roberts (CD9), Chris Ellison (CD10), Rob Kadota (CD11), Ken Sampson (CD12), Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13), Robert Ahn (CD13), Antonio Sanchez (CD14), Jerry Gaines (CD 15), Arturo Vargas (Mayor), LeRoy Chase (Mayor), Mona Soo Hoo (Mayor), Helen Kim (Controller), Julie Downey (City Attorney)

For Immediate Release - February 17, 2012

Contact: Daniella Masterson 323-791-9227 Media.lacityredistricting@gmail.com

## MEDI A ALERT <br> LACCRC Releases Pre-Final Draft Map Today (See Link Below) Will Meet Next Wednesday To Vote On Final Amendments

| Who: | The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) |
| :--- | :--- |
| What: | The LACCRC releases a pre-final draft map with new amendments approved <br> by the Commission at a meeting Wednesday, February $15^{\text {th }}$ today. To review <br> the draft map proposal with new adjustments, visit |
|  | http://ens.lacity.org/cla/importdocument/claimportdocument322175834 02172012.pd |

The LACCRC will hold two meetings before sending the map to the City Council on March 1. The next meeting to vote on final adjustments to the draft map will be held on February 22nd. A final report will be presented at the last Commission meeting on Wednesday, February $29^{\text {th }}$ at City Hall in Van Nuys.

```
When: Wednesday, February 22, 2012 4 pm
```


## Where: Los Angeles City Hall

John Ferraro Council Chambers
200 N. Spring Street, Room 430
How: For more information, contact the LACCRC office at 213-922-7740 or visit the website at www.redistricting2011.lacity.org.

David Trujillo (CD1),Craig Miller (CD2), David Ford (CD3), Grover McKean (CD4), David Roberti (CD5), Jose Cornejo (CD6), Michael Trujillo (CD7), Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8), David Roberts (CD9), Chris Ellison (CD10), Rob Kadota (CD11), Ken Sampson (CD12), Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13), Robert Ahn (CD13), Antonio Sanchez (CD14), Jerry Gaines (CD 15), Arturo Vargas (Mayor), (Mayor), Mona Soo Hoo (Mayor), Helen Kim (Controller), Julie Downey (City Attorney)

# PUBLIC OUTREACH TEAM A <br> OF THE <br> LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING <br> LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** 

## PUBLIC INPUT HEARING

Monday December 5, 2011<br>7 p.m.

LAPD Devonshire Youth Center<br>8721 Wilbur Avenue<br>Northridge, CA 91324

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria
d. Presentation by the Commission Committee on Communities of Interest Definitions (15 minutes)
2. Public Testimony regarding City Redistricting (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 92277408 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.orgfor accommodations.

[^4]Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707
email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

# PUBLIC OUTREACH TEAM C <br> OF THE <br> LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING <br> LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** 

## PUBLIC INPUT HEARING

Thursday December 8, 2011<br>6:30 p.m.<br>WLCAC Phoenix Hall<br>10950 S. Central Avenue<br>Watts, CA 90059

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria
d. Presentation by the Commission Committee on Communities of Interest Definitions (15 minutes)
2. Public Testimony regarding City Redistricting (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 92277408 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.orgfor accommodations.

[^5][^6]
# PUBLIC OUTREACH TEAM A <br> OF THE <br> LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING <br> LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** 

## PUBLIC INPUT HEARING

Saturday December 10, 2011<br>11 a.m.

Alicia Broadous-Duncan Senior Center 11300 Glenoaks Boulevard Pacoima, CA 91331

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria
d. Presentation by the Commission Committee on Communities of Interest Definitions ( 15 minutes)
2. Public Testimony regarding City Redistricting (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 92277408 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.orgfor accommodations.

[^7][^8]
# PUBLIC OUTREACH TEAM B <br> OF THE <br> LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING <br> LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** 

## PUBLIC INPUT HEARING

Saturday December 10, 2011<br>11 a.m.

Santee Educational Complex
1921 South Maple Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90011

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria
d. Presentation by the Commission Committee on Communities of Interest Definitions ( 15 minutes)
2. Public Testimony regarding City Redistricting (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 92277408 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.orgfor accommodations.

[^9][^10]
# PUBLIC OUTREACH TEAM C <br> OF THE <br> LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING 

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** PUBLIC INPUT HEARING 

Monday December 12, 2011
6:30 p.m.

North Valley City Hall<br>7747 Foothill Boulevard<br>Tujunga, CA 91042

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria
d. Presentation by the Commission Committee on Communities of Interest Definitions (15 minutes)
2. Public Testimony regarding City Redistricting (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.
** This meeting is also noticed as a special meeting of the LA City Redistricting Commission because there might be a quorum ( 11 members) of the Commission present during the course of this meeting.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission<br>www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commissioners
Estela Lopez (CD1) * Craig Miller (CD2) * David Ford (CD3) * Grover McKean (CD4) * David Roberti (CD5) * Jose Cornejo (CD6) * Michael Trujillo (CD7) *
Tunua Thrash (CD8) * David Roberts (CD9) * Chris Ellison (CD10) * Rob Kadota (CD11) * Ken Sampson (CD12) * Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13) * Robert Ahn (CD13) * Antonio Sanchez (CD14) * Jerry Gaines (CD15) * Arturo Vargas (Mayor) * LeRoy Chase (Mayor) * Kent Wong (Mayor) * Helen Kim (Controller) * Julie Downey (City Attorney)

# PUBLIC OUTREACH TEAM A <br> OF THE <br> LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING 

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** PUBLIC INPUT HEARING 

Tuesday December 13, 2011<br>6:30 p.m.

Boyle Heights Senior Center<br>2839 E. $3^{\text {rd }}$ Street<br>Boyle Heights, CA 90033

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria
d. Presentation by the Commission Committee on Communities of Interest Definitions (15 minutes)
2. Public Testimony regarding City Redistricting (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.
** This meeting is also noticed as a special meeting of the LA City Redistricting Commission because there might be a quorum ( 11 members) of the Commission present during the course of this meeting.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission<br>www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

# PUBLIC OUTREACH TEAM C <br> OF THE <br> LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING 

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** PUBLIC INPUT HEARING 

Thursday December 15, 2011
6:30 p.m.

IMAN Cultural Center<br>3376 Motor Avenue<br>Palms, CA 90034

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria
d. Presentation by the Commission Committee on Communities of Interest Definitions (15 minutes)
2. Public Testimony regarding City Redistricting (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.
** This meeting is also noticed as a special meeting of the LA City Redistricting Commission because there might be a quorum ( $\mathbf{1 1}$ members) of the Commission present during the course of this meeting.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission<br>www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

OF THE
LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** PUBLIC INPUT HEARING 

Saturday December 17, 2011 11:00 a.m.<br>West Valley Christian Church<br>22450 Sherman Way<br>West Hills, CA 91307

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria
d. Presentation by the Commission Committee on Communities of Interest Definitions (15 minutes)
2. Public Testimony regarding City Redistricting (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.
** This meeting is also noticed as a special meeting of the LA City Redistricting Commission because there might be a quorum ( $\mathbf{1 1}$ members) of the Commission present during the course of this meeting.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission<br>www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

# PUBLIC OUTREACH TEAM C <br> OF THE <br> LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING 

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** PUBLIC INPUT HEARING 

Tuesday January 3, 2012<br>6:30 p.m.

Nate Holden Performing Arts Center<br>4718 W. Washington Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90016

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria
d. Presentation by the Commission Committee on Communities of Interest Definitions (15 minutes)
2. Public Testimony regarding City Redistricting (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.
** This meeting is also noticed as a special meeting of the LA City Redistricting Commission because there might be a quorum ( $\mathbf{1 1}$ members) of the Commission present during the course of this meeting.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission<br>www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

# PUBLIC OUTREACH TEAM B <br> OF THE <br> LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING 

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** PUBLIC INPUT HEARING 

Tuesday January 3, 2012<br>6:30 p.m.<br>Van Nuys City Hall 14410 Sylvan Street, Second Floor Van Nuys, CA 91401

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria
d. Presentation by the Commission Committee on Communities of Interest Definitions (15 minutes)
2. Public Testimony regarding City Redistricting (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.
** This meeting is also noticed as a special meeting of the LA City Redistricting Commission because there might be a quorum ( $\mathbf{1 1}$ members) of the Commission present during the course of this meeting.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission<br>www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

# PUBLIC OUTREACH TEAM B <br> OF THE <br> LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING 

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** PUBLIC INPUT HEARING 

Wednesday January 4, 2012<br>6:30 p.m.

Friendship Auditorium 3201 Riverside Drive<br>Los Feliz, CA 90027

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria
d. Presentation by the Commission Committee on Communities of Interest Definitions (15 minutes)
2. Public Testimony regarding City Redistricting (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.
** This meeting is also noticed as a special meeting of the LA City Redistricting Commission because there might be a quorum ( $\mathbf{1 1}$ members) of the Commission present during the course of this meeting.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission<br>www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

# PUBLIC OUTREACH TEAM A <br> OF THE <br> LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING 

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** PUBLIC INPUT HEARING 

Thursday January 5, 2012 6:30 p.m.

Fairfax High School Auditorium<br>7850 Melrose Avenue<br>Los Angeles, CA 90046

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria
d. Presentation by the Commission Committee on Communities of Interest Definitions (15 minutes)
2. Public Testimony regarding City Redistricting (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.
** This meeting is also noticed as a special meeting of the LA City Redistricting Commission because there might be a quorum ( 11 members) of the Commission present during the course of this meeting.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission<br>www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

# PUBLIC OUTREACH TEAM C <br> OF THE <br> LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING 

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** PUBLIC INPUT HEARING 

Saturday January 7, 2012<br>11:00 a.m.

St. Peter's Italian Catholic Church<br>1039 N. Broadway<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria
d. Presentation by the Commission Committee on Communities of Interest Definitions (15 minutes)
2. Public Testimony regarding City Redistricting (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.
** This meeting is also noticed as a special meeting of the LA City Redistricting Commission because there might be a quorum ( 11 members) of the Commission present during the course of this meeting.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission<br>www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

PUBLIC OUTREACH TEAM B
OF THE
LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** PUBLIC INPUT HEARING 

Monday January 9, 2012<br>6:30 p.m.<br>Los Angeles City College Theatre 855 N. Vermont Avenue<br>Los Angeles, CA 90029

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria
d. Presentation by the Commission Committee on Communities of Interest Definitions (15 minutes)
2. Public Testimony regarding City Redistricting (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.
** This meeting is also noticed as a special meeting of the LA City Redistricting Commission because there might be a quorum ( $\mathbf{1 1}$ members) of the Commission present during the course of this meeting.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission<br>www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

# PUBLIC OUTREACH TEAM A <br> OF THE <br> LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING 

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** PUBLIC INPUT HEARING 

Tuesday January 10, 2012<br>6:30 p.m.

Expo Center<br>3980 Bill Robertson Lane<br>Los Angeles, CA 90037

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria
d. Presentation by the Commission Committee on Communities of Interest Definitions (15 minutes)
2. Public Testimony regarding City Redistricting (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.
** This meeting is also noticed as a special meeting of the LA City Redistricting Commission because there might be a quorum ( $\mathbf{1 1}$ members) of the Commission present during the course of this meeting.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission<br>www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

# LOS ANGELES CITY COMMISSION REDISTRICTING COMMISSION 

## RULES ON PUBLIC COMMENT FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. The Agenda for each public hearing meeting of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission ("Commission") shall be posted at least 72 hours before the meeting. It shall contain a brief general description of each item of business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting.
2. Public Testimony Agenda Item. The Commission shall provide an opportunity in open meetings for the public to address the Commission on the Agenda item known as "Public Testimony" for a total of up to two (2) minutes per speaker, not including interruptions for non-English translation. The Presiding Officer may grant or deny speakers additional time, subject to reversal by a majority of the Commission. Speakers shall limit their comments to matters relevant to providing the Commission input on the drafting of new Council District boundaries. The Presiding Officer may rule that the speaker is out of order if the comments are not germane to public testimony. The Presiding Officer shall have the sole authority to grant a speaker's request to loan, cede, defer or yield time to another speaker. (The public-comment procedures set forth in this rule are in addition to any other hearing requirement specifically imposed by law.)
3. Other Agenda Items. The Commission shall provide an opportunity in open meetings for the public to address the Commission on each Agenda item, other than the Public Testimony agenda item discussed above, for a cumulative total of up to five (5) minutes for each item. The Presiding Officer may grant or deny speakers additional time, subject to reversal by a majority of the Commission. Speakers shall limit their comments to matters relevant to the item on the agenda. The Presiding Officer may rule that the speaker is out of order if the comments are not germane to the item under consideration. If multiple speaker cards are submitted on one agenda item, preference will be granted to members of the public who have not spoken previously during the meeting, either during
public testimony or on another agenda item. A member of the public wishing to speak on more than one agenda item at a single meeting shall limit his or her remarks to a total of five (5) minutes per meeting. A member of the public may allocate time between items in one minute increments per item. The Presiding Officer, in his or her discretion, may allow a speaker to combine remarks on multiple items so as to speak to them during one appearance at the podium. The Presiding Officer shall have the sole authority to grant a speaker's request to loan, cede, defer or yield time to another speaker. (The publiccomment procedures set forth in this rule are in addition to any other hearing requirement specifically imposed by law.)
4. General Public Comment. The Brown Act requires the Commission to provide an opportunity in regular meetings for members of the public to address it on any nonagenda item generally considered to be a Commission affair and within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission. This shall be referred to as "general public comment." Only items not on the agenda may be addressed during this period. The Commission has determined that a reasonable amount of time for general public comment shall be a cumulative total of up to fifteen (15) minutes. The Presiding Officer may exercise his or her discretion, subject to reversal by a majority of the Commission, in conducting the public comment period, including, but not limited to: re-ordering the order of business; determining an equitable amount of time that each member of the public may speak; granting or denying speakers additional time to speak, individually or collectively. If multiple speaker cards are submitted for general public comment, the speakers shall be called in the order submitted by the Commission Executive Assistant, or designee, to the Presiding Officer. However, preference shall be granted to members of the public who have not spoken previously either during public testimony or on agenda items at the immediately preceding two regular meetings. The Commission shall not discuss or take action relative to any public comment, including public testimony, unless authorized by Section 54954.2(b) of the Government Code.
5. No person shall be permitted to interrupt Commissioners, Commission staff, or City staff during a Commission Meeting.
6. No person, other than Commissioners and Commission staff, shall be admitted into the Commission business area while the Commission is meeting except upon the request of a Commissioner and consent of the Presiding Officer.
7. To facilitate the orderly process of general public comment and agenda-item public comment, members of the public who wish to address the Commission shall hand a speaker card, which includes the speaker's name, or other identifying designation, to the Commission Executive Assistant, or designee, prior to the start of the particular comment period. Members of the public shall speak from the podium in the center aisle, or where such podium is situated in the meeting room. Each speaker shall promptly conclude all comments when his or her time to speak has expired. Except at hearings expressly required by law, speakers' comments shall be limited in time as determined by the Presiding Officer. The Presiding Officer may exercise discretion in determining the duration of speakers' comments based upon factors such as the length of the agenda or substance of the agenda items, the number of public comment speaker cards submitted, the need for the Commission to conclude its business as expeditiously as is practicable, and whether the Commission is in danger of losing a quorum.

## 8. Rules of Decorum:

a. Rules of Decorum. During a meeting of the Commission, there is the need for civility and expedition in the carrying out of public business in order to ensure that the public has a full opportunity to be heard and that the Commission has an opportunity for its deliberative process. While any meeting of the Commission is in session, the following rules of decorum shall be observed. All remarks shall be addressed to the Commission as a whole and not to any single Commissioner, unless in response to a question from a Commissioner. Persons addressing the Commission shall not make personal, impertinent, unduly repetitive, slanderous or profane remarks to the Commission, any Commissioner, Commission staff, City staff, or general public, nor utter loud, threatening, personal or abusive language, nor engage in any other disorderly conduct that disrupts, disturbs or
otherwise impedes the orderly conduct of any Commission meeting. No person in the audience at a Commission meeting shall engage in disorderly or boisterous conduct, including the utterance of loud, threatening or abusive language, whistling, stamping of feet or other acts which disturb, disrupt or otherwise impede the orderly conduct of any Commission meeting. Signs, placards, banners, or similar items shall not be permitted at any time at a Commission meeting. Unless addressing the Commission or entering or leaving the Commission meeting room, all persons in the audience shall remain sitting in the seats provided. No person shall stand or sit in the center aisle, nor shall the doorways be blocked. The Presiding Officer of the Commission, with the assistance of the Sergeant-at-Arms, shall be responsible for maintaining the order and decorum of meetings, as set forth more fully below.
b. Enforcement of Decorum. At the discretion of the Presiding Officer or upon a majority vote of the Commission, the Presiding Officer may order removed from the Commission meeting room any person who fails to observe these rules of decorum, including committing any of the following acts of disruptive conduct in respect to a regular, adjourned regular or special meeting of the Commission. Disorderly, contemptuous or insolent behavior toward the Commission, any Commissioner thereof, or Commission staff, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting; A breach of the peace, boisterous conduct or violent disturbance, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting; Disobedience of any lawful order of the Presiding Officer, which shall include an order to be seated or to refrain from addressing the Commission; and any other unlawful interference with the due and orderly course of said meeting; and any person so removed shall be excluded from further attendance at the meeting from which he/she has been removed, unless permission to attend is granted upon motion adopted by a majority vote of the Commission, and such exclusion shall be executed by the Sergeant-at-Arms upon being so directed by the Presiding Officer. These enforcement provisions are in addition to the authority held by the Sergeant-at-Arms to maintain order and pursuant to his or her lawful authority as a peace officer.
c. Penalties. Any person who has been ordered removed from a meeting may be charged with a violation of Penal Code Section 403, or other appropriate Penal Code or Los Angeles Municipal Code sections.

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION 

www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org<br>COMMENT FORM<br>ON<br>COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST

Input from the public is critical to help inform the Commission about your Community of Interest. The Commission has prepared this Public Comment Form to provide the public with a way of submitting information on characteristics that may define your Community of Interest.. If you would like the Commission to consider a particular Community of Interest, we invite you to complete and submit a Public Comment Form, to speak at this public hearing or to submit your written comments to the Commission. All personal information listed on this form is voluntary and will become a part of the Commission's and City of Los Angeles' public record. The public is not required to fill out all of the questions below, but the more information the Commission gathers, the better informed the process of redrawing Council District boundaries will be.

## Date:

Name:

## Email or phone number:

What is the neighborhood/zipcode where you reside:

Name your community (neighborhood, neighborhood council):

How do you describe your community to someone who hasn't visited?

What streets/boundaries define your community?

Do you have concerns about the current boundaries of your Council District?

What are the major cultural/recreational/educational/religious institutions in your community?

Does your community have major geographical boundaries/features (freeways, parks, lakes, mountains)?

What languages are spoken in your community?

What are the major race/ethnic groups in your community?

Are there public services (e.g. bus/rail lines, libraries, public schools, police, fire) that help identify your community?

Landscape (coastal, inland, urban/suburban,/rural):

Types of homes (houses, apartments):

What issues matter to your community?

Other Comments:

#  <br>  

## 
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# LOS ANGELES 市市議會重劃選區委員會 

www．redistricting2011．lacity．org
200 N．Spring Street，Room 275
Los Angeles，CA 90012
電郵：redistricting．lacity＠lacity．org

## 共同利益

## 社區評論表格

公眾的意見對帮助委員會嘹解您的共同利益社區至關重要。委員會編制此公眾評論表格，以便公眾用該表格提交資訊，界定您所在共同利益社區的特徴。如果您希啓委員會考慮某個特定的共同利益社區，我們邀請您填寫並提交公眾評論表格，在此公共㯖塏會上發言，或者向委員會提交您的書面意見。列於此表格中的所有個人資訊均由您自願提供，並将成為委員會及 Los Angeles 市公共檔案的組成部份。公眾不必填寫以下所有問題，但委員會收集的資訊越多，就越能在知情的前提下推進重劃選區邊界的過程。

## 日期：

姓名：
電郵或電話：
您住在哪個居民區／您住處的郵派區號是甚麼：

您所在社區（居民區，居民區委員會）的名㮽是：

您如何向從未去過您所在社區的人形容該社區？

您所在社區由哪些街道／邊界界定？

對於您所虎市議會區的現行邊界，有何使您感到闌注的問題？

您所在社區有哪些主要的文化／康樂／教育／宗教機構？

您所在社區是否有任何主要的地理邊界／特徵（高速公路，公園，湖泊，山脈）？

您所在的社區講哪些語言？

您所在的社區有哪些主要種族／族裔群體？

是否有任何公共服務（例如公車／鐵路線，圖書館，公立學校，警察局，消防局等）可以用來辨識您所在社區？

地貌（沿海，内陸，都市／郊區／鄉村）：

住房類型（獨戶住宅，公寓）：

哪些問題對您所在的社區至關重要？

其他評論：

# LOS ANGELES 市市議会 <br> 再区画委員会 

www．redistricting2011．lacity．org
200 N．Spring Street，Room 275
Los Angeles，CA 90012
Eメール：redistricting．lacity＠lacity．org

## 利害の共通に関する意見用紙

利害の共通性を委員会に伝える上で皆様の意見は重要です。利害の共通性を定義するための情報を提供していただきたく，委員会は市民意見用紙を用意しました。委員会に考慮して欲しい利害の共通性 については，市民意見用紙に書くか，公聴会で発言するか，ご意見を書面にて委員会に提出してくだ さい。この用紙に記入する個人情報は自発的であり，情報は委員会および Los Angeles 市の公的な記録となります。下記の質問のすべてに答える義務はありません。しかしながら，市議会区境界を再区画する上で，より多くの情報はより役立ちます。

日付：
氏名：
Eメールあるいは電話番号 ：
居住地の地域／郵便番号：

コミュニティ（近隣地域，近隣協議会）の名称：

あなたのコミュニティを訪れたことがない人に自分のコミュニティをどのように表現しますか？

あなたのコミュニティを定義する通り／境界線は何ですか？

現在のあなたの市議会区の境界線に関して懸念はありますか？

あなたのコミュニティの主要な文化／娯楽／教育／宗教組織は何ですか？

あなたのコミュニティには主要な地理的境界／環境特徴（フリーウェイ，公園，湖，山）はありますか？

あなたのコミュニティで話す言語は何ですか？

あなたのコミュニティの主要な人種／民族は何ですか？

あなたのコミュニティを識別するのに役立つ公共サービス（バス／鉄道，図書館，公立学校，警察，消防署など）はありますか？

景観（海岸，内陸，都市／郊外／田園）：

住宅の種類（家，アパート）：

あなたのコミュニティでの問題点は何ですか？

その他のコメント：

# LOS ANGELES 시의회 <br> 지구 재설정 위원회 
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## 이해관계 커뮤니티에 대한 의견 서식

일반으로부터의 의견은 여러분의 이해관계 커뮤니티에 관한 정보를 위원회에게 알리도록 돕는데 매우 중요합니다. 위원회에서는 여러분의 이해관계 커뮤니티를 정의하는 특성에 대한 정보를 제출하는 방법으로 본 공공 의견 서식을 준비하여 일반에게 제공합니다. 만일 여러분께서 위원회가 어느 특정한 이해관계 커뮤니티에 대해 고려해주기를 원하시면, 저희는 여러분께서 공공 의견 서식을 작성하여 제출하시거나, 본 공청회에서 발언하시거나 또는 위원회에 여러분이 쓴 의견을 제출해주실 것을 요청합니다. 본 서식에 나와있는 모든 개인 정보는 자발적으로 하는 것이며 그 내용은 위원회 및 Los Angeles 시 공공 기록의 일부가 될 것입니다. 일반인들은 아래 질문을 모두 작성하지 않아도 되지만, 위원회에서 정보를 많이 수집할 수록, 시의회 지구 경계를 재설정하는 과정에 더 나은 정보를 주게 될 것입니다.

## 날짜:

이름:
이메일 또는 전화번호:
귀하가 거주하는 지역/우편번호는 무엇입니까:

귀하의 커뮤니티 이름 (거주지역, 거주지역 협의회):

방문한 적이 없는 사람에게 귀하의 커뮤니티를 어떻게 설명하시겠습니까?

귀하의 커뮤니티는 무슨 도로/경계로 구분됩니까?

귀하께서는 귀하의 현 시의회 지구 경계에 대해 문제가 있습니까?

귀하 커뮤니티의 주요 문화/레크리에이션/교육/종교 기관들은 무엇입니까?

귀하의 커뮤니티에 주요 지리적인 경계/사물(고속도로, 공원, 호수, 산)이 있습니까?

귀하의 커뮤니티에서는 무슨 언어가 사용되고 있습니까?

귀하의 커뮤니티의 주요 인종/유색인 그룹은 무엇입니까?

귀하의 커뮤니티를 구분하는데 도움이 되는 공공 서비스(예: 버스/전철선, 도서관, 공립학교, 경찰서, 소방서)가 있습니까?

주변 일대 형태(해안, 내륙, 시내/교외/전원):

거주지 형태 (주택, 아파트):

귀하의 커뮤니티에 중요한 문제는 무엇입니까?

기타 의견:
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## FORMULARIO DE COMENTARIOS SOBRE LAS COMUNIDADES DE INTERÉS

La opinión del público es decisiva para ayudar a que la Comisión se informe sobre su Comunidad de Interés. La Comisión ha preparado este Formulario de Comentarios Públicos para que el público pueda enviar información sobre características que puedan definir a su Comunidad de Interés. Si desea que la Comisión considere una Comunidad de Interés en particular, lo invitamos a que complete y envíe un Formulario de Comentarios Públicos, hable ante esta audiencia pública o envíe sus comentarios por escrito a la Comisión. Toda la información personal que se incluya en este formulario es voluntaria y formará parte del registro público de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles y de la Comisión. El público no está obligado a responder todas las preguntas que aparecen a continuación. No obstante, cuanto mayor sea la información que reúna la Comisión, el proceso contará con mejor información para volver a realizar el trazado de los límites del distrito del Concejo Municipal.

Fecha:

## Nombre:

## Correo electrónico o número de teléfono:

¿En qué vecindario reside y cuál es el código postal?

Nombre su comunidad (vecindario, consejo vecinal):
¿Cómo describe usted su comunidad a una persona que nunca ha estado en ella?
¿Qué calles o límites definen a su comunidad?
¿Tiene inquietudes con los límites actuales de su Distrito del Concejo Municipal?
¿Cuáles son las principales instituciones religiosas, educativas, recreativas y culturales en su comunidad?
¿Hay en su comunidad límites geográficos o características principales (autopistas, parques, lagos, montañas)?
¿Qué idiomas se hablan en su comunidad?
¿Cuáles son los principales grupos étnicos y raciales en su comunidad?
¿Existen en su comunidad servicios públicos que ayudan a identificarla (por ej. líneas de autobuses y trenes, bibliotecas, escuelas públicas, policía, bomberos)?

Paisaje (costero, interior, urbano, suburbano, rural):

Tipos de hogares (casas, apartamentos):
¿Qué asuntos tienen importancia en su comunidad?

Otros comentarios:

# KONSEHO NG LUNSOD NG LOS ANGELES KOMISYON SA MULING PAGDISTRITO 
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## PORMULARYO PARA SA PUNA <br> SA MGA KOMUNIDAD NG INTERES

Ang kontribusyon mula sa publiko ay napakahalaga upang makatulong na ipagbigay-alam sa Komisyon ang tungkol sa inyong Komunidad ng Interes. Inihanda ng Komisyon itong Pormularyo para sa Puna ng Publiko upang bigyan ang publiko ng isang paraan ng pagsumite ng impormasyon tungkol sa mga katangian na maaaring maglarawan sa inyong Komunidad ng Interes. Kung gusto ninyong isaalang-alang ng Komisyon ang isang partikular na Komunidad ng Interes, iniimbitahan namin kayo na kumpletuhin at isumite ang isang Pormularyo para sa Puna ng Publiko, upang magsalita sa pampublikong pagdinig na ito o upang isumite ang inyong mga nakasulat na puna sa Komisyon. Lahat ng mga personal na impormasyong nakalista sa pormularyong ito ay boluntaryo at magiging isang bahagi ng pampublikong rekord ng Komisyon at ng Lunsod ng Los Angeles. Ang publiko ay hindi inaatasan na sagutin ang lahat ng mga katanungan sa ibaba, pero mas maraming impormasyon ang malikom ng Komisyon, higit na magkakaroon ng kaalaman ang proseso ng muling pagguhit ng mga hangganan ng Distrito ng Konseho.

## Petsa:

## Pangalan:

## Email o numero ng telepono:

Ano ang kapitbahayan/zipcode kung saan kayo naninirahan:

## Pangalanan ang inyong komunidad (kapitbahayan, konseho ng kapitbahayan):

Paano ninyo inilalarawan ang inyong komunidad sa isang taong hindi pa nakakabisita?

Anu-anong mga kalye/hangganan ang naglalarawan sa inyong komunidad?

Mayroon ba kayong mga ikinababahala tungkol sa mga kasalukuyang hangganan ng inyong Distrito ng Konseho?

Anu-ano ang mga pangunahing institusyong pangkultura/panlibangan/pang-edukasyon/panrelihiyon sa inyong komunidad?

Ang inyo bang komunidad ay may malalaking hangganang pangheograpiya/katangian (mga priwey, parke, lawa, bundok)?

Anu-anong mga wika ang sinasalita sa inyong komunidad?

Anu-ano ang mga pangunahing grupo batay sa lahi/etnisidad sa inyong komunidad?

Mayroon bang mga pampublikong serbisyo (halimbawa ay mga linya ng bus/tren, mga aklatan, mga pampublikong paaralan, pulisya, bumbero) na tumutulong na ilarawan ang inyong komunidad?

Likas na tanawin (baybaying-dagat, malayo sa dagat, lunsod/labas ng lunsod,/nayon):

Mga uri ng mga tahanan (mga bahay, mga apartment):

Anu-anong mga isyu ang mahalaga sa inyong komunidad?

Ibang mga Puna:

# คณะกรรมาธิการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ของ สภาเทศบาลนครลอสแองเจลลิส 
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## แบบฟอร์มแสดงความคิดเห็น เกี่ยวกับ ความสนใจร่วมกันของชุมชน

ความเห็นจากประชาชนป็นสิ่งที่สำคัญที่ช่วยแจ้งให้คณะกรรมาธิการทราบเกี่ยวกับความสนใจร่วมกันของชุมชนของคุณ คณะกรรมาธิการได้จัดเตรียมแบบฟอร์มแสดงความคิดเห็นของประชาชนนี้เพื่อให้ประชาชนมีวิธีการแจ้งข้อมูลเรื่องลักษณะต่างๆ ที่อาจกำหนดความสนใจร่วมกันของชุมชนของคุณ หากคุณต้องการให้คณะกรรมาธิการพิจารณาถึงความสนใจร่วมกัน ของชุมชนที่เป็นการเฉพาะ เราขอให้คุณกรอกรายละเอียดและส่งแบบฟอร์มแสดงความคิดเห็นของประชาชน เพื่อที่จะได้สนทนา เรื่องดังกล่าวที่ประชาพิจารณ์นี้ หรือ เขียนความคิดเห็นของคุณและส่งไปที่คณะกรรมาธิการ ข้อมูลส่วนบุคคลทั้งหมดที่มีอ ยู่ในแบบฟอร์มนี้ได้มาโดยสมัครใจ และจะเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของบันทึกสาธารณะของคณะกรรมาธิการและนครลอสแองเจลลิส ประชาชนไม่จำเป็นต้องตอบคำถามด้านล่างทั้งหมด แต่ถ้าคณะกรรมาธิการได้รวบรวมข้อมูลมากยิ่งขึ้นเท่าใด ก็จะทำให้กระบวนการ การกำหนดเขตแดนใหม่ยิ่งดีมากขึ้นเท่านั้น

วันที่:

ชื่อ:

อีเมลหรือหมายเลขโทรศัพท์:
คุณอาคัยอยู่ในชุมชนใดหรืออยู่ในเขตรหัสไปรษณีย์ใด:

ชื่อชุมชนของคุณ (ชุมชน สภาชุมชน):

คุณจะอธิบายถึงลักษณะชุมชนของคุณให้กับผู้ซึ่งไม่เคยไปชุมชนคุณมาก่อนว่าอย่างไร

ถนนหรือเขตแดนใดที่เป็นตัวกำหนดเขตชุมชนของคุณ

คุณมีข้อห่วงกังวลเกี่ยวกับเขตแดนในปัจจุบันของสภาเขตของคุณหรือไม่

สถาบันวัฒนธรรม/การสันทนาการ/การศึกษา/ศาสนาที่สัาคัญๆ ในชุมชนของคุณคือ

ชุมชนของคุณมีเขตแดน/ลักษณะทางภูมิศาสตร์ที่สำคัญๆ หรือไม่ (ทางหลวง สวนสาธารณะ ทะเลสาบ ภูเขา)

คุณพูดภาษาใดในชุมชนของคุณ

ในชุมชนของคุณประกอบด้วยกลุ่มเชื้อชาติ/ชาติพันธุ์ใดเป็นส่วนใหญ่

มีบริการสาธารณะ (เช่น รถประจำทาง/รถไฟ ห้องสมุด โรงเรียนรัฐบาล สถานีตำรวจ สถานีดับเพลิง) ที่ช่วยกำหนดชุมชนของคุณหรือไม่

ภูมิทัศน์ (ใกล้ชายฝัง ห่างจากชายผัง ในเมือง/ชานเมือง/ชนบท):

ประเภทของบ้าน (บ้าน อพาร์ทเมนท์):

มีประเด็นใดที่เป็นสิ่งสำคัญต่อชุมชนของคุณ

ความคิดเห็นอี่นๆ:

# HỘI ĐỒNG THÀNH PHỐ LOS ANGELES ỦY BAN TÁI PHÂN CHIA KHU 
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Sự góp ý của công chúng rất quan trọng nhằm giúp cho Ủy Ban biết về Quyền Lợi của Cộng Đồng quý vị. Ủy Ban đã soạn thảo Bản Góp Ý của Công Chúng này để tạo cho công chúng cách đệ trình những chi tiết về các đặc điểm vốn có thể giúp xác định Quyền Lợi của Cộng Đồng quý vị. Nếu quý vị muốn Ủy Ban xem xét cụ thể về Quyền Lợi của Cộng Đồng, chúng tôi mời quý vị điền và gửi lại Bản Góp Ý của Công Chúng này, trình bày bằng lời nói tại buổi trưng cầu dân ý hoặc gửi thư góp ý đến Ủy Ban. Tất cả những chi tiết cá nhân ghi trong bản này đều có tính cách tư nguyên và sẽ trở thành một phần trong hồ sơ công cộng của Ủy Ban và của Thành Phố Los Angeles. Công chúng không cần phải điền vào tất cả những câu hỏi dưới đây, nhưng Ủy Ban càng thu thập được nhiều chi tiết, thì tiến trình vẽ lại ranh giới của các Khu Hội Đồng càng được chính xác hơn.

Ngày:
Tên:

## Email hoặc số điện thoại:

Quý vị ở trong khu phố/số bưu chính nào:

Cho biết tên của cộng đồng quý vị (khu phố, hội đồng khu phố):

Quý vị mô tả về cộng đồng của mình như thế nào đối với người chưa từng đến đó?

Có những con đường/ranh giới nào giúp xác định cộng đồng của quý vị không?

Quý vị có quan tâm gì về ranh giới Khu Hội Đồng hiện thời của quý vị không?

Xin cho biết những cơ sở văn hóa/giải trí/giáo dục/tôn giáo chính trong cộng đồng của quý vị?

Cộng đồng của quý vị có nhũng ranh giới/đặc điểm chính nào về địa lý (xa lộ, công viên, hồ, núi)?

Những ngôn ngữ nào được sử dụng trong cộng đồng của quý vị?

Xin cho biết những nhóm chủng tộc/dân tộc chính trong cộng đồng của quý vị?

Có những dịch vụ công cộng nào (thí dụ như tuyến đường xe bus/xe điện, thư viện, trường công lập, cảnh sát, cứu hỏa) có thể giúp xác định cộng đồng của quý vị không?

Cây cảnh (duyên hải, nội địa, thành thị/ngoại ô,/nông thôn):

Loại nhà (nhà riêng, chung cư):

Nhũng vấn đề nào là quan trọng đối với cộng đồng của quý vị?

Ý Kiến Khác:

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION 
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## Frequently Asked Questions

## What is redistricting?

Every 10 years, City Council district boundaries are re-drawn to account for population changes. The Redistricting Commission makes recommendations to the City Council on adoption of the City's redistricting plan that sets the boundaries of City Council districts.

## Why is it important?

How and where districts are drawn can shape communities’ ability to elect the representatives of their choice. Districts must be made as equal in population as possible and practicable so that communities have equal access to political representation.

## Who are the Commissioners and how were they selected?

Information on the twenty-one (21) Commissioners and their duties, appointment, and term can be found on our website.

## How will the Commission encourage public input?

The Commission welcomes comments at any of our public meetings, as well as by telephone, letter, or email. In addition to regular meetings, at least 20 public hearings will be held throughout the redistricting process. At least one public hearing will be held in each current Council district. The public comment form for written comments can be found on our website.

## When and where will public hearings be held?

Public hearings will be held November through December 2011 in anticipation of adopting a draft plan in January 2012. Public hearings will again be held January through February 2012 in anticipation of adopting a final plan by March 1, 2012. The current schedule is available on our website. Suggestions for facilities locations are welcomed and encouraged.

## How can my community stay informed and get involved?

We encourage you to request a community presentation, attend a meeting, public hearing, submit comments, and contact us anytime throughout this process. More information on how to get involved is available on our website.

#   
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## 常見問題解答

## 何調重劃選區？

每隔 10 年需要對市議會區邊界進行一次重新劃分，以反映人口變化。重劃選區委員會就採納本市重劃選區計劃，確定市議會區的邊界而向市議會提供建議。

## 為何這很重要？

如何及在何處劃分選區將决定社區選舉其所選代表的能力。在可行的情況下，各選區的人口應儘量均等，以使所有社區都能平等享有政治代表權。

## 委員會有哪些委員，而且如何選出這些委員？

有關委員會二十一（21）名委員及其職責，委任及任期的資訊登載於我們的網站上。

## 委員會將如何鼓勵公眾發表意見？

委員會歡迎公眾透過公眾會議，電話，信件或電郵發表評論。除定期會議以外，還將在重劃選區的整個過程中至少舉行 20 次公共㯖證會。每個現有市議會區都將至少舉行一次公共聽證會。用來發表書面意見的公眾評論表格登載於我們的網站上。

## 公共聽證會將在何時及何地舉行？

公共聽證會將在2011年11月至12月期間舉行，以便在2012年1月採納一項計畫草案。 2012年1月至2月期間將再次舉行公共聽證會，以便於2012年3月1日前採納計畫定稿。目前的時間安排表登載於我們的網站上。歡迎並鼓勵您對舉行聽證會的地點提出建議。

## 我所在社區如何隨時獲悉進展情況並參與其中？

我們鼓勵您在此過程中隨時提出舉辦社區講座的請求，參加會議及公共聽證會，提交意見並聯絡我們。有關如何參與的詳細資訊，請瀏覽我們的網站。

# LOS ANGELES市市議会 <br> 再区画委員会 
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## よくある質問

## 再区画とは何ですか？

人口の変化に伴い市議会区境界線を10年ごとに再調整します。再区画委員会は，市議会に市議会区の境界線を引く再区画計画の推奨案を提出します。

## なぜそれが重要なのですか？

どのようにどこに区の境界線を引くかによって，代表を選出するコミュニティの選出力の度合いが決まります。コミュニティが政治代表者を平等に利用できるように，区はできる限り人口が均等であり実用的でなければなりません。

## 誰が委員で，どのように選出されたのですか？

二十一（21）名の委員，義務，専任，および期間はウェブサイトをご覧ください。

## 委員会が市民に意見を出すよう奨励する方法は何ですか？

委員会の公的なミーティングや電話，書状，Eメールで意見を伺います。定例会議に加えて再区画プロセスにおいて最低でも20の公聴会を開きます。現行の各市議会区で最低でも一回は公聴会が開かれます。意見を書く市民意見用紙はウェブサイトから入手できます。

## いつどこで公聴会が開かれるのですか？

2012年1月には計画の下書きが作成されることを想定して，公聴会は2011年11月から12月に開かれます。2012年3月1日には最終計画が作成されることを想定して，公聴会は2012年1月 と2月にも開かれます。現在の日程はウェブサイトをご覧ください。施設の場所についての ご提案をお願いいたします。

自分のコミュニティが情報に通じて関与するにはどうしたらいいですか？
コミュニティプレゼンテーションを要請し，ミーティングや公聴会に参加し，意見を提出 し，このプロセス中にいつでも委員会にご連絡ください。どのように関与するかの詳細は ウェブサイトをご覧ください。

# LOS ANGELES 시의회 지구 재설정 위원회 
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## 자주 나오는 질문들

## 지구 재설정이 무엇입니까?

매 10 년마다 시의회 지구 경계가 인구 변동을 반영하기 위해 새로 정해집니다. 지구 재설정 위원회에서는 시의회 지구 경계를 정하는 시의 지구 재설정 계획안 채택에 대해 시의회에 추천을 합니다.

## 무엇이 중요합니까?

지구 경계를 어떻게 어디에 정하는가 하는 것은 커뮤니티에서 자신이 선택한 대표를 선출시킬 수 있는 능력을 정하게 됩니다. 지구는 가능한한 그리고 실질적으로 동등한 숫자의 인구로 정해져서 커뮤니티들이 정치적 대표를 세우는데 동등한 입장을 가져야 합니다.

## 위원회 위원들은 누구이며 그들은 어떻게 선발됩니까?

이십일(21)명의 위원과 그들의 의무, 임명, 및 임기에 관한 정보는 저희 웹사이트에서 찾아볼 수 있습니다.

## 위원회에서는 일반인으로부터의 의견을 어떻게 장려할 것입니까?

위원회에서는 전화, 편지, 또는 이메일뿐만 아니라 저희 공청회 어디에서라도 의견을 환영합니다. 정기 모임 이외에 적어도 20 개의 공청회가 지구 재설정 과정 전체를 통해 열릴 것입니다. 현재의 각 시의회 지구마다 최소한 한번의 공청회가 열릴 것입니다. 서면으로 의견을 보내는 공공 의견 서식은 저희 웹사이트에서 찾아볼 수 있습니다.

## 언제 어디서 공청회가 열립니까?

공청회는 초기 계획안 채택이 2012년 1월에 있을 것으로 예상하여 2011년 11월부터 12월까지 열릴 것입니다. 최종 계획안 채택이 2012년 3월 1일에 있을 것으로 예상하여 2012년 1월부터 2월까지 공청회가 다시 열릴 것입니다. 현재 일정은 저희 웹사이트에 나와 있습니다. 공청회 장소에 대한 제안을 환영하고 있으며 장려합니다.

## 나의 커뮤니티가 어떻게 계속 정보를 받으며 참여할 수 있습니까?

저희들은 여러분께서 본 과정 전반에 걸쳐 커뮤니티에 대한 발표를 요청하고, 모임과 공청회에 참석하며, 의견을 제출하고 언제든지 저희에게 연락하실 것을 권합니다. 참여 방법에 대한 추가 정보는 저희 웹사이트에 나와 있습니다.

# CONCEJO MUNICIPAL DE LA CIUDAD DE LOS ÁNGELES COMISIÓN DE REDISTRIBUCIÓN DE DISTRITOS 
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## Preguntas Frecuentes

## ¿Qué es la redistribución de distritos?

Cada 10 años, se vuelve a realizar el trazado de los límites del distrito del Concejo Municipal de la ciudad en respuesta a los cambios poblacionales. La Comisión para la Redistribución de Distritos recomienda al Concejo Municipal en la adopción del plan de redistribución de la ciudad, el cual fija los límites de los distritos del Concejo Municipal.

## ¿Por qué es importante?

La forma y el lugar en que se trazan los distritos puede dar forma a la capacidad de las comunidades para elegir representantes. Los distritos deben tener, en lo posible, igual cantidad de población para que las comunidades tengan el mismo acceso a la representación política.

## ¿Quiénes son los Comisionados y cómo fueron elegidos?

Se puede obtener información sobre los veintiún (21) Comisionados y sus funciones, nombramiento y período en el cargo en nuestro sitio web.

## ¿De qué manera la Comisión incentivará la opinión pública?

La Comisión acoge los comentarios en todas las reuniones públicas, así como también por teléfono, carta o correo electrónico. Además de las reuniones regulares, se llevarán a cabo al menos 20 audiencias públicas a lo largo del proceso de redistribución de distritos. Se llevará a cabo al menos una audiencia pública en cada distrito actual del Concejo municipal. Se puede encontrar el formulario de comentarios públicos en nuestro sitio web.

## ¿Cuándo y dónde se llevarán a cabo las audiencias públicas?

Las audiencias públicas se llevarán a cabo de noviembre a diciembre de 2011 en antelación a la adopción de un plan borrador en enero de 2012. Las audiencias públicas se llevarán a cabo nuevamente de enero a febrero de 2012 en antelación a la adopción del plan final el 1 de marzo de 2012. El cronograma actual está disponible en nuestro sitio web. Se incentiva a que se realicen sugerencias sobre lugares para establecimientos y éstas son bienvenidas.

## ¿De qué manera puede mantenerse informada e involucrada mi comunidad?

Lo incentivamos a que solicite una presentación de comunidad, asista a una reunión, audiencia pública, envíe comentarios y se ponga en contacto con nosotros en cualquier momento durante este proceso. Hay más información disponible sobre la manera de involucrarse en nuestro sitio web.

# KONSEHO NG LUNSOD NG LOS ANGELES <br> KOMISYON SA MULING PAGDISTRITO 
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## Mga Madalas Itanong

## Ano ang muling pagdistrito?

Tuwing 10 taon, ang mga hangganan ng distrito ng Konseho ng Lunsod ay muling iginuguhit upang isaalang-alang ang mga pagbabago sa populasyon. Ang Komisyon sa Muling Pagdistrito ay gumagawa ng mga rekomendasyon sa Konseho ng Lunsod sa pagpapatibay ng plano sa muling pagdistrito ng Lunsod na nagtatatag ng mga hangganan ng mga distrito ng Konseho ng Lunsod.

## Bakit mahalaga ito?

Kung paano at saan iginuguhit ang mga distrito ay makahuhubog ng kakayahan ng mga komunidad na maghalal ng mga kinatawang pinili nila. Ang mga distrito ay dapat gawing pantay sa populasyon hanggang posible at makakaya upang ang mga komunidad ay magkaroon ng pantay na daan sa pagkatawang pampulitika.

## Sinu-sino ang mga Komisyonado at paano sila pinili?

Ang impormasyon tungkol sa dalawampu't-isang (21) Komisyonado at sa kanilang mga tungkulin, paghirang, at takdang panahon sa panunungkulan ay matatagpuan sa aming lugar ng web.

## Paano hihimukin ng Komisyon ang kontribusyon ng publiko?

Malugod na tinatanggap ng Komisyon ang mga puna sa alinman sa aming mga pampublikong pulong, gayon din sa pamamagitan ng telepono, liham, o email. Bilang karagdagan sa mga regular na pulong, hindi kukulangin sa 20 pampublikong pagdinig ang gaganapin sa buong proseso ng muling pagdistrito. Isa o higit na pampublikong pagdinig ang gaganapin sa bawat kasalukuyang distrito ng Konseho. Ang pormularyo para sa puna ng publiko para sa mga nakasulat na puna ay matatagpuan sa aming lugar ng web.

## Kailan at saan gaganapin ang mga pampublikong pagdinig?

Ang mga pampublikong pagdinig ay gaganapin sa Nobyembre hanggang Disyembre 2011 bilang pag-asa sa pagpapatibay ng isang borador na plano sa Enero 2012. Ang mga pampublikong pagdinig ay muling gaganapin sa Enero hanggang Pebrero 2012 bilang pagasa sa pagpapatibay ng isang panghuling plano sa ika-1 ng Marso, 2012. Ang kasalukuyang iskedyul ay makukuha sa aming lugar ng web. Ang mga mungkahi para sa mga lugar ng mga pasilidad ay malugod na tinatanggap at hinihimok.

# KONSEHO NG LUNSOD NG LOS ANGELES <br> KOMISYON SA MULING PAGDISTRITO 

## Paano mananatiling may-kaalaman at kalahok ang aking komunidad?

Hinihimok namin kayo na humiling ng isang presentasyon ng komunidad, dumalo sa isang pulong, pampublikong pagdinig, magsumite ng mga puna, at makipag-ugnayan sa amin kahit kailan sa buong prosesong ito. Ang karagdagang impormasyon tungkol sa kung paano lumahok ay makukuha sa aming lugar ng web.

# คณะกรรมาธิการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ของ สภาเทศบาลนครลอสแองเจลลิส 
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## คำถามที่พบบ่อย

## การจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่คืออะไร

ทุกๆ 10 ปี จะมีการจัดแบ่งเขตแดนของสภาเขตเทศบาลนครเนื่องจากมีการเปลี่ยนแปลงประชากร คณะกรรมการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่แนะนำให้สภาเขตลงมติยอมรับแผนงานการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ ของเมืองซึ่งมีการกำหนดเขตแดนของสภาเขตเทศบาลนคร

## ทำไมถึงมีความสำคัญ

จะมีการแบ่งเขตอย่างไรและที่ไหนซึ่งจะทำให้ชุมชนสามารถเลือกผู้แทนได้ตามที่ตนต้องการ เขตต่างๆ จะต้องได้รับการจัดแบ่งจำนวนประชากรให้เท่ากันมากที่สุดและเหมาะสมเพื่อที่ว่าชุมชนนั้นจะได้รับความเสมอ ภาคในการเข้าถึงผู้แทนทางการเมือง

## คณะกรรมาธิการคือใครและได้รับเลือกมาได้อย่างไร

สามารถดูรายละเอียดเกี่ยวกับคณะกรรมาธิการทั้งยิ่สิบเอ็ด (21) ท่าน พร้อมกับหน้าที่ ตารางนัดหมาย และวาระได้ที่เร็บไซซ์

## คณะกรรรมาธิการจะส่งเสริมให้ประชาชนช่วยกันออกความเห็นได้อย่างไร

คณะกรรมาธิการยินดีรับความคิดเห็นจากการประชุมสาธารณะของเรา และทางโทรศัพท์ จดหมาย หรืออีเมล นอกจากการประชุมการตามปกติแล้ว จะมีการจัดประชาพิจารณ์อย่างน้อย 20 ครั้ง ตลอดกระบวนการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ จะมีการจัดประชาพิจารณ์อย่างน้อยหนึ่งครั้งในสภาเขต ปัจจุบันแต่ละเขต สามารถดูความคิดเห็นของประชาชนที่เป็นลายลักษณ์อักษรได้ที่เว็บไซต์

## จะมีการจัดประชาพิจารณ์ขึ้นเมื่อใดและที่ใด

จะมีการจัดประชาพิจารณ์ในเดือนพฤศจิกายนจนถึงเดือนธันวาคม 2554 เพื่อหวังที่จะลงมติยอมรับ แผนงานฉบับร่างในเดือนมกราคม 2555 และจะมีการจัดประชาพิจารณ์ขึ้นอีกครั้งในเดือนมกราคม จนถึงเดือนกุมภาพันธ์ 2555 เพื่อหวังที่จะลงมติยอมรับแผนงานฉบับสมบูรณ์ภายในวันที่ 1 มีนาคม 2555 สามารถดูรายละเอียดกำหนดการปัจจุบันได้ที่เว็บไซต์ ทางเรายินดีรับฟังเกี่ยวกับข้อเสนอของสถานที่ จัดประชุม

## ชุมชนของข้าพเจ้าจะได้รับการแจ้งข่าวสารและมีส่วนร่วมได้อย่างไร

เราขอสนับสนุนให้คุณขอให้มีการนำเสนอของชุมชน การเข้าร่วมประชุม ประชาพิจารณ์ เสนอความเห็น และ ติดต่อเราได้ทุกเวลาตลอดกระบวนการนี้ สามารถดูรายละเอียดถึงวิธีการเข้าร่วมได้ที่เว็บไซต์

# HỘI ĐỒNG THÀNH PHỐ LOS ANGELES ỦY BAN TÁI PHÂN CHIA KHU <br> www.redistricting2011.lacity.org <br> 200 N. Spring Street, Room 275 <br> Los Angeles, CA 90012 <br> email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org 

## Nhũng Thắc Mắc Thông Thường

## Tái phân chia khu là gì?

Mỗi 10 năm, Hội Đồng Thành Phố sẽ vẽ lại đường ranh giới của các khu cho phù hợp với sự thay đổi về dân số. Ủy Ban Tái Phân Chia Khu đệ trình những đề nghị cho Hội Đồng Thành Phố để thông qua kế hoạch tái phân chia khu của Thành Phố nhằm ấn định ranh giới của các khu Hội Đồng Thành Phố.

## Tại sao điều đó lại quan trọng?

Cách thức và nơi vẽ các khu có thể quyết định khả năng của các cộng đồng để bầu chọn những người đại diện cho họ. Các khu phải có dân số ở mức tương đương nhau và nếu có thể được để các cộng đồng có cơ hội được đại diện bình đẳng về chính trị.

## Các Ủy Viên Hội Đồng là ai và họ được chọn như thế nào?

Có thể tìm đọc những chi tiết về hai mươi mốt (21) Ủy Viên Hội Đồng và những bổn phận, sự chỉ định, và nhiệm kỳ của họ trong website của chúng tôi.

## Ủy Ban sẽ làm thế nào để khuyến khích công chúng góp ý?

Ủy Ban tiếp nhận những góp ý tại tất cả những buổi họp công cộng của chúng tôi, cũng như qua điện thoại, thư, hay email. Ngoài những buổi họp thường, còn có ít nhất 20 buổi trưng cầu dân ý được tổ chức trong suốt tiến trình tái phân chia khu. Sẽ có ít nhất một buổi trưng cầu dân ý được tổ chức tại mỗi khu Hội Đồng hiện hữu. Bản góp ý của công chúng để đóng góp ý kiến có thể tìm thấy trong website của chúng tôi.

## Những buổi trưng cầu dân ý sẽ được tổ chức vào lúc nào và ở đâu?

Những buổi trưng cầu dân ý sẽ được tổ chức từ tháng Mười Một đến tháng Mười Hai năm 2011 trước khi thông qua kế hoạch dự thảo vào tháng Giêng năm 2012. Những buổi trưng cầu dân ý sẽ được tổ chức lại từ tháng Giêng đến tháng Hai năm 2012 trước khi thông qua kế hoạch cuối cùng vào ngày 1 tháng Ba , 2012. Lịch trình hiện thời đã có sẵn trong website của chúng tôi. Chúng tôi hoan nghênh và khuyến khích những đề nghị về địa điểm cơ sở.

## Làm thế nào để cộng đồng của tôi được cập nhật thông tin và được tham gia?

Chúng tôi khuyến khích quý vị nên yêu cầu thuyết trình về cộng đồng, tham dự buổi họp, trưng cầu dân ý, gửi góp ý, và liên lạc với chúng tôi bất cứ lúc nào trong suốt tiến trình này. Trong website của chúng tôi có đăng thêm thông tin về cách tham gia.

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION 

## 2011-12 WORKING TIMELINE

(Updated 1-13-12)

Opening of Commission Office
Nov. 21, 2011

Pre-Draft Map Public Hearings

Adoption of Commission's Guiding Principles

Commission Tour of the City of Los Angeles

Group Presentations to Commission
Presentation and Adoption of Draft Council District Boundaries Map

Pre-Final Map Public Hearings

Presentation and Adoption of Final Council District Boundaries Map

Presentation and Adoption of Final Commission Report

Final Commission Report Submitted to City Council

Commission Presentation on Final Report to City Council's Rules and Elections Committee

Closing of Commission Office
Mar. 31, 2012

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION 

## 2011-12 REGULAR MEETING SCHEDULE

(Updated 1-13-12)
All regular meetings of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission will take place at 4 pm in the afternoon, subject to change by the posting of a Special Meeting Agenda.

Tues. November 22, 2011

Wed. December 14, 2011

Wed. January 11, 2012

Tues. January 17, 2012

Wed. January 18, 2012

Wed. January 25, 2012

Wed. February 8, 2012 John Ferraro Council Chambers (Meeting moved to 6:30pm for Special Public Hearing)

Wed. February 22, 2012

Wed. February 29, 2012

John Ferraro Council Chambers Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring Street, Room 340
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Van Nuys City Hall

John Ferraro Council Chambers

Van Nuys City Hall

John Ferraro Council Chambers
John Ferraro Council Chambers

Van Nuys City Hall

John Ferraro Council Chambers

John Ferraro Council Chambers

John Eerraro Council Chambers

Van Nuys City Hall

Van Nuys City Hall 14410 Sylvan Street, Second Floor Van Nuys, CA 91401

## Standard Statement of the Chair - Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission Public Hearings

Welcome to this hearing of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission. Let me first ask my colleagues to introduce themselves and to state by whom they were appointed to serve on this Commission.

Thank you. The full Commission has 21 members: 14 appointed by each member of the City Council, the City Controller, and the City Attorney; two by the Council President; and three by the Mayor. We have elected Mr. Arturo Vargas as Chairman, and Ms. Jackie Dupont Walker and Mr. Robert Kadota as Vice Chairs. To date we have had XX meetings to organize ourselves, establish our procedures and processes, and hire staff.

This hearing is part of the first phase of soliciting public input in our work. There will be many other opportunities. We are committed to providing the residents of our City with full opportunity to participate in this process. We are holding at least one hearing in each Council District prior to the development of any maps. We have divided ourselves into three teams of seven so that we can hold these 15 hearings. After this first round of hearings, the full Commission will tour the City to observe firsthand the issues that you have presented before us. Once we develop an initial map public, the full Commission will hold a second round of hearings early next year to receive your further input. Our final map must be completed by March 1, 2012. Our map will then go to the City Council which has until July 1, 2012 to adopt the final map.

We are making redistricting software and data to the public so that you may submit your own recommended maps. We also are making the information we gather available online through our Commission website as well as providing the public the opportunity to submit testimony, comments and maps online.

Before we begin receiving your comments, the City Attorney will provide a brief overview of the redistricting law and criteria that we are obligated to follow. That presentation will be followed by a member of our Communities of Interest Committee who will explain the concept of "Communities of Interest" and how this information is crucial to the success of our work.
(City Attorney and Communities of Interest Committee representative report)
(Public testimony begins, limited to 2 minutes a person)
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## 主席的標準聲明－Los Angeles 市市議會重劃選區委員會公共聽證會

歡迎您出席 Los Angeles 市市議會重劃選區委員會的本次聽證會。讓我首先請我的同事做自我介紹，並說明他們由誰委任在本委員會任職。

謝謝。整個委員會共有 21 名委員：其中 14 名分別由市議會的各位議員，市審計長及市檢察官委任，兩名由市議會議長委任，三名由市長委任。我們推選 Arturo Vargas 先生擔任主席，Jackie Dupont Walker 女士及 Robert Kadota 先生擔任副主席。迄今，我們已經舉行 XX 次會議，商議委員會的組織，建立各項程序及流程並聘請工作人員。

本次聽證會是徵求公眾意見第一階段的部份工作。還會有許多其他機會。我們致力於向本市居民提供參與這一過程的充分機會。在編制任何地圖之前，我們將在每個市議會區至少舉行一次聽證會。我們把本委員會分成三組，每組七人，以便舉行這 15 次聽證會。在此第一輪聽證會之後，全體委員會將巡視本市，以便親自瞭解您向我們提交的問題。編制出最初的地圖後，全體委員會將於明年年初舉行第二輪聽證會，以聽取你們的進一步意見。我們必須於 2012 年 3 月 1 日之前完成最終的地圖。然後向市議會呈遞該地圖，而市議會必須於 2012 年 7 月 1 日之前採納最終地圖。

我們向公眾提供重劃選區的軟體及資料，以便您提交您推薦的地圖。我們還透過委員會的網站把我們收集的資訊公佈在網上，並向公眾提供在網上提交證詞，意見及地圖的機會。

在我們開始聽取您的意見之前，市檢察官將簡要介紹我們必須遵循的重劃選區之法律及標準。在上述講話之後，共同利益社區委員會的一名委員將解釋「共同利益社區」的概念以及此資訊對我們工作的成敗是多麼關鍵。
（市檢察官及共同利益社區委員會代表作報告）
（開始公眾證詞發言，限每人 2 分鐘時間）

## 議長からのお知らせ－Los Angeles 市市議会再区画委員会公聴会

Los Angeles 市市議会再区画委員会の公聴会にようこそ起こしくださいました。まず，私の同僚達に自己紹介と本委員会には誰から指名されたのかを話してもらいます。

よろしくお願いいたします。委員会には 21 名の委員がいます。各市議会議員，市監査官，市法務官から14名，市議会会長から2名，市長から 3 名が指名されました。議長 には Arturo Vargas 氏，副議長に Jackie Dupont Walker 氏および Robert Kadota 氏が選出さ れました。今までに XX 回のミーティングを開き，打ち合わせをし，手続きとプロセス を設定し，スタッフを雇いました。

本公聴会は委員会の任務に対して皆様のご意見を求める第一段階の一部です。今後，多 くの機会がもたらされます。市民の皆様がこのプロセスに参加されますように，委員会 は全力をあげてその機会を設けております。地図を作成する前に各市議会区では最低 1回の公聴会を開きます。一組7人のチームを三組作り，15の公聴会を開きます。第1回公聴会の後，皆様が提示した問題をじかに見るために委員全員が市を見て回ります。初回の地図を作成した後，委員会は皆様のご意見を伺うために来年早々に第 2 回の公聴会を開きます。2012年3月1日までに地図を完成しなければなりません。その地図は市議会に届けられ，2012年7月1日までに最終調整がされます。

皆さまが自分の推奨する地図を提示できるように再区画ソフトウェアとデータを作成し ております。また，委員会ウェブサイトを通じて委員会が得た情報の閲覧や，皆様の主張，意見，地図を提出できるようにいたします。

皆さまのご意見を伺う前に，準拠しなければならない再区画法および基準の概要を市法務官が説明いたします。続いて，利害の共通委員会委員が「利害の共通」の概念と委員会の任務の成功にこの情報がいかに重要であるかを説明いたします。
（市法務官および利害の共通委員会代表からのお知らせ）
（市民の発言開始，一人 2 分に制限）

## 의장의 표준 성명서 - Los Angeles 시의회 지구 재설정 위원회 청문회

Los Angeles 시의회 지구 재설정 위원회의 본 청문회에 오신 것을 환영합니다. 먼저 동료 위원들에게 각자 자신을 소개하고 누구에게 임명을 받아 본 위원회에서 봉직하게 되었는지 밝히도록 부탁하겠습니다.

감사합니다. 위원회 전원은 21 명입니다: 시의회 의원 각자에 의해 임명된 14 명, 시회계관, 그리고 시법무관; 시의회 의장에 의해 임명된 2 명; 그리고 시장에 의해 임명된 3 명입니다. 저희는 Arturo Vargas 씨를 의장에, Jackie Dupont Walker 여사와 Robert Kadota 씨를 부의장으로 선출하였습니다. 지금까지 저희는 우리의 조직을 갖추고, 절차와 과정을 세우며, 직원들을 고용하기 위해 XX 번 회의를 하였습니다.

본 청문회는 우리의 작업에 대한 공공 의견을 요청 반영하기 위한 제 일단계의 일부입니다. 여러가지 다른 기회들이 있을 것입니다. 저희는 우리 시 주민들에게 본 과정에 참여할 수 있는 모든 기회를 드릴 것을 약속합니다. 우리는 어떠한 지도가 개발되기 이전에 시의회 각 지구에서 최소한 한번의 청문회를 가질 것입니다. 저희는 본 15 번의 청문회를 가질 수 있도록 우리를 7 명씩 세 팀으로 나누었습니다. 본 제 1 차 청문회 후에 위원회 전체가 여러분께서 저희에게 제시한 문제점들을 직접 살펴보기 위해 시 전체를 둘러 보겠습니다. 저희가 일단 초기 지도를 개발 공개한 후, 위원회 전체가 여러분들로부터 추가 의견을 수렴하기 위해 내년 초에 제 2 차 청문회를 열겠습니다. 우리의 최종 지도는 2012 년 3 월 1 일까지 반드시 완성되어야 합니다. 우리의 지도는 그후 시의회에 갈 것이며 시의회에서는 최종 지도를 채택하기 위해 2012 년 7 월 1 일까지 시한을 갖게 됩니다.

저희는 여러분께서 여러분 자신이 추천하는 지도를 제출하도록, 일반에게 공개할 지구 재설정 소프트웨어와 데이타를 만들고 있습니다. 저희는 또한 일반인들에게 증언, 의견 및 지도를 온라인으로 제출할 수 있는 기회를 제공하는 것뿐만 아니라 저희가 수집한 자료들을 위원회 웹사이트를 통해 온라인으로 입수할 있게 하고 있습니다.

저희가 여러분의 의견을 접수하기 전에, 시 법무관이 우리가 의무적으로 따라야하는 지구 재설정법과 기준에 대한 개요를 간단히 발표할 것입니다. 본 발표가 끝나면 이해관계 커뮤니티 위원회의 위원이 나와 "이해관계 커뮤니티"의 개념에 대해 그리고 본 내용이 우리 작업의 성공에 얼마나 중요한지 설명할 것입니다.
(시 법무관과 이해관계 커뮤니티 위원회 대표 보고)
(일반인 증언 시작, 각 사람마다 2 분 제한)

Declaración Estándar del Presidente - Audiencias Públicas de la Comisión para la Redistribución de Distritos del Concejo Municipal de Los Ángeles.

Bienvenido a esta audiencia de la Comisión para la Redistribución de Distritos del Concejo Municipal de Los Ángeles. En primer lugar, permítanme pedirles a mis colegas que se presenten y digan por quiénes fueron nombrados para prestar servicio en esta Comisión.

Gracias. Toda la Comisión tiene 21 miembros: 14 fueron nombrados por cada miembro del Concejo Municipal, el Contralor de la Ciudad y el Abogado Municipal; dos por el Presidente del Concejo Municipal y tres por el Alcalde. Hemos elegido como Presidente al Sr. Arturo Vargas y como Vicepresidentes, a la Sra. Jackie Dupont Walker y al Sr. Robert Kadota. A la fecha, hemos llevado a cabo XX reuniones para organizarnos, establecer nuestros procedimientos y procesos y contratar al personal.

Esta audiencia forma parte de la primera fase para solicitar la opinión pública en nuestro trabajo. Habrán muchas más oportunidades. Estamos comprometidos a que los residentes de nuestra ciudad tengan todas las oportunidades de participar en este proceso. Antes de desarrollar los mapas, estamos llevando a cabo al menos una audiencia en cada distrito del Concejo Municipal. Nos hemos dividido en tres equipos de siete personas para poder llevar a cabo las 15 audiencias. Luego de esta primera ronda de audiencias, toda la Comisión recorrerá la ciudad para observar por sí misma los asuntos que le fueron presentados. Una vez que desarrollemos un mapa público inicial, toda la Comisión llevará a cabo una segunda ronda de audiencias a principios del año que viene para recibir más opiniones. El mapa final debe completarse hasta el 1 de marzo de 2012. Luego se lo enviará al Concejo Municipal, el cual tendrá hasta el 1 de julio de 2012 para adoptar el mapa final.

Estamos creando un software de redistribución de distritos y datos para el público para que éste pueda enviar sus propios mapas que desee recomendar. También estamos poniendo a disposición en línea la información que reunimos a través del sitio web de la Comisión y dándole al público la oportunidad de enviar testimonios, comentarios y mapas a través de Internet.

Antes de comenzar a recibir sus comentarios, el Abogado Municipal dará una breve perspectiva general de las leyes de redistribución de distritos y los criterios que debemos seguir. Luego de la presentación, un miembro del Comité de Comunidades de Interés explicará el concepto de "Comunidades de Interés" y de qué manera es decisiva esta información para que nuestro trabajo tenga éxito.
(Informe representativo del Abogado Municipal y del Comité de Comunidades de Interés)
(Comienza el testimonio público, está limitado a 2 minutos por persona)

## Pangkaraniwang Pahayag ng Tagapangulo - Mga Pampublikong Pagdinig ng Komisyon sa Muling Pagdistrito ng Konseho ng Lunsod ng Los Angeles

Tuloy kayo dito sa pagdinig ng Komisyon sa Muling Pagdistrito ng Konseho ng Lunsod ng Los Angeles Hayaan ninyong ipakilala muna ng aking mga kasamahan ang kanilang mga sarili at sabihin kung sino ang humirang sa kanila na maglingkod sa Komisyong ito.

Salamat po. Ang buong Komisyon ay may 21 miyembro: 14 na hinirang ng bawat miyembro ng Konseho ng Lunsod, ng Kontroler ng Lunsod, at ng Abugado ng Lunsod; dalawa ang hinirang ng Presidente ng Konseho; at tatlo ang hinirang ng Alkalde. Inihalal namin si Mr. Arturo Vargas bilang Tagapangulo, at Ms. Jackie Dupont Walker at Mr. Robert Kadota bilang mga Pangalawang Tagapangulo. Sa ngayon nagkaroon na tayo ng XX pulong upang organisahin ang ating mga sarili, itatag ang ating mga patakaran at proseso, at kumuha ng mga tauhan.

Ang pagdinig na ito ay bahagi ng unang yugto ng paghingi ng kontribusyon ng publiko sa ating gawain. Magkakaroon ng marami pang ibang mga pagkakataon. Kami ay nakalaang magbigay sa mga residente ng ating Lunsod ng buong pagkakataong lumahok sa prosesong ito. Kami ay magsasagawa ng isa o higit na pagdinig sa bawat Distrito ng Konseho bago ang pagbuo ng anumang mga mapa. Hinati namin ang aming sarili sa tatlong pangkat ng pito upang maisagawa namin ang 15 pagdinig na ito. Pagkatapos nitong unang raun ng mga pagdinig, ang buong Komisyon ay maglilibot sa Lunsod upang obserbahan nang tuwiran ang mga isyung iniharap ninyo sa amin. Sa sandaling mabuo namin ang panimulang mapa, ang buong Komisyon ay magsasagawa ng ikalawang raun ng mga pagdinig sa unang bahagi ng susunod na taon upang matanggap ang karagdagang kontribusyon ninyo. Ang aming panghuling mapa ay dapat makumpleto bago lumampas ang ika-1 ng Marso, 2012. Kasunod ay pupunta ang aming mapa sa Konseho ng Lunsod na may hanggang ika-1 ng Hulyo, 2012 upang pagtibayin ang panghuling mapa.

Kami ay gumagawa ng programa sa muling pagdistrito at mga datos sa publiko upang maaari kayong magsumite ng inyong mga inirerekomendang mapa. Ang impormasyong nalilikom namin ay inihahanda rin namin online sa pamamagitan ng lugar ng web ng Komisyon at nagbibigay rin kami sa publiko ng pagkakataong magsumite ng testimonya, puna at mga mapa online.

Bago kami magsimulang tumanggap ng inyong mga puna, ang Abugado ng Lunsod ay magbibigay ng maikling pangkalahatang-tanaw sa batas at mga pamantayan sa muling pagdistrito na dapat naming sundin. Ang presentasyong iyon ay susundan ng isang miyembro ng aming Komite ng mga Komunidad ng Interes na magpapaliwanag ng konsepto ng "Mga Komunidad ng Interes" at kung paano ang impormasyong ito ay napakahalaga sa tagumpay ng aming gawain.
(Ulat ng Abugado ng Lunsod at kinatawan ng Komite ng mga Komunidad ng Interes)
(Ang testimonya ng publiko ay magsisimula, limitado sa 2 minuto bawat tao)

## แถลงการณ์ของประธาน - ประชาพิจารณ์ของคณะกรรมการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ของสภาเทศบาล นครลอสแองเจลลิส

ขอต้อนรับเข้าสู่ประชาพิจารณ์ของคณะกรรมการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ของสภาเทศบาล นครลอสแองเจลลิสนี้ ก่อนอื่นผม/ดิฉันอยากให้เพื่อนร่วมงานของผม/ดิฉันได้แนะนำตัวเอง และชี้แจงให้พวกเราทราบว่าใครเป็นผู้แต่งตั้งตนเป็นคณะกรรมาธิการนี้

ขอขอบคุณ คณะกรรมาธิการทั้งหมดมีสมาชิก 21 ท่าน: สมาชิกแต่ละท่านของสภาเทศบาลนครแต่งตั้ง 14 ท่าน ผู้ดูแลคลังของเมืองแต่งตั้ง 1 ท่าน และอัยการเมืองแต่งตั้ง 1 ท่าน ประธานสภาแต่งตั้ง 2 ท่าน และนายกเทศมนตรีแต่งตั้ง 3 ท่าน เราได้เลือก Mr. Arturo Vargas ให้เป็นประธาน และ Ms. Jackie Dupont Walker และ Mr. Robert Kadota เป็นรองประธาน จวบจนถึงปัจจุบันนี้เรามีประชุม XX ครั้งเพื่อที่จัดระบบองค์กรของเรา จัดตั้งขั้นตอนและกระบวนการต่างๆ และว่าจ้างเจ้าหน้าที่

ประชาพิจารณ์ครั้งนี้เป็นส่วนหนึ่งของช่วงแรกของการระดมความคิดเห็นจากประชาชนเกี่ยวกับงานของเรา และจะมีโอกาสอื่นๆ อีกมากมาย เรามุ่งมั่นที่จะให้โอกาสผู้อาศัยในเมืองของเราอย่างเต็มที่ในการเข้า ร่วมในกระบวนการนี้ เราจะจัดให้มีประชาพิจารณ์อย่างน้อยหนึ่งครั้งในสภาเขตแต่ละเขตก่อนที่จะมี การจัดทำแผนที่ใดๆ เราได้จัดตั้งทีมงานสามทีมด้วยกันโดยที่แต่ละทีมจะประกอบด้วยเจ้าหน้าที่ เจ็ดท่านเพื่อให้เราสามารถจัดประชาพิจารณ์นี้ได้ 15 ครั้ง หลังจากประชาพิจารณ์ที่จัดขึ้นเป็นครั้งแรกนี้ คณะกรรมาธิการทุกท่านจะเดินทางไปทั่วเมืองเพื่อรับฟังประเด็นปัญหาที่คุณได้แจ้งให้เราทราบโดยตรง เมื่อเราได้จัดทำแผนที่สาธารณะเป็นครั้งแรก คณะกรรมาธิการทุกท่านจะจัดประชาพิจารณ์ขึ้นเป็นครั้ง ที่สองในตอนต้นปีหน้าเพื่อเปิดรับความคิดเห็นเพิ่มเติมจากคุณ เราต้องจัดทำแผนที่ฉบับสมบูรณ์ให้เสร็จสิ้น ภายในวันที่ 1 มีนาคม 2555 จากนั้น จะมีการส่งแผนที่ของเราไปที่สภาเขตภายใน 1 กรกฎาคม 2555 เพื่อมีการลงมติยอมรับแผนที่ฉบับสมบูรณ์นี้

เรากำลังทำซอฟแวร์และข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่นี้ให้กับประชาชน คุณจะได้ส่งแผนที่ ที่คุณแนะนำแก่เราได้ นอกจากนี้ เรากำลังจัดทำข้อมูลที่เรารวบรวมได้ไว้ทางออนไลน์ผ่านทางเว็บไซต์ ของคณะกรรมาธิการของเรา พร้อมกับให้โอกาสประชาชนในการส่งข้อเท็จจริง ความคิดเห็น และแผนที่ได้ทางออนไลน์

ก่อนที่เราเริ่มรับความคิดเห็นของคุณ อัยการเมืองจะแจ้งให้ทราบถึงภาพรวมโดยย่อของกฎหมาย และเกณฑ์เกี่ยวกับการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ที่เราต้องปฎิบัติตาม หลังการนำเสนอดังกล่าว สมาชิกของคณะกรรมการด้านความสนใจร่วมกันของชุมชนจะเป็นผู้อธิบายแนวคิดของ "ความสนใจร่วมกันของชุมชน" และข้อมูลนี้มีความสำคัญอย่างไรที่จะทำให้งานของเราประสบ ความสำเร็จลุล่วงได้ด้วยดี
(รายงานของอัยการเมืองและตัวแทนคณะกรรมการด้านความสนใจร่วมกันของชุมชน)
(เริ่มคำให้การข้อเท็จจริงของประชาชน จำกัดไว้ที่ 2 นาทีต่อหนึ่งคน)

## Tuyên Ngôn Tiêu Chuẩn của Chủ Tịch - Trung Cầu Dân Ý của Ủy Ban Tái Phân Chia Khu Hội Đồng Thành Phố Los Angeles

Kính chào quý vị đến dự buổi họp này của Ủy Ban Tái Phân Chia Khu Hội Đồng Thành Phố Los Angeles. Trước tiên xin cho phép tôi được nhờ các đồng nghiệp của tôi tự giới thiệu về chính họ và nói rõ ai đã chỉ định họ để phục vụ trong Ủy Ban này.

Cám ơn quý vị. Toàn bộ Ủy Ban gồm có 21 ủy viên: 14 ủy viên được chỉ định bởi mỗi ủy viên Hội Đồng Thành Phố, Kiểm Soát Viên Thành Phố, và Luật Sư Thành Phố; hai người bởi Chủ Tịch Hội Đồng; và ba người bởi Thị Trưởng. Chúng tôi đã bầu Ông Arturo Vargas làm Chủ Tịch, và Cô Jackie Dupont Walker và Ông Robert Kadota làm Phó Chủ Tịch. Đến nay chúng tôi đã có XX buổi họp để tổ chức cơ cấu, đặt ra những thủ tục và tiến trình, và tuyển nhân viên.

Buổi họp này là một phần của giai đoạn thứ nhất nhằm lấy ý kiến công chúng trong công việc của chúng tôi. Sẽ còn rất nhiều dịp khác. Chúng tôi quyết tâm đem đến cho người dân trong Thành Phố của chúng ta cơ hội trọn vẹn để được tham gia vào tiến trình này. Chúng tôi sẽ tổ chức ít nhất là một buổi họp tại mỗi Khu Hội Đồng trước khi soạn thảo bản đồ. Chúng tôi đã chia ra thành ba nhóm bảy người để chúng tôi có thể tổ chức 15 buổi họp này. Sau vòng họp thứ nhất này, toàn bộ Ủy Ban sẽ đi khắp Thành Phố để quan sát tận mắt những vấn đề mà quý vị trình bày với chúng tôii. Sau khi chúng tôi soạn thảo bản đồ công cộng khởi đầu, toàn bộ Ủy Ban sẽ tổ chức vòng họp thứ hai vào đầu năm tới để đón nhận thêm ý kiến của quý vị. Bản đồ sau cùng của chúng tôi phải hoàn tất vào ngày 1 tháng $\mathrm{Ba}, 2012$. Sau đó bản đồ của chúng tôi sẽ được đệ trình cho Hội Đồng Thành Phố trong thời gian đến ngày 1 tháng Bảy, 2012 để thông qua bản đồ cuối cùng.

Chúng tôi sẽ lập ra software và dữ kiện tái phân chia khu cho công chúng để quý vị có thể gửi những bản đồ mà quý vị đề nghị. Chúng tôi cũng sẽ cung cấp những thông tin mà chúng tôi thu thập được trong mạng điện toán qua website của Ủy Ban chúng tôi cũng như cung cấp cho công chúng cơ hội để gửi lời chứng, ý kiến nhận xét và các bản đồ trong mạng điện toán.

Trước khi chúng tôi bắt đầu đón nhận ý kiến của quý vị, Luật Sư Thành Phố sẽ cung cấp những thông tin tổng quát ngắn gọn về điều luật và tiêu chuẩn tái phân chia khu mà chúng tôi có bổn phận phải tuân theo. Tiếp theo phần thuyết trình đó sẽ có ủy viên của Ủy Ban Quyền Lợi Cộng Đồng của chúng tôi giải thích về khái niệm "Quyền Lợi của Cộng Đồng" và lý do tại sao thông tin này rất quan trọng đối với sự thành cồng trong công việc của chúng tôi.
(Luật Sư Thành Phố và đại diện Ủy Ban Quyền Lợi Cộng Đồng báo cáo)
(Phần tiếp nhận lời chứng của công chúng bắt đầu, giới hạn mỗi người 2 phút)

## Standard Statement of the City Attorney's Office - Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission Public Hearings

On behalf of the Los Angeles City Attorney’s Office, we welcome you to this public hearing of the Los Angeles City Redistricting Commission. Our Office’s role is to provide legal advice to the City, including this Commission, throughout the redistricting process. We would like to take this opportunity to discuss several important laws and legal principles that apply to redistricting.

The Los Angeles City Charter requires the City Council to redraw the lines for the City’s 15 Council districts at least once every 10 years. The Charter creates this Redistricting Commission to advise the City Council on the drawing of the Council district lines. The Charter requires the Redistricting Commission to obtain public input, prepare a redistricting proposal and present the proposal to the City Council by March 1, 2012.

Several important legal criteria govern the redistricting process:
Equal Population Principle - Council districts must contain, as nearly as practicable, equal portions of the total population of the City. This principle is established in the City Charter and also in the United State Supreme Court's "One-Person, One-Vote" decisions.
U.S. Constitution's Equal Protection Clause - The United States Supreme Court has held that race cannot be used as the predominant factor in drawing district lines such that traditional redistricting criteria are subordinated to considerations of race.

Voting Rights Act of 1965 - The Voting Rights Act prohibits voting practices which result in a denial or abridgement of the right to vote on account of race, color or language minority status. Redistricting plans must be analyzed under the Voting Rights Act to ensure they do not deprive minority voters of an equal opportunity to elect representatives of their choice in violation of the Act.

Traditional Redistricting Criteria - Federal, state and city law have established several traditional redistricting criteria all of which shall be considered to the extent feasible when drawing district lines:

Contiguity - all parts of a district should connect Compactness - districts should be geographically compact
Existing Boundaries - districts should consider boundaries such as geographic, street and political boundaries
Communities of Interest - districts should preserve communities of people sharing common interests

More information regarding the laws governing the City's redistricting process are available on the Redistricting Commission's website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org. Thank you.
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## 市檢察官辦公室的標準聲明－Los Angeles 市市議會重劃選區委員會公共聽證會

我們代表 Los Angeles 市檢察官辦公室歡迎您參加 Los Angeles 市重劃選區委員會的本次公共聽證會。本辦公室的作用是在整個重劃選區的過程中向市府提供法律建議。我們願意藉此機會討論適用於重劃選區的若干重要法律及法律原則。

Los Angeles 市憲章要求市議會至少每隔 10 年將本市 15 個市議會區的邊界重新劃分一次。本重劃選區委員會係依據市憲章的規定成立，旨在向市議會提供有關劃分市議會區邊界的建議。市憲章要求重劃選區委員會於 2012 年 3 月 1 日前徵求公眾意見，擬定重劃選區的提議，並向市議會呈遞該提議。

重劃選區的過程受若干重要法律標準的管限：

人口均等原則－在可行的情況下，各個市議會區的人口必須儘量均等。市憲章及美國最高法院在「一人一票」之裁定中規定了這一原則。

美國憲法的平等保護條款－美國最高法院已經裁定，不能把種族作為劃分選區邊界的主要因素，例如傳統的重劃選區標準服從於關於種族的考慮。

1965 年投票權法案－投票權法案禁止以種族，膚色或語言少數族群身份為由而否決或剝奪投票權的投票做法。必須依據投票權法案而分析重劃選區的計畫，以確保這些計畫不會違反該法案，剝奪少數族群選民按照自己的意願選舉其代表者的平等機會。

傳統的重劃選區標準－聯邦，州及市法律都規定了若干傳統的重劃選區標準。在可行的前提下，劃分選區邊界時應考慮這些標準：

連綿性－一個選區的所有部份應彼此連接
緊湊性－各選區均應具備地理方面的緊湊性
現有邊界－選區應考慮現有邊界，例如地理邊界，街道及政治邊界等
共同利益社區－選區應保全擁有共同利益的社區

有關適用於本市重劃選區過程法律的詳盡資訊，請瀏覽重劃選區委員會網站： www．redistricting2011．lacity．org。謝謝。

## 市法務官事務局からのお知らせ－Los Angeles 市市議会再区画委員会公聴会

Los Angeles 市再区画委員会公聴会にご出席いただき，Los Angeles 市法務官事務局にな り代わりお礼申し上げます。当事務局の役割は，本委員会を含め再区画のプロセスにお いて法的な助言を市に提供することです。この場をお借りして再区画に関する重要な法律や法的事項について説明させていただきたいと思います。

Los Angeles 市憲章は15の市議会区の境界線を最低でも 10 年ごとに再区画することを市議会に要請します。憲章により市議会再区画の境界線を助言する再区画委員会が創設さ れます。憲章に準拠し，再区画委員会は市民の意見を聞き，再区画提案を作成し，2012年3月1日までに提案を市議会に提出します。

再区画プロセスにおける重要な法的基準：
均等人口の原則－市議会区の人口比率は，可能な限り，市の合計人口と均等な比率であること。本原則は市憲章に制定されており，かつ米国最高裁判所の「一人一票」の判決に基づきます。

アメリカ合衆国憲法均等保護条項－米国最高裁判所は境界線を引く上で人種が支配要因であってはならないとしており，人種に関しては従来型の再区画基準は従属的である。

1965 年投票権利法－投票権利法は人種，肌の色，または少数民族言語による投票権の拒否または剥奪を禁止する。再区画計画は，少数民族の有権者が選択肢の代表者に投票する均等機会を剥奪されないことを保証する投票権利法に違反しない ように，検討されなければなりません。

従来型再区画基準－連邦法，州法，市法は区の境界線を引く上で適当であるとす る以下の従来型の再区画基準を制定しました。

隣接－区の全ての箇所は隣接していなければならない
小規模－区は地理的に小規模であること
既存の境界－区は地理的，街路，政治的境界を考慮しなければならない
利害の共通－区は市民共通の利害を保護しなければならない
市の再区画プロセスに関する法律の詳細は再区画委員会ウェブサイト www．redistricting2011．lacity．orgをご覧ください。よろしくお願いいたします。

## 시 법무관실의 표준 성명서 - Los Angeles 시의회 지구 재설정 위원회 청문회

Los Angeles 시 법무관실을 대표하여, Los Angeles 시의회 지구 재설정 위원회의 본 청문회에 오신 여러분을 환영합니다. 저희 법무관실의 역할은 지구 재설정 과정 전반에 걸쳐, 본 위원회를 포함하여, 시에 법률 자문을 제공하는 것입니다. 저희는 이 기회를 통해 지구 재설정에 적용되는 여러 주요 법률과 법적 원칙을 설명하고자 합니다.

Los Angeles 시 헌장은 시의회로 하여금 매 10 년마다 최소한 한번 시의 15 개 시의회 지구 경계를 재설정하도록 요구하고 있습니다. 본 헌장은 시의회 지구 경계 설정에 대해 시의회에 자문을 제공하도록 지구 재설정 위원회를 창설하고 있습니다. 본 헌장은 지구 재설정 위원회로 하여금 2012년 3월 1일까지 일반 의견을 수렴하여, 지구 재설정 제안서를 준비하고 본 제안서를 시의회에 제출하도록 요구하고 있습니다.

여러 주요 법적 기준이 지구 재설정 과정에 적용됩니다:
인구 균등 원칙 - 시의회 지구에는, 실질적으로 근사하게, 시 전체 인구의 동일한 숫자가 포함되어야 합니다. 이 원칙은 시 헌장에 또한 미 연방 대법원의 "일인 일표" 결정에 수립되어 있습니다.

미 헌법의 균등 보호 조항 - 미 대법원에서는 지구 경계 설정에 인종이 주요 요소로 사용될 수 없음을 명시하였으며 따라서 전통적인 지구 재설정 기준은 인종을 고려하는 것에 종속됩니다.

1965년 투표권 법 - 투표권 법은 인종, 피부색 또는 언어상으로 소수 민족인 이유로 인해 투표권이 거부 또는 탈취되는 결과를 초래하는 투표 진행을 금하고 있습니다. 지구 재설정 계획은 본 계획이 소수계 유권자들이 그들 선택에 따른 대표를 선출하는 동등한 기회를 투표권 법을 위반하여 탈취하지 않도록 보장하기 위해 투표권 법 하에 반드시 검토되어야 합니다.

전통적인 지구 재설정 기준 - 연방, 주, 시 법은 전통적인 지구 재설정 기준을 여러가지 제정하였으며 이 모든 법은 지구 경계 설정시 적용가능 한도까지 고려되어야 합니다:

인접성 - 지구의 모든 부분은 붙어 있어야 합니다
밀집성 - 지구는 지리적으로 밀집되어 있어야 합니다
기존의 경계 - 지구는 지리적, 도로상 및 정치적인 경계선을 고려해야 합니다
이해관계 커뮤니티 - 지구는 공통된 이해를 갖고 있는 주민 사회를 보존해야 합니다

시의 지구 재설정 과정에 적용되는 법에 대한 추가 정보는 지구 재설정 위원회의 다음 웹사이트에 나와 있습니다: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org. 감사합니다.

## Declaración estándar de la Oficina del Abogado Municipal - Audiencias Públicas de la

 Comisión para la Redistribución de Distritos del Concejo Municipal de Los ÁngelesEn representación de la Oficina del Abogado Municipal de Los Ángeles, le damos la bienvenida a esta audiencia pública de la Comisión para la Redistribución de Distritos de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles. La función de nuestra oficina es asesorar legalmente a la ciudad, incluso a esta Comisión, a lo largo del proceso de redistribución de distritos. Queremos aprovechar esta oportunidad para hablar sobre varias leyes y principios legales importantes que se aplican a la redistribución de distritos.

En la Carta Constitutiva de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles se exige que, por lo menos una vez cada 10 años, el Concejo Municipal vuelva a realizar el trazado de líneas de los 15 distritos del Concejo Municipal de la Ciudad. La Carta crea esta Comisión para la Redistribución de Distritos, cuyo fin es asesorar al Concejo Municipal en relación con el trazado de las líneas del distrito del Concejo Municipal. En la Carta se exige a la Comisión para la Redistribución de Distritos que obtenga la opinión pública, prepare una propuesta de redistribución de distritos y la presente ante el Concejo Municipal hasta el 1 de marzo de 2012.

En el proceso de redistribución de distritos rigen varios criterios legales de importancia:
Principio de Igualdad de Población - En la medida de lo posible, los distritos del Concejo Municipal deben tener porciones iguales del total de población de la ciudad. Este principio está establecido en la Carta Constitutiva y en las decisiones de la Corte Suprema de los Estados Unidos que se basan en el principio "Una persona, un voto".

Cláusula de Protección Igualitaria de la Constitución de los EE. UU. - La Corte Suprema de los Estados Unidos sostiene que la raza no puede ser el factor predominante durante el trazado de las líneas de los distritos, de tal forma que los criterios tradicionales de redistribución de distritos están subordinados a consideraciones de raza.

Ley de Derecho al Voto de 1965 - La Ley de Derecho al Voto prohíbe las prácticas electorales que tengan como resultado la negación o reducción del derecho al voto según la situación de las minorías en cuanto a raza, color o idioma. Los planes para la redistribución de distritos deben analizarse conforme a la Ley de Derecho al Voto con el fin de asegurarse de que los votantes que pertenecen a las minorías no sean privados de la igualdad de oportunidades para elegir a sus representantes y de que no se viole la Ley.

Criterios Tradicionales de Redistribución - Las leyes federales, estatales y municipales establecieron varios criterios tradicionales de redistribución que, en la medida de lo posible, deben considerarse para el trazado de las líneas de los distritos:

Contigüidad - todas las partes de un distrito deben conectarse
Compactibilidad - los distritos deben ser geográficamente compactos
Límites Existentes - los distritos deben tener en cuenta los límites, como límites geográficos, de calles y políticos
Comunidades de Interés - los distritos deben preservar las comunidades de personas que tienen intereses en común

Hay más información disponible sobre las leyes que rigen el proceso de redistribución de distritos de la ciudad en el sitio web de la Comisión para la Redistribución de Distritos: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org. Gracias.

Pangkaraniwang Pahayag ng Opisina ng Abugado ng Lunsod - Mga Pampublikong Pagdinig ng Komisyon sa Muling Pagdistrito ng Konseho ng Lunsod ng Los Angeles

Sa ngalan ng Opisina ng Abugado ng Lunsod ng Los Angeles, malugod naming tinatanggap kayo sa pampublikong pagdinig na ito ng Komisyon sa Muling Pagdistrito ng Lunsod ng Los Angeles. Ang tungkulin ng aming Opisina ay magkaloob ng payong pambatas sa Lunsod, kabilang ang Komisyong ito, sa buong proseso ng muling pagdistrito. Gusto naming samantalahin ang pagkakataong ito upang talakayin ang ilang mahahalagang batas at mga prinsipyong pambatas na angkop sa muling pagdistrito.

Ang Saligang-Batas ng Los Angeles ay nag-aatas sa Konseho ng Lunsod na muling iguhit ang mga linya para sa 15 distrito ng Konseho ng Lunsod kahit minsan tuwing 10 taon. Nililikha ng Saligang-Batas itong Komisyon sa Muling Pagdistrito upang payuhan ang Konseho ng Lunsod sa pagguhit ng mga linya ng distrito ng Konseho. Ang Saligang-Batas ay nag-aatas sa Komisyon sa Muling Pagdistrito na kumuha ng kontribusyon ng publiko, maghanda ng isang mungkahi sa muling pagdistrito at iharap ang mungkahi sa Konseho ng Lunsod bago lumampas ang ika-1 ng Marso, 2012.

Ilang mahahalagang pamantayang pambatas ang namamahala sa proseso ng muling pagdistrito:

Prinsipyo ng Pantay na Populasyon - Ang mga distrito ng konseho ay dapat magtaglay, hanggang sa pinakamalapit na makakaya, ng magkakapantay na bahagi ng kabuuang populasyon ng Lunsod. Ang prinsipyong ito ay itinatag sa Saligang-Batas ng Lunsod at gayon din sa mga desisyong "Isang-Tao, Isang-Boto" ng Korte Suprema ng Estados Unidos.

Sugnay na Pantay na Proteksiyon ng Saligang-Batas ng Estados Unidos - Ang Korte Suprema ng Estados Unidos ay nagpasiya na ang lahi ay hindi magagamit bilang pangunahing dahilan sa pagguhit ng mga linya ng distrito upang ang naturang tradisyunal na pamantayan sa muling pagdistrito ay mapailalim sa mga pagsasaalang-alang sa lahi.

Batas ng 1965 sa mga Karapatan sa Pagboto - Ang Batas sa mga Karapatan sa Pagboto ay nagbabawal sa mga gawaing pagboto na nagreresulta sa pagkakait o pagkaputol ng karapatang bumoto dahil sa katayuan bilang minorya batay sa lahi, kulay o wika. Ang mga plano sa muling pagdistrito ay dapat suriin sa ilalim ng Batas sa mga Karapatan sa Pagboto upang matiyak na ang mga ito ay hindi labag sa Batas na nagkakait sa mga minoryang botante ng pantay na pagkakataong maghalal ng mga kinatawang pinili nila.

Mga Pamantayan sa Tradisyunal na Muling Pagdistrito - Ang pederal, pang-estado at panlunsod na batas ay nagtatag ng ilang tradisyunal na pamantayan sa muling pagdistrito na dapat isaalang-alang lahat hanggang magagawa kapag gumuguhit ng mga linya ng distrito:

Pagkamagkaratig - lahat ng mga bahagi ng isang distrito ay dapat magkakarugtong Pagkasiksik - ang mga distrito ay dapat na siksik sa heograpiya
Mga Umiiral na Hangganan - dapat isaalang-alang ng mga distrito ang mga hangganang tulad ng mga hangganang pangheograpiya, pangkalye at pampulitika
Mga Komunidad ng Interes - dapat pangalagaan ng mga distrito ang mga komunidad ng mga taong may mga magkakatulad na interes

Ang karagdagang impormasyon tungkol sa mga batas na namamahala sa proseso ng muling pagdistrito ng Lunsod ay makukuha sa lugar ng web ng Komisyon sa Muling Pagdistrito: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org. Salamat po.

## แถลงการณ์ของสำนักงานอัยการเมือง - ประชาพิจารณ์ของคณะกรรมาธิการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ ของสภาเทศบาลนครลอสแองเจลลิส

ในนามของสำนักงานอัยการแห่งนครลอสแองเจลลิส เราขอต้อนรับท่านสู่ประชาพิจารณ์ของคณะ กรรมาธิการในการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ของนครลอสแองเจลลิส หน้าที่ของ สำนักงานเราคือให้คำ ปรึกษาด้านกฎหมายให้กับเมือง ซึ่งรวมถึงคณะกรรมาธิการนี้ ตลอดกระบวนการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ เราขอถือโอกาสนื้อภิปรายเกี่ยวกับกฎหมาย และหลักกฎหมายที่สำคัญหลายข้อ ที่ใช้ในการจัดแบ่งเขต เลือกตั้งใหม่

กฎบัตรจัดตั้งเมืองของนครลอสแองเจลลิสกำหนดให้สภาเทศบาลกำหนดแบ่งสภาเขตทั้ง 15 เขตของเมือง ใหม่อย่างน้อยทุกๆ 10 ปี กฎบัตรกำหนดให้คณะกรรมาธิการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่นี้ให้คำแนะนำ สภาเทศบาลนครในการกำหนดเขตแดนสภาเขต กฎบัตรกำหนดให้คณะกรรมาธิการการจัดแบ่งเขต เลือกตั้งใหม่รับความคิดเห็นจากสาธารณชน เตรียมข้อเสนอเกี่ยวกับการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ และยื่น ข้อเสนอนี้ต่อสภาเทศบาลนครภายในวันที่ 1 มีนาคม 2555

เกณฑ์ทางกฎหมายที่สำคัญหลายประการจะเป็นตัวบังคับควบคุมกระบวนการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่นี้:
หลักการว่าด้วยเรื่องจำนวนประชากรที่เท่าเทียมกัน - สภาเขตต้องประกอบด้วย จำนวนประชากร ที่เป็นสัดส่วนที่เท่าเทียมกันหรือ แทบเท่าเทียมกันที่สามารถทำได้ของจำนวนประชากรทั้งหมด ที่อาคัยอยู่ในเมือง หลักการนี้ได้ถูกกำหนดไว้ในกฎบัตรจัดตั้งเมืองและในคำวินิจฉัยของศาลสูง สหรัฐที่ว่า "หนึ่งคน ลงคะแนนเสียงได้หนึ่งคะแนน"

ข้อกำหนดเรื่องการคุ้มครองที่เท่าเทียมกันของรัฐธรรมนูญสหรัฐฯ - ศาลสูงสหรัฐฯ สั่งห้ามมิให้ใช้ เชื้อชาติเป็นปัจจัยหลักในการกำหนดเขตแดนโดยเกณฑ์ดั้งเดิมของการแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่นั้นให้ ความสำคัญของเชื้อชาติน้อยกว่า

กฎหมายสิทธิเลือกตั้งปี 1965 - กฎหมายสิทธิเลือกตั้งห้ามการปฏิบัติในการออกเสียงเลือกตั้ง ซึ่งส่งผลให้เกิดการปฏิเสธหรือตัดสิทธิ์สิทธิในการออกเสียงเลือกตั้งเนื่องจากเชื้อชาติ สีผิวหรือ สถานภาพของชนกลุ่มน้อยที่พูดต่างภาษา ต้องมีการวิเคราะห์แผนงานการแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ ภายใต้กฎหมายสิทธิเลือกตั้งเพื่อให้มั่นใจได้ว่า จะไม่มีการตัดสิทธิ์ผู้ลงคะแนนเสียงที่เป็นชนส่วนน้อย ในเรื่องของความเสมอภาคเท่าเทียมกัน เพื่อเลือกผู้แทนตามความต้องการของตนซึ่งจะเป็นการฝ่าฝืน กฎหมายนี้

เกณฑ์การจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่แบบดั้งเดิม - กฎหมายแห่งรัฐบาลกลาง แห่งรัฐและแห่งเมือง ได้กำหนดเกณฑ์การจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่แบบดั้งเดิมหลายประการ ซึ่งจะมีการนำเกณฑ์ทั้งหมด มาพิจารณาการกำหนดเขตแดนให้เกิดความเหมาะสมมากที่สุด:

การติดกัน - ทุกส่วนของเขตควรเชื่อมต่อกัน
ความหนาแน่น - เขตควรมีความหนาแน่นของประชากรเชิงภูมิศาสตร์
เขตแดนที่มีอยู่เดิม - เขตควรพิจารณาถึงเขตแดนเช่น ทางภูมิศาสตร์ ถนน และเขตแดน ทางการเมือง
ความสนใจร่วมกันของชุมชน - เขตควรดำรงชุมชนไว้ซึ่งกลุ่มประชาชนที่มีความสนใจร่วมกัน
สามารถหาข้อมูลเพิ่มเติมเกี่ยวกับกฎหมายที่บังคับควบคุมกระบวนการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ของเมืองได้ ที่เว็บไซต์ของคณะกรรมาธิการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org ขอบคุณ

## Tuyên Ngôn Tiêu Chuẩn của Văn Phòng Luật Sư Thành Phố - Trưng Cầu Dân Ý của Ủy

 Ban Tái Phân Chia Khu Hội Đồng Thành Phố Los AngelesThay mặt cho Văn Phòng Luật Sư Thành Phố Los Angeles, chúng tôi xin được chào đón quý vị đến dự buổi trưng cầu dân ý này của Ủy Ban Tái Phân Chia Khu Thành Phố Los Angeles. Vai trò của Văn Phòng chúng tôi là đưa ra sự cố vấn pháp lý cho Thành Phố, trong đó có Ủy Ban này, trong suốt tiến trình tái phân chia khu. Chúng tôi muốn nhân dịp này thảo luận một số điều luật và nguyên tắc pháp lý quan trọng sẽ áp dụng trong việc tái phân chia khu.

Hiến Chương Thành Phố Los Angeles đòi hỏi Hội Đồng Thành Phố phải vẽ lại ranh giới của 15 khu Hội Đồng Thành Phố ít nhất là mỗi 10 năm một lần. Hiến Chương lập ra Ủy Ban Tái Phân Chia Khu này để cố vấn cho Hội Đồng Thành Phố việc vẽ lại lằn ranh giới của các khu Hội Đồng. Hiến Chương đòi hỏi Ủy Ban Tái Phân Chia Khu phải thu thập ý kiến của công chúng, soạn thảo đề nghị tái phân chia khu và trình đề nghị đó cho Hội Đồng Thành Phố vào ngày 1 tháng Ba, 2012.

Có một số tiêu chuẩn quan trọng làm ảnh hưởng đến tiến trình tái phân chia khu:
Nguyên Tắc Về Dân Số Tương Đương - Các khu Hội Đồng phải có, mức gần nhất nếu được, phần phân chia bằng nhau của tổng dân số Thành Phố. Nguyên tắc này được quy định trong Hiến Chương Thành Phố và đồng thời trong phán quyết "Một Người, Một Lá Phiếu" của Tối Cao Pháp Viện Hoa Kỳ.

Điều Khoản Bảo Vệ Sự Bình Đẳng Trong Hiến Pháp Hoa Kỳ - Tối Cao Pháp Viện Hoa Kỳ đã phán quyết rằng chủng tộc không thể được dùng làm yếu tố chính trong việc vẽ đường ranh giới khu theo như tiêu chuẩn tái phân chia khu truyền thống phụ thuộc vào sự xem xét về chủng tộc.

Đạo Luật Về Quyền Bầu Cử Năm 1965 - Đạo Luật Về Quyền Bầu Cử cấm những nguyên tẳc bầu cử đưa đến sự phủ nhận hay hạn chế quyền bầu cử do tình trạng thiểu số về chủng tộc, màu da hoặc ngôn ngũ. Kế hoạch tái phân chia khu phải được phân tích chiếu theo Đạo Luật Về Quyền Bầu Cử để bảo đảm là chúng không tước đi của các cử tri thiểu số cơ hội bình đẳng để bầu chọn những người đại diện cho họ theo cách vi phạm Đạo Luật này.

Tiêu Chuẩn Tái Phân Chia Khu Theo Truyền Thống - Luật liên bang, tiểu bang và thành phố đã quy định một số tiêu chuẩn tái phân chia khu theo truyền thống mà tất cả những tiêu chuẩn đó sẽ phải được xem xét trong trường hợp khả thi khi vẽ các đường ranh giới khu:

Sự Tiếp Giáp - tất cả các phần của một khu phải nối liền với nhau
Tính Cách Thu Gọn - các khu phải thu gọn về hình thể địa lý
Ranh Giới Hiện Hữu - các khu cần phải xem xét những ranh giới thí dụ như ranh giới về địa lý, đường phố và chính trị
Quyền Lọ̣i của Cộng Đồng - khu phải duy trì những người trong cộng đồng được chia sẻ quyền lợi chung

Trong website của Ủy Ban Tái Phân Chia Khu có thêm chi tiết về các điều luật ảnh hưởng đến tiến trình tái phân chia khu của Thành Phố: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org. Cám ơn quý vị.

## Standard Statement of the Communities of Interest Committee - Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission Public Hearings

Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen. The City Attorney has just provided a brief overview of the redistricting law and criteria that the Commission is obligated to follow in the redistricting process. As a member of the Commission's Ad Hoc Committee on Communities of Interest, I will now address the concept of "Communities of Interest" and how this information is crucial to the success of the Commission's work.

As the City Attorney mentioned, traditional redistricting criteria consists of: maintaining compact districts, drawing contiguous districts, observing natural boundaries and respecting communities of interest. While the first three are easily identifiable, protecting Communities of Interest is typically the most subjective and controversial of the traditional redistricting criteria.

The concept of protecting communities of interest is to draw boundaries in a manner that preserves communities that share common interests. There are many types of common interests that may identify a community of interest. For example, communities may share common housing patterns: urban, rural or suburban. Communities may share a common culture or language. Communities may be defined by their neighborhood, their neighborhood council, or by the location of cultural, religious or educational institutions. Communities may also be defined by the location of geographic boundaries or features, such as parks, lakes, mountains or freeways. Certain public services, like public schools, public transit, the Los Angeles Police Department or the Los Angeles Fire Department, may also help define a community.

The Commission will be using a wide range of information, including Census data on income level, educational background, housing patterns, same-sex households, cultural and language characteristics, employment and economic patterns, health and environmental conditions, crime, schools and other common issues. The Commission will also consider City planning maps, school zone maps of the Los Angeles Unified School District, transit maps of the Los Angeles Metro, and division maps of the Los Angeles Police Department and Los Angeles Fire Department, as well as other maps and geographic information.

While all of this written information is critical to the Commission's work, so is input from the public. The Commission has prepared a Public Comment Form on Communities of Interest. If you would like the Commission to consider a particular Community of Interest, we invite you to complete and submit a Public Comment Form, to speak at this public hearing or to submit your written comments to the Commission.

Thank you.
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## 共同利益社區委員會標準聲明－Los Angeles 市市議會重劃選區委員會公共聽證會

女士們，先生們，晚上好。市檢察官剛才簡要介紹了委員會在重劃選區過程中必須遵循的重劃選區法律及標準。身為委員會的共同利益社區專門委員會成員，我現在要談談「共同利益社區」概念，以及這一資訊對委員會工作的成敗具有何種關鍵作用。

市檢察官剛才提到，傳統的重劃選區標準包括：保持選區緊湊，劃分連綿選區，遵循自然邊界，並尊重共同利益社區。前三條很容易辨識，但保護共同利益社區通常是傳統重劃選區標準中最主觀且最有爭議的一條。

保護共同利益社區的概念係指劃分邊界時要保全擁有共同利益的社區。有許多共同利益類型可用來辨識共同利益社區。例如，可以用共同的住房類型來辨識社區：都市，鄉村或郊區。可以用共同的文化或語言來辨識社區。可以按照居民區，居民區委員會或者文化機構，宗教機構或教育機構所處的位置來界定社區。也可以按照地理邊界或特徴界定社區，例如公園，湖泊，山脈或高速公路等。某些公共服務，例如公立學校，公共交通，Los Angeles 警察局或 Los Angeles 消防局等，也有助於界定一個社區。

委員會將運用廣泛資訊，包括有關收入水準的人口普查資料，學歷，住房類型，同性家庭，文化和語言特點，就業和經濟類型，健康和環境條件，犯罪，學校及其他共同問題。委員會還將考慮本市的規劃地圖，Los Angeles 聯合學區的學校區域地圖，Los Angeles 捷運局的交通地圖，Los Angeles 警察局和 Los Angeles 消防局的區域地圖以及其他地圖和地理資訊。

儘管所有這些書面資訊對委員會的工作都至關重要，但公眾的意見也具有同樣的重要意義。委員會已經編制了一份共同利益社區公眾評論表格。如果您希望委員會考慮某個特定的共同利益社區，我們邀請您填寫並提交公眾評論表格，在此公共聽證會上發言，或者向委員會提交您的書面意見。

謝謝。

## 利害の共通委員会からのお知らせ－Los Angeles 市市議会再区画委員会公聴会

市民の皆さま，こんばんは。委員会が再区画のプロセスにおいて準拠しなければならな い再区画法および基準の概要を市法務官が提示しました。利害の共通特別委員会委員と して，「利害の共通」の概念および委員会の任務を成就する上でこの情報がいかに重要 かを申し上げます。

市法務官が述べたように，従来型の再区画基準は小規模であり，区は隣接しており，自然な境界を守り，利害の共通性を配慮します。はじめの 3 件は識別しやすいですが，利害の共通性を維持することは，一般的に言って極めて主観的であり，かつ従来型の再区画基準に物議を醸しだします。

利害の共通性を守るという概念は，共通の利益を共有するコミュニティを保護する境界線を引くということです。共通の利益を識別する種類はいろいろあります。たとえば，都市，田園，郊外というようなコミュニティには居住地形態の共通性があります。コミ ユニティは共通の文化や言語を共有する場合があります。コミュニティは近隣地区，近隣協議会，文化組織，宗教施設，教育機関の場所で定義される場合があります。コミュ ニティはまた，地理的境界線や，公園，湖，山，あるいはフリーウェイなどの環境の特徴で定義される場合があります。公立学校，公共交通機関，Los Angeles 警察，Los Angeles 消防署などの公共サービスもコミュニティを定義する助けとなります。

委員会は国勢調査に基づく所得層，学歴，住居，同性住居人，文化，言語，雇用状況や，経済形態，健康および環境状況，犯罪，学校，その他の共通する課題など，広域に渡る情報を使用します。委員会はまた市計画地図，Los Angeles 統一学区の学区地図，Los Angeles メトロの交通地図，Los Angeles 警察および Los Angeles 消防署の分署地図，お よびその他の地図や地理的情報を考慮します。

それらの文書資料は委員会の任務に重要ですが，皆さまからのご意見も大切です。委員会は利害の共通の市民意見用紙を用意しました。委員会に考慮して欲しい利害の共通性 については，市民意見用紙に書くか，公聴会で発言するか，ご意見を書面にて委員会に提出してください。

よろしくお願いいたします。

## 이해관계 커뮤니티 위원회의 표준 성명서 - Los Angeles 시의회 지구 재설정 위원회 청문회

안녕하십니까, 신사 숙녀 여러분. 시 법무관께서 방금 지구 재설정에 있어 위원회가 의무적으로 따라야하는 지구 재설정법과 기준에 대한 개요를 간단히 발표하였습니다. 이해관계 커뮤니티에 대한 본 위원회의 특별위원회 위원으로서, 저는 이제 "이해관계 커뮤니티"의 개념에 대해 그리고 본 내용이 위원회 작업의 성공에 얼마나 중요한지 설명하겠습니다.

시 법무관이 언급한 바대로, 전통적인 지구 재설정 기준은 다음과 같이 구성되어 있습니다: 밀집된 지구 유지, 인접한 지구 경계선, 자연적인 경계 준수 및 이해관계 커뮤니티에 대한 존중. 처음 세가지는 쉽게 알아볼 수 있는 반면, 이해관계 커뮤니티를 보존하는 것은 보통 가장 주관적이며 전통적인 지구 재설정 기준에 논쟁거리입니다.

이해관계 커뮤니티를 보존하자는 개념은 공통된 이해를 갖고 있는 주민 사회를 보존하는 방법으로 경계선을 만들자는 것입니다. 이해관계 커뮤니티로 인정될 수 있는 공통된 이해관계에는 여러 형태가 있습니다. 예를 들면, 다음과 같이 공통된 주택 형태를 갖고 있는 커뮤니티가 있습니다: 도시, 전원 및 교외. 공통된 문화 또는 언어를 사용하는 커뮤니티가 있습니다. 커뮤니티는 그들의 지역성, 지역협의회에 의해, 또는 문화, 종교 또는 교육 기관의 위치에 의해 정의될 수 있습니다. 커뮤니티는 또한 공원, 호수, 산 또는 고속도로와 같은 지리적인 경계 또는 사물의 위치에 의해 정의될 수 있습니다. 공립학교, 대중 교통, Los Angeles 경찰국 또는 Los Angeles 소방국과 같은 특정 공공 서비스 또한 커뮤니티를 정의하는데 도움이 될 수 있습니다.

위원회에서는 소득 수준, 교육 배경, 주거지 형태, 동성 거주 세대, 문화 및 언어 특성, 고용 및 경제 형편, 건강 및 환경 조건, 범죄, 학교 및 기타 공통 사항에 대한 인구 조사를 포함하여 폭넓은 범위의 정보를 사용할 것입니다. 위원회에서는 또한 다른 지도와 지리적인 정보는 물론, 시 계획 지도, Los Angeles 통합교육구의 학교 지구 지도, 그리고 Los Angeles 경찰국 및 Los Angeles 소방국의 지역 지도들을 고려할 것입니다.

이러한 문서 정보가 모두 위원회의 작업에 중요한 반면, 일반으로부터의 의견도 중요합니다. 위원회에서는 이해관계 커뮤니티에 대한 공공 의견 서식을 준비하였습니다. 만일 여러분께서 위원회가 어느 특정한 이해관계 커뮤니티에 대해 고려해주기를 원하시면, 저희는 여러분께서 공공 의견 서식을 작성하여 제출하시거나, 본 공청회에서 발언하시거나 또는 위원회에 여러분이 쓴 의견을 제출해주실 것을 요청합니다.

감사합니다.

## Declaración Estándar del Comité de Comunidades de Interés - Audiencias Públicas de la Comisión para la Redistribución de Distritos del Concejo Municipal de Los Ángeles

Buenas noches, damas y caballeros. El Abogado Municipal acaba de darnos una breve perspectiva general sobre la ley de redistribución de distritos y los criterios que debe seguir la Comisión durante el proceso de redistribución de distritos. Como miembro del Comité de comunidades de interés Ad Hoc de la Comisión, abordaré ahora el concepto de "Comunidades de Interés" y la forma en que esta información es decisiva para que el trabajo de la Comisión tenga éxito.

Tal como lo mencionó el Abogado Municipal, los criterios tradicionales de redistribución de distritos consisten en lo siguiente: mantener distritos compactos, trazar distritos contiguos, respetar los límites naturales y las comunidades de interés. Los tres primeros criterios pueden identificarse con facilidad. No obstante, el criterio de protección de las Comunidades de Interés es típicamente el más subjetivo y controversial entre los criterios tradicionales de redistribución de distritos.

El concepto de proteger a las comunidades de interés implica trazar límites de tal forma que se preserven las comunidades que tienen intereses en común. Existen numerosos tipos de intereses comunes que pueden identificar a una comunidad de interés. Por ejemplo, las comunidades pueden tener diseños de vivienda en común: urbanos, rurales o suburbanos. Las comunidades pueden tener en común una cultura o idioma. Las comunidades pueden definirse según el vecindario, su consejo vecinal o por la ubicación de instituciones educativas, religiosas o culturales. Las comunidades también pueden definirse según la ubicación de límites geográficos o características, como parques, lagos, montañas o autopistas. Algunos servicios públicos también pueden ayudar a definir una comunidad, como escuelas públicas, transporte público, el Departamento de Policía de Los Ángeles o el Departamento de Bomberos de Los Ángeles.

La Comisión utilizará una amplia gama de información, como datos obtenidos en los Censos en relación con el nivel de ingresos, antecedentes educativos, diseños de vivienda, habitantes de un hogar del mismo sexo, características relacionadas con el idioma y la cultura, patrones económicos y de empleo, condiciones ambientales y de salud, delito, escuelas y otros asuntos comunes. Además, la Comisión considerará los mapas de planificación municipal, mapas de zonas escolares del Distrito Escolar Unificado de Los Ángeles, mapas de transporte de Los Ángeles Metro y mapas divisorios del Departamento de Policía de Los Ángeles y el Departamento de Bomberos de Los Ángeles, así como también otros mapas e información geográfica.

Si bien toda esta información escrita es decisiva para el trabajo de la Comisión, también lo es la opinión del público. La Comisión ha preparado un Formulario de Comentarios Públicos sobre las Comunidades de Interés. Si desea que la Comisión considere una Comunidad de Interés en particular, lo invitamos a que complete y envíe un Formulario de Comentarios Públicos, hable ante esta audiencia pública o envíe sus comentarios por escrito a la Comisión.

Gracias.

## Pangkaraniwang Pahayag ng Komite sa mga Komunidad ng Interes - Mga Pampublikong Pagdinig ng Komisyon sa Muling Pagdistrito ng Konseho ng Lunsod ng Los Angeles

Magandang gabi, mga Binibini, Ginang at Ginoo. Ang Abugado ng Lunsod ay nagbigay ng isang maikling pangkalahatang-tanaw sa batas at mga pamantayan sa muling pagdistrito na dapat sundin ng Komisyon sa proseso ng muling pagdistrito. Bilang isang miyembro ng Nakatutok sa Isang Layunin na Komite sa mga Komunidad ng Interes ng Komisyon, tutugunan ko ngayon ang konsepto ng "Mga Komunidad ng Interes" at kung paano ang impormasyong ito ay napakahalaga sa tagumpay ng gawain ng Komisyon.

Tulad ng binanggit ng Abugado ng Lunsod, ang mga pamantayan sa tradisyunal na muling pagdistrito ay binubuo ng: pagpapanatili ng mga siksik na distrito, pagguhit ng mga magkakaratig na distrito, pagsunod sa mga likas na hangganan at paggalang sa mga komunidad ng interes. Habang ang unang tatlo ay madaling matukoy, ang pangangalaga sa mga Komunidad ng Interes ay pangkaraniwang ang pinakapansarili at mapagtatalunan sa mga pamantayan sa tradisyunal na muling pagdistrito.

Ang konsepto ng pangangalaga ng mga komunidad ng interes ay upang gumuhit ng mga hangganan sa isang paraan na nagpapanatili ng mga komunidad na may mga magkakatulad na interes. Maraming uri ng mga magkakatulad na interes na maaaring tumukoy sa isang komunidad ng interes. Halimbawa, ang mga komunidad ay maaaring may mga magkakatulad na katangiang may kaugnayan sa bahay: panlunsod, pangnayon o panlabas ng lunsod. Ang mga komunidad ay maaaring may mga magkakatulad na kultura o wika. Ang mga komunidad ay maaaring ilarawan batay sa kanilang kapitbahayan, kanilang konseho ng kapitbahayan, o sa pamamagitan ng kinalalagyan ng mga institusyong pangkultura, panrelihiyon o pang-edukasyon. Ang mga komunidad ay maaari ring ilarawan batay sa kinalalagyan ng mga hangganang pangheograpiya o mga itinatampok, tulad ng mga parke, lawa, bundok o priwey. Ang mga partikular na pampublikong serbisyo, tulad ng mga pampublikong paaralan, pampublikong transportasyon, ng Kagawaran ng Pulisya ng Los Angeles o ng Kagawaran ng Bumbero ng Los Angeles, ay maaari ring makatulong na ilarawan ang isang komunidad.

Ang Komisyon ay gagamit ng maraming impormasyon, kabilang ang mga datos ng Sensus sa antas ng kita, karanasang pang-edukasyon, mga katangiang may kaugnayan sa bahay, mga sambahayan ng magkatulad na kasarian, mga katangiang pangkultura at pangwika, mga nagaganap na pantrabaho at pangkabuhayan, mga kondisyong pangkalusugan at pangkapaligiran, krimen, mga paaralan at ibang mga karaniwang isyu. Isasaalang-alang din ng Komisyon ang mga mapa sa pagpaplano ng Lunsod, mga mapa ng sona ng paaralan ng Distrito ng Pinag-isang Paaralan ng Los Angeles, mga mapa ng transportasyon ng Los Angeles Metro, at mga mapa ng dibisyon ng Kagawaran ng Pulisya ng Los Angeles at Kagawaran ng Bumbero ng Los Angeles, gayon din ng ibang mga mapa at impormasyon sa heograpiya.

Kung ang lahat ng mga nakasulat na impormasyong ito ay napakahalaga sa gawain ng Komisyon, gayon din ang kontribusyon mula sa publiko. Ang Komisyon ay naghanda ng isang Pormularyo para sa Puna ng Publiko sa mga Komunidad ng Interes. Kung gusto ninyong isaalang-alang ng Komisyon ang isang partikular na Komunidad ng Interes, iniimbitahan namin kayo na kumpletuhin at isumite ang isang Pormularyo para sa Puna ng Publiko, upang magsalita sa pampublikong pagdinig na ito o upang isumite ang inyong mga nakasulat na puna sa Komisyon.

Salamat po.

## แถลงการณ์ของคณะกรรมการด้านความสนใจร่วมกันของชมชน - ประชาพิจารณ์ของคณะกรรมการ การจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ของสภาเทศบาลนครลอสแองเจลลิส

สวัสดีท่านสุภาพสตรีและท่านสุภาพบุรุษ สำนักอัยการได้แถลงภาพรวมโดยย่อเกี่ยวกับกฎหมายและเกณฑ์การ จัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ที่คณะกรรมาธิการจะต้องปฏิบัติตามในกระบวนการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ ในฐานะที่เป็นสมาชิกของคณะกรรมการวิสามัญเรื่องความสนใจร่วมกันของชุมชนภายใต้คณะกรรมาธิการชุดนี้ ผม/ดิฉันจะกล่าวถึงความคิดเกี่ยวกับ "ความสนใจร่วมกันของชุมชน" และข้อมูลนี้มีความสำคัญอย่างไรที่จะทำ ให้งาน ของคณะกรรมาธิการสำเร็จลุล่วงไปได้ด้วยดี

ตามที่อัยการเมืองได้กล่าวไปแล้วว่า เกณฑ์การจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่แบบดั้งเดิมนั้นประกอบด้วย: การรักษา ความหนาแน่นของประชากรในเขตต่างๆ การแบ่งเขตติดกัน การสังเกตเขตแดนตามภูมิประเทศ และการเคารพ ต่อความสนใจร่วมกันของชุมชน ในขณะที่สามข้อแรกนั้นสามารถระบุได้ง่าย แต่การคุ้มครองความสนใจร่วมกัน ของชุมชนนั้น มักจะเป็นเกณฑ์การจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งแบบดั้งเดิมที่มีการโต้แย้งและการแสดงความเห็นส่วนบุคคล มากที่สุด

แนวคิดการคุ้มครองความสนใจร่วมกันของชุมชนคือ การแบ่งเขตแดนในลักษณะที่เป็นการอนุรักษ์ชุมชน ที่มีความสนใจร่วมกัน ความสนใจร่วมกันนั้นมีหลายประเภทที่สามารถกำหนดถึงผลประโยชน์ร่วมของชุมชน ตัวอย่างเช่น ชุมชนนั้นให้ความสนใจในแบบบ้านประเภทเดียวกัน การอยู่อาศัยในเมือง ชนบท หรือ ชานเมือง ชุมชนอาจมีความสนใจในวัฒนธรรม หรือ ภาษาร่วมกัน อาจจะมีการกำหนดแบ่งชุมชน ตามละแวกบ้านของตน สภาในละแวกบ้านของตน หรือ จากสถานที่ตั้งของสถาบันทางวัฒนธรรม ทางศาสนา หรือทางการศึกษา นอกจากนี้ อาจมีการกำหนดชุมชนตามสถานที่ตั้งเขตแดนทางภูมิศาสตร์ หรือลักษณะ ภูมิประเทศ เช่น สวนสาธารณะ ทะเลสาบ ภูเขา หรือ ทางหลวง นอกจากนี้ บริการสาธารณะบางประเภท เช่น โรงเรียนรัฐบาล ขนส่งมวลชน สถานีตำรวจแห่งนครลอสแองเจลลิส หรือ สถานีดับเพลิงแห่งนครลอสแองเจลลิส ตัวกำหนดชุมชนด้วย

คณะกรรมาธิการจะใช้ข้อมูลหลากหลาย รวมถึงข้อมูลการสำรวจจำนวนประชากรด้านระดับรายได้ ประวัติการศึกษา รูปแบบครัวเรือน ครอบครัวเพศเดียวกัน ลักษณะของวัฒนธรรมและภาษา รูปแบบการจ้างงานและเศรษฐกิจ สภาวะของสุขภาพและสิ่งแวดล้อม อาชญากรรม โรงเรียน และประเด็นทั่วไปต่างๆ นอกจากนี้ คณะกรรมาธิการจะพิจารณาถึงแผนที่ผังเมือง แผนที่ของเขตการศึกษานครลอสแองเจลลิส แผนที่ขนส่งมวลชน ของนครลอสแองเจลลิส และแผนที่กองบังคับการของสถานีตำรวจแห่งนครลอสแองเจลลิส และสถานีดับเพลิง แห่งนครลอสแองเจลลิส รวมถึงแผนที่และข้อมูลทางภูมิศาสตร์อื่นๆ

ในขณะที่ข้อมูลที่เป็นลายลักษณ์อักษรนี้มีความสำคัญต่อการทำงานของคณะกรรมาธิการ ข้อคิดเห็นจากประชาชน ก็มีความสำคัญไม่ยิ่งหย่อนไปกว่ากัน คณะกรรมาธิการได้จัดเตรียมแบบฟอร์มแสดงความคิดเห็นของประชาชน เกี่ยวกับความสนใจร่วมกันของชุมชนไว้ให้แล้ว หากคุณต้องการให้คณะกรรมาธิการพิจารณาถึงความสนใจร่วมกัน ของชุมชนที่เป็นการเฉพาะ เราขอให้คุณกรอกรายละเอียดและส่งแบบฟอร์มแสดงความคิดเห็นของประชาชน เพื่อที่จะได้สนทนาเรื่องดังกล่าวที่ประชาพิจารณ์นี้ หรือ เขียนความคิดเห็นของคุณและส่งไปที่คณะกรรมาธิการ
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## Tuyên Ngôn Tiêu Chuẩn của Ủy Ban Quyền Lợi Công Đồng - Trung Cầu Dân Ý của Ủy Ban Tái Phân Chia Khu Hội Đồng Thành Phố Los Angeles

Kính chào Quý Ông Bà. Luật Sư Thành Phố vừa cho chúng ta biết những thông tin tổng quát ngắn gọn về điều luật và tiêu chuẩn tái phân chia khu mà Ủy Ban có bổn phận phải tuân theo trong tiến trình tái phân chia khu. Là ủy viên của Ủy Ban Đặc Trách Quyền Lợi Cộng Đồng trong Ủy Ban, giờ đây tôi sẽ giải thích về khái niệm "Quyền Lợi của Cộng Đồng" và lý do tại sao thông tin này rất quan trọng đối với sự thành công trong công việc của Ủy Ban.

Như Luật Sư Thành Phố đã đề cập, tiêu chuẩn tái phân chia khu theo truyền thống bao gồm: duy trì sự thu gọn của các khu, vẽ các khu sát cạnh nhau, quan sát những ranh giới thiên nhiên và tôn trọng quyền lợi của cộng đồng. Mặc dù ba tiêu chuẩn đầu có thể xác định dễ dàng, việc bảo vệ Quyền Lợi của Cộng Đồng thường là tiêu chuẩn có tính cách chủ quan và dễ gây mâu thuẫn nhất trong tiêu chuẩn tái phân chia khu theo truyền thống.

Khái niệm bảo vệ quyền lợi của cộng đồng là vẽ những đường ranh giới theo cách duy trì được cộng đồng có sự chia sẻ những quyền lợi chung. Có nhiều loại quyền lợi chung có thể xác định được quyền lợi của cộng đồng. Thí dụ, các cộng đồng có thể chia sẻ cùng một kiểu nhà ở: thành thị, nông thôn hoặc ngoại ô. Các cộng đồng có thể chia sẻ cùng một nền văn hóa hoặc ngôn ngữ. Các cộng đồng có thể được xác định bởi khu phố của họ, hội đồng khu phố của họ, hay bởi địa điểm của những cơ sở văn hóa, tôn giáo hoặc giáo dục. Các cộng đồng cũng có thể được xác định bởi địa điểm của những ranh giới hoặc hình thể địa lý, thí dụ như công viên, hồ, núi hay xa lộ. Một số dịch vụ công cộng, như trường công lập, giao thông công cộng, Sở Cảnh Sát Los Angeles hoặc Sở Cứu Hỏa Los Angeles, cũng có thể giúp xác định cộng đồng.

Ủy Ban sẽ dùng nhiều thông tin đa dạng, kể cả dữ kiện Thống Kê Dân Số về mức lợi tức, quá trình học vấn, kiểu mẫu nhà ở, gia đình có vợ chồng cùng phái, những đặc điểm về văn hóa và ngôn ngữ, kiểu mẫu về việc làm và kinh tế, điều kiện y tế và môi sinh, tội phạm, trường học và những vấn đề thông thường khác. Ủy Ban cũng sẽ xem xét bản đồ kế hoạch của Thành Phố, bản đồ vùng trường học của Khu Học Chánh Los Angeles Unified, bản đồ giao thông của Los Angeles Metro, và các bản đồ phân khu của Sở Cảnh Sát Los Angeles và Sở Cứu Hỏa Los Angeles, cũng như những bản đồ và thông tin khác về địa lý.

Trong khi tất cả những thông tin nêu trong văn bản này rất quan trọng đối với công việc của Ủy Ban, do đó những ý kiến đóng góp từ công chúng cũng quan trọng không kém. Ủy Ban đã soạn thảo sẵn Bản Góp Ý của Công Chúng về Quyền Lợi Cộng Đồng. Nếu quý vị muốn Ủy Ban xem xét cụ thể về Quyền Lợi của Cộng Đồng, chúng tôi mời quý vị điền và gửi lại Bản Góp Ý của Công Chúng này, trình bày bằng lời nói tại buổi trưng cầu dân ý hoặc gửi thư góp ý đến Ưy Ban.

Cám ơn quý vị.

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** <br> (REVISED) <br> PUBLIC INPUT HEARING ON PROPOSED DRAFT MAP 

## CENTRAL REGION

Wednesday February 1, 2012<br>6:30 p.m.

Wilshire Ebell Theatre<br>743 S. Lucerne Boulevard<br>Los Angeles, CA 90005

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria (10 minutes)
2. Public Testimony and Possible Discussion by Commissioners regarding Commission Proposed Draft Map (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission<br>www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
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# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** 

# PUBLIC INPUT HEARING ON PROPOSED DRAFT MAP 

WESTERN REGION<br>(REVISED)

Thursday February 2, 2012 6:30 p.m.

Westchester Recreation Center, Gym<br>7000 W. Manchester Avenue<br>Los Angeles, CA 90045

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria (10 minutes)
2. Public Testimony and Possible Discussion by Commissioners regarding Commission Proposed Draft Map (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission<br>www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commissioners
David Trujillo (CD1) * Craig Miller (CD2) * David Ford (CD3) * Grover McKean (CD4) * David Roberti (CD5) * Jose Cornejo (CD6) * Michael Trujillo (CD7) * Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8) * David Roberts (CD9) * Chris Ellison (CD10) * Rob Kadota (CD11) * Ken Sampson (CD12) * Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13) * Robert Ahn (CD13) * Antonio Sanchez (CD14) * Jerry Gaines (CD15) * Arturo Vargas (Mayor) * LeRoy Chase (Mayor) *Mona Soo Hoo (Mayor) * Helen Kim (Controller) * Julie Downey (City Attorney)

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** 

## PUBLIC INPUT HEARING ON PROPOSED DRAFT MAP

WEST VALLEY REGION<br>(REVISED)

Saturday February 4, 2012
11 a.m.
Pierce College, The Great Hall
6201 Winnetka Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 91367

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria (10 minutes)
2. Public Testimony and Possible Discussion by Commissioners regarding Commission Proposed Draft Map (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commissioners
David Trujillo (CD1) * Craig Miller (CD2) * David Ford (CD3) * Grover McKean (CD4) * David Roberti (CD5) * Jose Cornejo (CD6) * Michael Trujillo (CD7) * Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8) * David Roberts (CD9) * Chris Ellison (CD10) * Rob Kadota (CD11) * Ken Sampson (CD12) * Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13) * Robert Ahn (CD13) * Antonio Sanchez (CD14) * Jerry Gaines (CD15) * Arturo Vargas (Mayor) * LeRoy Chase (Mayor) *Mona Soo Hoo (Mayor) * Helen Kim (Controller) * Julie Downey (City Attorney)

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** 

# PUBLIC INPUT HEARING ON PROPOSED DRAFT MAP 

## EAST REGION

(REVISED)
Monday February 6, 2012
6:30 p.m.
Occidental College, Thorne Hall 1600 Campus Road
Los Angeles, CA 90041

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria (10 minutes)
2. Public Testimony and Possible Discussion by Commissioners regarding Commission Proposed Draft Map (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission<br>www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** 

# PUBLIC INPUT HEARING ON PROPOSED DRAFT MAP 

DOWNTOWN REGION<br>(REVISED)<br>Wednesday February 8, 2012<br>6:30 p.m.<br>Los Angeles City Hall<br>John Ferraro Council Chambers<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 340<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria (10 minutes)
2. Public Testimony and Possible Discussion by Commissioners regarding Commission Proposed Draft Map (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707
email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org
Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commissioners
David Trujillo (CD1) * Craig Miller (CD2) * David Ford (CD3) * Grover McKean (CD4) * David Roberti (CD5) * Jose Cornejo (CD6) * Michael Trujillo (CD7) * Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8) * David Roberts (CD9) * Chris Ellison (CD10) * Rob Kadota (CD11) * Ken Sampson (CD12) * Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13) * Robert Ahn (CD13) * Antonio Sanchez (CD14) * Jerry Gaines (CD15) * Arturo Vargas (Mayor) * LeRoy Chase (Mayor) *Mona Soo Hoo (Mayor) * Helen Kim (Controller) * Julie Downey (City Attorney)

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** 

# PUBLIC INPUT HEARING ON PROPOSED DRAFT MAP 

## EAST VALLEY REGION

(REVISED)
Thursday February 9, 2012
6:30 p.m.
Walter Reed Middle School, Auditorium 4525 Irvine Avenue
Studio City, CA 91602

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria (10 minutes)
2. Public Testimony and Possible Discussion by Commissioners regarding Commission Proposed Draft Map (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commissioners
David Trujillo (CD1) * Craig Miller (CD2) * David Ford (CD3) * Grover McKean (CD4) * David Roberti (CD5) * Jose Cornejo (CD6) * Michael Trujillo (CD7) * Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8) * David Roberts (CD9) * Chris Ellison (CD10) * Rob Kadota (CD11) * Ken Sampson (CD12) * Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13) * Robert Ahn (CD13) * Antonio Sanchez (CD14) * Jerry Gaines (CD15) * Arturo Vargas (Mayor) * LeRoy Chase (Mayor) *Mona Soo Hoo (Mayor) * Helen Kim (Controller) * Julie Downey (City Attorney)

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING** 

# PUBLIC INPUT HEARING ON PROPOSED DRAFT MAP 

SOUTH REGION
(REVISED)
Saturday February 11, 2012
11 a.m.
West Angeles Church of God in Christ
3045 South Crenshaw Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90016

The Following Teleconferencing Site is Available:
Hilton San Diego Bay Front
1 Park Boulevard
Lobby
San Diego, CA 92101

1. Call to Order and Presentations
a. Introduction of the Commissioners
b. Presentation of the Commission Structure and Process
c. Presentation by the City Attorney on the Redistricting Law and Criteria (10 minutes)
2. Public Testimony and Possible Discussion by Commissioners regarding Commission Proposed Draft Map (Each presenter is allowed no more than two minutes per speaker at the discretion of the hearing Presiding Officer. All written testimony will be accepted, as well as testimony submitted on-line)

For information concerning this Commission, please contact Myriam Lopez at (213) 922-7740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org. Translators, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please call (213) 9227740 or e-mail myriam.lopez@lacity.org for accommodations.

# Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission 

 www.redistricting2011.lacity.org200 N. Spring Street, Room 275
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707
email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commissioners
David Trujillo (CD1) * Craig Miller (CD2) * David Ford (CD3) * Grover McKean (CD4) * David Roberti (CD5) * Jose Cornejo (CD6) * Michael Trujillo (CD7) * Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8) * David Roberts (CD9) * Chris Ellison (CD10) * Rob Kadota (CD11) * Ken Sampson (CD12) * Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13) * Robert Ahn (CD13) * Antonio Sanchez (CD14) * Jerry Gaines (CD15) * Arturo Vargas (Mayor) * LeRoy Chase (Mayor) * Mona Soo Hoo (Mayor) *

Helen Kim (Controller) * Julie Downey (City Attorney)

# LOS ANGELES CITY COMMISSION REDISTRICTING COMMISSION 

## RULES ON PUBLIC COMMENT FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. The Agenda for each public hearing meeting of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission ("Commission") shall be posted at least 72 hours before the meeting. It shall contain a brief general description of each item of business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting.
2. Public Testimony Agenda Item. The Commission shall provide an opportunity in open meetings for the public to address the Commission on the Agenda item known as "Public Testimony" for a total of up to two (2) minutes per speaker, not including interruptions for non-English translation. The Presiding Officer may grant or deny speakers additional time, subject to reversal by a majority of the Commission. Speakers shall limit their comments to matters relevant to providing the Commission input on the drafting of new Council District boundaries. The Presiding Officer may rule that the speaker is out of order if the comments are not germane to public testimony. The Presiding Officer shall have the sole authority to grant a speaker's request to loan, cede, defer or yield time to another speaker. (The public-comment procedures set forth in this rule are in addition to any other hearing requirement specifically imposed by law.)
3. Other Agenda Items. The Commission shall provide an opportunity in open meetings for the public to address the Commission on each Agenda item, other than the Public Testimony agenda item discussed above, for a cumulative total of up to five (5) minutes for each item. The Presiding Officer may grant or deny speakers additional time, subject to reversal by a majority of the Commission. Speakers shall limit their comments to matters relevant to the item on the agenda. The Presiding Officer may rule that the speaker is out of order if the comments are not germane to the item under consideration. If multiple speaker cards are submitted on one agenda item, preference will be granted to members of the public who have not spoken previously during the meeting, either during
public testimony or on another agenda item. A member of the public wishing to speak on more than one agenda item at a single meeting shall limit his or her remarks to a total of five (5) minutes per meeting. A member of the public may allocate time between items in one minute increments per item. The Presiding Officer, in his or her discretion, may allow a speaker to combine remarks on multiple items so as to speak to them during one appearance at the podium. The Presiding Officer shall have the sole authority to grant a speaker's request to loan, cede, defer or yield time to another speaker. (The publiccomment procedures set forth in this rule are in addition to any other hearing requirement specifically imposed by law.)
4. General Public Comment. The Brown Act requires the Commission to provide an opportunity in regular meetings for members of the public to address it on any nonagenda item generally considered to be a Commission affair and within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission. This shall be referred to as "general public comment." Only items not on the agenda may be addressed during this period. The Commission has determined that a reasonable amount of time for general public comment shall be a cumulative total of up to fifteen (15) minutes. The Presiding Officer may exercise his or her discretion, subject to reversal by a majority of the Commission, in conducting the public comment period, including, but not limited to: re-ordering the order of business; determining an equitable amount of time that each member of the public may speak; granting or denying speakers additional time to speak, individually or collectively. If multiple speaker cards are submitted for general public comment, the speakers shall be called in the order submitted by the Commission Executive Assistant, or designee, to the Presiding Officer. However, preference shall be granted to members of the public who have not spoken previously either during public testimony or on agenda items at the immediately preceding two regular meetings. The Commission shall not discuss or take action relative to any public comment, including public testimony, unless authorized by Section 54954.2(b) of the Government Code.
5. No person shall be permitted to interrupt Commissioners, Commission staff, or City staff during a Commission Meeting.
6. No person, other than Commissioners and Commission staff, shall be admitted into the Commission business area while the Commission is meeting except upon the request of a Commissioner and consent of the Presiding Officer.
7. To facilitate the orderly process of general public comment and agenda-item public comment, members of the public who wish to address the Commission shall hand a speaker card, which includes the speaker's name, or other identifying designation, to the Commission Executive Assistant, or designee, prior to the start of the particular comment period. Members of the public shall speak from the podium in the center aisle, or where such podium is situated in the meeting room. Each speaker shall promptly conclude all comments when his or her time to speak has expired. Except at hearings expressly required by law, speakers' comments shall be limited in time as determined by the Presiding Officer. The Presiding Officer may exercise discretion in determining the duration of speakers' comments based upon factors such as the length of the agenda or substance of the agenda items, the number of public comment speaker cards submitted, the need for the Commission to conclude its business as expeditiously as is practicable, and whether the Commission is in danger of losing a quorum.

## 8. Rules of Decorum:

a. Rules of Decorum. During a meeting of the Commission, there is the need for civility and expedition in the carrying out of public business in order to ensure that the public has a full opportunity to be heard and that the Commission has an opportunity for its deliberative process. While any meeting of the Commission is in session, the following rules of decorum shall be observed. All remarks shall be addressed to the Commission as a whole and not to any single Commissioner, unless in response to a question from a Commissioner. Persons addressing the Commission shall not make personal, impertinent, unduly repetitive, slanderous or profane remarks to the Commission, any Commissioner, Commission staff, City staff, or general public, nor utter loud, threatening, personal or abusive language, nor engage in any other disorderly conduct that disrupts, disturbs or
otherwise impedes the orderly conduct of any Commission meeting. No person in the audience at a Commission meeting shall engage in disorderly or boisterous conduct, including the utterance of loud, threatening or abusive language, whistling, stamping of feet or other acts which disturb, disrupt or otherwise impede the orderly conduct of any Commission meeting. Signs, placards, banners, or similar items shall not be permitted at any time at a Commission meeting. Unless addressing the Commission or entering or leaving the Commission meeting room, all persons in the audience shall remain sitting in the seats provided. No person shall stand or sit in the center aisle, nor shall the doorways be blocked. The Presiding Officer of the Commission, with the assistance of the Sergeant-at-Arms, shall be responsible for maintaining the order and decorum of meetings, as set forth more fully below.
b. Enforcement of Decorum. At the discretion of the Presiding Officer or upon a majority vote of the Commission, the Presiding Officer may order removed from the Commission meeting room any person who fails to observe these rules of decorum, including committing any of the following acts of disruptive conduct in respect to a regular, adjourned regular or special meeting of the Commission. Disorderly, contemptuous or insolent behavior toward the Commission, any Commissioner thereof, or Commission staff, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting; A breach of the peace, boisterous conduct or violent disturbance, tending to interrupt the due and orderly course of said meeting; Disobedience of any lawful order of the Presiding Officer, which shall include an order to be seated or to refrain from addressing the Commission; and any other unlawful interference with the due and orderly course of said meeting; and any person so removed shall be excluded from further attendance at the meeting from which he/she has been removed, unless permission to attend is granted upon motion adopted by a majority vote of the Commission, and such exclusion shall be executed by the Sergeant-at-Arms upon being so directed by the Presiding Officer. These enforcement provisions are in addition to the authority held by the Sergeant-at-Arms to maintain order and pursuant to his or her lawful authority as a peace officer.
c. Penalties. Any person who has been ordered removed from a meeting may be charged with a violation of Penal Code Section 403, or other appropriate Penal Code or Los Angeles Municipal Code sections.

## Everybody Counts

## Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission

## COMMISSION DRAFT MAPS PUBLIC COMMENT FORM:

If you would like to provide input to the Commission on the draft map of Council District boundaries and have the Commission consider how they affect, or do not affect, your community, we invite you to complete and submit this form, to speak at a public hearing, or to submit your written comments to the Commission.

All personal information listed on this form is voluntary, and will become a part of the Commission's and City of Los Angeles' public record. The public is not required to fill out all of the questions below, but the more information the Commission gathers, the better informed the process of redrawing Council District boundaries will be.

Date:

Email or phone number:

My name is $\qquad$ and I live/work in the community of $\qquad$ .

Existing Council District: $\qquad$ Preferred Council District: $\qquad$ Boundaries ( $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ ): $\qquad$

The Commission's draft maps positively or negatively affect the representation of my community in the following way:
1.) $\qquad$
2.) $\qquad$
3.) $\qquad$
The following communities share common socioeconomic \& demographic characteristics with my community (state neighborhoods \& characteristics.):
1.) $\qquad$
2.) $\qquad$
3.) $\qquad$
My community is different from the following communities. State Why? (i.e. Demographics and/or socioeconomic characteristics):
1.) $\qquad$
2.) $\qquad$
3.) $\qquad$

My recommendation is that the Commission removes the following communities from my district. Please state why?
1.)
2.) $\qquad$
3.) $\qquad$
My recommendation is that the Commission add following communities to my district. Please state the commonalities if any.
1.) $\qquad$
2.) $\qquad$
3.) $\qquad$
Other comments:

## SUMBIT PUBLIC COMMENT VIA:

Mail:
L.A. City Council Redistricting Commission
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Email:

Survey:
www.redistricting2011.lacity.org

## In Person:

Thursday, February 2 @ 6:30PM
Westchester Recreation Center, Gym 7000 West Manchester Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90045

Wednesday, February 8 @ 6:30PM
LA City Hall, John Ferraro Chambers 200 North Spring Street, Room 340 Los Angeles, CA 90012

Saturday, February 4 @ 11AM
Pierce College, The Great Hall 6201 Winnetka Avenue Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Thursday, February 9 @ 6:30PM
Walter Reed Middle School, Auditorium 4525 Irvine Avenue Studio City, CA 91602

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION 

www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275
Los Angeles, CA 90012
email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

## Frequently Asked Questions

## What is redistricting?

Every 10 years, City Council district boundaries are re-drawn to account for population changes. The Redistricting Commission makes recommendations to the City Council on adoption of the City's redistricting plan that sets the boundaries of City Council districts.

## Why is it important?

How and where districts are drawn can shape communities’ ability to elect the representatives of their choice. Districts must be made as equal in population as possible and practicable so that communities have equal access to political representation.

## Who are the Commissioners and how were they selected?

Information on the twenty-one (21) Commissioners and their duties, appointment, and term can be found on our website.

## How will the Commission encourage public input?

The Commission welcomes comments at any of our public meetings, as well as by telephone, letter, or email. In addition to regular meetings, at least 20 public hearings will be held throughout the redistricting process. At least one public hearing will be held in each current Council district. The public comment form for written comments can be found on our website.

## When and where will public hearings be held?

Public hearings will be held November through December 2011 in anticipation of adopting a draft plan in January 2012. Public hearings will again be held January through February 2012 in anticipation of adopting a final plan by March 1, 2012. The current schedule is available on our website. Suggestions for facilities locations are welcomed and encouraged.

## How can my community stay informed and get involved?

We encourage you to request a community presentation, attend a meeting, public hearing, submit comments, and contact us anytime throughout this process. More information on how to get involved is available on our website.
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# LOS ANGELES市市議會重畫選區委員會 <br> www．redistricting2011．lacity．org <br> 200 N．Spring Street，Room 275 <br> Los Angeles，CA 90012 <br> 電郵：redistricting．lacity＠lacity．org 

## 常見問題解答

## 何調重劃選區？

每隔 10 年需要對市議會區邊界進行一次重新劃分，以反映人口變化。重劃選區委員會就採納本市重劃選區計劃，確定市議會區的邊界而向市議會提供建議。

## 為何這很重要？

如何及在何處劃分選區將决定社區選舉其所選代表的能力。在可行的情況下，各選區的人口應儘量均等，以使所有社區都能平等享有政治代表權。

## 委員會有哪些委員，而且如何選出這些委員？

有關委員會二十一（21）名委員及其職責，委任及任期的資訊登載於我們的網站上。

## 委員會將如何鼓勵公眾發表意見？

委員會歡迎公眾透過公眾會議，電話，信件或電郵發表評論。除定期會議以外，還將在重劃選區的整個過程中至少舉行 20 次公共㯖證會。每個現有市議會區都將至少舉行一次公共聽證會。用來發表書面意見的公眾評論表格登載於我們的網站上。

## 公共聽證會將在何時及何地舉行？

公共聽證會將在2011年11月至12月期間舉行，以便在2012年1月採納一項計畫草案。 2012年1月至2月期間將再次舉行公共聽證會，以便於2012年3月1日前採納計畫定稿。目前的時間安排表登載於我們的網站上。歡迎並鼓勵您對舉行聽證會的地點提出建議。

## 我所在社區如何隨時獲悉進展情況並參與其中？

我們鼓勵您在此過程中隨時提出舉辦社區講座的請求，參加會議及公共聽證會，提交意見並聯絡我們。有關如何參與的詳細資訊，請瀏覽我們的網站。

# LOS ANGELES市市議会 <br> 再区画委員会 

www．redistricting2011．lacity．org
200 N．Spring Street，Room 275
Los Angeles，CA 90012
Eメール：redistricting．lacity＠lacity．org

## よくある質問

## 再区画とは何ですか？

人口の変化に伴い市議会区境界線を10年ごとに再調整します。再区画委員会は，市議会に市議会区の境界線を引く再区画計画の推奨案を提出します。

## なぜそれが重要なのですか？

どのようにどこに区の境界線を引くかによって，代表を選出するコミュニティの選出力の度合いが決まります。コミュニティが政治代表者を平等に利用できるように，区はできる限り人口が均等であり実用的でなければなりません。

## 誰が委員で，どのように選出されたのですか？

二十一（21）名の委員，義務，専任，および期間はウェブサイトをご覧ください。

## 委員会が市民に意見を出すよう奨励する方法は何ですか？

委員会の公的なミーティングや電話，書状，Eメールで意見を伺います。定例会議に加えて再区画プロセスにおいて最低でも20の公聴会を開きます。現行の各市議会区で最低でも一回は公聴会が開かれます。意見を書く市民意見用紙はウェブサイトから入手できます。

## いつどこで公聴会が開かれるのですか？

2012年1月には計画の下書きが作成されることを想定して，公聴会は2011年11月から12月に開かれます。2012年3月1日には最終計画が作成されることを想定して，公聴会は2012年1月 と2月にも開かれます。現在の日程はウェブサイトをご覧ください。施設の場所についての ご提案をお願いいたします。

自分のコミュニティが情報に通じて関与するにはどうしたらいいですか？
コミュニティプレゼンテーションを要請し，ミーティングや公聴会に参加し，意見を提出 し，このプロセス中にいつでも委員会にご連絡ください。どのように関与するかの詳細は ウェブサイトをご覧ください。

# LOS ANGELES 시의회 지구 재설정 위원회 

www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
200 N. Spring Street, Room 275
Los Angeles, CA 90012
이메일: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

## 자주 나오는 질문들

## 지구 재설정이 무엇입니까?

매 10 년마다 시의회 지구 경계가 인구 변동을 반영하기 위해 새로 정해집니다. 지구 재설정 위원회에서는 시의회 지구 경계를 정하는 시의 지구 재설정 계획안 채택에 대해 시의회에 추천을 합니다.

## 무엇이 중요합니까?

지구 경계를 어떻게 어디에 정하는가 하는 것은 커뮤니티에서 자신이 선택한 대표를 선출시킬 수 있는 능력을 정하게 됩니다. 지구는 가능한한 그리고 실질적으로 동등한 숫자의 인구로 정해져서 커뮤니티들이 정치적 대표를 세우는데 동등한 입장을 가져야 합니다.

## 위원회 위원들은 누구이며 그들은 어떻게 선발됩니까?

이십일(21)명의 위원과 그들의 의무, 임명, 및 임기에 관한 정보는 저희 웹사이트에서 찾아볼 수 있습니다.

## 위원회에서는 일반인으로부터의 의견을 어떻게 장려할 것입니까?

위원회에서는 전화, 편지, 또는 이메일뿐만 아니라 저희 공청회 어디에서라도 의견을 환영합니다. 정기 모임 이외에 적어도 20 개의 공청회가 지구 재설정 과정 전체를 통해 열릴 것입니다. 현재의 각 시의회 지구마다 최소한 한번의 공청회가 열릴 것입니다. 서면으로 의견을 보내는 공공 의견 서식은 저희 웹사이트에서 찾아볼 수 있습니다.

## 언제 어디서 공청회가 열립니까?

공청회는 초기 계획안 채택이 2012년 1월에 있을 것으로 예상하여 2011년 11월부터 12월까지 열릴 것입니다. 최종 계획안 채택이 2012년 3월 1일에 있을 것으로 예상하여 2012년 1월부터 2월까지 공청회가 다시 열릴 것입니다. 현재 일정은 저희 웹사이트에 나와 있습니다. 공청회 장소에 대한 제안을 환영하고 있으며 장려합니다.

## 나의 커뮤니티가 어떻게 계속 정보를 받으며 참여할 수 있습니까?

저희들은 여러분께서 본 과정 전반에 걸쳐 커뮤니티에 대한 발표를 요청하고, 모임과 공청회에 참석하며, 의견을 제출하고 언제든지 저희에게 연락하실 것을 권합니다. 참여 방법에 대한 추가 정보는 저희 웹사이트에 나와 있습니다.

# CONCEJO MUNICIPAL DE LA CIUDAD DE LOS ÁNGELES COMISIÓN DE REDISTRIBUCIÓN DE DISTRITOS 

www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>Correo electrónico: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

## Preguntas Frecuentes

## ¿Qué es la redistribución de distritos?

Cada 10 años, se vuelve a realizar el trazado de los límites del distrito del Concejo Municipal de la ciudad en respuesta a los cambios poblacionales. La Comisión para la Redistribución de Distritos recomienda al Concejo Municipal en la adopción del plan de redistribución de la ciudad, el cual fija los límites de los distritos del Concejo Municipal.

## ¿Por qué es importante?

La forma y el lugar en que se trazan los distritos puede dar forma a la capacidad de las comunidades para elegir representantes. Los distritos deben tener, en lo posible, igual cantidad de población para que las comunidades tengan el mismo acceso a la representación política.

## ¿Quiénes son los Comisionados y cómo fueron elegidos?

Se puede obtener información sobre los veintiún (21) Comisionados y sus funciones, nombramiento y período en el cargo en nuestro sitio web.

## ¿De qué manera la Comisión incentivará la opinión pública?

La Comisión acoge los comentarios en todas las reuniones públicas, así como también por teléfono, carta o correo electrónico. Además de las reuniones regulares, se llevarán a cabo al menos 20 audiencias públicas a lo largo del proceso de redistribución de distritos. Se llevará a cabo al menos una audiencia pública en cada distrito actual del Concejo municipal. Se puede encontrar el formulario de comentarios públicos en nuestro sitio web.

## ¿Cuándo y dónde se llevarán a cabo las audiencias públicas?

Las audiencias públicas se llevarán a cabo de noviembre a diciembre de 2011 en antelación a la adopción de un plan borrador en enero de 2012. Las audiencias públicas se llevarán a cabo nuevamente de enero a febrero de 2012 en antelación a la adopción del plan final el 1 de marzo de 2012. El cronograma actual está disponible en nuestro sitio web. Se incentiva a que se realicen sugerencias sobre lugares para establecimientos y éstas son bienvenidas.

## ¿De qué manera puede mantenerse informada e involucrada mi comunidad?

Lo incentivamos a que solicite una presentación de comunidad, asista a una reunión, audiencia pública, envíe comentarios y se ponga en contacto con nosotros en cualquier momento durante este proceso. Hay más información disponible sobre la manera de involucrarse en nuestro sitio web.

# KONSEHO NG LUNSOD NG LOS ANGELES <br> KOMISYON SA MULING PAGDISTRITO 

www.redistricting2011.lacity.org<br>200 N. Spring Street, Room 275<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012<br>email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

## Mga Madalas Itanong

## Ano ang muling pagdistrito?

Tuwing 10 taon, ang mga hangganan ng distrito ng Konseho ng Lunsod ay muling iginuguhit upang isaalang-alang ang mga pagbabago sa populasyon. Ang Komisyon sa Muling Pagdistrito ay gumagawa ng mga rekomendasyon sa Konseho ng Lunsod sa pagpapatibay ng plano sa muling pagdistrito ng Lunsod na nagtatatag ng mga hangganan ng mga distrito ng Konseho ng Lunsod.

## Bakit mahalaga ito?

Kung paano at saan iginuguhit ang mga distrito ay makahuhubog ng kakayahan ng mga komunidad na maghalal ng mga kinatawang pinili nila. Ang mga distrito ay dapat gawing pantay sa populasyon hanggang posible at makakaya upang ang mga komunidad ay magkaroon ng pantay na daan sa pagkatawang pampulitika.

## Sinu-sino ang mga Komisyonado at paano sila pinili?

Ang impormasyon tungkol sa dalawampu't-isang (21) Komisyonado at sa kanilang mga tungkulin, paghirang, at takdang panahon sa panunungkulan ay matatagpuan sa aming lugar ng web.

## Paano hihimukin ng Komisyon ang kontribusyon ng publiko?

Malugod na tinatanggap ng Komisyon ang mga puna sa alinman sa aming mga pampublikong pulong, gayon din sa pamamagitan ng telepono, liham, o email. Bilang karagdagan sa mga regular na pulong, hindi kukulangin sa 20 pampublikong pagdinig ang gaganapin sa buong proseso ng muling pagdistrito. Isa o higit na pampublikong pagdinig ang gaganapin sa bawat kasalukuyang distrito ng Konseho. Ang pormularyo para sa puna ng publiko para sa mga nakasulat na puna ay matatagpuan sa aming lugar ng web.

## Kailan at saan gaganapin ang mga pampublikong pagdinig?

Ang mga pampublikong pagdinig ay gaganapin sa Nobyembre hanggang Disyembre 2011 bilang pag-asa sa pagpapatibay ng isang borador na plano sa Enero 2012. Ang mga pampublikong pagdinig ay muling gaganapin sa Enero hanggang Pebrero 2012 bilang pagasa sa pagpapatibay ng isang panghuling plano sa ika-1 ng Marso, 2012. Ang kasalukuyang iskedyul ay makukuha sa aming lugar ng web. Ang mga mungkahi para sa mga lugar ng mga pasilidad ay malugod na tinatanggap at hinihimok.

# KONSEHO NG LUNSOD NG LOS ANGELES <br> KOMISYON SA MULING PAGDISTRITO 

## Paano mananatiling may-kaalaman at kalahok ang aking komunidad?

Hinihimok namin kayo na humiling ng isang presentasyon ng komunidad, dumalo sa isang pulong, pampublikong pagdinig, magsumite ng mga puna, at makipag-ugnayan sa amin kahit kailan sa buong prosesong ito. Ang karagdagang impormasyon tungkol sa kung paano lumahok ay makukuha sa aming lugar ng web.

# คณะกรรมาธิการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ของ สภาเทศบาลนครลอสแองเจลลิส 

www.redistricting2011.lacity.org

200 N. Spring Street, Room 275
Los Angeles, CA 90012
อีเมล: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

## คำถามที่พบบ่อย

## การจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่คืออะไร

ทุกๆ 10 ปี จะมีการจัดแบ่งเขตแดนของสภาเขตเทศบาลนครเนื่องจากมีการเปลี่ยนแปลงประชากร คณะกรรมการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่แนะนำให้สภาเขตลงมติยอมรับแผนงานการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ ของเมืองซึ่งมีการกำหนดเขตแดนของสภาเขตเทศบาลนคร

## ทำไมถึงมีความสำคัญ

จะมีการแบ่งเขตอย่างไรและที่ไหนซึ่งจะทำให้ชุมชนสามารถเลือกผู้แทนได้ตามที่ตนต้องการ เขตต่างๆ จะต้องได้รับการจัดแบ่งจำนวนประชากรให้เท่ากันมากที่สุดและเหมาะสมเพื่อที่ว่าชุมชนนั้นจะได้รับความเสมอ ภาคในการเข้าถึงผู้แทนทางการเมือง

## คณะกรรมาธิการคือใครและได้รับเลือกมาได้อย่างไร

สามารถดูรายละเอียดเกี่ยวกับคณะกรรมาธิการทั้งยิ่สิบเอ็ด (21) ท่าน พร้อมกับหน้าที่ ตารางนัดหมาย และวาระได้ที่เร็บไซซ์

## คณะกรรรมาธิการจะส่งเสริมให้ประชาชนช่วยกันออกความเห็นได้อย่างไร

คณะกรรมาธิการยินดีรับความคิดเห็นจากการประชุมสาธารณะของเรา และทางโทรศัพท์ จดหมาย หรืออีเมล นอกจากการประชุมการตามปกติแล้ว จะมีการจัดประชาพิจารณ์อย่างน้อย 20 ครั้ง ตลอดกระบวนการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ จะมีการจัดประชาพิจารณ์อย่างน้อยหนึ่งครั้งในสภาเขต ปัจจุบันแต่ละเขต สามารถดูความคิดเห็นของประชาชนที่เป็นลายลักษณ์อักษรได้ที่เว็บไซต์

## จะมีการจัดประชาพิจารณ์ขึ้นเมื่อใดและที่ใด

จะมีการจัดประชาพิจารณ์ในเดือนพฤศจิกายนจนถึงเดือนธันวาคม 2554 เพื่อหวังที่จะลงมติยอมรับ แผนงานฉบับร่างในเดือนมกราคม 2555 และจะมีการจัดประชาพิจารณ์ขึ้นอีกครั้งในเดือนมกราคม จนถึงเดือนกุมภาพันธ์ 2555 เพื่อหวังที่จะลงมติยอมรับแผนงานฉบับสมบูรณ์ภายในวันที่ 1 มีนาคม 2555 สามารถดูรายละเอียดกำหนดการปัจจุบันได้ที่เว็บไซต์ ทางเรายินดีรับฟังเกี่ยวกับข้อเสนอของสถานที่ จัดประชุม

## ชุมชนของข้าพเจ้าจะได้รับการแจ้งข่าวสารและมีส่วนร่วมได้อย่างไร

เราขอสนับสนุนให้คุณขอให้มีการนำเสนอของชุมชน การเข้าร่วมประชุม ประชาพิจารณ์ เสนอความเห็น และ ติดต่อเราได้ทุกเวลาตลอดกระบวนการนี้ สามารถดูรายละเอียดถึงวิธีการเข้าร่วมได้ที่เว็บไซต์

# HỘI ĐỒNG THÀNH PHỐ LOS ANGELES ỦY BAN TÁI PHÂN CHIA KHU <br> www.redistricting2011.lacity.org <br> 200 N. Spring Street, Room 275 <br> Los Angeles, CA 90012 <br> email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org 

## Nhũng Thắc Mắc Thông Thường

## Tái phân chia khu là gì?

Mỗi 10 năm, Hội Đồng Thành Phố sẽ vẽ lại đường ranh giới của các khu cho phù hợp với sự thay đổi về dân số. Ủy Ban Tái Phân Chia Khu đệ trình những đề nghị cho Hội Đồng Thành Phố để thông qua kế hoạch tái phân chia khu của Thành Phố nhằm ấn định ranh giới của các khu Hội Đồng Thành Phố.

## Tại sao điều đó lại quan trọng?

Cách thức và nơi vẽ các khu có thể quyết định khả năng của các cộng đồng để bầu chọn những người đại diện cho họ. Các khu phải có dân số ở mức tương đương nhau và nếu có thể được để các cộng đồng có cơ hội được đại diện bình đẳng về chính trị.

## Các Ủy Viên Hội Đồng là ai và họ được chọn như thế nào?

Có thể tìm đọc những chi tiết về hai mươi mốt (21) Ủy Viên Hội Đồng và những bổn phận, sự chỉ định, và nhiệm kỳ của họ trong website của chúng tôi.

## Ủy Ban sẽ làm thế nào để khuyến khích công chúng góp ý?

Ủy Ban tiếp nhận những góp ý tại tất cả những buổi họp công cộng của chúng tôi, cũng như qua điện thoại, thư, hay email. Ngoài những buổi họp thường, còn có ít nhất 20 buổi trưng cầu dân ý được tổ chức trong suốt tiến trình tái phân chia khu. Sẽ có ít nhất một buổi trưng cầu dân ý được tổ chức tại mỗi khu Hội Đồng hiện hữu. Bản góp ý của công chúng để đóng góp ý kiến có thể tìm thấy trong website của chúng tôi.

## Những buổi trưng cầu dân ý sẽ được tổ chức vào lúc nào và ở đâu?

Những buổi trưng cầu dân ý sẽ được tổ chức từ tháng Mười Một đến tháng Mười Hai năm 2011 trước khi thông qua kế hoạch dự thảo vào tháng Giêng năm 2012. Những buổi trưng cầu dân ý sẽ được tổ chức lại từ tháng Giêng đến tháng Hai năm 2012 trước khi thông qua kế hoạch cuối cùng vào ngày 1 tháng Ba , 2012. Lịch trình hiện thời đã có sẵn trong website của chúng tôi. Chúng tôi hoan nghênh và khuyến khích những đề nghị về địa điểm cơ sở.

## Làm thế nào để cộng đồng của tôi được cập nhật thông tin và được tham gia?

Chúng tôi khuyến khích quý vị nên yêu cầu thuyết trình về cộng đồng, tham dự buổi họp, trưng cầu dân ý, gửi góp ý, và liên lạc với chúng tôi bất cứ lúc nào trong suốt tiến trình này. Trong website của chúng tôi có đăng thêm thông tin về cách tham gia.

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION 

## 2011-12 WORKING TIMELINE

(Updated 1-13-12)

Opening of Commission Office
Nov. 21, 2011

Pre-Draft Map Public Hearings
Dec. 5 to Jan. 10, 2011

Adoption of Commission's Guiding Principles

Commission Tour of the City of Los Angeles
Jan. 14, 2012

Group Presentations to Commission
Jan. 18, 2012
Presentation and Adoption of
Draft Council District Boundaries Map

Pre-Final Map Public Hearings
Feb. 1 to Feb. 11, 2012

Presentation and Adoption of
Final Council District Boundaries Map
Feb. 22, 2012

## Presentation and Adoption of

 Final Commission ReportFeb. 29, 2012

Final Commission Report Submitted to City Council
Mar. 1, 2012

Commission Presentation on Final Report to City Council's Rules and Elections Committee

Mar. 16, 2012

Closing of Commission Office
Mar. 31, 2012

# LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION 

## 2011-12 REGULAR MEETING SCHEDULE

(Updated 1-13-12)
All regular meetings of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission will take place at 4 pm in the afternoon, subject to change by the posting of a Special Meeting Agenda.

Los Angeles, CA 90012

Tues. November 22, 2011

Wed. December 14, 2011

Wed. January 11, 2012

Tues. January 17, 2012
Van Nuys City Hall

Wed. January 18, 2012
John Ferraro Council Chambers

Wed. January 25, 2012
Van Nuys City Hall

Wed. February 8, 2012 John Ferraro Council Chambers
(Meeting moved to 6:30pm for Special Public Hearing)
Wed. February 8, 2012 John Ferraro Council

$$
\text { (Meeting moved to 6:30pm for Special Public Hearing) }
$$

Wed. February 22, 2012
John Ferraro Council Chambers

Wed. February 29, 2012

John Ferraro Council Chambers Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring Street, Room 340
John Ferraro Council Chambers

Van Nuys City Hall

John Ferraro Council Chambers

John Ferraro Council Chambers

Van Nuys City Hall

Van Nuys City Hall 14410 Sylvan Street, Second Floor Van Nuys, CA 91401

Welcome to this hearing of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission. Let me first ask my colleagues to introduce themselves and to state by whom they were appointed to serve on this Commission.

Thank you. The full Commission has 21 members: 14 appointed by each member of the City Council, the City Controller, and the City Attorney; two by the Council President; and three by the Mayor. We have elected Mr. Arturo Vargas as Chairman, and Ms. Jackie Dupont Walker and Mr. Robert Kadota as Vice Chairs. To date we have had 11 business meetings and 15 public hearings before drafting a map, established our procedures and processes, and developed a Draft Map Proposal for your review.

This hearing is part of the second phase of soliciting public input in our work. The hearing will be televised on Channel 35 for a later broadcast, as well as available on our website within a few days. We will also make the audio from the public hearing available, as well as a Court Reporter Transcript of the public hearing. The Commission's website is REDISTRICTING.2011.LACITY.ORG. There will be six other opportunities for public comment as well:
Wednesday, February 1 @-6:30pM
Wilshire Ebell Theatre
4401 West $8^{\text {th }}$ Street
tos Angeles,CA 90005
Monday, February 6 @ 6:30PM
Occidental College, Thorne Hall
1600 Campus Road
Los Angeles, CA 90041
Thursday, February 2 @ 6:30PM
Westchester Recreation Center, Gym
7000 West Manchester Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Wednesday, February 8 @ 6:30PM
LA City Hall, John Ferraro Chambers
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Saturday, February 4 @ 11:00AM<br>Pierce College, The Great Hall<br>6201 Winnetka Avenue<br>Woodland Hills, CA 91367<br>Thursday, February 9 @ 6:30PM<br>Walter Reed Middle School, Auditorium 4525 Irvine Avenue<br>Studio City, CA 91602

## Saturday, February 11 @ 11:00AM

West Angeles Church Of God In Christ
3045 South Crenshaw Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90016
We are committed to providing the residents of our City with full opportunity to participate in this process. We are holding seven public hearings in each region of the City on the Draft Map Proposal prior to the adoption of a Final Recommendation to the City Council. Our final map must be completed by March 1, 2012. Our map will then go to the City Council which has until July 1, 2012 to adopt the final map.

We have made redistricting software and data available to the public so that you may submit your own recommended maps, as well as posted our Draft Map Proposal with maps covering Neighborhood Councils, LA Times Communities, and Streets on our website. We have two types of software available ... Maptitude on the Commission website and through our partners The Advancement Project, WEDRAWLA.ORG. We are also making the information we gather available online through our Commission website as well as providing the public the opportunity to submit testimony, comments and maps online. Our website address again is

## REDISTRICTING.2011.LACITY.ORG

In this second phase of public hearings, we will be grouping speakers by geographic topic. As you fill out your public comment cards, please indicate if you are in favor or against the draft map, as well as indicate the community or Council District you would like to talk about. Commissioners will also be allowed to ask clarifying questions from the public, so please stick around until your geographic area of interest is completed in case a Commissioner may want to ask you a question. Members of the public will be given two minutes to speak before the Commission.

In this region of the City, I want to give you a basic rationale for how the Commission developed the Draft Map Proposal. In terms of ...

- Council District 4 - Changed based on the public testimony to have only one Council District straddle Mulholland Drive. Loses Hancock Park, Larchmont Village, and the Miracle Mile. Gains Beverly Crest, Sherman Oaks, Encino, some of Van Nuys, and some of Lake Balboa
- Council District 5 -Changed based on the public testimony to have only one Council District straddle Mulholland Drive. Loses everything north of Mulholland Drive and Beverly Crest. Picks up Miracle Mile, Hancock Park, Larchmont Village, and some of Hollywood.
- Council District 10 - Maintains most of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Loses Palms, Windsor Village, Wilshire Park, and a portion of the Miracle Mile. Picks up most of the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council, a portion of Exposition Park, Baldwin Vista, and most of Leimert Park.
- Council District 13 - Maintains most of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Loses a portion of Hollywood, and picks up all of Rampart Village, all of Atwater Village, the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council north of Third Street, and most of Glassell Park.

Before we begin receiving your comments, the City Attorney will provide a brief overview of the redistricting law and criteria that we are obligated to follow.
(City Attorney representative report)
(Public testimony begins, limited to 2 minutes a person)

Welcome to this hearing of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission. Let me first ask my colleagues to introduce themselves and to state by whom they were appointed to serve on this Commission.

Thank you. The full Commission has 21 members: 14 appointed by each member of the City Council, the City Controller, and the City Attorney; two by the Council President; and three by the Mayor. We have elected Mr. Arturo Vargas as Chairman, and Ms. Jackie Dupont Walker and Mr. Robert Kadota as Vice Chairs. To date we have had 11 business meetings and 15 public hearings before drafting a map, established our procedures and processes, and developed a Draft Map Proposal for your review.

This hearing is part of the second phase of soliciting public input in our work. The hearing will be televised on Channel 35 for a later broadcast, as well as available on our website within a few days. We will also make the audio from the public hearing available, as well as a Court Reporter Transcript of the public hearing. The Commission's website is REDISTRICTING.2011.LACITY.ORG. There will be five other opportunities for public comment as well:

```
Wednesday, February 1@-6:30PM
Wilshire Ebell Theatre
4401 West 8 }\mp@subsup{8}{}{\mathrm{ th }}\mathrm{ Street
Los Angeles,CA 90005
```

Monday, February 6 @ 6:30PM
Occidental College, Thorne Hall
1600 Campus Road
Los Angeles, CA 90041

Thursday, February 2 @6:30PM
Westchester Recreation Center, Gym
7000 West Manchester Avenue
tos Angeles, CA 90045
Wednesday, February 8 @ 6:30PM
LA City Hall, John Ferraro Chambers 200 North Spring Street Los Angeles, CA 90012

Saturday, February 4 @ 11:00AM
Pierce College, The Great Hall
6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
Thursday, February 9 @ 6:30PM
Walter Reed Middle School, Auditorium 4525 Irvine Avenue
Studio City, CA 91602

## Saturday, February 11 @ 11:00AM

West Angeles Church Of God In Christ
3045 South Crenshaw Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90016
We are committed to providing the residents of our City with full opportunity to participate in this process. We are holding seven public hearings in each region of the City on the Draft Map Proposal prior to the adoption of a Final Recommendation to the City Council. Our final map must be completed by March 1, 2012. Our map will then go to the City Council which has until July 1, 2012 to adopt the final map.

We have made redistricting software and data available to the public so that you may submit your own recommended maps, as well as posted our Draft Map Proposal with maps covering Neighborhood Councils, LA Times Communities, and Streets on our website. We have two types of software available ... Maptitude on the Commission website and through our partners The Advancement Project, WEDRAWLA.ORG. We are also making the information we gather available online through our Commission website as well as providing the public the opportunity to submit testimony, comments and maps online. Our website address again is

## REDISTRICTING.2011.LACITY.ORG

In this second phase of public hearings, we will be grouping speakers by geographic topic. As you fill out your public comment cards, please indicate if you are in favor or against the draft map, as well as indicate the community or Council District you would like to talk about. Commissioners will also be allowed to ask clarifying questions from the public, so please stick around until your geographic area of interest is completed in case a Commissioner may want to ask you a question. Members of the public will be given two minutes to speak before the Commission.

In this region of the City, I want to give you a basic rationale for how the Commission developed the Draft Map Proposal. In terms of ...

- Council District 11 - Maintains most of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Gains all of Palms and loses half of Westchester.
- Council District 8 - Maintains many of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Loses Baldwin Vista and Leimert Park. Picks up half of Westchester and most of Vermont-Slauson.
- Council District 10 - Maintains most of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Loses Palms, Windsor Village, Wilshire Park, and a portion of the Miracle Mile. Picks up most of the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council, a portion of Exposition Park, Baldwin Vista, and most of Leimert Park.
- Council District 5 -Changed based on the public testimony to have only one Council District straddle Mulholland Drive. Loses everything north of Mulholland Drive and Beverly Crest. Picks up Miracle Mile, Hancock Park, Larchmont Village, and some of Hollywood.

Before we begin receiving your comments, the City Attorney will provide a brief overview of the redistricting law and criteria that we are obligated to follow.
(City Attorney representative report)
(Public testimony begins, limited to 2 minutes a person)

Welcome to this hearing of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission. Let me first ask my colleagues to introduce themselves and to state by whom they were appointed to serve on this Commission.

Thank you. The full Commission has 21 members: 14 appointed by each member of the City Council, the City Controller, and the City Attorney; two by the Council President; and three by the Mayor. We have elected Mr. Arturo Vargas as Chairman, and Ms. Jackie Dupont Walker and Mr. Robert Kadota as Vice Chairs. To date we have had 11 business meetings and 15 public hearings before drafting a map, established our procedures and processes, and developed a Draft Map Proposal for your review.

This hearing is part of the second phase of soliciting public input in our work. The hearing will be televised on Channel 35 for a later broadcast, as well as available on our website within a few days. We will also make the audio from the public hearing available, as well as a Court Reporter Transcript of the public hearing. The Commission's website is REDISTRICTING2011.LACITY.ORG. There will be five other opportunities for public comment as well:

```
Wednesday, February 1@-6:30PM
Wilshire Ebell Theatre
4401 West 8 'th Street
tos-Angeles,CA90005
Monday, February 6 @ 6:30PM
Occidental College, Thorne Hall
1600 Campus Road
Los Angeles, CA }9004
```

Saturday, February-4@11:00AM

Thursday, February 9 @ 6:30PM
Walter Reed Middle School, Auditorium 4525 Irvine Avenue
Studio City, CA 91602

Pierce College, The Great Hall
6201 Winnetka-Avenue
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

## Saturday, February 11 @ 11:00AM

West Angeles Church Of God In Christ 3045 South Crenshaw Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90016
Thursday, February 2 @ 6:30PM
Westchester Recreation Center, Gym
7000 West Manchester Avenue
Wednesday, February 8 @ 6:30PM
LA City Hall, John Ferraro Chambers
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

We are committed to providing the residents of our City with full opportunity to participate in this process. We are holding seven public hearings in each region of the City on the Draft Map Proposal prior to the adoption of a Final Recommendation to the City Council. Our final map must be completed by March 1, 2012. Our map will then go to the City Council which has until July 1, 2012 to adopt the final map.

In this second phase of public hearings, we will be grouping speakers by geographic topic. As you fill out your public comment cards, please indicate if you are in favor or against the draft map, as well as indicate the community or Council District you would like to talk about. Commissioners will also be allowed to ask clarifying questions from the public, so please stick around until your geographic area of interest is completed in case a Commissioner may want to ask you a question. Members of the public will be given two minutes to speak before the Commission.

In this region of the City, I want to give you a basic rationale for how the Commission developed the Draft Map Proposal. In terms of ...

- Council District 3 - Maintains many of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Loses West Hills and takes in most of Reseda.
- Council District 12 - Maintains most of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Loses a portion of Winnetka, a portion of Canoga Park, a portion of Encino, and a portion of Lake Balboa. Gains all of West Hills.
- Council District 4 - Drastically changed based on the public's desire to have only one Council District straddle Mulholland Drive. Loses Hancock Park, Larchmont Village, and the Miracle Mile. Gains Beverly Crest, Sherman Oaks, Encino, some of Van Nuys, and some of Lake Balboa
- Council District 5 - Drastically changed based on the public’s desire to have one Council District straddle Mulholland Drive. Loses everything north of Mulholland Drive and Beverly Crest. Picks up Miracle Mile, Hancock Park, Larchmont Village, and some of Hollywood.
- Council District 6 - Maintains many of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Loses some of Van Nuys and Lake Balboa. Picks up Shadow Hills and all of Panorama City.

Before we begin receiving your comments, the City Attorney will provide a brief overview of the redistricting law and criteria that we are obligated to follow.
(City Attorney representative report)
(Public testimony begins, limited to 2 minutes a person)

Welcome to this hearing of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission. Let me first ask my colleagues to introduce themselves and to state by whom they were appointed to serve on this Commission.

Thank you. The full Commission has 21 members: 14 appointed by each member of the City Council, the City Controller, and the City Attorney; two by the Council President; and three by the Mayor. We have elected Mr. Arturo Vargas as Chairman, and Ms. Jackie Dupont Walker and Mr. Robert Kadota as Vice Chairs. To date we have had 11 business meetings and 15 public hearings before drafting a map, established our procedures and processes, and developed a Draft Map Proposal for your review.

This hearing is part of the second phase of soliciting public input in our work. The hearing will be televised on Channel 35 for a later broadcast, as well as available on our website within a few days. We will also make the audio from the public hearing available, as well as a Court Reporter Transcript of the public hearing. The Commission's website is REDISTRICTING2011.LACITY.ORG. There will be five other opportunities for public comment as well:

```
Wednesday, February 1@-6:30PM
Wilshire Ebell Theatre
4401 West 8 'th Street
tos-Angeles,CA90005
Monday,February-6@-6:30PM
Occidental College,Thorne Hall
1600-Campus Road
Los_Angeles,CA 90041
```

Saturday, February-4@11:00AM

Pierce-College, The-Great Hall
6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Thursday, February 9 @ 6:30PM
Walter Reed Middle School, Auditorium 4525 Irvine Avenue
Studio City, CA 91602

## Saturday, February 11 @ 11:00AM

West Angeles Church Of God In Christ
3045 South Crenshaw Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90016
Thursday, February 2 @ 6:30PM
Westchester Recreation Center, Gym
7000 West Manchester Avenue
Wednesday, February 8 @ 6:30PM
LA City Hall, John Ferraro Chambers
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

We are committed to providing the residents of our City with full opportunity to participate in this process. We are holding seven public hearings in each region of the City on the Draft Map Proposal prior to the adoption of a Final Recommendation to the City Council. Our final map must be completed by March 1, 2012. Our map will then go to the City Council which has until July 1, 2012 to adopt the final map.

In this second phase of public hearings, we will be grouping speakers by geographic topic. As you fill out your public comment cards, please indicate if you are in favor or against the draft map, as well as indicate the community or Council District you would like to talk about. Commissioners will also be allowed to ask clarifying questions from the public, so please stick around until your geographic area of interest is completed in case a Commissioner may want to ask you a question. Members of the public will be given two minutes to speak before the Commission.

In this region of the City, I want to give you a basic rationale for how the Commission developed the Draft Map Proposal. In terms of ...

- Council District 1 - Maintains many of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Takes in most of Highland Park, and lost Rampart Village and north Harvard Heights.
- Council District 13 - Maintains most of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Loses a portion of Hollywood, and picks up all of Rampart Village, all of Atwater Village, and most of Glassell Park.
- Council District 14 - Maintains many of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Loses most of Mt. Washington and most of Highland Park. Gains most of Downtown and some of Central Alameda.

Before we begin receiving your comments, the City Attorney will provide a brief overview of the redistricting law and criteria that we are obligated to follow.
(City Attorney representative report)
(Public testimony begins, limited to 2 minutes a person)

Welcome to this hearing of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission. Let me first ask my colleagues to introduce themselves and to state by whom they were appointed to serve on this Commission.

Thank you. The full Commission has 21 members: 14 appointed by each member of the City Council, the City Controller, and the City Attorney; two by the Council President; and three by the Mayor. We have elected Mr. Arturo Vargas as Chairman, and Ms. Jackie Dupont Walker and Mr. Robert Kadota as Vice Chairs. To date we have had 11 business meetings and 15 public hearings before drafting a map, established our procedures and processes, and developed a Draft Map Proposal for your review.

This hearing is part of the second phase of soliciting public input in our work. The hearing will be televised on Channel 35 for a later broadcast, as well as available on our website within a few days. We will also make the audio from the public hearing available, as well as a Court Reporter Transcript of the public hearing. The Commission's website is REDISTRICTING2011.LACITY.ORG. There will be two other opportunities for public comment as well:

```
Wednesday, February 1@-6:30PM
Wilshire Ebell Theatre
4401 West 8 'th Street
tos-Angeles,CA90005
Monday, February-6@-6:30PM
Occidental College,Thorne Hall
1600-Campus Road
Los_Angeles,CA 90041
```


## Saturday, February 11 @ 11:00AM

West Angeles Church Of God In Christ
3045 South Crenshaw Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90016


Saturday, February-4@11:00AM<br>Pierce College, The Great Hall<br>6201 Winnetka Avenue<br>Woodland Hills, CA 91367<br>Thursday, February 9 @ 6:30PM<br>Walter Reed Middle School, Auditorium 4525 Irvine Avenue<br>Studio City, CA 91602<br>Woodland Hills, CA 91367<br>Studio City, CA 91602

- Council District 9 - Maintains many of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Loses most of Downtown Los Angeles north of Olympic Blvd., most of Vermont-Slauson, and most of Central Alameda. Picks up more of Green Meadows and all of Watts.

Before we begin receiving your comments, the City Attorney will provide a brief overview of the redistricting law and criteria that we are obligated to follow.
(City Attorney representative report)
(Public testimony begins, limited to 2 minutes a person)

Welcome to this hearing of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission. Let me first ask my colleagues to introduce themselves and to state by whom they were appointed to serve on this Commission.

Thank you. The full Commission has 21 members: 14 appointed by each member of the City Council, the City Controller, and the City Attorney; two by the Council President; and three by the Mayor. We have elected Mr. Arturo Vargas as Chairman, and Ms. Jackie Dupont Walker and Mr. Robert Kadota as Vice Chairs. To date we have had 11 business meetings and 15 public hearings before drafting a map, established our procedures and processes, and developed a Draft Map Proposal for your review.

This hearing is part of the second phase of soliciting public input in our work. The hearing will be televised on Channel 35 for a later broadcast, as well as available on our website within a few days. We will also make the audio from the public hearing available, as well as a Court Reporter Transcript of the public hearing. The Commission's website is REDISTRICTING2011.LACITY.ORG. There will be one other opportunity for public comment as well:
Wednesday, February 1 @-6:30PM
Wilshire Ebell Theatre
4401 West $8^{\text {th }}$ Street
tos Angeles,CA 90005
Monday, February-6@-6:30PM
Occidental College, Thorne Hall
1600Campus Road
Los Angeles,CA 90041

## Wednesday, February 1 @-6:30PM

Wilshire Ebell Theatre
4401 West $8^{\text {th }}$ Street
tosAngeles, CA 90005

Monday, February-6@-6:30PM
Occidental College, Thorne Hall
1600 Campus Road
tosAngeles, CA 90041
Thursday, February 2 @-6:30PM
Westchester Recreation Center, Gym
7000 West Manchester Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Wednesday, February 8 @ 6:30PM
LA City Hall, John Ferraro Chambers
Z00 North Spring Street
LOSAngeles, CA 90012

Saturday,February-4@11:00AM
Pierce-College, The-Great Hall
6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Thursday, February-9—6-30PM
Walter Reed Middle-School, Auditorium 4525 Irvine Avenue
Studio-City, CA 91602

## Saturday, February 11 @ 11:00AM

West Angeles Church Of God In Christ 3045 South Crenshaw Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90016
We are committed to providing the residents of our City with full opportunity to participate in this process. We are holding seven public hearings in each region of the City on the Draft Map Proposal prior to the adoption of a Final Recommendation to the City Council. Our final map must be completed by March 1, 2012. Our map will then go to the City Council which has until July 1, 2012 to adopt the final map.

In this second phase of public hearings, we will be grouping speakers by geographic topic. As you fill out your public comment cards, please indicate if you are in favor or against the draft map, as well as indicate the community or Council District you would like to talk about. Commissioners will also be allowed to ask clarifying questions from the public, so please stick around until your geographic area of interest is completed in case a Commissioner may want to ask you a question. Members of the public will be given two minutes to speak before the Commission.

In this region of the City, I want to give you a basic rationale for how the Commission developed the Draft Map Proposal. In terms of ...

- Council District 2 - Drastically changed based on the public’s desire for a more geographically compact district. Maintains Valley Glen, Valley Village, and Studio City. Picks up Toluca Lake and all of the North Hollywood neighborhoods. Loses Foothill Trails, Sherman Oaks, and Sunland-Tujunga.
- Council District 4 - Drastically changed based on the public’s desire to have only one Council District straddle Mulholland Drive. Loses Hancock Park, Larchmont Village, and the Miracle Mile. Gains Beverly Crest, Sherman Oaks, Encino, some of Van Nuys, and some of Lake Balboa
- Council District 5 - Drastically changed based on the public’s desire to have one Council District straddle Mulholland Drive. Loses everything north of Mulholland Drive and Beverly Crest. Picks up Miracle Mile, Hancock Park, Larchmont Village, and some of Hollywood.
- Council District 6 - Maintains many of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Loses some of Van Nuys, Lake Balboa, and North Hollywood. Picks up Shadow Hills, most of the Foothill Trails, and all of Panorama City.
- Council District 7 - Maintains many of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Picks up some of the Foothill Trails and all of Sunland-Tujunga. Loses Panorama City.

Before we begin receiving your comments, the City Attorney will provide a brief overview of the redistricting law and criteria that we are obligated to follow.
(City Attorney representative report)
(Public testimony begins, limited to 2 minutes a person)

Welcome to this hearing of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission. Let me first ask my colleagues to introduce themselves and to state by whom they were appointed to serve on this Commission.

Thank you. The full Commission has 21 members: 14 appointed by each member of the City Council, the City Controller, and the City Attorney; two by the Council President; and three by the Mayor. We have elected Mr. Arturo Vargas as Chairman, and Ms. Jackie Dupont Walker and Mr. Robert Kadota as Vice Chairs. To date we have had 11 business meetings and 15 public hearings before drafting a map, established our procedures and processes, and developed a Draft Map Proposal for your review.

This hearing is part of the second phase of soliciting public input in our work. The hearing will be televised on Channel 35 for a later broadcast, as well as available on our website within a few days. We will also make the audio from the public hearing available, as well as a Court Reporter Transcript of the public hearing. The Commission’s website is REDISTRICTING2011.LACITY.ORG. Today's meeting represents the last of our public hearings. After the conclusion of today's hearings, the Commission will continue to accept written comments via post, fax, or email until Monday, February 13, 2012 at 5:00pm. You can also go to the Commission website to fill out a public comment form directly on the website.



Saturday, February 4-@11:00AM
Pierce College, The Great Hall
6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
Thursday, February-9@6:30PA
Walter Reed Middle School, Auditorium 4525 Irvine Avenue
Studio City, CA 91602

We are committed to providing the residents of our City with full opportunity to participate in this process. We are holding seven public hearings in each region of the City on the Draft Map Proposal prior to the adoption of a Final Recommendation to the City Council. Our final map must be completed by March 1, 2012. Our map will then go to the City Council which has until July 1, 2012 to adopt the final map.

In this second phase of public hearings, we will be grouping speakers by geographic topic. As you fill out your public comment cards, please indicate if you are in favor or against the draft map, as well as indicate the community or Council District you would like to talk about. Commissioners will also be allowed to ask clarifying questions from the public, so please stick around until your geographic area of interest is completed in case a Commissioner may want to ask you a question. Members of the public will be given two minutes to speak before the Commission.

In this region of the City, I want to give you a basic rationale for how the Commission developed the Draft Map Proposal. In terms of ...

- Council District 8 - Maintains many of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Loses Baldwin Vista and Leimert Park. Picks up half of Westchester and most of Vermont-Slauson.
- Council District 9 - Maintains many of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Loses most of Downtown Los Angeles north of Olympic Blvd., most of Vermont-Slauson, and most of Central Alameda. Picks up more of Green Meadows and all of Watts.
- Council District 10 - Maintains most of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Loses Palms, Windsor Village, Wilshire Park, and a portion of the Miracle Mile. Picks up most of the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council, a portion of Exposition Park, Baldwin Vista, and most of Leimert Park.
- Council District 11 - Maintains most of the same neighborhoods it has currently. Gains all of Palms and loses half of Westchester.

Before we begin receiving your comments, the City Attorney will provide a brief overview of the redistricting law and criteria that we are obligated to follow.
(City Attorney representative report)
(Public testimony begins, limited to 2 minutes a person)

## Standard Statement of the City Attorney's Office - Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission Public Hearings

On behalf of the Los Angeles City Attorney’s Office, we welcome you to this public hearing of the Los Angeles City Redistricting Commission. Our Office’s role is to provide legal advice to the City, including this Commission, throughout the redistricting process. We would like to take this opportunity to discuss several important laws and legal principles that apply to redistricting.

The Los Angeles City Charter requires the City Council to redraw the lines for the City’s 15 Council districts at least once every 10 years. The Charter creates this Redistricting Commission to advise the City Council on the drawing of the Council district lines. The Charter requires the Redistricting Commission to obtain public input, prepare a redistricting proposal and present the proposal to the City Council by March 1, 2012.

Several important legal criteria govern the redistricting process:
Equal Population Principle - Council districts must contain, as nearly as practicable, equal portions of the total population of the City. This principle is established in the City Charter and also in the United State Supreme Court's "One-Person, One-Vote" decisions.
U.S. Constitution's Equal Protection Clause - The United States Supreme Court has held that race cannot be used as the predominant factor in drawing district lines such that traditional redistricting criteria are subordinated to considerations of race.

Voting Rights Act of 1965 - The Voting Rights Act prohibits voting practices which result in a denial or abridgement of the right to vote on account of race, color or language minority status. Redistricting plans must be analyzed under the Voting Rights Act to ensure they do not deprive minority voters of an equal opportunity to elect representatives of their choice in violation of the Act.

Traditional Redistricting Criteria - Federal, state and city law have established several traditional redistricting criteria all of which shall be considered to the extent feasible when drawing district lines:

Contiguity - all parts of a district should connect Compactness - districts should be geographically compact
Existing Boundaries - districts should consider boundaries such as geographic, street and political boundaries
Communities of Interest - districts should preserve communities of people sharing common interests

More information regarding the laws governing the City's redistricting process are available on the Redistricting Commission's website: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org. Thank you.
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## 市檢察官辦公室的標準聲明－Los Angeles 市市議會重劃選區委員會公共聽證會

我們代表 Los Angeles 市檢察官辦公室歡迎您參加 Los Angeles 市重劃選區委員會的本次公共聽證會。本辦公室的作用是在整個重劃選區的過程中向市府提供法律建議。我們願意藉此機會討論適用於重劃選區的若干重要法律及法律原則。

Los Angeles 市憲章要求市議會至少每隔 10 年將本市 15 個市議會區的邊界重新劃分一次。本重劃選區委員會係依據市憲章的規定成立，旨在向市議會提供有關劃分市議會區邊界的建議。市憲章要求重劃選區委員會於 2012 年 3 月 1 日前徵求公眾意見，擬定重劃選區的提議，並向市議會呈遞該提議。

重劃選區的過程受若干重要法律標準的管限：

人口均等原則－在可行的情況下，各個市議會區的人口必須儘量均等。市憲章及美國最高法院在「一人一票」之裁定中規定了這一原則。

美國憲法的平等保護條款－美國最高法院已經裁定，不能把種族作為劃分選區邊界的主要因素，例如傳統的重劃選區標準服從於關於種族的考慮。

1965 年投票權法案－投票權法案禁止以種族，膚色或語言少數族群身份為由而否決或剝奪投票權的投票做法。必須依據投票權法案而分析重劃選區的計畫，以確保這些計畫不會違反該法案，剝奪少數族群選民按照自己的意願選舉其代表者的平等機會。

傳統的重劃選區標準－聯邦，州及市法律都規定了若干傳統的重劃選區標準。在可行的前提下，劃分選區邊界時應考慮這些標準：

連綿性－一個選區的所有部份應彼此連接
緊湊性－各選區均應具備地理方面的緊湊性
現有邊界－選區應考慮現有邊界，例如地理邊界，街道及政治邊界等
共同利益社區－選區應保全擁有共同利益的社區

有關適用於本市重劃選區過程法律的詳盡資訊，請瀏覽重劃選區委員會網站： www．redistricting2011．lacity．org。謝謝。

## 市法務官事務局からのお知らせ－Los Angeles 市市議会再区画委員会公聴会

Los Angeles 市再区画委員会公聴会にご出席いただき，Los Angeles 市法務官事務局にな り代わりお礼申し上げます。当事務局の役割は，本委員会を含め再区画のプロセスにお いて法的な助言を市に提供することです。この場をお借りして再区画に関する重要な法律や法的事項について説明させていただきたいと思います。

Los Angeles 市憲章は15の市議会区の境界線を最低でも 10 年ごとに再区画することを市議会に要請します。憲章により市議会再区画の境界線を助言する再区画委員会が創設さ れます。憲章に準拠し，再区画委員会は市民の意見を聞き，再区画提案を作成し，2012年3月1日までに提案を市議会に提出します。

再区画プロセスにおける重要な法的基準：
均等人口の原則－市議会区の人口比率は，可能な限り，市の合計人口と均等な比率であること。本原則は市憲章に制定されており，かつ米国最高裁判所の「一人一票」の判決に基づきます。

アメリカ合衆国憲法均等保護条項－米国最高裁判所は境界線を引く上で人種が支配要因であってはならないとしており，人種に関しては従来型の再区画基準は従属的である。

1965 年投票権利法－投票権利法は人種，肌の色，または少数民族言語による投票権の拒否または剥奪を禁止する。再区画計画は，少数民族の有権者が選択肢の代表者に投票する均等機会を剥奪されないことを保証する投票権利法に違反しない ように，検討されなければなりません。

従来型再区画基準－連邦法，州法，市法は区の境界線を引く上で適当であるとす る以下の従来型の再区画基準を制定しました。

隣接－区の全ての箇所は隣接していなければならない
小規模－区は地理的に小規模であること
既存の境界－区は地理的，街路，政治的境界を考慮しなければならない
利害の共通－区は市民共通の利害を保護しなければならない
市の再区画プロセスに関する法律の詳細は再区画委員会ウェブサイト www．redistricting2011．lacity．orgをご覧ください。よろしくお願いいたします。

## 시 법무관실의 표준 성명서 - Los Angeles 시의회 지구 재설정 위원회 청문회

Los Angeles 시 법무관실을 대표하여, Los Angeles 시의회 지구 재설정 위원회의 본 청문회에 오신 여러분을 환영합니다. 저희 법무관실의 역할은 지구 재설정 과정 전반에 걸쳐, 본 위원회를 포함하여, 시에 법률 자문을 제공하는 것입니다. 저희는 이 기회를 통해 지구 재설정에 적용되는 여러 주요 법률과 법적 원칙을 설명하고자 합니다.

Los Angeles 시 헌장은 시의회로 하여금 매 10 년마다 최소한 한번 시의 15 개 시의회 지구 경계를 재설정하도록 요구하고 있습니다. 본 헌장은 시의회 지구 경계 설정에 대해 시의회에 자문을 제공하도록 지구 재설정 위원회를 창설하고 있습니다. 본 헌장은 지구 재설정 위원회로 하여금 2012년 3월 1일까지 일반 의견을 수렴하여, 지구 재설정 제안서를 준비하고 본 제안서를 시의회에 제출하도록 요구하고 있습니다.

여러 주요 법적 기준이 지구 재설정 과정에 적용됩니다:
인구 균등 원칙 - 시의회 지구에는, 실질적으로 근사하게, 시 전체 인구의 동일한 숫자가 포함되어야 합니다. 이 원칙은 시 헌장에 또한 미 연방 대법원의 "일인 일표" 결정에 수립되어 있습니다.

미 헌법의 균등 보호 조항 - 미 대법원에서는 지구 경계 설정에 인종이 주요 요소로 사용될 수 없음을 명시하였으며 따라서 전통적인 지구 재설정 기준은 인종을 고려하는 것에 종속됩니다.

1965년 투표권 법 - 투표권 법은 인종, 피부색 또는 언어상으로 소수 민족인 이유로 인해 투표권이 거부 또는 탈취되는 결과를 초래하는 투표 진행을 금하고 있습니다. 지구 재설정 계획은 본 계획이 소수계 유권자들이 그들 선택에 따른 대표를 선출하는 동등한 기회를 투표권 법을 위반하여 탈취하지 않도록 보장하기 위해 투표권 법 하에 반드시 검토되어야 합니다.

전통적인 지구 재설정 기준 - 연방, 주, 시 법은 전통적인 지구 재설정 기준을 여러가지 제정하였으며 이 모든 법은 지구 경계 설정시 적용가능 한도까지 고려되어야 합니다:

인접성 - 지구의 모든 부분은 붙어 있어야 합니다
밀집성 - 지구는 지리적으로 밀집되어 있어야 합니다
기존의 경계 - 지구는 지리적, 도로상 및 정치적인 경계선을 고려해야 합니다
이해관계 커뮤니티 - 지구는 공통된 이해를 갖고 있는 주민 사회를 보존해야 합니다

시의 지구 재설정 과정에 적용되는 법에 대한 추가 정보는 지구 재설정 위원회의 다음 웹사이트에 나와 있습니다: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org. 감사합니다.

## Declaración estándar de la Oficina del Abogado Municipal - Audiencias Públicas de la

 Comisión para la Redistribución de Distritos del Concejo Municipal de Los ÁngelesEn representación de la Oficina del Abogado Municipal de Los Ángeles, le damos la bienvenida a esta audiencia pública de la Comisión para la Redistribución de Distritos de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles. La función de nuestra oficina es asesorar legalmente a la ciudad, incluso a esta Comisión, a lo largo del proceso de redistribución de distritos. Queremos aprovechar esta oportunidad para hablar sobre varias leyes y principios legales importantes que se aplican a la redistribución de distritos.

En la Carta Constitutiva de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles se exige que, por lo menos una vez cada 10 años, el Concejo Municipal vuelva a realizar el trazado de líneas de los 15 distritos del Concejo Municipal de la Ciudad. La Carta crea esta Comisión para la Redistribución de Distritos, cuyo fin es asesorar al Concejo Municipal en relación con el trazado de las líneas del distrito del Concejo Municipal. En la Carta se exige a la Comisión para la Redistribución de Distritos que obtenga la opinión pública, prepare una propuesta de redistribución de distritos y la presente ante el Concejo Municipal hasta el 1 de marzo de 2012.

En el proceso de redistribución de distritos rigen varios criterios legales de importancia:
Principio de Igualdad de Población - En la medida de lo posible, los distritos del Concejo Municipal deben tener porciones iguales del total de población de la ciudad. Este principio está establecido en la Carta Constitutiva y en las decisiones de la Corte Suprema de los Estados Unidos que se basan en el principio "Una persona, un voto".

Cláusula de Protección Igualitaria de la Constitución de los EE. UU. - La Corte Suprema de los Estados Unidos sostiene que la raza no puede ser el factor predominante durante el trazado de las líneas de los distritos, de tal forma que los criterios tradicionales de redistribución de distritos están subordinados a consideraciones de raza.

Ley de Derecho al Voto de 1965 - La Ley de Derecho al Voto prohíbe las prácticas electorales que tengan como resultado la negación o reducción del derecho al voto según la situación de las minorías en cuanto a raza, color o idioma. Los planes para la redistribución de distritos deben analizarse conforme a la Ley de Derecho al Voto con el fin de asegurarse de que los votantes que pertenecen a las minorías no sean privados de la igualdad de oportunidades para elegir a sus representantes y de que no se viole la Ley.

Criterios Tradicionales de Redistribución - Las leyes federales, estatales y municipales establecieron varios criterios tradicionales de redistribución que, en la medida de lo posible, deben considerarse para el trazado de las líneas de los distritos:

Contigüidad - todas las partes de un distrito deben conectarse
Compactibilidad - los distritos deben ser geográficamente compactos
Límites Existentes - los distritos deben tener en cuenta los límites, como límites geográficos, de calles y políticos
Comunidades de Interés - los distritos deben preservar las comunidades de personas que tienen intereses en común

Hay más información disponible sobre las leyes que rigen el proceso de redistribución de distritos de la ciudad en el sitio web de la Comisión para la Redistribución de Distritos: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org. Gracias.

Pangkaraniwang Pahayag ng Opisina ng Abugado ng Lunsod - Mga Pampublikong Pagdinig ng Komisyon sa Muling Pagdistrito ng Konseho ng Lunsod ng Los Angeles

Sa ngalan ng Opisina ng Abugado ng Lunsod ng Los Angeles, malugod naming tinatanggap kayo sa pampublikong pagdinig na ito ng Komisyon sa Muling Pagdistrito ng Lunsod ng Los Angeles. Ang tungkulin ng aming Opisina ay magkaloob ng payong pambatas sa Lunsod, kabilang ang Komisyong ito, sa buong proseso ng muling pagdistrito. Gusto naming samantalahin ang pagkakataong ito upang talakayin ang ilang mahahalagang batas at mga prinsipyong pambatas na angkop sa muling pagdistrito.

Ang Saligang-Batas ng Los Angeles ay nag-aatas sa Konseho ng Lunsod na muling iguhit ang mga linya para sa 15 distrito ng Konseho ng Lunsod kahit minsan tuwing 10 taon. Nililikha ng Saligang-Batas itong Komisyon sa Muling Pagdistrito upang payuhan ang Konseho ng Lunsod sa pagguhit ng mga linya ng distrito ng Konseho. Ang Saligang-Batas ay nag-aatas sa Komisyon sa Muling Pagdistrito na kumuha ng kontribusyon ng publiko, maghanda ng isang mungkahi sa muling pagdistrito at iharap ang mungkahi sa Konseho ng Lunsod bago lumampas ang ika-1 ng Marso, 2012.

Ilang mahahalagang pamantayang pambatas ang namamahala sa proseso ng muling pagdistrito:

Prinsipyo ng Pantay na Populasyon - Ang mga distrito ng konseho ay dapat magtaglay, hanggang sa pinakamalapit na makakaya, ng magkakapantay na bahagi ng kabuuang populasyon ng Lunsod. Ang prinsipyong ito ay itinatag sa Saligang-Batas ng Lunsod at gayon din sa mga desisyong "Isang-Tao, Isang-Boto" ng Korte Suprema ng Estados Unidos.

Sugnay na Pantay na Proteksiyon ng Saligang-Batas ng Estados Unidos - Ang Korte Suprema ng Estados Unidos ay nagpasiya na ang lahi ay hindi magagamit bilang pangunahing dahilan sa pagguhit ng mga linya ng distrito upang ang naturang tradisyunal na pamantayan sa muling pagdistrito ay mapailalim sa mga pagsasaalang-alang sa lahi.

Batas ng 1965 sa mga Karapatan sa Pagboto - Ang Batas sa mga Karapatan sa Pagboto ay nagbabawal sa mga gawaing pagboto na nagreresulta sa pagkakait o pagkaputol ng karapatang bumoto dahil sa katayuan bilang minorya batay sa lahi, kulay o wika. Ang mga plano sa muling pagdistrito ay dapat suriin sa ilalim ng Batas sa mga Karapatan sa Pagboto upang matiyak na ang mga ito ay hindi labag sa Batas na nagkakait sa mga minoryang botante ng pantay na pagkakataong maghalal ng mga kinatawang pinili nila.

Mga Pamantayan sa Tradisyunal na Muling Pagdistrito - Ang pederal, pang-estado at panlunsod na batas ay nagtatag ng ilang tradisyunal na pamantayan sa muling pagdistrito na dapat isaalang-alang lahat hanggang magagawa kapag gumuguhit ng mga linya ng distrito:

Pagkamagkaratig - lahat ng mga bahagi ng isang distrito ay dapat magkakarugtong Pagkasiksik - ang mga distrito ay dapat na siksik sa heograpiya
Mga Umiiral na Hangganan - dapat isaalang-alang ng mga distrito ang mga hangganang tulad ng mga hangganang pangheograpiya, pangkalye at pampulitika
Mga Komunidad ng Interes - dapat pangalagaan ng mga distrito ang mga komunidad ng mga taong may mga magkakatulad na interes

Ang karagdagang impormasyon tungkol sa mga batas na namamahala sa proseso ng muling pagdistrito ng Lunsod ay makukuha sa lugar ng web ng Komisyon sa Muling Pagdistrito: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org. Salamat po.

## แถลงการณ์ของสำนักงานอัยการเมือง - ประชาพิจารณ์ของคณะกรรมาธิการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ ของสภาเทศบาลนครลอสแองเจลลิส

ในนามของสำนักงานอัยการแห่งนครลอสแองเจลลิส เราขอต้อนรับท่านสู่ประชาพิจารณ์ของคณะ กรรมาธิการในการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ของนครลอสแองเจลลิส หน้าที่ของ สำนักงานเราคือให้คำ ปรึกษาด้านกฎหมายให้กับเมือง ซึ่งรวมถึงคณะกรรมาธิการนี้ ตลอดกระบวนการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ เราขอถือโอกาสนื้อภิปรายเกี่ยวกับกฎหมาย และหลักกฎหมายที่สำคัญหลายข้อ ที่ใช้ในการจัดแบ่งเขต เลือกตั้งใหม่

กฎบัตรจัดตั้งเมืองของนครลอสแองเจลลิสกำหนดให้สภาเทศบาลกำหนดแบ่งสภาเขตทั้ง 15 เขตของเมือง ใหม่อย่างน้อยทุกๆ 10 ปี กฎบัตรกำหนดให้คณะกรรมาธิการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่นี้ให้คำแนะนำ สภาเทศบาลนครในการกำหนดเขตแดนสภาเขต กฎบัตรกำหนดให้คณะกรรมาธิการการจัดแบ่งเขต เลือกตั้งใหม่รับความคิดเห็นจากสาธารณชน เตรียมข้อเสนอเกี่ยวกับการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ และยื่น ข้อเสนอนี้ต่อสภาเทศบาลนครภายในวันที่ 1 มีนาคม 2555

เกณฑ์ทางกฎหมายที่สำคัญหลายประการจะเป็นตัวบังคับควบคุมกระบวนการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่นี้:
หลักการว่าด้วยเรื่องจำนวนประชากรที่เท่าเทียมกัน - สภาเขตต้องประกอบด้วย จำนวนประชากร ที่เป็นสัดส่วนที่เท่าเทียมกันหรือ แทบเท่าเทียมกันที่สามารถทำได้ของจำนวนประชากรทั้งหมด ที่อาคัยอยู่ในเมือง หลักการนี้ได้ถูกกำหนดไว้ในกฎบัตรจัดตั้งเมืองและในคำวินิจฉัยของศาลสูง สหรัฐที่ว่า "หนึ่งคน ลงคะแนนเสียงได้หนึ่งคะแนน"

ข้อกำหนดเรื่องการคุ้มครองที่เท่าเทียมกันของรัฐธรรมนูญสหรัฐฯ - ศาลสูงสหรัฐฯ สั่งห้ามมิให้ใช้ เชื้อชาติเป็นปัจจัยหลักในการกำหนดเขตแดนโดยเกณฑ์ดั้งเดิมของการแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่นั้นให้ ความสำคัญของเชื้อชาติน้อยกว่า

กฎหมายสิทธิเลือกตั้งปี 1965 - กฎหมายสิทธิเลือกตั้งห้ามการปฏิบัติในการออกเสียงเลือกตั้ง ซึ่งส่งผลให้เกิดการปฏิเสธหรือตัดสิทธิ์สิทธิในการออกเสียงเลือกตั้งเนื่องจากเชื้อชาติ สีผิวหรือ สถานภาพของชนกลุ่มน้อยที่พูดต่างภาษา ต้องมีการวิเคราะห์แผนงานการแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ ภายใต้กฎหมายสิทธิเลือกตั้งเพื่อให้มั่นใจได้ว่า จะไม่มีการตัดสิทธิ์ผู้ลงคะแนนเสียงที่เป็นชนส่วนน้อย ในเรื่องของความเสมอภาคเท่าเทียมกัน เพื่อเลือกผู้แทนตามความต้องการของตนซึ่งจะเป็นการฝ่าฝืน กฎหมายนี้

เกณฑ์การจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่แบบดั้งเดิม - กฎหมายแห่งรัฐบาลกลาง แห่งรัฐและแห่งเมือง ได้กำหนดเกณฑ์การจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่แบบดั้งเดิมหลายประการ ซึ่งจะมีการนำเกณฑ์ทั้งหมด มาพิจารณาการกำหนดเขตแดนให้เกิดความเหมาะสมมากที่สุด:

การติดกัน - ทุกส่วนของเขตควรเชื่อมต่อกัน
ความหนาแน่น - เขตควรมีความหนาแน่นของประชากรเชิงภูมิศาสตร์
เขตแดนที่มีอยู่เดิม - เขตควรพิจารณาถึงเขตแดนเช่น ทางภูมิศาสตร์ ถนน และเขตแดน ทางการเมือง
ความสนใจร่วมกันของชุมชน - เขตควรดำรงชุมชนไว้ซึ่งกลุ่มประชาชนที่มีความสนใจร่วมกัน
สามารถหาข้อมูลเพิ่มเติมเกี่ยวกับกฎหมายที่บังคับควบคุมกระบวนการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่ของเมืองได้ ที่เว็บไซต์ของคณะกรรมาธิการการจัดแบ่งเขตเลือกตั้งใหม่: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org ขอบคุณ

## Tuyên Ngôn Tiêu Chuẩn của Văn Phòng Luật Sư Thành Phố - Trưng Cầu Dân Ý của Ủy

 Ban Tái Phân Chia Khu Hội Đồng Thành Phố Los AngelesThay mặt cho Văn Phòng Luật Sư Thành Phố Los Angeles, chúng tôi xin được chào đón quý vị đến dự buổi trưng cầu dân ý này của Ủy Ban Tái Phân Chia Khu Thành Phố Los Angeles. Vai trò của Văn Phòng chúng tôi là đưa ra sự cố vấn pháp lý cho Thành Phố, trong đó có Ủy Ban này, trong suốt tiến trình tái phân chia khu. Chúng tôi muốn nhân dịp này thảo luận một số điều luật và nguyên tắc pháp lý quan trọng sẽ áp dụng trong việc tái phân chia khu.

Hiến Chương Thành Phố Los Angeles đòi hỏi Hội Đồng Thành Phố phải vẽ lại ranh giới của 15 khu Hội Đồng Thành Phố ít nhất là mỗi 10 năm một lần. Hiến Chương lập ra Ủy Ban Tái Phân Chia Khu này để cố vấn cho Hội Đồng Thành Phố việc vẽ lại lằn ranh giới của các khu Hội Đồng. Hiến Chương đòi hỏi Ủy Ban Tái Phân Chia Khu phải thu thập ý kiến của công chúng, soạn thảo đề nghị tái phân chia khu và trình đề nghị đó cho Hội Đồng Thành Phố vào ngày 1 tháng Ba, 2012.

Có một số tiêu chuẩn quan trọng làm ảnh hưởng đến tiến trình tái phân chia khu:
Nguyên Tắc Về Dân Số Tương Đương - Các khu Hội Đồng phải có, mức gần nhất nếu được, phần phân chia bằng nhau của tổng dân số Thành Phố. Nguyên tắc này được quy định trong Hiến Chương Thành Phố và đồng thời trong phán quyết "Một Người, Một Lá Phiếu" của Tối Cao Pháp Viện Hoa Kỳ.

Điều Khoản Bảo Vệ Sự Bình Đẳng Trong Hiến Pháp Hoa Kỳ - Tối Cao Pháp Viện Hoa Kỳ đã phán quyết rằng chủng tộc không thể được dùng làm yếu tố chính trong việc vẽ đường ranh giới khu theo như tiêu chuẩn tái phân chia khu truyền thống phụ thuộc vào sự xem xét về chủng tộc.

Đạo Luật Về Quyền Bầu Cử Năm 1965 - Đạo Luật Về Quyền Bầu Cử cấm những nguyên tẳc bầu cử đưa đến sự phủ nhận hay hạn chế quyền bầu cử do tình trạng thiểu số về chủng tộc, màu da hoặc ngôn ngũ. Kế hoạch tái phân chia khu phải được phân tích chiếu theo Đạo Luật Về Quyền Bầu Cử để bảo đảm là chúng không tước đi của các cử tri thiểu số cơ hội bình đẳng để bầu chọn những người đại diện cho họ theo cách vi phạm Đạo Luật này.

Tiêu Chuẩn Tái Phân Chia Khu Theo Truyền Thống - Luật liên bang, tiểu bang và thành phố đã quy định một số tiêu chuẩn tái phân chia khu theo truyền thống mà tất cả những tiêu chuẩn đó sẽ phải được xem xét trong trường hợp khả thi khi vẽ các đường ranh giới khu:

Sự Tiếp Giáp - tất cả các phần của một khu phải nối liền với nhau
Tính Cách Thu Gọn - các khu phải thu gọn về hình thể địa lý
Ranh Giới Hiện Hữu - các khu cần phải xem xét những ranh giới thí dụ như ranh giới về địa lý, đường phố và chính trị
Quyền Lọ̣i của Cộng Đồng - khu phải duy trì những người trong cộng đồng được chia sẻ quyền lợi chung

Trong website của Ủy Ban Tái Phân Chia Khu có thêm chi tiết về các điều luật ảnh hưởng đến tiến trình tái phân chia khu của Thành Phố: www.redistricting2011.lacity.org. Cám ơn quý vị.

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 1

Total Participants: 80

## COI Emphasized:

Glassell Park, Highland Park, Echo Park, Angelino Heights, Koreatown, Chinatown, Lincoln Heights

## Issue Messaging/Ask:

1) Keep Koreatown in a single council district.
2) Keep Chinatown in a single council district.
3) Keep the communities of Chinatown and Lincoln heights together.
4) Don't change the council district.
5) Keep the Arts District in CD 14.

## Preference of Existing CD to Shifts in CD:

See above

## Affiliations of Participants:

Lincoln Heights NC, Skid Row Hosing Trust, Korean Chamber of Commerce, Lincoln Heights NC, Police Advisory, Korean Chamber of Commerce, Korean American Bar Association, Menteet Mentor Project, Pueblo Nuevo NN, Pico Union NC, Asian Pacific Legal Center, North Harvard Heights Neighborhood Association, Budlong-Juliet Catalina Block Club, Glassell Park NC, Korean American Federation of LA, LA 32 NC, Kenwood Raymond Avenue Block Club, Van de Kamp Coalition, Kenwood Raymond Avenue Block Club, Korean American Coalition, Biscuit Company Lofts Homeowners Association, Korean American Bar Association, Korean Chamber of Commerce, Asian Pacific Policy and Planning Council, Korean American Bar Association, Wilshire Center Koreatown NC, Chinese American Citizens Alliance, Southwest Museum Coalition, Chinatown Service Center, LARABA, BLQ BID, All Nations Church, Asian Pacific Islander Preserve America Neighborhood Coalition, Little Bangladesh Improvements Inc, NCs, Disability Commission, Watts Task Force, CATHEDRAL HIGH SCHOOL, Northeast Deal, Korean Churches, LA Riots Community development, PAVA, Korean Attorney Lawyer Associates, United Methodist Church, Los Angeles Chinatown Business Council, The Wall Las Memorias, Arroyo Seco Neighborhood Council, IDEPSCA, Chinese Historic la Society

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 2

Total Participants: 32

## COI Emphasized:

Sunland, Tujunga, Lake View Terrace, Foothills Trails District, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon

## Issue Messaging/Ask:

1) Keep/Make Sunland, Tujunga, Lake View Terrace, Foothill Trails District, Shadow Hills, and La Tuna Canyon united under one council district - Council District 2.
2) Make Lake View Terrace and Foothill Trails District communities/neighborhoods unified as it was before with Sunland-Tujunga under the same council district as Sunland Tujunga.
3) Keep the existing boundaries for Council District 2 intact.
4) Unite the agricultural, rural, and equestrian areas of the area under the same council district.
5) Six complete city council districts within the San Fernando Valley.

## Preference of Existing CD to Shifts in CD:

Participants strongly prefer CD 2 to CD 7.

## Affiliations of Participants:

Sunland-Tujunga Neighborhood Council , Foothill Division Community Police Advisory Board, Sunland Tujunga Emergency Response \& Volunteer Service, Sunland-Tujunga Alliance, Alliance Club, and Rotary Club, La Tuna Canyon Community Association, Lake View Terrace Homeowner's Association, Shadow Hills Property Owner's Association, LA 32 Neighborhood Council, Northeast LA Coalition, Foothill Trails Neighborhood Council, Studio City Neighborhood Council, Ventura Cahuenga Borders Specific Plan.

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 3

Total Participants: 24

## COI Emphasized:

Reseda, West Hills, Canoga Park, Woodland Hills, Chatsworth, Tarzana, Winnetka

## Issue Messaging/Ask:

1) Create a sixth Council District in San Fernando Valley north of Mulholland
2) Respect neighborhood council boundaries
3) Unite portion of Reseda in CD 12 into CD 3
4) Unite small portion of West Hills in CD 12 into CD 3
5) Unite Canoga Park
6) Draw median line on Nordhoff Street to divide CD 12 and CD 3, extending it through Chatsworth Reservoir.

## Preference of Existing CD to Shifts in CD:

See Above

## Affiliations of Participants:

Canoga Park NC, Encino NC, Reseda NC, Santa Susana Clean-up, Valley Industry and Commerce Association, Warner Center Citizen Advisory Committee, West Hills NC, West Valley Senior Center Association, Woodland Hills NC

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 4

## Total Participants: 66

## COI Emphasized:

Koreatown, San Fernando Valley, Hollywood, Encino, Atwater Village, Hancock Park

## Issue Messaging/Ask:

1) Unite Koreatown, which is currently split into 4 council districts into one council district
2) Unite the Armenian community, which is currently split into 5 council districts into one council district
3) Respect boundaries of Greater Wilshire NC, which is currently divided between 3 council districts and place it in Council District 4
4) Unite Hollywood into one Council District 4
5) Unite Atwater Village into Council District 13

## Preference of Existing CD to Shifts in CD:

See above

## Affiliations of Participants:

Advancement Project, Armenian Apostolic Church, Armenian General Athletic Union and Scout, Armenian High Schools in San Fernando Valley, Armenian National Committee, Armenian National Committee, San Fernando Valley North, Armenian National Committee of America, South Valley, Armenian Relief Society Anahid Chapter, Armenian Youth Federation, Asian Pacific Islander Small Business Program, Asian Pacific Islanders Preserve American Neighborhood Coalition, Asian Pacific Planning and Policy Council, Atwater Residents Association, Atwater Village Neighborhood Council, Boozers Association, Bridgewood Wilton Neighborhood Association, Brookeshire Homeowners Association, Coalition of Asian Pacific Entertainment, Community Redevelopment Agency, Los Angeles East Hollywood Neighborhood Council, Encino Neighborhood Council, Equestrian Trails, Inc., Equine Advisory Committee, Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council, Hancock Park Homeowners Association, Hollywoodland Homeowners Association, Holy Martyrs Armenian School, Jamison

Services, Korean American Artists Association of Southern California, Korean American Chamber of Commerce, Korean American Coalition, Korean American Democratic Committee, Korean American Federation, Korean American Service Center, Korean Churches for Community Development, Korean Resource Center, Koreatown Youth and Community Center, K.W. Lee Center for Leadership, La Brea Hancock Homeowners Association, LAPD Olympic Committee Advisory Board, North Hills West Neighborhood Council, Outpost Homeowners Association, Spaulding Square HPOZ, St. Andrews Square Neighborhood Association, Studio City Neighborhood Council, Tarzana Neighborhood Council, Thai American Chamber of Commerce, Thai Community Development Corporation, Thai Town Rotary Club, Toluca Lake, Toluca Lake Homeowners Association, Van Nuys Airport Citizens Advisory Committee, Wilshire Center Business Improvement District, Wilshire Center Koreatown Neighborhood Council, Windsor Square Association

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 5

Total Participants: 21

## COI Emphasized:

Bel Air-Beverly Crest, Palms, Laurel Canyon, Greater Wilshire Area, Westwood, Valley Village, Hollywood

## Issue Messaging/Ask:

1) Keep existing Bel Air-Beverly Crest neighborhood council boundaries - including Laurel Canyon - intact and under Council District 5.
2) Unify the neighborhood of Palms under one council district.
3) Respect neighborhood council boundaries and attempt to keep communities intact or unify them if split.
4) Unify the Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council under one council district.
5) Keep the community of Westwood intact.

## Preference of Existing CD to Shifts in CD:

Participants slightly prefer CD 5 to CD 4.

## Affiliations of Participants:

Log Cabin Republicans of Los Angeles, Valley Industry Commerce Association, Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council, Advancement Project, Studio City Neighborhood Council, Beverly Wilshire Homeowners Association, Brookside Homeowners Association, Comstock Hills Homeowners Association, Westwood Community Council, Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 6

## Total Participants: 38

## COI Emphasized:

Studio City, Sun Valley, North Hollywood, Sherman Oaks, Pacoima, Arleta, Sunland-Tujunga

## Issue Messaging/Ask:

1) Keep communities whole and use neighborhood council district boundaries for redistricting.
2) Unite Studio City into one City Council district.
3) The rural and equestrian areas of the San Fernando Valley Foothills (Sun Valley, Lake View Terrace, Sunland Tujunga, Shadow Hills, La Tuna Canyon, Shadow Hills) should be united in one City Council district.
4) Six entire City Council districts in the San Fernando Valley that don't cross over "the hill" - Mulholland Drive. If necessary, only cross Mulholland Drive in one (not two) council district.
5) Several participants endorsed the package of maps (all 15 City Council districts) submitted by Barry Johnson. This package of maps largely follows neighborhood council lines.

## Preference of Existing CD to Shifts in CD:

Some preference expressed to keep CD 6 the same/intact.

## Affiliations of Participants:

Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association, Sun Valley Neighborhood Council, Valley Industry and Commerce Association, Southwest Panorama City Homeowners Association, Lake Balboa Neighborhood Council, Studio City Residents Association, Save LA River Open Space, Sunland Tujunga Neighborhood Council, Arleta
Neighborhood Council, Neighborhood Council Valley Village, Studio City
Neighborhood Council, Ventura/Cahuenga Blvd. Corridors Review Board, Midtown
North Hollywood Neighborhood Council, Holy Rosary Catholic School, East Valley Coalition.

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 7

Total Participants: 24

## COI Emphasized:

Pacoima, Lake View Terrance, Sunland Tujunga, Sylmar, Granada Hills, Panorama City

## Issue Messaging/Ask:

1) Keep communities whole.
2) Keep rural communities together.
3) Keep council district 7 intact and as is.
4) San Fernando Valley council districts should be north of Mulholland.
5) Keep the equestrian community together.

## Preference of Existing CD to Shifts in CD:

From two councils districts into a single council district.

## Affiliations of Participants:

Advancement Project, Mission Hills NC, Sunland NC, West Hills NC, Studio City NC, Sylmar NC, Foothill Trails NC, Arleta NC

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 8

Total Participants: 36

## COI Emphasized:

Baldwin Hills, Crenshaw Corridor, Hyde Park, Leimert Park, Vermont Knolls

## Issue Messaging/Ask:

1) Keep CD 8 intact
2) Keep historically African American districts (CD 8, 9, and 10) together and intact.
3) Unite Leimert Park in one district.
4) Consider the cultural and historic sites in each of the districts.
5) Make sure there is equity in looking at the division of economic resources.

## Preference of Existing CD to Shifts in CD:

Baldwin Vista Gardens HOA is split between CD 8 and CD 10. Area just south of Rodeo Road and east of Crenshaw should be in CD 10.

## Affiliations of Participants:

$10^{\text {th }}$ District Women's Steering Committee, All People's Community Center, Baldwin Neighborhood HOA, Brotherhood Crusade, California Democratic Party, California Redistricting Commissioner, CH GOP, Cherrywood/Leimert Block Club, Community Coalition, Community Financial Resources Center, Community Health Council, The Dialogue, Empowerment Congress West Area NDC, LAUSD Teacher, LAX Community Noise Roundtable, Los Angeles Neighborhood Initiative, Lulu Washington Dance Theatre, Sheen Educational Center, Southwest Community College, Ward Villas, Westchester Neighbors Association

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 9

Total Participants: 35

## COI Emphasized:

Little Tokyo, South Central Los Angeles, Downtown LA

## Issue Messaging/Ask:

1) Keeping Little Tokyo together
2) Keeping Downtown LA in CD 9
3) Keep Little Tokyo in CD 9
4) Many residents of Skid Row are originally from South Los Angeles
5) History of collaboration between Downtown and South Los Angeles.

## Preference of Existing CD to Shifts in CD:

Participants expressed a preference to stay in CD 9.

Affiliations of Participants:<br>Little Tokyo Service Center Community Development Corporation, Centenary United Methodist Church, LA 32 Neighborhood Council, Central City East Association, Asian Pacific American Legal Center, Central Avenue Business, Union Rescue Mission, Nuevo South , Beyond Shelters, Place Call Home, Little Tokyo Community, Los Angeles River Artists \& Business Association, Downtown Neighborhood Council, Korean American Coalition, Coalition for Responsible Community Development, LA River Artists Business Association, Walker Temple AME Church

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 10

Total Participants: 53

## COI Emphasized:

Koreatown, Wilshire Center, Wellington Square, La Brea, Crewnshaw, Adams, La Fayette Square

## Issue Messaging/Ask:

1) Put Koreatown in one district
2) Keep the $10^{\text {th }}$ district intact.
3) Remain the same
4) Group Leimert Park into CD 10.
5) Keep Lafayette Square, Wellington Square, and Victoria Circle together.

## Preference of Existing CD to Shifts in CD: <br> N/A

## Affiliations of Participants:

West Adams Heights/ Sugar Hill Neighborhood, Koreatown Immigrant Workers Alliance, Vice President of Lafayette Square Association, Ton Group University, Christian Korean Business Association, Bethel Korean Presbyterian Church, KYCC, Korean American Community, Pacific American Volunteer Association, Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 11

## Total Participants: 14

## COI Emphasized:

Palms

Issue Messaging/Ask:

1) Keep Council District 11 intact.
2) Unite neighborhood of Palms into one council district.

## Preference of Existing CD to Shifts in CD:

Participants expressed a desire to move Palms into CD 11.

## Affiliations of Participants:

Palms Neighborhood Council, Venice Neighborhood Council, Brentwood Community Council, Westchester / Playa NC, Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council, Pacific Palisades Community Council

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 12

Total Participants: 24

## COI Emphasized:

North Hills West, North Hills East, Encino/Encino Village, Northridge, Lake Balboa, Granada Hills

## Issue Messaging/Ask:

1) Keep North Hills West part of CD 12
2) Continue to use 405 Freeway as eastern boundary for CD 12 \& North Hills West. Do not go east of 405 Freeway.
3) Make community of Encino whole under one council district
4) Use Neighborhood Council District boundaries in redistricting process. When possible, keep communities whole.
5) Six complete city council districts within the San Fernando Valley.

## Preference of Existing CD to Shifts in CD:

1) North Hills West residents strongly prefer CD 12 to CD 7.
2) Encino residents want to be unified and made whole. They seem to prefer CD 5 to CD 12.

## Affiliations of Participants:

Los Angeles 32 Neighborhood Council, Encino Neighborhood Council, Encino Village Neighborhood Alliance, Valley Industry and Commerce Association, Granada Hills South Neighborhood Council, North Hills West Neighborhood Council

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 13

## Total Participants: 77

## COI Emphasized:

Koreatown, Wilshire Center, Wellington Square, La Brea, Crenshaw, Adams, La Fayette Square

## Issue Messaging/Ask:

1) Unite Koreatown in one council district using the Wilshire Center-Koreatown Neighborhood Council boundaries.
2) Keep communities together/whole.
3) Use the East Hollywood Neighborhood Council district boundaries to unite Thai Town, Little Armenia, and East Hollywood into the same council district.
4) Keep Thai Town whole.
5) Keep the greater community of Hollywood in the same council district

## Preference of Existing CD to Shifts in CD: <br> N/A

## Affiliations of Participants:

Armenian National Committee, KYCC, Filipino communities, Hollywood Chamber of Commerce (East), Korean Workforce Alliance, ANC Hollywood Chapter, Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, Dongguk University, Korean Chamber of Commerce, Realestate, Rotary Club of Thai Town, Thai Immigrant Chamber of Commerce, Thai Government Center \& API Small Business Program, Asian Pacific American Legal Center.

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 14

Total Participants: 36

## COI Emphasized:

Eagle Rock, Washington Heights, Highland Park, El Sereno, Boyle Heights, Industrial
Downtown, Skid row, El Pueblo, and Broadway

Issue Messaging/Ask:

1) Add all of downtown to CD 14
2) Keep Boyle Heights whole
3) Downtown is a community of interest
4) Unify Highland park
5) Boyle Heights connected to Downtown

## Preference of Existing CD to Shifts in CD:

Participants prefer one council district to being split into two or three council district.
Preference expressed for council districts 1 and 14 over 14 and 9

## Affiliations of Participants:

Council, LA 32 NC, Central City, Highland Park NC, Wall Las Memorias, Boyle Heights NC

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 15

## Total Participants: 16

## COI Emphasized:

Watts, San Pedro, Harbor Gateway, Wilmington

## Issue Messaging/Ask:

1) Keep Watts together
2) Keep the Senior Center open.
3) Keep Athens on the Hill in CD 15.
4) There was not enough time for the community to come up with ideas. Don’t do anything until after March 2012, because we need to spend time in the community and communicate with residents better.
5) Need better resources for the communities of Watts and Wilmington.

## Preference of Existing CD to Shifts in CD:

An equal number of people wanted to keep Watts in CD 15 compared to those wanting to move Watts into CD 9.

## Affiliations of Participants:

Athens on the Hill Community Association, Baptist Church, Center for Grief and Loss for Children, Youth, and Teens, Democrats of San Pedro, Greater Watts Group Chamber of Commerce, Harbor Alliance of Neighborhood Councils, Watts Gang Task Force, Watts Labor Community Action Committee, Watts Neighborhood Council, Watts Rose Garden Senior Citizen Center

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 1

Date: Saturday, January 7, 2012
Location: St. Peter’s Italian Catholic Church
Address: 1039 N Broadway, Los Angeles, CA 90012
Time: 11:00AM
Total Attendees: 187 (signed in)

Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 83
Total COI Document Collected: 10

Team: A

Commissioners in Attendance: Ahn, Cornejo, Downey, Dupont-Walker, Ellison, Gaines, Kadota, Kim, Lopez, Roberts, Sanchez, Vargas, Trujillo

Commissioners from Team not in attendance: Anderson, Roberti, Sampson
City Attorney at Hearing: Judith Reel
Elected Official(s): Councilmember Ed Reyes, Assemblymember Gil Cedillo
Interpreter(s): Torres (Spanish), Yang (Mandarin), Ogden (Cantonese), Wang (Korean)
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 2

Date: Monday, December 12, 2011
Location: North Valley City Hall
Address: 7747 Foothill Boulevard, Tujunga, CA 91042
Time: 6:30PM
Total Attendees: 88 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 32
Total COI Document Collected: 6

Team: C
Commissioners in Attendance: Chase, Cornejo, Ford, Gaines, Kadota, Kim, Lopez, McKean, Miller, Roberti, Sanchez, Trujillo, Vargas

Commissioners from Team not in attendance: Ellison

City Attorney at Hearing: Judith Reel
Elected Official(s): Councilmember Paul Krekorian
Interpreter(s): Barragan (Spanish), Hovanessian (Armenian)
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 3

Date: Saturday, December 17, 2011
Location: West Valley Christian Church
Address: 22450 Sherman Way, West Hills, CA 91307
Time: 11:00AM
Total Attendees: 36 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 24
Total COI Document Collected: 8

Team: B

Commissioners in Attendance: Chase, Cornejo, Dupont-Walker, Ford, Gaines, Kadota, Kim, Roberts, Sampson, Sanchez, Vargas

Commissioners from Team not in attendance: Ahn, McKean, Wong
City Attorney at Hearing: Judith Reel
Elected Official(s): Councilmember Dennis Zine

Interpreter(s): Torres (Spanish)
Court Reporter: Jennifer Smith

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 4

Date: Wednesday, January 4, 2012
Location: Friendship Auditorium
Address: 3201 Riverside Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90027
Time: 6:30PM
Total Attendees: 155 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 65
Total COI Document Collected: 13

Team: B
Commissioners in Attendance: Ahn, Cornejo, Dupont-Walker, Ford, Kim, Lopez, McKean, Roberti, Roberts, Sanchez

Commissioners from Team not in attendance: Wong
City Attorney at Hearing: Judith Reel
Elected Official(s): Councilmember Tom LaBonge
Interpreter(s): Torres (Spanish), Park (Korean), Hovanessian (Armenian)
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 5

Date: Thursday, January 5, 2012
Location: Fairfax High School
Address: 7850 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90046
Time: 6:30PM
Total Attendees: 55 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 21
Total COI Document Collected: 1

Team: A

Commissioners in Attendance: Anderson, Downey, Dupont-Walker, Kadota, Roberti, Roberts, Sampson, Vargas

Commissioners from Team not in attendance: Sanchez, Trujillo
City Attorney at Hearing: Judith Reel
Elected Official(s): Councilmember Paul Koretz
Interpreter(s): Torres (Spanish)
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 6

Date: Tuesday, January 3, 2012
Location: Van Nuys City Hall
Address: 14410 Sylvan Street, Van Nuys, CA 91401
Time: 6:30PM
Total Attendees: 120 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 38
Total COI Document Collected: 6

Team: B

Commissioners in Attendance: Chase, Cornejo, Downey, Ford, Sampson, Sanchez, Trujillo, Vargas

Commissioners from Team not in attendance: Ahn, Dupont-Walker, McKean, Roberts, Wong City Attorney at Hearing: Dion O’Connell

Elected Official(s): Councilmember Tony Cardenas, Councilmember Paul Krekorian
Interpreter(s): Barragan (Spanish)
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 7

Date: Saturday, December 10, 2011
Location: Alicia Broadus-Duncan Senior Center
Address: 11300 Glenoaks Boulevard, Pacoima, CA

Time: 11:00AM
Total Attendees: 76 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 32
Total COI Document Collected: 6

Team: A

Commissioners in Attendance: Chase, Cornejo, Kadota, Miller, Sampson, Trujillo, Vargas
Commissioners from Team not in attendance: Downey, Sanchez, Thrash

City Attorney at Hearing: Judith Reel
Elected Official(s): Councilmember Richard Alarcon, Assmblymember Felipe Fuentes

Interpreter(s): Baraggan (Spanish)
Court Reporter: Jennifer Smith

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 8

Date: Tuesday, January 10, 2012
Location: Expo Center
Address: 3980 Bill Robertson Lane, Los Angeles, CA 90037
Time: 6:30PM
Total Attendees: 174 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 36
Total COI Document Collected: 21

Team: A

Commissioners in Attendance: Anderson, Downey, Dupont-Walker, Ellison, Kadota, Kim, Lopez, Roberti, Roberts, Sampson, Vargas

Commissioners from Team not in attendance: Sanchez, Trujillo
City Attorney at Hearing: Judith Reel
Elected Official(s): Councilmember Bernard Parks, Councilmember Jan Perry
Interpreter(s): Torres (Spanish)
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 9

Date: Saturday, December 10, 2011
Location: Santee Learning Complex
Address: 1921 S. Maple Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90011
Time: 11:00AM
Total Attendees: 107 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 14
Total COI Document Collected: 10

Team: B

Commissioners in Attendance: Ahn, Dupont-Walker, Ellison, Gains, Kadota, Kim, Lopez, McKean, Roberts, Sanchez

Commissioners from Team not in attendance: Cornejo, Thrash, Wong
City Attorney at Hearing: Dion O’Connell
Elected Official(s): Councilmember Jan Perry
Interpreter(s): Torres (Spanish), Park (Korean)
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 10

Date: Tuesday, January 3, 2012
Location: Nate Holden Performing Arts Center
Address: 4718 W. Washington Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90016
Time: 6:30PM
Total Attendees: 275 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 58
Total COI Document Collected: 16

Team: C
Commissioners in Attendance: Ahn, Anderson, Dupont-Walker, Ellison, Gaines, Kadota, Kim, Lopez, Roberts

Commissioners from Team not in attendance: Chase, Miller
City Attorney at Hearing: Harit Trivedi
Elected Official(s): Council President Herb Wesson Jr., Representative Karen Bass
Interpreter(s): Torres (Spanish), Park (Korean)
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 11

Date: Thursday, December 15, 2011
Location: IMAN Cultural Center
Address: 3376 Motor Ave., Los Angeles, CA, 900034
Time: 6:30PM
Total Attendees: 40 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 14
Total COI Document Collected: 4

Team: C

Commissioners in Attendance: Downey, Dupont-Walker, Gaines, Kadota, Miller, Roberts
Commissioners from Team not in attendance: Chase, Ellison, Kim, Lopez

City Attorney at Hearing: Judith Reel
Elected Official(s): Councilmember Bill Rosendahl

Interpreter(s): Torres (Spanish)
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 12

Date: Monday, December 5, 2011
Location: LAPD Devonshire Youth Center

Address: 8721 Wilbur Avenue, Northridge, CA 91324
Time: 7:00PM
Total Attendees: 102 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 24
Total COI Document Collected: 13

Team: A

Commissioners in Attendance: Downey, Kim, Roberti, Sampson, Sanchez, Thrash, Trujillo
Commissioners from Team not in attendance: Vargas
City Attorney at Hearing: Judith Reel
Elected Official(s):

Interpreter(s): Torres (Spanish)
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 13

Date: Monday, January 9, 2011
Location: Los Angeles City College Theatre
Address: 855 North Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90029
Time: 6:30PM
Total Attendees: 265 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 77
Total COI Document Collected: 30

Team: B

Commissioners in Attendance: Ahn, Anderson, Cornejo, Downey, Dupont-Walker, Ford, Gaines, Kadota, Kim, Lopez, Roberts, Sampson

Commissioners from Team not in attendance: McKean, Wong
City Attorney at Hearing: Judith Reel
Elected Official(s): Councilmember Eric Garcetti
Interpreter(s): Spanish, Korean, Armenian
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 14

Date: Saturday, December 13, 2011
Location: Boyle Heights Senior Center
Address: 2839 East $3^{\text {rd }}$ Street, Los Angeles, CA, 90033
Time: 6:30PM
Total Attendees: 92 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 36
Total COI Document Collected: 5

Team: A

Commissioners in Attendance: Cornejo, Downey, Lopez, Roberts, Sampson, Sanchez, Trujillo, Vargas

Commissioners from Team not in attendance: Roberti, Thrash
City Attorney at Hearing: Judith Reel
Elected Official(s): Councilmember Jose Huizar
Interpreter(s): Spanish
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 15

Date: Thursday, December 15, 2011
Location: Watts Labor Community Action Committee, Phoenix Hall
Address: 10950 S. Central Ave., Watts, CA 90059
Time: 6:30PM
Total Attendees: 54 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 16
Total COI Document Collected: 1

Team: C
Commissioners in Attendance: Chase, Dupont-Walker, Ellison, Gaines, Kadota, Kim, Lopez, Miller, Thrash

Commissioners from Team not in attendance:

City Attorney at Hearing: Dion O’Connell
Elected Official(s): State Assemblyperson Warren Furutani
Interpreter(s): Torres (Spanish)
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## CENTRAL REGION

Date: Wednesday, February 1, 2012
Location: Wilshire Ebell Theatre
Address: 4401 W. $8^{\text {th }}$ Street, Los Angeles, CA 90010
Time: 6:30PM
Total Attendees: 404 (signed in)

Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 211 (cards collected), 119 (speakers)

|  | For Proposal | Against Proposal | General <br> Comments | Not Sure/Did Not <br> Indicate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Speakers | 14 | 80 | 17 | 8 |
| Non-Speakers | 5 | 77 | 2 | 8 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ |

Total COI Document Collected: 20
Commissioners in Attendance: David Trujillo (CD1), David Ford (CD3), David Roberti (CD5), Jose Cornejo (CD6), Michael Trujillo (CD7), Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8), David Roberts (CD9), Chris Ellison (CD10), Rob Kadota (CD11), Ken Sampson (CD12), Jackie DupontWalker (CD13), Robert Ahn (CD13), Antonio Sanchez (CD14), Jerry Gaines (CD15), Arturo Vargas (Mayor), LeRoy Chase (Mayor), Helen Kim (Controller), Julie Downey (City Attorney)

Commissioners Not in Attendance: Craig Miller (CD2), Grover McKean (CD4), Mona Soo Hoo (Mayor)

City Attorney at Hearing: Dion O’Connell
Elected Officials (if applicable): Councilmember Bernard Parks

Interpreters: Korean and Spanish
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## WESTERN REGION

Date: Thursday, February 2, 2012
Location: Westchester Recreation Center
Address: 7000 W. Manchester Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90045
Time: 6:30PM
Total Attendees: 728 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 92 (cards collected), 65 (speakers)

|  | For Proposal | Against Proposal | General <br> Comments | Not Sure/Did Not <br> Indicate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Speakers/Non- <br> Speakers | 1 | 77 | 2 | 12 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{7 7}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ |

Total COI Document Collected: 35
Commissioners in Attendance: David Trujillo (CD1), Grover McKean (CD4), David Roberti (CD5), Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8), David Roberts (CD9), Chris Ellison (CD10), Rob Kadota (CD11), Ken Sampson (CD12), Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13), Jerry Gaines (CD15), Mona Soo Hoo (Mayor), Arturo Vargas (Mayor)

Commissioners Not in Attendance: Craig Miller (CD2), David Ford (CD3), Jose Cornejo (CD6), Michael Trujillo (CD7), Robert Ahn (CD13), Antonio Sanchez (CD14), LeRoy Chase (Mayor), Helen Kim (Controller), Julie Downey (City Attorney)

City Attorney at Hearing: Judith Reel
Elected Officials (if applicable): Councilmembers Bernard Parks (CD8), Jan Perry (CD9), Bill Rosendal (CD11), Eric Garcetti (CD13)

Interpreters: Spanish
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## WEST VALLEY REGION

Date: Saturday, February 4, 2012
Location: Pierce College, The Great Hall
Address: 6201 Winnetka Ave., Woodland Hills, CA 91371

Time: 11:00AM
Total Attendees: 184 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 94 (cards completed), 81(speakers)

|  | For Proposal | Against Proposal | General <br> Comments | Not Sure/Did Not <br> Indicate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Speakers/ <br> Non-Speakers | 3 | 66 | 22 | 3 |
| TOTAL | 3 | 66 | 22 | 3 |

Total COI Document Collected: 13
Commissioners in Attendance: David Trujillo (CD1), Craig Miller (CD2), David Ford (CD3), Grover McKean (CD4), David Roberti (CD5), Jose Cornejo (CD6), Michael Trujillo (CD7), Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8), David Roberts (CD9), Chris Ellison (CD10), Rob Kadota (CD11), Ken Sampson (CD12), Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13), Robert Ahn (CD13), Antonio Sanchez (CD14), Jerry Gaines (CD15), Arturo Vargas (Mayor), LeRoy Chase (Mayor), Helen Kim (via Teleconference) (Controller), Julie Downey (City Attorney)

Commissioners Not in Attendance: N/a
City Attorney at Hearing: Harit Trivedi
Elected Officials (if applicable): None
Interpreters: Spanish and Armenian
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## EAST REGION

Date: Monday, February 6, 2012
Location: Occidental College, Thorne Hall
Address: 1600 Campus Road, Los Angeles, CA 90041
Time: 6:30PM
Total Attendees: 99 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 45 (cards completed), 44(speakers)

|  | For Proposal | Against Proposal | General <br> Comments | Not Sure/Did Not <br> Indicate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Speakers | 3 | 20 | 1 | 11 |
| TOTAL | 3 | 20 | 1 | 11 |

## Total COI Document Collected: 6

Commissioners in Attendance: David Trujillo (CD1), Craig Miller (CD2), David Ford (CD3), Grover McKean (CD4), David Roberti (CD5), Jose Cornejo (CD6), Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8), David Roberts (CD9), Chris Ellison (CD10), Rob Kadota (CD11), Ken Sampson (CD12), Jerry Gaines (CD15), LeRoy Chase (Mayor), Helen Kim (Controller), Julie Downey (City Attorney)

Commissioners Not in Attendance: Michael Trujillo (CD7), Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13), Robert Ahn (CD13), Antonio Sanchez (CD14), Arturo Vargas (Mayor),

City Attorney at Hearing: Dion O’Connell
Elected Officials (if applicable): Councilmember Jose Huizar
Interpreters: Spanish and Tagalog
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## DOWNTOWN REGION

Date: Wednesday, February 8, 2012
Location: Los Angeles City Hall, Council Chambers
Address: 200 N. Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012
Time: 6:30PM
Total Attendees: 785 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 265 (cards collected), 155 (speakers)

|  | For Proposal | Against Proposal | General <br> Comments | Not Sure/Did Not <br> Indicate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Speakers/ <br> Non-Speakers | 82 | 87 | 42 | 54 |
| TOTAL | 82 | 87 | 42 | 54 |

Total COI Document Collected: 13
Commissioners in Attendance: David Trujillo (CD1), Craig Miller (CD2), David Ford (CD3), Grover McKean (CD4), David Roberti (CD5), Jose Cornejo (CD6), Michael Trujillo (CD7), Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8), David Roberts (CD9), Chris Ellison (CD10), Rob Kadota (CD11), Ken Sampson (CD12), Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13), Robert Ahn (CD13), Antonio Sanchez (CD14), Jerry Gaines (CD15), LeRoy Chase (Mayor), Helen Kim (Controller), Julie Downey (City Attorney)

Commissioners Not in Attendance: Arturo Vargas (Mayor)
City Attorney at Hearing: Harit Trivedi
Elected Officials (if applicable): Councilmember Jan Perry (CD9), Councilmember Jose Huizar (CD14)

Interpreters: Korean and Spanish
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## EAST VALLEY REGION

Date: Thursday, February 9, 2012
Location: Walter Reed Middle School Auditorium
Address: 4525 Irvine Ave., North Hollywood, CA 91602
Time: 6:30PM
Total Attendees: 315 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 91(card s collected), 89 (speakers)

|  | For Proposal | Against Proposal | General <br> Comments | Not Sure/Did Not <br> Indicate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Speakers/Non- <br> Speakers | 18 | 56 | 4 | 13 |
| TOTAL | 18 | 56 | 4 | 13 |

Total COI Document Collected: 50
Commissioners in Attendance: David Trujillo (CD1), Craig Miller (CD2), David Roberti (CD5), Jose Cornejo (CD6), David Roberts (CD9), Rob Kadota (CD11), Ken Sampson (CD12), Robert Ahn (CD13), Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13), Jerry Gaines (CD15), LeRoy Chase (Mayor), Arturo Vargas (Mayor), Helen Kim (Controller), Julie Downey (City Attorney)

Commissioners Not in Attendance: David Ford (CD3), Grover McKean (CD4), Michael Trujillo (CD7), Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8), Chris Ellison (CD10), Antonio Sanchez (CD14),

City Attorney at Hearing: Harit Trivedi
Elected Officials (if applicable): None
Interpreters: Spanish
Court Reporter: Wendy Driscoll

## SOUTH REGION

Date: Saturday, February 11, 2012
Location: West Angeles Church of God in Christ
Address: 3045 S. Crenshaw Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90016
Time: 11:00AM
Total Attendees: 345 (signed in)
Total Individuals Providing Public Comment (verbal): 121 (cards completed), 83 (speakers)

|  | For Proposal | Against Proposal | General <br> Comments | Not Sure/Did Not <br> Indicate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Speakers/Non- <br> Speakers | 18 | 54 | 12 | 37 |
| TOTAL | 18 | 54 | 12 | 37 |

Total COI Document Collected: 102
Commissioners in Attendance: David Trujillo (CD1), Craig Miller (CD2), David Ford (CD3), Grover McKean (CD4), David Roberti (CD5), Jose Cornejo (CD6), Michael Trujillo (CD7), Bobbie Jean Anderson (via Teleconference) (CD8), David Roberts (CD9), Chris Ellison (CD10), Rob Kadota (CD11), Ken Sampson (CD12), Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13), Antonio Sanchez (CD14), Jerry Gaines (CD15), LeRoy Chase (Mayor), Arturo Vargas (Mayor), Helen Kim (Controller), Julie Downey (City Attorney)

Commissioners Not in Attendance: Robert Ahn (CD13)
City Attorney at Hearing: Harit Trivedi
Elected Officials (if applicable): Councilmember Bernard Parks (CD8), Jan Perry (CD9), Herb Wesson, Jr. (CD10)

Interpreters: Spanish
Court Reporter: Jennifer Smith

## Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission: Fact Sheet Totals (draft)

| Hearing Findings | First Round of Public Hearings (Pre-Draft Map) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Day | 12/5/2011 | 12/8/2011 | 12/10/2011 | 12/10/2011 | 12/12/2011 | 12/13/2011 | 12/15/2011 | 12/17/2011 |
| Time | 7:00 PM | 6:30 PM | 11:00 AM | 6:30 PM | 6:30 PM | 6:30 PM | 6:30 PM | 11:00AM |
| Council District | 12 | 15 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 14 | 11 | 3 |
| Location | LAPD Devonshire Youth Center | Watts Labor Community Action Committee, Phoenix Hall | Santee Learning Center | Alicia BroadusDuncan Senior Center | North Valley City Hall | Boyle Heights <br> Senior Center | IMAN Cultural Ceter | West Valley Christian Church |
| Total Attendees | 102 | 54 | 107 | 76 | 88 | 92 | 40 | 36 |
| Total Individual Public Comment | 24 | 16 | 14 | 32 | 32 | 36 | 14 | 24 |
| For Proposal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Against Proposal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| General Comments | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Not Sure/Did not Indicate | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Total COI Documents Collected | 13 | 1 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 8 |
| Interperters Available | Spanish | Spanish | Spanish \& Korean | Spanish |  <br> Armenian | Spanish | Spanish | Spanish |
| Council Members in Attendance | NA | NA | Perry | Huizar | Krekorian |  | Rosenthal | Zine |
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## Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission: Fact Sheet Totals (draft)

| Hearing Findings | First Round of Public Hearings (Pre-Draft Map) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Day | 1/3/2012 | 1/3/2012 | 1/4/2012 | 1/5/2012 | 1/7/2012 | 1/9/2012 | 1/10/2012 |
| Time | 6:30 PM | 6:30 PM | 6:30 PM | 6:30 PM | 11:00 AM | 6:30 PM | 11:00 AM |
| Council District | 10 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 13 | 8 |
| Location | Nate Holden Performing Arts Center | Van Nuys City Hall | Friendship <br> Auditorium | Fairfax High School | St. Peter's Italian Catholic Church | LA City College | Expo Center |
| Total Attendees | 275 | 120 | 155 | 55 | 187 | 265 | 174 |
| Total Individual Public Comment | 58 | 38 | 65 | 21 | 83 | 77 | 36 |
| For Proposal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Against Proposal | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| General Comments | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Not Sure/Did not Indicate | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Total COI Documents Collected | 16 | 6 | 13 | 1 | 10 | 30 | 21 |
| Interperters Available | Spanish, \& Korean | Spanish | Spanish, Korean, \& Armenian |  | Spanish, Mandarin, Cantonese, \& $\qquad$ Korean | Spanish \& Korean | Spanish |
| Council Members in Attendance | Wesson | Cardenas, Krekorian | LaBonge | Koretz | Reyes | Garcetti | Parks, Perry |

[^14]
## Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission: Fact Sheet Totals (draft)

| Hearing Findings | Second Round of Public Hearings (Post-Draft Map) |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTALS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Day | 2/1/2012 | 2/2/2012 | 2/4/2012 | 2/6/2012 | 2/8/2012 | 2/9/2012 | 2/11/2012 |  |
| Time | 6:30 PM | 6:30 PM | 11:00 AM | 6:30 PM | 6:30 PM | 6:30 PM | 11:30 AM |  |
| Council District | Regional | Regional | Regional | Regional | Regional | Regional | Regional |  |
| Location | Wilshire Eball Theater | Westchester Recreation Center | Piece College | Occidental College | City Council Chambers | Walter Reed Middle School | West Angeles Church |  |
| Total Attendees | 404 | 728 | 184 | 99 | 785 | 315 | 345 | 4686 |
| Total Individual Public Comment | 119 | 65 | 81 | 44 | 155 | 89 | 83 | 1206 |
| For Proposal | 14 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 82 | 18 | 18 | 139 |
| Against Proposal | 80 | 77 | 66 | 20 | 87 | 56 | 54 | 440 |
| General Comments | 17 | 2 | 22 | 1 | 42 | 4 | 12 | 100 |
| Not Sure/Did not Indicate | 8 | 12 | 3 | 11 | 54 | 13 | 37 | 138 |
| Total COI Documents Collected | 20 | 35 | 13 | 6 | 13 | 50 | 102 | 389 |
| Interperters Available | Korean \& Spanish | Spanish | Spanish \& Armenian | Spanish \& Tagalog | Spanish \& Korean | Spanish | Spanish |  |
| Council Members in Attendance | Parks | Perry, Parks, Garcettu, Rosendal |  | Huizar | Perry, Huizar, Nate Holden |  | Wesson, Perry, Parks |  |
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## 15. MEDIA APPENDIX

This section includes:
Community Event Flyers and Press Releases
Media Coverage of the Commission

## Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission Events \& Media Advisories

Chair
Arturo Vargas
Vice Chairs
"Jackie" Dupont-Walker Robert Kadota

Commissioners
Robert Ahn
LeRoy Chase
Jose Cornejo Julie Downey David Ford Christopher Ellison Jerry Gaines Helen B. Kim David Trujillo Grover McKean Craig Miller David Roberti David Roberts Ken Sampson Antonio Sanchez Bobbie Jean Anderson Amber Martinez Michael Trujillo Mona Soo Hoo

## Executive Director

Andrew Westall
Outreach Director
Rani Woods
Media Director
Daniella Masterson

## Koreatown Press Conference



Event: Koreatown Press Conference hosted by KYCC
Date: December 17, 2012
Speakers: Arturo Vargas, Helen Kim, Robert Ahn, and Andrew Westall
Media: $\quad$ Radio Seoul, Korean Times Los Angeles, TVk, KBS America, SBS International, MBC Broadcasting

The press received the following Media Packet:

1. FAQ
2. Standard Communities of Interest
3. Census Population Deviation
4. Standard Comment Form
5. LACCRC Pre-Draft Map
6. Public Hearing Schedule
7. Regular Meeting Schedule
8. LACCRC Flyer

## For Immediate Release

Contact: Daniella Masterson 323-791-9227 Media.lacityredistricting@gmail.com

# MEDIA ADVISORY <br> Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission <br> Chair Seeks Input From The Koreatown Community 

Arturo Vargas

## Vice Chairs

"Jackie" Dupont-Walker
Robert Kadota
Who: Commission Chair Arturo Vargas, Commissioner Helen Kim,
Commissioner Robert Ahn and Executive Director Andrew Westall
Commissioners
Robert Ahn
LeRoy Chase
Jose Cornejo
Julie Downey
David Ford
Christopher Ellison
Jerry Gaines
Helen B. Kim
Estela Lopez
Grover McKean
Craig Miller
David Roberti
David Roberts
Ken Sampson
Antonio Sanchez
What: The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission will hold a press conference to encourage input from local residents, businesses and community activists regarding the redistricting plan to draw new boundaries in Koreatown. Public Hearings have been held throughout city to give the communities an opportunity to deliver testimonies, submit comments and provide public input directly to Commissioners about the neighborhoods they reside in.

Where: Korean American Museum 3727 West $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, $4^{\text {th }}$ Floor Los Angeles, CA 90027

When: Friday, December $16^{\text {th }}, 2011$ 1:30 pm
Tunua Thrash Michael Trujillo
Kent Wong

## Executive Director

Andrew Westall
Outreach Director
Rani Woods

## Media Director

Daniella Masterson

## \#\#\#

About the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission:
The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission is comprised of 21 appointed individuals representing constituencies citywide. Commissioners are charged with advising the Los Angeles City Council on drawing lines as mandated every 10 years by the Los Angeles City Charter. For additional information visit:
http://redistricting2011.lacity.or

## Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission Events \& Media Advisories

Chair
Arturo Vargas
Vice Chairs
"Jackie" Dupont-Walker Robert Kadota

Commissioners
Robert Ahn
LeRoy Chase
Jose Cornejo
Julie Downey
David Ford
Christopher Ellison
Jerry Gaines
Helen B. Kim
David Trujillo
Grover McKean
Craig Miller
David Roberti
David Roberts
Ken Sampson
Antonio Sanchez
Bobbie Jean Anderson
Amber Martinez
Michael Trujillo
Mona Soo Hoo
Executive Director
Andrew Westall
Outreach Director
Rani Woods
Media Director
Daniella Masterson

## API Press Conference



EVENT: $\quad$ LACCRC API Press Conference 244 South San Pedro Ave.

DATE: Wednesday, Jan. 4th, 2012
SPEAKERS: Arturo Vargas, Helen Kim, Robert Ahn, and Andrew Westall
MEDIA: KABC Ch. 7, Rafu Shimpu, Korean Times, Radio Seoul, KBS, MBC, Sereechai, KSCI Television, Singtoa Newspaper, Balita, The Korea Daily

# Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission 

## For Immediate Release

Contact: Daniella Masterson 323-791-9227 Media.lacityredistricting@gmail.com

# MEDIA ADVISORY <br> Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission Seeks Input From the Asian Pacific Islander Communities 

Chair
Arturo Vargas
Vice Chairs
"Jackie" Dupont-Walker
Robert Kadota

Commissioners
Robert Ahn
LeRoy Chase
Jose Cornejo
Julie Downey
David Ford
Christopher Ellison
Jerry Gaines
Helen B. Kim
Estela Lopez
Grover McKean
Craig Miller
David Roberti
David Roberts
Ken Sampson
Antonio Sanchez
Bobbie Jean Anderson
Michael Trujillo
Kent Wong
Executive Director
When: January $4^{\text {th }}, 2012$
Where: Japanese American Cultural and Community Center 244 South San Pedro Street Los Angeles, CA 90012

Andrew Westall

> What: The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission will hold a press conference to encourage input from local residents, businesses and community activists regarding the redistricting plan to draw new boundaries in Little Tokyo, Chinatown, Koreatown and the Thai, Filipino and Vietnamese' communities. Public Hearings have been held citywide to give the community an opportunity to submit comments and provide public input directly to the Commissioners about the neighborhoods they reside and or work in.
> This series of hearings will be held in Council Districts 6, 10, 4, 5, 1, 13 and $\mathbf{8}$ between January $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}-\mathbf{1 0}^{\text {th }} \mathbf{2 0 1 2}$.

## Outreach Director

Rani Woods

## Media Director

Daniella Masterson

About the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission:<br>The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission is comprised of 21 appointed individuals representing constituencies citywide. Commissioners are charged with advising the Los Angeles City Council on drawing lines as mandated every 10 years by the Los Angeles City Charter. For additional information visit:<br>http://redistricting2011.lacity.org

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission Events \& Media Advisories

## LACCRC City Bus Tour

Chair
Arturo Vargas

## Vice Chairs

"Jackie" Dupont-Walker Robert Kadota

Commissioners
Robert Ahn
LeRoy Chase
Jose Cornejo Julie Downey David Ford Christopher Ellison Jerry Gaines Helen B. Kim David Trujillo Grover McKean
Craig Miller
David Roberti David Roberts
Ken Sampson
Antonio Sanchez
Bobbie Jean Anderson
Amber Martinez
Michael Trujillo
Mona Soo Hoo
Executive Director
Andrew Westall
Outreach Director
Rani Woods

Media Director
Daniella Masterson


EVENT: LACCRC City Bus Tour
DATE: Saturday, Jan. 14th, 2012
SPEAKERS: LACCRC Chair Arturo Vargas
MEDIA:
Data Not Available

# Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission 

## For Immediate Release

Contact: Daniella Masterson 323-791-9227 Media.lacityredistricting@gmail.com

## MEDIA ADVISORY <br> The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission Conducts A City Tour of Heavily Split Communities in Council Districts

Who: Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commissioners
What: The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission will hold a press conference before embarking on a city bus tour to visit 14 of the 15 Los Angeles City Council Districts. The purpose of the tour is to allow the Commissioners to see various communities' district lines and to explore what changes, if any, are feasible after hearing public testimony in all 15 City Council Districts since December 2011.

Members of the media and the community are welcomed to join the Commissioners for a lunchtime roundtable discussion at La Costa Azul restaurant in Pacoima later that afternoon.

Where: Press Conference<br>City Hall<br>Spring Street Steps<br>200 North Spring Street<br>Los Angeles, 90012<br>When: Saturday, January 14, 2012<br>9 am

Where: Lunch Roundtable Discussion
La Costa Azul
9771 Laurel Canyon Blvd
Pacoima, 91331
When: Saturday, January 14, 2012
12:30 pm
Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission:
Estella Lopez (CD1),Craig Miller (CD2), David Ford (CD3), Grover McKean (CD4), David Roberti (CD5), Jose Cornejo (CD6), Michael Trujillo (CD7), Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8), David Roberts (CD9), Chris Ellison (CD10), Rob Kadota (CD11), Ken Sampson (CD12), Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13) Robert Ahn (CD13), Antonio Sanchez (CD14), Jerry Gaines (CD 15), Arturo Vargas (Mayor), LeRoy Chase (Mayor),
Mona Soo Hoo (Mayor), Helen Kim (Controller), Julie Downey (City Attorney)

Chair
Arturo Vargas
Vice Chairs
"Jackie" Dupont-Walker Robert Kadota

Commissioners
Robert Ahn
LeRoy Chase
Jose Cornejo Julie Downey David Ford Christopher Ellison Jerry Gaines Helen B. Kim David Trujillo Grover McKean
Craig Miller
David Roberti
David Roberts
Ken Sampson
Antonio Sanchez
Bobbie Jean Anderson
Amber Martinez
Michael Trujillo
Mona Soo Hoo
Executive Director
Andrew Westall
Outreach Director
Rani Woods
Media Director
Daniella Masterson

## LACCRC LGBT Roundtable



EVENT: LACCRC LGBT Roundtable
SEIU Local 721
Los Angeles, CA
DATE: Tuesday, Jan. 31st, 2012

MEDIA:

SPEAKERS: Arturo Vargas, Richard Zaldivar, Andrew Westall
Data Not Available

# Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission 

## For Immediate Release

Contact: Daniella Masterson 323-791-9227 Media.lacityredistricting@gmail.com

## MEDIA ALERT

## Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission to Hold LGBT Roundtable, Jan. 31

WHO: Arturo Vargas, chair, Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) Andrew Westall, Executive Director, LACCRC Richard Zaldivar, Executive Director of The Wall, Las Memorias Project and (SEUI) Local 721

WHAT: LACCRC will hold a Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Media Roundtable to discuss the city's redistricting process, the new map drafts and LGBT community engagement. The meeting is being facilitated by Las Memorias, a nonprofit dedicated to promoting wellness and preventing illness among Latino populations affected by HIV/AIDS (see http://www.thewalllasmemorias.org)

WHEN: Tuesday, Jan. 31, 2012 6:30 p.m.
Space is limited. Please RSVP at 323-791-9227
WHERE: Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 721 1545 Wilshire Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90017

Every 10 years, the City Council District boundaries are redrawn to account for population changes. The Redistricting Commission makes recommendations to the City Council on adoption of the city's redistricting plan that will establish new boundaries for the Council Districts (CD). For more information, contact the LACCRC office at 213-922-7740 or visit the website at www.redistricting2011.lacity.org.

## Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission:

Estella Lopez (CD1),Craig Miller (CD2), David Ford (CD3), Grover McKean (CD4), David Roberti (CD5), Jose Cornejo (CD6),
Michael Trujillo (CD7), Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8), David Roberts (CD9), Chris Ellison (CD10), Rob Kadota (CD11), Ken Sampson (CD12), Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13), Robert Ahn (CD13), Antonio Sanchez (CD14), Jerry Gaines (CD 15), Arturo Vargas (Mayor), LeRoy Chase (Mayor), Mona Soo Hoo (Mayor), Helen Kim (Controller), Julie Downey (City Attorney)

## LACCRC Latino Media Roundtable

# Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission Events \& Media Advisories 

Chair
Arturo Vargas
Vice Chairs
"Jackie" Dupont-Walker
Robert Kadota

## Commissioners

Robert Ahn
LeRoy Chase
Jose Cornejo Julie Downey David Ford
Christopher Ellison
Jerry Gaines
Helen B. Kim
David Trujillo
Grover McKean
Craig Miller
David Roberti
David Roberts
Ken Sampson
Antonio Sanchez
Bobbie Jean Anderson
Amber Martinez
Michael Trujillo
Mona Soo Hoo

## Executive Director

Andrew Westall
Outreach Director
Rani Woods
Media Director
Daniella Masterson

## Latino Media Roundtable

EVENT: Latino Media Roundtable Hosted by La Opinion Newspaper in Los Angeles

DATE: Friday, Feb. 7th, 2012
SPEAKERS: Arturo Vargas, Jackie Dupont Walker, Anthony Sanchez, Fernando Guerra, Daniella Masterson, and Paulina Velasco

MEDIA: La Opinion, LatinoLA, La Prensa, LA Sentinel, KPCC

# Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission 

## For Immediate Release

Contact: Daniella Masterson 323-791-9227 Media.lacityredistricting@gmail.com

# MEDIA ALERT <br> Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission to Hold A Latino Media Roundtable At La Opinion Friday, Feb. 3 

WHO: LACCRC Chair Arturo Vargas<br>LACCRC Chair Jack Dupont-Walker Commission LACCRC Commissioner Antonio Sanchez<br>Redistricting Expert Fernando Guerra

WHAT: Latinos now represent one of the fastest growing populations in Los Angeles. To reflect Los Angeles' significant Latino population growth from the 2010 US Census data, the LACCRC's draft map increases the number of Voting Rights Act majority-minority council districts from four to five. Latinos have been significantly absent from the public hearing process. LACCRC's encourages them to participate in the last series of public hearings and to learn what's at stake in their communities.

WHEN: Friday, February 3, 2012
11:00 a.m. - 12:30 pm
Space is limited. Please RSVP at 323-791-9227
WHERE: LA Opinion Newspaper
700 S. Flower St. Ste 3100
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Every 10 years, the City Council District boundaries are redrawn to account for population changes. The Redistricting Commission makes recommendations to the City Council on adoption of the city's redistricting plan that will establish new boundaries for the Council Districts (CD). For more information, contact the LACCRC office at 213-922-7740 or visit the website www.redistricting2011.lacity.org. Get up-to-date information by checking the Facebook.com/Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission and on twitter.com @ LACCRC.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission:
David Trujillo (CD1),Craig Miller (CD2), David Ford (CD3), Grover McKean (CD4), David Roberti (CD5), Jose Cornejo (CD6), Michael Trujillo (CD7), Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8), David Roberts (CD9), Chris Ellison (CD10), Rob Kadota (CD11), Ken Sampson (CD12), Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13), Robert Ahn (CD13), Antonio Sanchez (CD14), Jerry Gaines (CD 15), Arturo Vargas (Mayor), LeRoy Chase (Mayor), Mona Soo Hoo (Mayor), Helen Kim (Controller), Julie Downey (City Attorney)

# Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission <br> <br> Events \& Media Advisories 

 <br> <br> Events \& Media Advisories}

## Chair

Arturo Vargas
Vice Chairs
"Jackie" Dupont-Walker
Robert Kadota

Commissioners
Robert Ahn
LeRoy Chase
Jose Cornejo Julie Downey David Ford
Christopher Ellison
Jerry Gaines
Helen B. Kim
David Trujillo
Grover McKean
Craig Miller
David Roberti
David Roberts
Ken Sampson
Antonio Sanchez
Bobbie Jean Anderson
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Executive Director
Andrew Westall
Outreach Director
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Media Director
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## Community Redistricting Roundtable

EVENT: Community Redistricting Roundtable Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Bank of America Room 350 South Bixel Street, Los Angeles, CA 90017

DATE: Friday, Feb. 7th, 2012
SPEAKERS: Arturo Vargas, Jackie Dupont Walker, Fernando Guerra, Dan Schnur, Raphael Sonenshein, Maria Blanco

MEDIA: La Opinion, LatinoLA, La Prensa, LA Sentinel, KPCC

Co-sponsored by: Jesse M. Unruh Institute Politics at USC, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles County Federation of Labor.

Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission

## LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

## Media Report: News Articles \& Editorials

Los Angeles Times
February 24, 2012 Friday
Home Edition

## New L.A. council districts approved; <br> The map-redrawing process is lambasted even by some on the panel tasked with it.

BYLINE: David Zahniser

SECTION: LATEXTRA; Metro Desk; Part AA; Pg. 1

## LENGTH: 724 words

A plan to redraw Los Angeles City Council districts has won approval from a special redistricting commission, with panel members disparaging the five-month public process as ugly, dysfunctional and sad.
Even some who serve on the Los Angeles Redistricting Commission and backed the changes sounded ashamed of the final product, which passed on a 16-5 vote after an eight-hour hearing that ended minutes before midnight Wednesday.
Commissioner Jose Cornejo, who may run for City Council in one of the districts he helped create, called the proposed district lines -- and the process used to create them -- "ugly." Commissioner Rob Kadota, who also backed the map, said the commission failed to demonstrate equal concern for all parts of the city.
And Commissioner David Roberti, a former state senator well versed in power politics, said he felt badly about rejecting demands of hundreds of Korean Americans who called for the area covered by Koreatown's neighborhood council to be unified in a single district.
"I am terribly guilt-ridden over the concerns of the Korean community," said Roberti, who cast a series of votes opposed by Koreatown advocates. "They did not win here, and 10 years ago [in the last redistricting] they didn't win either. And I was on that commission as well." The redrawn map will be considered by the 15-member City Council next month. Korean American legal advocates, who have threatened to sue, are among an array of groups expressing dismay at the recommended changes. The Valley Industry and Commerce Assn., which had praised the commission's original proposal, criticized the panel this week for abandoning plans to create a sixth council district in the San Fernando Valley. And the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund has repeatedly warned that the plan would probably reduce the number of Latino council members from five to four.

Council district boundaries are redrawn every 10 years, following the release of new population numbers from the U.S. census. The process is inherently political because it can boost or sap the influence of politicians, neighborhoods and community groups.

This year's map was largely drafted by a voting bloc centered around appointees of Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa and Councilmen Herb Wesson, Jose Huizar, Richard Alarcon and Tony Cardenas. The big winners have been Wesson and Huizar, who added coveted territory to their districts. The losers were council members Jan Perry and Bernard C. Parks, both of whom have threatened to sue.

Commissioner Jackie Dupont-Walker, who voted for the latest map, said she was "saddened" for Little Tokyo and skid row, which were carved out of Perry's district, and Baldwin Hills, an affluent black neighborhood taken from Parks' district. Commissioner David Roberts, who fought unsuccessfully to keep downtown in Perry's district, said the proposed boundaries would make the public more cynical about government. "I don't think l've ever seen a process this dysfunctional," he said. Parks contends that his district was systematically dismantled, with iconic assets such as Leimert Park and USC shifted to other districts. Forescee Hogan-Rowles, who tried to unseat Parks in last year's election, told the commission that the "economic engines" were being taken out of her former rival's district.
Some were upbeat about the proposed changes. Andrew Westall, a former Wesson aide and the commission's top executive, said they reflected important achievements, ensuring that dozens of neighborhood council areas were not split between multiple districts. He contends Koreatown will be brought together in a single district -- the one represented by his former boss -- for the first time in 40 years.
That argument has not placated Korean American civic groups, which for weeks had been asking for a larger area that includes Koreatown to be moved entirely out of Wesson's domain and into a neighboring district that includes other Asian communities, such as Thai Town and Historic Filipinotown. Such a move would increase the chances of an Asian American winning a council seat, they argue.
Commissioner Michael Trujillo suggested Koreatown was simply a victim of its central location. "Unfortunately, the way the process goes is, if you're in the middle of the city ... that's going to be carved up," he said.
david.zahniser@latimes.com
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## REDISTRICTING BATTLE RAGES ON; <br> MEETING: Hundreds testify before commission considering political lines.

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. A3
LENGTH: 448 words

Tensions over newly drawn council district boundaries erupted Wednesday night as the redistricting commission prepared to finalize the map and send it off for City Council approval.

Hundreds of speakers packed City Hall chambers to speak out against the lines, with the the majority of criticism heard over decisions in downtown, Westchester, Koreatown and the San Fernando Valley.
The commission was expected to debate the lines late into the night, and it had not taken a vote on the new map by the Daily News' deadline.
In particular, speakers decried a decision to separate Studio City into at least two different districts.

The neighborhood has already been split for the last 15 years, according to Lisa Sarkin, a member of the Studio City Neighborhood Council, but local leaders hoped the redistricting committee would keep the district together.
She also questioned the dual role of Andrew Westall, who serves as executive director of the Redistricting Commission, and as president of the Greater Toluca Lake Neighborhood Council. Under the newly released maps, Toluca Lake would remain whole - and in District 4 - and stay politically protected, Sarkin said.

Her criticisms come amid speculation that Westall plans to run for City Councilman Tom LaBonge's seat in 2015.
"There's something here that stinks," said Sarkin, who distributed a recent email exchange between herself and Westall.

In the email, Westall writes "he has been very hands off" on the topic of Toluca Lake, given his role on the commission.

But at the same time, Westall reveals personal opinions on the San Fernando Valley.
"As a resident and homeowner of Toluca Lake for the last 5 1/2 years, I understand where my fellow Tolucans are coming from," wrote Westall. "It is the general belief of our community that we are not part of, and do not identify with, the San Fernando Valley and feel more affinity and spend more time in the Hollywood Hills, Hollywood, Griffith Park, Los Feliz, and Burbank than we do in Studio City or North Hollywood."

Westall, who confirmed the email exchange, denied he would run for LaBonge's seat. If he does run for office, he said, it would be for the 46th District Assembly seat.
Meanwhile, some Toluca Lake residents expressed gratitude to the redistricting commission.
"Thank you for keeping us whole," said Peter Hartz, president of the Toluca Lake Homeowners Association. Hartz believes the Valley is served well by more city-Valley districts.
"We don't want to be balkanized in the Valley," he said.
The council members and the mayor must approve the lines no later than July 1. The new districts are slated to go into effect for the 2013 elections.
dakota.smith@dailynews.com
818-713-3761
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## L.A. Now (Los Angeles Times)

February 23, 2012 Thursday 8:44 PM EST

## BLOG: L.A. Now: Proposed L.A. council redistricting map leaves many dissatisfied

BYLINE: David Zahniser
LENGTH: 768 words

Feb. 23--[http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/.a/6a00d8341c630a53ef0168e7dc6f77970c-pi]
The Los Angeles Redistricting Commission finalized its package of proposed boundaries for 15 council districts, rejecting requests from hundreds of Korean Americans to have their neighborhood council placed in a single district.
Minutes before midnight Wednesday, the panel voted 16 to 5 to send a map to the council. But even some who approved it said they weren't particularly proud of it.
Several on the 21-member panel were sheepish about having dealt a blow to Koreatown [http://projects.latimes.com/mapping-la/neighborhoods/neighborhood/koreatown/?q=Korea town\%2C+Los+Angeles\%2C+CA\%2C+USA=34.0708598=-118.2935891=Geocodify] civic groups, which had spent weeks sending residents, business people and activists to testify on the proposed boundaries.
"I am terribly guilt-ridden over the concerns of the Korean community," said Commissioner David Roberti, who nevertheless voted for the changes that disappointed Koreatown advocates. "They did not win here and 10 years ago they didn't win either, and I was on that commission as well."
The 21-member panel meets Wednesday to finalize the proposal, which will then go to the City Council for a vote.
For weeks, Koreatown civic groups and activists had asked for their neighborhood -- an area covered by the boundaries of the Wilshire Center Koreatown Neighborhood Council -to be placed in the district represented by Councilman Eric Garcetti.
Because that neighborhood also includes Thai Town and Historic Filipinotown, advocates believed it would give an Asian American candidate a better chance at winning a council seat. Commissioners rejected the proposal while acknowledging Koreatown was experiencing a political "awakening."
Roberti, who was appointed by Councilman Paul Koretz, said he had focused his energy on satisfying the demands of the Orthodox Jewish community, which wanted specific neighborhoods to be kept out of Councilman Tom LaBonge's district.

Meanwhile, others gave their work equally mixed reviews. Commissioner Jose Cornejo, who may run for the City Council in one of the districts he helped create, called the map and the process used to create it "ugly."
Commissioner Rob Kadota said he was dissatisfied with the map, which he nevertheless approved.
"I don't think we were as visionary or caring about all parts of our city," said Kadota, an appointee of Councilman Bill Rosendahl. Those who voted against the map were even more critical.

Commissioner Helen Kim, an appointee of City Controller Wendy Greuel, said the panel had favored some neighborhoods over others. Commissioner David Roberts said the commission's work would only "add to public distrust of government."
"I don't think l've ever seen a process this dysfunctional," he said.
The maps were created largely by a voting bloc that included representatives of Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa and council members Herb Wesson, Jose Huizar, Richard Alarcon and Tony Cardenas.

On the council, the biggest winners were Wesson and Huizar, who added major assets to their districts. The biggest losers were council members Jan Perry and Bernard C. Parks, both of whom have threatened to sue.

Commissioner Jackie Dupont-Walker, who voted for the final map, said she was "saddened" for Little Tokyo and skid row, both of which were carved out of Perry's district, and for Baldwin Hills, the affluent black neighborhood that was removed from Parks' district.
Commissioner Michael Trujillo, whose votes helped ensure that Parks' district was stripped of assets like USC and Baldwin Hills, was more philosophical about the slight felt by Koreatown.

He told the audience that as long as Koreatown sits in the middle of Los Angeles, it would always be in danger of being redistricted across multiple council districts.
"Unfortunately, the way the process goes is, if you're in the middle of the city ... that's going to be carved up," he said.
ALSO:
Power outage causes major delays on Blue Line [http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2012/02/blue-line-major-delays-power-outage.html]
L.A. schools chief 'horrified' at handling of teacher abuse cases
[http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2012/02/la-schools-chief-horrified-over-handling-tea cher-abuse-cases.html]
Copter collision near Yuma kills 7 Marines; crash under investigation
[http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2012/02/7-marines-helicopter-collision.html]
-- David Zahniser at Los Angeles City Hall
Photo: L.A. City Councilman Herb Wesson is one of the winners in the proposed redistricting map. Credit: Genaro Molina / Los Angeles Times.
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## CALIFORNIA;

Critics say council districts hinder Latino candidates

BYLINE: David Zahniser

SECTION: LATEXTRA; Metro Desk; Part AA; Pg. 3
LENGTH: 633 words

Politicians, advocacy groups and neighborhood activists warned Wednesday that boundary lines drawn up by the Los Angeles Redistricting Commission for new council districts will reduce the number of Latino lawmakers and favor certain candidates in coming years.
Assemblyman Gilbert Cedillo (D-Los Angeles) said the map released last week was drawn to help his likely opponent in the upcoming election in a Westlake-to-Lincoln Heights district. Cedillo said his home was cut out of the district now represented by Councilman Ed Reyes, who leaves office in June 2013.
Cedillo is running against Jose Gardea, who is backed by Reyes and is the councilman's chief of staff. Gardea lives in Councilman Jose Huizar's district but, under the latest plan, would live in Reyes' district.
"It's very evident that they cut me out," said Cedillo, who added that the proposed district boundaries would force him to move to continue his council campaign.
Cedillo's complaint was one of several lodged by individuals and civic groups during the mapmaking process, which occurs once every decade and has drawn complaints from neighborhoods as varied as downtown, Sherman Oaks, Sunland-Tujunga and Westchester.
Officials with the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund contend that the latest plan would not ensure that five Latino council members have a strong chance of getting elected. Steven Ochoa, the group's national redistricting coordinator, said the commission wrongly identified Councilwoman Jan Perry's proposed district, which takes in the eastern flank of South Los Angeles, as a Latino district.
Ochoa said that even though a majority of that district's voting age citizens would be Latino, long-standing voting patterns would still favor an African American candidate. Alan Clayton, a longtime redistricting expert, said a Latino candidate could win in Perry's district only under a narrow set of circumstances.
"If two blacks and a Latino ran and the two blacks fought in the primary, and one of the two was weak and had no money, then yeah, a Latino could win," he said.
Clayton and Ochoa said the commission should keep three black districts intact while redrawing the 13th District, which is represented by Councilman Eric Garcetti, to include more Latino voters.

The new map drew favorable reviews from some who attended Wednesday's commission meeting. But in Studio City, neighborhood activists alleged that a San Fernando Valley district was drawn to give Andrew Westall, the commission's executive director, an opportunity to run for a seat that will be vacated by Councilman Tom LaBonge in 2015.

LaBonge's district was reworked last week to include Toluca Lake, where Westall lives. Lisa Sarkin, vice president of the Studio City Neighborhood Council, said the change will divide her community between two council districts.
Westall, who ran for the Assembly two years ago, said he has no interest in seeking LaBonge's seat in 2015. But he would not rule out a political campaign there or elsewhere in later years.

Bernard C. Parks and Perry said they are preparing to sue over the new boundaries. So are activists in Koreatown who want their neighborhood to be placed in a district with Thai Town and Historic Filipinotown, which they said would improve their chances of electing an Asian American candidate.

Cedillo said he called Council President Herb Wesson to complain that his home had been written out of Reyes' district. As a result of the change, Cedillo's side of the street is in Huizar's district while the opposite side is in Reyes'.
The move was led by Commissioner David Trujillo, a Reyes appointee. A Reyes spokeswoman said her boss did not instruct Trujillo to pursue the change, which was described as a way of unifying downtown in a single district.
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## Perry, Parks Allege Illegal Redistricting Practices, Threaten Lawsuit
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Two Los Angeles City Council members angered over new proposed boundaries for their districts alleged today that the process for drawing the boundaries was flawed and possibly even illegal.
Jan Perry and Bernard Parks expressed their discontent over the Los Angeles Redistricting Commission's latest proposed district maps in a joint letter to Commission Chair Arturo Vargas and City Attorney Carmen Trutanich. Perry also distributed copies to fellow council members during today's City Council meeting.
The commission is scheduled to vote on the final maps during an afternoon meeting tomorrow.
"We have very serious doubts that the commission has complied with applicable law in fashioning these districts," Parks and Perry wrote.
Vargas, who also serves as the commission's spokesman, could not be reached for comment.
A spokesman for City Attorney Carmen Trutanich confirmed the letter had been received, but said it was still being reviewed and it was too soon to comment.
The letter accuses the commission of trying to move black voters out of Parks' majority-black South L.A. district -- the only majority-black district of the 15 council districts in the city -without evidence of public input to justify the move.
The commission also expressed interest in turning Perry's 9th Council District south of downtown, which is currently about evenly split between blacks and Latinos, into a majori-ty-Latino district.
Under the Voting Rights Act, race-conscious decisions in redistricting must be backed up by evidence of racially polarized voting to demonstrate a need to create a new majority non-white district, the council members' letter states.
"There has been no presentation of any evidence showing racially polarized voting in any districts in Los Angeles," Parks and Perry wrote. "Without this evidence, the commission obviously placed undue and illegal emphasis on race in this process."
The Redistricting Commission is scheduled to vote on the final district maps tomorrow. The maps will then go to the full City Council for debate and final approval.

Parks and Perry have threatened to file a lawsuit challenging the maps if the existing recommendations are approved.
"We hope a common-sense individual (on the council) will stand up and say, 'Let's do this a different way,"' said Parks' chief of staff and son, Bernard Parks Jr.
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Downtown Los Angeles today is divided between two City Council districts, with Jose Huizar representing one part of the city center and Jan Perry representing the other. Despite maneuverings and tweaks, when a city commission and the council finish redrawing the council district boundaries, Huizar will still represent one part and Perry will still represent another.

So what's the fuss? Why has Perry accused the city Redistricting Commission -- a citizens panel named by the council and citywide elected officials that has been drafting new lines that then go to the council, which will finalize the map -- of engaging in a "power grab" to transfer real estate from her to Huizar? And why is Huizar touting the benefits of unified downtown leadership when he knows that even if he gets his way, he won't get all the land bounded by the 110 Freeway to the west, the 10 Freeway to the south and the L.A. River to the east?

It's about politics, of course -- the prestige and potential money that come from representing what passes for the center of this sprawling set of suburbs famously in search of a city.
Downtown has long oscillated between council districts, which are huge given the size of Los Angeles and its relatively small council. One consequence is that downtown is too small to be a district by itself, so it's been joined to one of the neighboring areas. Years ago, it was connected to Boyle Heights and the Eastside; more recently, it's been tied to South Los Angeles.
The racial implications of that connection are obvious: Today, downtown's orientation is toward historically African American Los Angeles, with its roots along Central Avenue. If connected to Boyle Heights, it would take on a more Latino cast. Not coincidentally, the two council members vying for the area reflect that distinction. Huizar is Latino. Perry is black.
That's part of what has made redistricting dicey in past years, and race enters the debate in other ways too. Take the battle over Koreatown, where merchants and residents want to be
consolidated in a single district to maximize their clout. Curiously, though, the tussle for downtown this time isn't drawing much racial fire. (Both Perry's district and Huizar's are heavily Latino.) Rather, it's personal.
Perry spies the hand of City Council President Herb Wesson at work in the move to strip her of much of her downtown base. In a recent column for the Downtown News, she did not name Wesson but alluded to "political interests" taking precedence "over the pragmatic process of drawing district lines." Perry and Wesson don't get along, and Perry's suspicions about the president's influence were heightened when the citizens commission taking the lead in the process picked a former Wesson staff member as its executive director. Wesson also is closely allied with the mayor, as is Huizar.

For his part, Huizar recognizes that the power is on his side, so he's sticking with the high road. He lavishly praises Perry for her representation of downtown but stresses that some of the existing boundaries create confusion. Along one stretch of Spring Street, for instance, Huizar represents one side of the street while Perry has the other. Unifying the area, he says, will make it easier for residents and businesses to get city services.
Moreover, Huizar's district needs to grow a bit to equalize the council districts, and he can't expand to the east because he's at the city limit. At the northern edge of his district, he bumps up against two other districts that need to grow. The leaves him looking south, which is downtown.

But Huizar knows this is about more than numbers. A council member's district defines his base, and downtown makes for an appealing one. It means votes, of course, and in the case of downtown -- with its hotels, developers and burgeoning businesses -- the potential for campaign contributions. Huizar vehemently protests that he's not in this for the money, but there's no denying there's money on the table.

Finally, there's one more curiosity in this debate, which is that despite all the talk of keeping downtown together (from Perry) or unifying it at last (from Huizar), the tentative lines would do neither. That's because the map as it stands turns over much of downtown to Huizar but allows Perry to hold on to the neighborhoods that include L.A. Live, Staples Center and the proposed football stadium.
Why peel off L.A. Live from the rest of downtown? Again, it's hard not to see politics in that. Keeping L.A. Live in Perry's district raises the district's median income and provides it with a solid job base, not to mention a core component of Perry's argument for her mayoral candidacy. Put another way: If Perry is this upset about losing part of downtown, imagine how frosted she'd be to lose it all. And there's this: Moving L.A. Live to Huizar would risk annoying AEG and its chief, Tim Leiweke, who works closely with Perry; the council doesn't pick too many fights with Leiweke.

The debates over redistricting already are contentious and personal. They'll get more so before this process is over.
jim.newton@latimes.com
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## New council maps could get vote Wednesday
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The citizens commission redrawing the City Council district lines is expected to discuss and possibly vote Wednesday on a final draft of maps that are expected to leave activists from the San Fernando Valley to South Los Angeles unhappy.
The 21-member Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission released its latest map proposal late Friday.
The plan splits two districts between the Valley and other parts of Los Angeles, something that local activists had hoped to avoid. Feeling it dilutes the Valley's political power, they had instead sought an additional district located almost entirely in the Valley.
Councilman Bernard Parks is also expected to be upset with the plan, which takes his own home out of his district, and he has threatened to sue.

Councilman Bill Rosendahl, however, was generally pleased with the new boundaries. He was glad to see the commission reversed its earlier proposal to shift most of Westchester out of his 11th District. But he does hope to keep pushing for the final map to restore all of Westchester, rather than making the 405 Freeway the eastern boundary of his district.
"But the job is not yet finished and our efforts are not yet over," Rosendahl said in a note to supporters.
Newly elected Councilman Joe Buscaino's 15th District, representing San Pedro, remained mostly the same, with only a few blocks moved into District 9.
The commission meets 4 p.m. Wednesday at City Hall. It has a March 1 deadline to make its recommendation and send the maps to the City Council for final approval.
The maps and more information can be viewed at http://redistricting2011.lacity.org/.
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The Los Angeles Redistricting Commission on Friday unveiled its latest draft map [http://graphics.latimes.com/la-council-redistricting-v2/], which includes changes approved by the 21-member panel during a marathon nine-hour session earlier this week.
The newest map pulls Encino and Lake Balboa, in the San Fernando Valley, out of the much-maligned district proposed for Councilman Tom LaBonge. In previous proposals [http://graphics.latimes.com/la-council-redistricting/], LaBonge's district snaked from Silver Lake to the west Valley.
As expected, the map also keeps the vast majority of Westchester in the coastal district represented by Councilman Bill Rosendahl. And it shifts downtown out of Councilwoman Jan Perry's district and turns that neighborhood -- with the exception of Staples Center, LA Live and the Convention Center -- over to Councilman Jose Huizar's Eastside district.
The map will be discussed at the commission's next meeting, scheduled for Wednesday. The final map must be forwarded to the City Council by March 1.
ALSO:
Map: L.A. City Council redistricting, before and after
[http://graphics.latimes.com/la-council-redistricting-v2/]
Data: The demographics of the revised districts [http://spreadsheets.latimes.com/demographics-revised-l-council-districts/]
Boy, 2, beaten to death by mother's boyfriend, authorities say
[http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2012/02/boy-2-killed-by-mothers-boyfriend-authoriti es-say.html]
John and Ken apologize for Whitney Houston 'crack' comments [http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2012/02/john-ken-apologize-for-whitney-houston-cr ack-comment.html]

BLOG: L.A. Now: New map shows latest L.A. redistricting moves L.A. Now (Los Angeles Times) February 18, 2012
Saturday 2:13 AM EST
Police believe East Hollywood gunman may have killed himself
[http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2012/02/east-hollywood-gunman-may-have-killed-hi mself-after-shooting.html]
-- David Zahniser at Los Angeles City Hall
Map: The latest proposed Los Angeles City Council district boundaries. Credit: Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
[http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/.a/6a00d8341c630a53ef016762877de9970b-pi]
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The Los Angeles Redistricting Commission on Friday unveiled its latest draft map, which includes changes approved by the 21-member panel during a marathon nine-hour session earlier this week.

The newest map pulls Encino and Lake Balboa, in the San Fernando Valley, out of the much-maligned district proposed for Councilman Tom LaBonge. In previous proposals, LaBonge's district snaked from Silver Lake to the west Valley.
As expected, the map also keeps the vast majority of Westchester in the coastal district represented by Councilman Bill Rosendahl. And it shifts downtown out of Councilwoman Jan Perry's district and turns that neighborhood -- with the exception of Staples Center, LA Live and the Convention Center -- over to Councilman Jose Huizar's Eastside district.

The map will be discussed at the commission's next meeting, scheduled for Wednesday. The final map must be forwarded to the City Council by March 1.

ALSO:
Map: L.A. City Council redistricting, before and after
Data: The demographics of the revised districts
Boy, 2, beaten to death by mother's boyfriend, authorities say
John and Ken apologize for Whitney Houston 'crack' comments
Police believe East Hollywood gunman may have killed himself
-- David Zahniser at Los Angeles City Hall
Map: The latest proposed Los Angeles City Council district boundaries. Credit: Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
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SINCE the early days of the city of Los Angeles, the San Fernando Valley was treated as an afterthought, sending in its tax revenue but getting little in return. Not until the Valley tried to divorce itself from the city itself (and nearly succeeded) did the leaders over the hill start to take Vals seriously.
But not seriously enough.
The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission is still refining its new maps of the council districts, but so far its proposals don't do the Valley any favors. The newest proposal, approved by the commission Wednesday, splits up Valley communities, sticking some in the districts of council members on the other side of the hill.
Most notable is District 4, represented by Tom LaBonge, whose Hollywood/Los Feliz district already had a small handful of Valley people. The proposal has LaBonge taking a larger share of the Valley in strange chunks that reach as far north as Roscoe Boulevard. Worse, this minority-Valley proposal makes an island of Lake Balboa, not contiguous with the rest of the district.

The council's District 5 also steals a portion of Valley neighborhoods to fill out its mostly Westside district. In the new maps, that district still dips over into the Valley, but not enough to give the Valley a significant voice.
The redrawing of districts occurs every 10 years to accommodate shifts in population and demographics. The Valley Industry and Commerce Association has taken a lead on making sure the Valley gets a decent shake in the redistricting process. The state and county have already adopted new political lines that were fair to the Valley, in large part due to the work of VICA.

EDITORIAL; LINES OF DIVISION; PROPOSED L.A. CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT MAPS MUFFLE POLITICAL VOICE OF SAN FERNANDO VALLEY RESIDENTS \{SUBHEAD\} Proposed L.A. City Council district maps muffle political voice of San Fernando Valley residents The Daily News of Los Angeles February 17, 2012 Friday
During the redistricting of state legislative and congressional seats, the group submitted maps and advocated for more wholly Valley districts. In the end, that's exactly what we ended up with.
Now VICA is sounding the alarm about the proposed city lines and asking the commission to revise the maps so that, if it has to split districts, it splits only one in the Valley.

That's fair and right, and the commission should listen.
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Ignoring the pleas of the San Fernando Valley and threats by two downtown area council members, the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission began changes to its draft plan for the new 2013 council districts.
A new map is scheduled to be released Saturday showing the most recent changes, but much is still to be decided when the 21-member panel meets again next week. A meeting is being scheduled for Wednesday to further discuss the map.
The committee held a nine-hour hearing, culminating at 1 a.m. Thursday, leaving a number of issues to be decided next week as it works to meet a March 1 deadline to submit a map to the City Council.
Angering some stakeholders, the panel said it wanted to keep the 4th and 5th districts split between the San Fernando Valley and the L.A. basin, as they are now. The earlier map had put five districts wholly in the Valley and one district partially in the Valley.
Stuart Waldman, president of the Valley Industry and Commerce Association, called the decision "a travesty."
"The Valley is a distinct community of interest and VICA will continue to fight any redistricting plan that threatens to carve up our community," Waldman said.
The panel voted to exclude Encino and the Lake Balboa area from the 4th District while no decision has been made on where to place those communities.

Waldman said he was also disappointed that committee members representing the Valley voted against proposals to help the Valley.
"Once again, San Fernando Valley residents are slighted by the city of Los Angeles," he added.

The revised map continued to draw an angry response from Councilwoman Jan Perry, who lost most of her downtown district, and Councilman Bernard Parks, who lost the area where his home is located.

Parks said he believes the only recourse left is a lawsuit against the city.
"I don't think anything will change when this gets to council," Parks said. "The commissioners we talked with said they were getting their arms twisted to go along. The arrogance of this commission is shown when they refuse to listen to the public. Even with people telling them they are wrong, they went ahead and developed this map."

Perry blamed it on internal City Council politics and a feud she and Parks have been having with Council President Herb Wesson.

The changes would give Baldwin Hills, Baldwin Vista and Leimert Park to Wesson, while Parks would lose USC and the Coliseum.

Perry would lose much of her downtown district and be given USC, the Coliseum and LA Live areas.
"We will fight this in the City Council, but Councilman Parks and I are starting to talk with attorneys to seek legal advice on what our options are, Perry said. "We will bring people down to tell the story of our districts, but I am not optimistic things will change."
The committee placed the Westchester community back into the 11th District represented by Councilman Bill Rosendahl, who also will retain Los Angeles International Airport in his district.
rick.orlov@dailynews.com
213-978-0390
twitter.com/rick.orlov
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Los Angeles' combative redistricting battle is signaling a new, harder-edged political era at City Hall -- one that some are tracing to the rise of new Council President Herb Wesson.
On Thursday, Councilwoman Jan Perry accused Wesson of gutting her district during the Redistricting Commission's latest map-making session, saying she was being punished for her refusal to back his bid to run the council.

Wesson responded that he doesn't take things personally and isn't paying anyone back. Some following the boundary drawing process are drawing a different conclusion.
Wesson's appointee on the redistricting panel, working with representatives of Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa and Councilman Jose Huizar, formed a voting bloc with several other commissioners. During a nine-hour meeting that ended after 1 a.m. Thursday, they voted to strip Baldwin Hills, Leimert Park and other neighborhoods from the South L.A. district represented by Councilman Bernard C. Parks, who like Perry has been at odds with Wesson.

In the proposal, Wesson's district would pick up those neighborhoods. Elsewhere, the panel took downtown out of the South L.A. district represented by Perry and put it into the Eastside district represented by Huizar. And in a final stroke, the commission took USC out of Parks' district and put it into Perry's. If the latest changes win final approval, Parks and Perry would no longer live in their districts.

Commissioner Helen Kim, who opposed the changes, said they were "absolutely" designed to punish Perry and Parks. "Parks has just gotten written out of the district where he lives. You don't think that's a slap in the face?" she said.
Jaime Regalado, emeritus professor of political science at Cal State L.A., said Wesson is playing hardball in a way that his predecessor, Councilman Eric Garcetti, did not. And he argued that this year's redistricting process is far more politicized than it was a decade ago.
"The council appears to be at war with each other. There seem to be factions. The incoming president is coming with his team, and rewarding his team and punishing others -- specifically Parks, and to a lesser extent, Perry," he said.
Perry and Parks did not show up for the Nov. 23 meeting in which Wesson was voted president. Parks said he specifically met with Wesson to discuss the presidency weeks earlier and told him he could not guarantee his support because of unspecified "personal issues."

Since then, Wesson yanked Parks off the powerful budget committee and pulled Perry from the panel that greenlights utility rate hikes. Parks also tried unsuccessfully to keep the Redistricting Commission from hiring a Wesson aide as its executive director.

Perry contends that splitting downtown from South Los Angeles would create a form of "economic apartheid" in her district.
Redistricting commissioners appointed by Villaraigosa and Wesson said the latest boundary changes were a response to public testimony at recent hearings. Wesson appointee Chris Ellison said key neighborhoods in Parks' district have wanted to leave it, an assertion that Parks disputes.

Commission President Arturo Vargas, a mayoral appointee, said all of downtown -- a coveted hub of business activity and campaign contributors -- should be in a single council district. And Michael Trujillo, an appointee of Councilman Richard Alarcon and a former Huizar campaign consultant, said downtown should be oriented toward Huizar's district, where some of downtown's blue-collar workers, such as custodians, reside.
Wesson has repeatedly sought to downplay any influence he has over the map-making process. "No single person controls this commission, not even the president," he said in a statement.

Maps incorporating changes approved this week come out Saturday, followed by more commission votes on Wednesday and Feb. 29.
Perry and Parks were not the only ones voicing disappointment. Koreatown activists failed to persuade the panel to move their community out of Wesson's district and into one represented by Garcetti.
In the San Fernando Valley, business leaders accused the commission of backing away from a commitment to have only one council district straddle the mountains between the Valley and the rest of the city.
--
david.zahniser@latimes.com
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## L.A.'s flawed redistricting;

Though City Council members still pull the strings, they avoid accountability for the final result.
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Under the old-school method of redrawing political boundaries, elected officials would get together in a back room to horse-trade, bicker and dicker, then meet again in the open to adopt their new maps as a done deal. If you didn't like what they came up with, you had to sue -- and you could win, but only if you could show that the maps discriminated against a historically underrepresented group. This is still the way it's done in most jurisdictions in the country, and was the way the Los Angeles City Council did things until 2000.
Under the reform method adopted for this year's state Assembly, Senate, Board of Equalization and congressional redistricting, a somewhat randomly selected citizens commission conducts numerous hearings, considers public testimony, consults with legal experts, demonstrates how well it has or has not complied with legal and voter-designated criteria, and arrives at a final version of district maps. The reform method needs some tweaking by the next time it's used -- after the decennial census in 2020 -- but generally it's a step forward for California.
And then there's the City Council's current hybrid method, dictated by a charter adopted by voters in 1999. It is almost perfect -- perfect, that is, in the sense that it is almost perfectly devoid of redeeming qualities.
Under this system, a redistricting commission is selected by the city's incumbent elected officials. And of course those 15 City Council members, the mayor, the controller and the city attorney will swear up and down that they made their selections based on the integrity and independence of their appointees, and certainly not based on their faith that their designees will do the bidding of the appointing officials.
Commissioners meet numerous times throughout the city in full public view -- except for the many times that they meet in cliques behind closed doors, receiving private instructions from emissaries sent from council offices. They hold exhaustive hearings in which everyone has an equal chance to speak -- except for incumbent office-holders, who are favored with the opportunity to make their comments first. Speaker cards are often shuffled to ensure that
particular constituent comments are heard early and that others come only after a wait of up to five hours.

The City of Los Angeles Redistricting Commission's process culminates Saturday, when the panel -- which in fairness includes many well-meaning members who believe the process can work -- releases what is for all practical purposes a final map. And because this map was drawn up independently (insert air quotes here) without any direction (wink, wink) from the City Council, the council will be merely accepting the commission's hard work (cough) when it approves the map in a final vote sometime in March.
Who really cares whether Koreatown is linked on City Council maps with Thai Town, whether Watts is paired with the distant harbor or the equally distant Staples Center, whether the residents of Westchester who live under the flight path of Los Angeles International Airport share a district with LAX or not?
We all should, but not necessarily for the reasons that have so many residents up in arms. The downfall of the Los Angeles redistricting process is not that it is laden with politics. Drawing district lines, even if it were done by a computer programmed by apolitical technocrats, is an inherently political process. Who will represent me? What community am I part of? Those are political questions that must in the end have political answers.
But we use "politics" to describe two different phenomena, one of them vital to the exercise of democracy, the other inherently corrupting. The commission redistricting process has demonstrated that it is subject to that second, corrosive form of politics.
That sort of politics has less to do with adequate representation for a community of interest than it does with whether the process itself is being engineered to ensure that particular seats are crafted for particular candidates who are supported by particular incumbents. Raise this much campaign money for me, one incumbent may say to another, and ensure that your appointee votes for a final map that includes a particularly wealthy development in my district, and l'll make sure that your protege has a district drawn that almost certainly will ensure her election next year.
In the old days, council members had no choice but to acknowledge that they drew the lines, and they would have to account for their decisions to voters, funders, supporters and others. Now, with the appointees as a buffer, the council members still pull the strings, but they avoid accountability for the final decisions. There is a veneer of public input and openness that covers the incumbent-orchestrated power plays taking place underneath.
The old way was flawed, but for all its back-room deal-making, it was more honest. Better than stepping backward, though, would be to move forward -- to a system more similar to the state's new method, which is uncorrupted (or rather, less corrupted) by the incumbents.

Let's not mistake incumbent-oriented politics with empowering politics, which is the engine of a healthy democracy. When, for example, Angelenos of Armenian descent argue for a single Armenian-centric district running from Granada Hills to Hollywood, the idea may be unworkable, but it demonstrates a political awakening. When Korean Americans demand a single Koreatown district, even though voters there would be predominantly Latino, it represents a first step in a political coming of age (to be followed, if history is a guide, by a more deft and sophisticated forging of coalitions).
L.A.'s flawed redistricting; Though City Council members still pull the strings, they avoid accountability for the final result. Los Angeles Times February 17, 2012 Friday

In the meantime, to salvage the current process, the commissioners would be wise to reject the marching orders coming at them from City Hall and to present voters with maps unrelated to incumbent demands. If there is dickering to be done, let the council do it -- and be held accountable for it.
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Feb. 16--[http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/.a/6a00d8341c630a53ef016762752f50970b-pi]
The Los Angeles Redistricting Commission sharply redrew the boundaries for three South Los Angeles council districts, creating a clear set of winners and losers in the city's politically charged map-making process.
In a meeting that ended shortly after 1 a.m. Thursday, Council President Herb Wesson and Councilman Jose Huizar -- two close allies of Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa -- emerged as the winners, adding highly coveted neighborhoods and commercial areas to their districts.
The losers were council members Bernard C. Parks and Jan Perry, who saw their proposals repeatedly rejected. After the meeting, Perry said she and Parks were both being punished for "not voting for Mr. Wesson for president and being noncompliant."
Wesson did not immediately respond to a request for comment.
The changes, backed by the commission in a flurry of votes, will be incorporated into a new map that will be released Saturday. The panel will cast its final votes Wednesday and Feb. 29 before sending the plan to the City Council.
Throughout the nine-hour meeting, appointees of Villaraigosa, Wesson and Huizar worked in sync as they carved up the districts represented by Perry and Parks. The panel gave Huizar even more of downtown than it had proposed for him last month, pushing Perry almost completely out of the business district she has represented since 2001.
Under the new plan, Perry, who lives in downtown, would see the northern boundary of her district run largely along Washington Boulevard. Perry had repeatedly argued that the commission would create "economic apartheid" if it severed downtown from her South Los Angeles district.
But Commissioner Michael Trujillo, an appointee of Councilman Richard Alarcon, said downtown should be reoriented toward Huizar's Eastside district.
"If you look at the majority of folks that work in these skyscrapers ... they live in Boyle Heights," said Trujillo, who worked as Huizar's campaign consultant in last year's election.

Wesson, for his part, picked up Baldwin Hills, Baldwin Vista, Village Green and part of Leimert Park -- all areas that had been represented by Parks.
The panel also pushed Wesson's district farther north so that it takes in a bigger chunk of Koreatown, a business district that has served as a rich source of campaign contributions for Wesson in recent years.

Under the proposal, Parks would no longer represent Baldwin Hills, the well-to-do black neighborhood where he lives. He also lost USC, the institution that he has represented since 2003, which will be pushed into Perry's district.
Parks and Perry have been at odds with Wesson for months.
The commission is headed by Wesson's longtime aide, Andrew Westall. The commission also took the first steps toward dismantling the much maligned, snakelike district drawn for Councilman Tom LaBonge, which would have stretched from Silver Lake to the west San Fernando Valley.
In a vote shortly after midnight, the panel voted to remove Encino from the district that had been proposed for LaBonge, who currently represents such neighborhoods as Silver Lake, Los Feliz and Hollywood.
The panel also backed away from its effort to have only one council district straddle the San Fernando Valley and the rest of the city, a move that angered some of the Valley's representatives.

Other changes approved by the commission include keeping a majority of Westchester in the district represented by Councilman Bill Rosendahl, moving Toluca Lake into the district represented by LaBonge and removing Watts from the district proposed for Perry.
ALSO:
Man suspected of killing, eating cats, Kern County officials say
[http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2012/02/man-suspected-of-eating-cats-in-californias -central-valley.html]
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Drowned girl's mom sought mental help, was rebuffed, relative says
[http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2012/02/relative-says-mom-tried-seeking-psychiatri c-help-but-was-rebuffed.html]
-- David Zahniser at Los Angeles City Hall
Photo: L.A. City Councilman Jose Huizar emerges as one of the winners in redistricting. Credit: Al Seib / Los Angeles Times
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## Three South L.A. council districts sharply redrawn by panel
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The Los Angeles Redistricting Commission sharply redrew the boundaries for three South Los Angeles council districts, creating a clear set of winners and losers in the city's politically charged map-making process.
In a meeting that ended shortly after 1 a.m. Thursday, Council President Herb Wesson and Councilman Jose Huizar -- two close allies of Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa -- emerged as the winners, adding highly coveted neighborhoods and commercial areas to their districts.
The losers were council members Bernard C. Parks and Jan Perry, who saw their proposals repeatedly rejected. After the meeting, Perry said she and Parks were both being punished for "not voting for Mr. Wesson for president and being noncompliant."
Wesson did not immediately respond to a request for comment.
The changes, backed by the commission in a flurry of votes, will be incorporated into a new map that will be released Saturday. The panel will cast its final votes Wednesday and Feb. 29 before sending the plan to the City Council.
Throughout the nine-hour meeting, appointees of Villaraigosa, Wesson and Huizar worked in sync as they carved up the districts represented by Perry and Parks. The panel gave Huizar even more of downtown than it had proposed for him last month, pushing Perry almost completely out of the business district she has represented since 2001.
Under the new plan, Perry, who lives in downtown, would see the northern boundary of her district run largely along Washington Boulevard. Perry had repeatedly argued that the commission would create "economic apartheid" if it severed downtown from her South Los Angeles district.
But Commissioner Michael Trujillo, an appointee of Councilman Richard Alarcon, said downtown should be reoriented toward Huizar's Eastside district.
"If you look at the majority of folks that work in these skyscrapers ... they live in Boyle Heights," said Trujillo, who worked as Huizar's campaign consultant in last year's election.
Wesson, for his part, picked up Baldwin Hills, Baldwin Vista, Village Green and part of Leimert Park -- all areas that had been represented by Parks.

The panel also pushed Wesson's district farther north so that it takes in a bigger chunk of Koreatown, a business district that has served as a rich source of campaign contributions for Wesson in recent years.
Under the proposal, Parks would no longer represent Baldwin Hills, the well-to-do black neighborhood where he lives. He also lost USC, the institution that he has represented since 2003, which will be pushed into Perry's district.
Parks and Perry have been at odds with Wesson for months.
The commission is headed by Wesson's longtime aide, Andrew Westall. The commission also took the first steps toward dismantling the much maligned, snakelike district drawn for Councilman Tom LaBonge, which would have stretched from Silver Lake to the west San Fernando Valley.
In a vote shortly after midnight, the panel voted to remove Encino from the district that had been proposed for LaBonge, who currently represents such neighborhoods as Silver Lake, Los Feliz and Hollywood.
The panel also backed away from its effort to have only one council district straddle the San Fernando Valley and the rest of the city, a move that angered some of the Valley's representatives.
Other changes approved by the commission include keeping a majority of Westchester in the district represented by Councilman Bill Rosendahl, moving Toluca Lake into the district represented by LaBonge and removing Watts from the district proposed for Perry.

ALSO:
Man suspected of killing, eating cats, Kern County officials say
Playmate of the Year seeks restraining order against Hefner's son
Drowned girl's mom sought mental help, was rebuffed, relative says
-- David Zahniser at Los Angeles City Hall
Photo: L.A. City Councilman Jose Huizar emerges as one of the winners in redistricting. Credit: Al Seib / Los Angeles Times
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## L.A. redistricting panel tries to quell anger with an eraser
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Responding to an avalanche of criticism from various neighborhoods, Los Angeles' Redistricting Commission began reworking plans Wednesday evening for new City Council districts -- two weeks before the proposal heads to city lawmakers.
Seeking to quell anger in the city's coastal neighborhoods, the 21-member panel put the vast majority of Westchester back into the LAX-area district represented by Councilman Bill Rosendahl.

The commission also responded to residents in Watts, putting their neighborhood back into the Harbor district represented by Councilman Joe Buscaino. In draft maps, Watts had been placed in the downtown-to-South Los Angeles district represented by Councilwoman Jan Perry.

In a third action, the panel took Baldwin Hills, Baldwin Vista and a portion of Leimert Park out of Councilman Bernard Parks' district, turning it over to Council President Herb Wesson. Parks lives in Baldwin Hills and has been at odds with Wesson for months.

And in a fourth decision, the commission moved all of downtown except for L.A. Live, Staples Center and the Convention Center out of Perry's district into the district represented by Councilman Jose Huizar. Perry is a longtime Parks ally.
Late Wednesday, the commission was still debating an array of proposals. The panel was weighing a plan to address protests from Koreatown, where activists have demanded that their community be placed in a single district, by expanding the community area that would be represented by Wesson.
Korean American activists warned commissioners that they were willing to sue to ensure that their neighborhood was taken entirely out of Wesson's district and placed into one currently represented by Councilman Eric Garcetti. Such a move would greatly increase the concentration of Asian American voters in Garcetti's district, which already has Thai Town.
"We are prepared to fight for our community if our legitimate demands are not supported," said Koreatown resident Ronald Kim, who is the vice president of the Korean Community Lawyers Assn.
The proposed boundary changes have drawn hundreds of people to public hearings and triggered protests from such varied communities as Sherman Oaks, Sunland-Tujunga, Watts, Baldwin Hills, Encino and downtown. They also have brought heated exchanges between council members, community advocates and commissioners.
The redistricting panel will release final proposed maps on Saturday, and is scheduled to decide on recommendations at meetings Wednesday and Feb 29. From there, the City Council could rework the proposed boundaries before giving its approval.
Redistricting is required every 10 years to adjust political districts for population changes. It's a high-stakes process both for politicians and community groups. Many neighborhoods want to avoid being divided between districts because, they argue, it makes it harder to obtain city services.
Council members typically don't want to lose areas where they have spent years nurturing projects and developing both community ties and political support.
--
david.zahniser@latimes.com
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## Remapping panel mulls changes to final draft; <br> REDISTRICTING: Meeting today to forge proposal to go before the City Council.

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. A3

LENGTH: 463 words

Following weeks of complaints and praise from community groups, the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission will consider today more than 75 proposed changes to its draft City Council boundary map before submitting it to the council for final review.
"It's one of those things where you cross your fingers and hope they have been listening," said Jill Barad, founder of the San Fernando Valley Alliance of Neighborhood Councils, which has criticized the most recent proposal for the way it divides up the San Fernando Valley.

The 21-member commission will meet at 4 p.m. in the City Council chambers at City Hall, where the different proposals will be debated. The commission will then give instructions on the final map to be presented to the City Council by March 1. The City Council then will have the option of accepting or modifying the proposal.
Arturo Vargas, chairman of the commission, said he expects to see some major changes in the map that has been proposed and its final drafting.
"We've heard from the community and I expect there to be some major tweaks to the map," Vargas said. "Particularly in the Westchester area and some in the San Fernando Valley."
The committee will be holding three hearings between now and the end of the month as it meets its March 1 deadline to submit a map to the City Council. The council has until June 30 to adopt the maps.

For the San Fernando Valley, the biggest change was stretching the 4th Council District from Silver Lake to Sherman Oaks and Lake Balboa.
"To us, that makes no sense," Barad said. "Where is the community of interest between Silver Lake and Sherman Oaks?"

As a result of the opposition, new proposals have surfaced that would keep the Valley with five districts wholly in the Valley with two others, the 4th and 5th, crossing over the Santa Monica Mountains.

Elsewhere in the city, there are protests over how Westchester was excluded from Councilman Bill Rosendahl's 11th district, which includes Los Angeles International Airport. Westchester was transferred to Councilman Bernard Parks.
Rosendahl and Parks both appeared at a public hearing on the proposal, objecting to how the map is drawn.
Parks also is concerned over the potential loss of the Leimert Park area from his district, while Councilwoman Jan Perry is upset that the plan excludes much of the downtown area from her district. She would retain the LA Live-Staples Center area as well as the USC-Exposition Park area.
"What disturbs me is we only had 1 percent population growth in the entire city and they made these changes," Parks said. "We went to every public hearing and made the case that we did not want to lose Baldwin Hills, Baldwin Vista or Leimert Parks. We lost all those." rick.orlov@dailynews.com
213-978-0390
twitter.com/rickorlov
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# Redistricting sparks anger; <br> Discussions turn nasty, old rivalries resurface and fraud is alleged as deadline nears for new council boundaries. 

BYLINE: David Zahniser
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The once-a-decade ritual to redraw Los Angeles City Council district lines has become an increasingly messy and acrimonious bit of political theater as lawmakers and community groups jockey for favored positions.
Councilman Bernard C. Parks is seething over what he said was a four-letter epithet directed his way by the executive director of the Redistricting Commission, a former aide and close ally of rival lawmaker and Council President Herb Wesson.

Tongues also were wagging last week about a widely circulated email that said downtowners had "a deal" to speak out in favor of a map sought by Councilman Jose Huizar in exchange for a funding meeting with a top Huizar aide. After The Times inquired about the email, Huizar and the email's author insisted that there was no deal or quid pro quo.

Elsewhere, angry Koreatown activists who want their neighborhood to be placed in a single council district announced that they have set up a phone line to gather information on City Hall corruption and misdeeds.
Those activists have testified that Korean business owners have fallen prey to crooked city employees but have not provided names of any alleged victims. They also have claimed that the city's politicians neglect their neighborhood while routinely demanding campaign contributions.
"Our community will no longer sit idly and be pimped out like a two-dollar whore," said 34-year-old James Beck, a Korean American lawyer who testified at a hearing two weeks ago.

The tensions reflect the high stakes for both politicians and community groups -- and are likely to intensify in the coming weeks as the deadline for approving new district maps nears. After hearing complaints from around the city, the commission will meet Wednesday to consider 75 changes to the new council district maps initially drafted.

Roughly 800 people showed up at a City Hall redistricting hearing last week, a turnout that filled the council chamber and an overflow room. More attendees milled about in the hallways.
That night, testimony focused on downtown -- a rich source of campaign funds -- and whether it should remain partly in Councilwoman Jan Perry's 9th District or moved mostly into Huizar's 14th District.
Adding to the drama was an email from a downtown marketing consultant who encouraged his allies to show up and side with Huizar.
Consultant Josh Gray-Emmer said in his email that property owner Michael Delijani had promised to reward a strong turnout by arranging a meeting with Huizar aide Jessica Wethington McLean to discuss projects sought by downtown residents, including an effort to relight a historic radio tower. Wethington McLean heads Huizar's initiative to revitalize Broadway, where Delijani's family has multiple properties.
"I made a deal with Michael," said Gray-Emmer's email, a copy of which was obtained by The Times. "If I show up, and bring people to support me (and therefore him and CD14), he will take LaTanya, Francie and I to sushi with Jessica from CD14 to discuss FUNDING and pushing forward the re-lighting of the KRKD Tower."
Delijani called the assertions fabricated. Gray-Emmer initially told The Times that the email was intended for "a small group of people." Hours later, he called back to say its contents were untrue.

Perry, whose district could lose much of downtown, seized on the email, saying it reflected the "transactional" politics influencing redistricting.
Perry and Huizar backers testified for nearly five hours, while some speakers from Koreatown waited. That infuriated redistricting Commissioner Helen Kim, who complained that 80 - and 90 -year-old citizens were being forced to wait for hours. Kim, an appointee of City Controller Wendy Greuel, said she confronted Huizar's chief of staff and told her to stop rifling through the speaker cards and changing the order.
"At first she said that she was merely culling out the public comment cards of people who had left," Kim said.
"Then she went on to say that her people -- people from [Huizar's district] -- had gotten there early and she was entitled to make sure they didn't testify last."
Huizar spokesman Rick Coca called Kim's assertions false, saying the councilman's aide was simply helping to identify cards from Huizar's district.
He said many of Huizar's constituents left after not being called to the microphone for several hours, even though they had arrived early.

Meanwhile, Parks wrote the commission last week alleging that the panel's executive director, Andrew Westall, directed a profanity at one of his staff members. "Mr. Westall told one of my employees: Tell your boss to go F himself," Parks wrote. "To clarify, Mr. Westall did not stop at the letter F."

The exchange, according to Parks, took place Feb. 2 at a commission hearing where hundreds of Westchester residents protested a proposal to put their neighborhood into Parks' district. It was unclear whether the alleged statement was related to a key departure from Parks' office that same day.
Less than an hour before the hearing, Westall's stepson, Domingo Orosco, abruptly announced he was stepping down as an aide to Parks.
Orosco could not be reached for comment and Parks would not discuss the departure.
Neither Westall nor commission president Arturo Vargas responded to requests for comment on the profanity allegation.
Westall is a former aide to Wesson, the council president whose relations with Parks have grown increasingly chilly.

Parks, saying he was ill, did not show up for the vote in November that made Wesson council president. Last month, Wesson yanked Parks from the Budget and Finance Committee that he chaired for eight years.
david.zahniser@latimes.com
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THE outcry against the new Los Angeles city redistricting proposals has been long and loud. The charges are by now well known.
The plan will rip whole chunks of neighborhoods out of one district and stuff them into wildly disparate districts. The two districts that have been most often cited to prove the point are Councilwoman Jan Perry's 9th District and Councilman Bernard Parks's 8th district. Both represent some of the the poorest and most heavily minority neighborhoods in the city.
Under the proposed redistricting plan, Perry will lose most of downtown to 14th District City Councilman Jose Huizar. She'll be left with a district that, if not for the remaining downtown section, would have the city's highest unemployment rate and the greatest dearth of upscale manufacturing and businesses.
Perry has worked hard to change that by leveraging the financially booming downtown as a fulcrum for gaining resources and drawing in major business and redevelopment dollars in the impoverished portion of her district. Perry protests that losing downtown will put a severe crimp in her efforts.

Parks has been even more vociferous in opposing much of the current redistricting proposal, though it created an opposite dilemma for him. The proposed new maps graft on part of the more upscale, largely white, Westchester section to his mostly minority 8th District.
The proposals are still in the talking - and shouting - stage. And while a litany of L.A. city officials, residents and businesspeople have weighed in on the district's reshuffling, one person has been strangely mute. That's Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa.
Redistricting is in the purview of the City Council to approve. A redistricting panel is convened by city officials every 10 years to adjust council district boundaries to reflect changes in population and ethnic makeup. Part of that process is designed to ensure that Latinos, African-Americans and other groups denied representation in the past have adequate opportunity to win office, as required under the federal Voting Rights Act.
But Villaraigosa ultimately has to sign off on the final proposal. And he has much power over its final shape since he put three of the members on the 21-member Redistricting Com-
mission, including Commission Chairman Arturo Vargas, who is the executive director of the National Association of Elected and Appointed Officials.
So what does the mayor think about the proposal? He hasn't said a word. Perhaps he simply prefers to let the process play out and see what's finally approved. Another possibility is that since the mayor has deep ties with those on the council and the commission that are charged with redrawing the lines, his hand is at work behind the scenes making changes. Either answer is plausible and valid.
Villaraigosa will be out of office in another year. His legacy is already being written as a mayor who was either an abject failure or did the best job he could given the crisis problems that he had to deal with.

Villaraigosa's silence on the redistricting imbroglio will weigh heavy on the latter.
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Feb. 09--In the latest controversy over redrawing Los Angeles City Council districts, an email circulated among downtowners this week said a "deal" had been made to secure a meeting with a key aide to Councilman Jose Huizar on an iconic Central City project if people spoke out in favor of shifting much of the area into Huizar's district.
A Huizar spokesman said any suggestion of a quid pro quo is "ridiculous." But Councilwoman Jan Perry, who represents most of downtown, took issue with the email's implications.

In the message sent Tuesday, consultant Josh Gray-Emmer encouraged fellow downtown residents to show up at Wednesday's Redistricting Commission meeting and voice support for the panel's proposal to move much of downtown from Perry's 9th District to Huizar's 14th District.

Gray-Emmer, 33, wrote that property owner Michael Delijani would reward those efforts by arranging a meeting with Huizar aide Jessica Wethington McLean to discuss downtown projects, including an effort to illuminate an old rooftop radio tower. Wethington McLean heads Huizar's initiative to revitalize Broadway, where Delijani's family has multiple properties.
"I made a deal with Michael," said the email, a copy of which was obtained by The Times. "If I show up, and bring people to support me (and therefore him and CD14), he will take LaTanya, Francie and I to sushi with Jessica from CD14 to discuss FUNDING and pushing forward the re-lighting of the KKRD Tower. This is one of our THREE projects selected to push forward. Let's make it happen. IT'S ALL ABOUT BODIES!!"

Both Delijani and Huizar spokesman Rick Coca said the email's contents were untrue. Delijani said he made no such offer and simply informed Gray-Emmer that the redistricting meeting was taking place. "If [Gray-Emmer] wants to have a meeting, he can call the council office" to arrange one himself, Delijani added.

Contacted by The Times, Gray-Emmer said he was "disappointed" the email was being circulated beyond the intended recipients. Asked if bringing people to testify at the hearing was part of a quid pro quo, he initially responded: "I would just say that that email was completely internal, and intended for a small group of people."

Gray-Emmer would not specify what type of funding he expected to discuss with Huizar's aide, insisting the money would never have come from Huizar's office. Hours later, he called The Times to apologize for the email's contents, saying it "wasn't factually accurate" and that Delijani never offered any deal.
"I knew that Michael would take me to sushi regardless," he said.
Huizar was the first speaker at Wednesday's hearing, which was attended by 800 people. He lobbied the commission to approve the plan to put most of downtown -- a rich source of funds for political campaigns -- in his district.
Perry, who testified against the proposed map, told The Times the email showed that redistricting has become "just another venue" for political horse-trading at City Hall. "I don't understand why representatives of an elected official would have to offer their constituents favors to come in and testify," she said.
For weeks, the process of redrawing council district boundaries has been stirring controversy, with residents in Koreatown, Westchester, Sunland-Tujunga and other communities criticizing proposed changes.

Gray-Emmer, who lives downtown, said he brought as many as 15 people to Wednesday night's hearing but left before his name was called to speak. LaTanya Spann, a property manager who received the email and was mentioned in it, said the matter is being blown out of proportion, noting neither Gray-Emmer nor his friends provided any testimony.
Spann said she wants downtown to stay in Perry's district. Although she is friends with Gray-Emmer, she said she sent him an email chiding him for sending an email that linked community projects with public testimony.
"Sometimes people do things in a rush, without thinking," she added.
ALSO:
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-- David Zahniser at Los Angeles City Hall
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## Email prompts new flare-up over downtown L.A. redistricting
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In the latest controversy over redrawing Los Angeles City Council districts, an email circulated among downtowners this week said a "deal" had been made to secure a meeting with a key aide to Councilman Jose Huizar on an iconic Central City project if people spoke out in favor of shifting much of the area into Huizar's district.
A Huizar spokesman said any suggestion of a quid pro quo is "ridiculous." But Councilwoman Jan Perry, who represents most of downtown, took issue with the email's implications.
In the message sent Tuesday, consultant Josh Gray-Emmer encouraged fellow downtown residents to show up at Wednesday's Redistricting Commission meeting and voice support for the panel's proposal to move much of downtown from Perry's 9th District to Huizar's 14th District.

Gray-Emmer, 33, wrote that property owner Michael Delijani would reward those efforts by arranging a meeting with Huizar aide Jessica Wethington McLean to discuss downtown projects, including an effort to illuminate an old rooftop radio tower. Wethington McLean heads Huizar's initiative to revitalize Broadway, where Delijani's family has multiple properties.
"I made a deal with Michael," said the email, a copy of which was obtained by The Times. "If I show up, and bring people to support me (and therefore him and CD14), he will take LaTanya, Francie and I to sushi with Jessica from CD14 to discuss FUNDING and pushing forward the re-lighting of the KKRD Tower. This is one of our THREE projects selected to push forward. Let's make it happen. IT'S ALL ABOUT BODIES!!"
Both Delijani and Huizar spokesman Rick Coca said the email's contents were untrue. Delijani said he made no such offer and simply informed Gray-Emmer that the redistricting meeting was taking place. "If [Gray-Emmer] wants to have a meeting, he can call the council office" to arrange one himself, Delijani added.
Contacted by The Times, Gray-Emmer said he was "disappointed" the email was being circulated beyond the intended recipients. Asked if bringing people to testify at the hearing was part of a quid pro quo, he initially responded: "I would just say that that email was completely internal, and intended for a small group of people."

Gray-Emmer would not specify what type of funding he expected to discuss with Huizar's aide, insisting the money would never have come from Huizar's office. Hours later, he called The Times to apologize for the email's contents, saying it "wasn't factually accurate" and that Delijani never offered any deal.
"I knew that Michael would take me to sushi regardless," he said.
Huizar was the first speaker at Wednesday's hearing, which was attended by 800 people. He lobbied the commission to approve the plan to put most of downtown -- a rich source of funds for political campaigns -- in his district.
Perry, who testified against the proposed map, told The Times the email showed that redistricting has become "just another venue" for political horse-trading at City Hall. "I don't understand why representatives of an elected official would have to offer their constituents favors to come in and testify," she said.
For weeks, the process of redrawing council district boundaries has been stirring controversy, with residents in Koreatown, Westchester, Sunland-Tujunga and other communities criticizing proposed changes.

Gray-Emmer, who lives downtown, said he brought as many as 15 people to Wednesday night's hearing but left before his name was called to speak. LaTanya Spann, a property manager who received the email and was mentioned in it, said the matter is being blown out of proportion, noting neither Gray-Emmer nor his friends provided any testimony.
Spann said she wants downtown to stay in Perry's district. Although she is friends with Gray-Emmer, she said she sent him an email chiding him for sending an email that linked community projects with public testimony.
"Sometimes people do things in a rush, without thinking," she added.
ALSO:
Big surf, 80-degree weather expected across L.A. area
Miramonte school to reopen in wake of sex-abuse scandal
Anti-gay-marriage forces plan Prop. 8 strategy after legal defeat
-- David Zahniser at Los Angeles City Hall
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How do 'minority seats' make L.A. better?
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What does race have to do with Los Angeles City Council redistricting?
It is truly astonishing in the year 2012 to hear politicians, pundits and newspapers speak openly and unashamedly about ensuring "minority seats" in Los Angeles City Council. What does any of this have to do with clean, safe streets and good schools?

Every 10 years, Los Angeles City Council redraws its boundaries for its 15 seats. Or more precisely, it has the districts redrawn by somebody else.

Then the incumbent politicians start complaining. Usually it's lefty politician vs. lefty politician as to who keeps or loses what in whose district. No political ideology is at stake.
Councilwoman Jan Perry, for example, complains, "If you split downtown L.A., and South L.A., you condemn South L.A. to a form of economic apartheid."

Perry apparently confuses pre-Mandela South Africa with South L.A. It happens.
Councilman Bill Rosendahl warns against moving LAX out of his district. "I would go ballistic," he said, "if someone tried to take the airport." Such a move, Rosendahl informs us, would be "democracy at it's worst." Next thing you know, the Taliban makes it a safe haven. Can't be too careful.

Politicians do not want to learn new areas and new voters while fighting to retain old donors and recruit new ones. But also there's this: The city's changing demographics mean more Hispanic voters and fewer black ones. This scares politicians who built careers making racial appeals to voters.

The 21-member Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission is supposed to ensure the preservation of a certain number of minority seats.

In a city like Los Angeles - whose population today is 48.5 percent Hispanic, 28.7 percent non-Hispanic white, 11.3 percent Asian, and 9.6 percent black - what exactly is a minority, let alone a minority seat? Must a minority represent a "minority district"? From the same minority group?

Didn't a black man, three years ago, become president of the United States, a country that is 70 percent white?
Tim Scott, a black Republican representing South Carolina in the U.S House of Representatives, serves a district that is 70 percent white. Black Rep. Allen West, R-Fla., represents a district that is less than 10 percent black. Four times Los Angeles voters elected Tom Bradley, a black man, to serve as mayor.
The Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund insists its redistricting ideas guarantee three "African-American" seats. This means a group with 10 percent city population gets 20 percent of the seats. Isn't that "over-representation"? Will we someday worry about preserving "white seats" for L.A.'s declining white population?
Martin Luther King Jr. dreamed of a society where people are judged based upon the content of their character. Some talk the talk of a color-blind society but walk the walk of a col-or-coordinated one.
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## Redistricting plan upsets Koreatown; <br> Many residents want a single City Council member to represent the neighborhood.

BYLINE: Kate Linthicum
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LENGTH: 651 words

Alex Cha stood before the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission last week and told panel members: "As an Asian American living in the city of Los Angeles, I feel voiceless."

He had gone to the San Fernando Valley meeting to protest proposed new City Council boundaries that call for Koreatown to be divided between two council districts. Disappointment over the proposal has run deep in the neighborhood, where over the weekend ministers complained about it to their congregations, and volunteers gathered signatures on protest petitions outside local grocery stores.
In a biting editorial, the Korea Times attacked lawmakers for treating Koreatown like a "cash register" by taking campaign contributions from the neighborhood but not fighting for it.
For months Cha and hundreds of others had urged the commission to unite the neighborhood in a single district, which they argued would improve chances that the area would get the attention and services it deserves. For a community not known for its engagement with City Hall, it's been an impressive showing. One commissioner described it as Koreatown's political coming of age.
The proposed redistricting would split Koreatown, now divided among four council districts, between areas represented by Councilmen Herb Wesson and Eric Garcetti. As activists prepare to fight the proposed boundaries -- Cha expects 1,000 people to turn out for a public hearing on the draft maps Wednesday night -- others are questioning whether the protest leaders are representative of one of the city's most diverse neighborhoods.

Korean immigrants moved into the area in the 1960s and 1970s, helping build it into the dense urban quarter it is today, with towering office towers, blocks of apartments and hundreds of restaurants and nightclubs.
But Asian Americans make up only $32 \%$ of the area's population, according to a Times analysis of 2000 Census data. With $53 \%$ of the population, Latinos make up the majority.

The interests of working-class Latinos are different from those of many Korean Americans, said Edward Park, the director of the Asian Pacific American studies program at Loyola Marymount University. Although Korean American business owners might care primarily about development issues, affordable housing may be a bigger priority to Latinos, he said.
He said he wished the Koreatown activists would focus on issues like housing and less on "who can we get elected to the City Council that looks like us."
The current political division of Koreatown makes life hard for everybody, said Grace Yoo, the director of the Korean American Coalition. "Instead of going to one person to get something done, you have to go to four," she said. "And getting four different council members to sign off on something is not an easy task."
Some council offices don't always have Korean speakers available, Yoo said, which can discourage immigrants from getting help. "You're talking to limited-English people," she said. "They give up."
Yoo moved from Korea to Koreatown at age 3. An outspoken attorney, she did not conceal her scorn during remarks at the commission meeting where the proposed boundaries were revealed. She referred to about 60 older Korean Americans in the room as the people with "names that you're going to have difficulty pronouncing."
Helen Kim, one of two Korean Americans on the redistricting panel, voted against the commission's proposed district boundaries. Koreatown, with its potholes and lack of green space, "is really a very needy community," she said.
Korean immigrants traditionally have relied on families or church for assistance, she said.
But as their American-raised children age, many are wondering why their community doesn't get more help, Kim said.
"I think the community finally understands that nobody else is advocating for them," she said.
kate.linthicum@latimes.com
Times staff writer Victoria Kim contributed to this report.
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## Confusion abounds in remapping;

DISTRICTS: L.A. panel schedules series of meetings to hear input from the public.

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. A1

LENGTH: 849 words

Residents of Sunland-Tujunga feel betrayed.
Sherman Oaks and Studio City residents are divided over what might happen to them. And there is wide confusion from Lake Balboa to Silver Lake over how they'll share a single City Council district.

Last week the Los Angeles redistricting commission released new maps that dramatically reshape City Council districts. That's prompted a flurry of emergency meetings by neighborhood councils and other groups to determine how the new maps will affect them, while City Council members stage rallies in opposition to their new districts.
"If there is one thing that is certain, it is that these maps will change," said Arturo Vargas, chair of the 21-member redistricting committee.
"I recognize there are problems in the Valley and the Westchester area and other parts of the city with these maps," Vargas said. "What we would like people to know is that these are preliminary maps and they will change."
Vargas said the panel has scheduled a number of hearings over the next several weeks to hear from the public.
"We would like to hear what they like and don't like so we can make changes," Vargas said. "That's what this process is for."
Residents are already voicing concerns over the new 4th Council District, which would stretch from Silver Lake through Hollywood to Sherman Oaks, Encino and Lake Balboa.
"I have received more emails and calls about this than anything the city has done in a long time," said Jill Barad, founder of the Valley Alliance of Neighborhood Councils.
"Not only does this represent a disservice to the community, it is a disservice to the person representing the area and their staff. How can they possibly know what's going on in such a diverse area?"

Yet, Richard Close of the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association, said he likes the proposal.
"All of Sherman Oaks is in the one district and in three years, there will be a vacancy in the seat, and I think a Valley person will stand a good chance of winning the seat," Close said.
Complaints were also voiced in the Northeast San Fernando Valley, which has been represented by Councilman Paul Krekorian and will be divided into two districts represented by Councilmen Tony Cardenas and Richard Alarcon.
Cindy Cleghorn, secretary of the Sunland-Tujunga Neighborhood Council, said more than 50 people turned out for an emergency meeting over the weekend to develop a statement of opposition to the proposal.
"We feel like everything we said was ignored," Cleghorn said. "We have communities with the same ZIP code that will now be in two City Council districts.
All our services will be coming from different communities."
Nina Royal, who also serves on the Sunland-Tujunga Neighborhood Council, said the new maps could leave the area more vulnerable to development.
"The maps cut up the rural, agricultural and equestrian communities," Royal said. "Developers are going to be licking their chops. We're disenfranchised."
Krekorian, who has represented the area, said he recognizes the shifts in population will force him to give up some areas.
"Under any scenario, I will be required to give up some neighborhoods that I care about very much," Krekorian said.
Likewise, complaints are being voiced over the hill, from the airport area through South Los Angeles.
Councilman Bernard Parks, who last week described his district as being treated like a junkyard, said he will use his new post as chairman of the Education and Neighborhoods Committee to review the entire plan.
"I plan to use this position to involve the neighborhood councils to fix the redistricting process, which has been broken from the start," Parks said.
Parks is upset that his district will lose portions of Leimert Park and Baldwin Hills and gain the Westchester area.
That's raised the ire of Councilman Bill Rosendahl, who retains the Los Angeles International Airport area but loses neighboring Westchester.
"Doing this will divide communities that share a neighborhood council, a chamber of commerce and a community plan," Rosendahl said. "It makes no sense to tear Westchester from Los Angeles International Airport."
Councilwoman Jan Perry also organized a rally in her downtown district over the weekend, objecting to the proposal which would remove Little Tokyo, downtown, Central City East and parts of South Los Angeles from the 9th District.

Redistricting expert Alan Clayton, who has worked on maps for more than 25 years, said the maps are supposed to create compact, competitive districts, and he believes substantial changes are needed if the city maps are to withstand legal challenge.
"Based on the way they are drawn now, I think they might violate federal law," Clayton said.
"I think these maps could open the door to litigation by the way they are drawn."
The city revises council district boundaries every 10 years based on population changes documented by the U.S. Census.
The redistricting panel must approve its final map by March1, and the council has the final vote on the new district boundaries.

Staff Writer Dakota Smith contributed to this report.
rick.orlov@dailynews.com
213-978-0390
twitter.com/rickorlov
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## Some balk at draft council map; <br> Widely disparate L.A. areas are lumped together in proposed new 4th District.

BYLINE: Stephen Ceasar<br>SECTION: MAIN NEWS; Metro Desk; Part A; Pg. 27

LENGTH: 902 words

Stacy Matulis doesn't see how one politician could represent everyone in the newly proposed 4th Los Angeles City Council District that stretches from the trendy neighborhoods northeast of downtown to the heart of the San Fernando Valley.
She would know.
The 33-year-old greets many of the baristas in her Silver Lake neighborhood by name, but she's also lived among the rows of strip malls in the Valley and teaches yoga to millionaires in their sprawling mansions in the Hollywood Hills.
"With so many types of concerns going to one person, it would divide focus," she said last week betweens sips of a cappuccino. "I don't know how the same person could represent all three interests well."
The map also puzzles other would-be constituents of District 4, which Councilman Tom LaBonge represents.
Los Angeles' City Council Redistricting Commission released its proposed boundary changes for council districts last week, sparking harsh criticism from politicians, community advocates and neighborhood leaders who contend the maps do not reflect the comments and desires expressed during weeks of public hearings.
The redistricting panel is convened by city officials every 10 years to adjust council district boundaries to reflect changes in population levels and ethnic makeup. It is tasked to ensure that Latinos, African Americans and members of other groups denied representation in the past have an adequate opportunity to win office, as required under the federal Voting Rights Act.

New census data shows Los Angeles is 48.5\% Latino, 28.6\% white, 11.3\% Asian and 9.2\% black. Redistricting officials are attempting to ensure that five of the 15 council districts are heavily Latino and that three have sizable concentrations of African Americans.
The drafts will be further discussed during seven upcoming hearings before being voted on by the council.

The new District 4 would start at the southeastern tip of Silver Lake and reach north through Los Feliz and Griffith Park and across the 101 Freeway. It would continue west through parts of the Hollywood Hills and Beverly Crest, extending across the mansion-dotted hillsides and into Sherman Oaks. It would again overlap the 101 Freeway and head north through the Valley into the Lake Balboa area, a stone's throw from Northridge and Reseda.

The suggested new boundaries address some prominent business leaders' desire for a sixth district either entirely or largely in the San Fernando Valley.
The redistricting panel worked to avoid creating more than one district partly but not wholly in the Valley, which helped cause the unusual configuration of the proposed District 4, said David Roberti, a commission member and former state Senate president.

One of the goals of redistricting is to create communities of interest, said Roberti, who voted against the proposed maps.
"You don't do that if you put Silver Lake in the same district as Lake Balboa and the same district with Beverly Crest," he said.
The proposed District 4 includes a variety of residents with vastly different lifestyles and concerns.

Florist Carmen Gabriel operates her Lake Balboa shop in a graffiti-riddled, mostly vacant strip mall. It's typical to hear about a shooting every now and then, she said. People in the area mostly stick to themselves.

To Gabriel, there is little in Lake Balboa that resembles the glitz and glamour found in the Hollywood Hills.
"The movie stars with their little poodles sashaying down the street," she said with a smirk. "They have nothing in common with people here."
Nickie Miner, who has lived in Benedict Canyon for the last 40 years, says the problems residents face there are too specific to be bunched in with such different neighborhoods. Her home now sits in District 5, represented by Councilman Paul Koretz. The proposed new district boundaries would split her neighborhood from other hillside communities such as Bel-Air and Beverly Glen.
"It's insane. Might as well put Chicago in our district," she said. "We have nothing to do with the flats in the Valley."
In Silver Lake, Quincy Schwartz, 43, dropped off her daughter at Ivanhoe Elementary School early Friday and was taking her new puppy, Wanda, for a walk.
"Ugh, the Valley," she said, tongue in cheek, when asked about the proposed district boundaries. Silver Lake differs greatly from both the Westside and the Valley, and attempting to combine their economic and social lifestyles doesn't make any sense, she said.

Not to mention the different vibes of the neighborhoods.
"It's crazy different," she said. "Silver Lake feels more hippie, down to earth."
And LaBonge, who would represent the proposed district, does not see the commonality among the neighborhoods in the suggested District 4 that he sees among those in the current district. He would keep Silver Lake, Los Feliz and Griffith Park but lose neighborhoods along Wilshire Boulevard such as Miracle Mile.
"The only common thread here is the Canadian geese that migrate from the Encino Reservoir to the Silver Lake Reservoir," he said.
LaBonge said he intends to voice his displeasure through the remainder of the process, in hopes that the concerns of residents in his district are heard.
"If this was changed as it's proposed, it's not just me that's affected, but it's a dedicated [council office] staff that knows the neighborhood, know the constituents," he said. "There would be a break in that relationship."
stephen.ceasar @latimes.com
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## L.A. City Council: Wesson strips Parks, Perry of key chairmanships [Updated]

## BYLINE: Rich Connell

LENGTH: 708 words

Los Angeles City Council President Herb Wesson engineered another shake-up at City Hall on Friday, removing Councilman Bernard C. Parks from his post as chairman of the powerful Budget and Finance Committee, which serves as the clearinghouse for budgets proposed by Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa.
The move is expected to widen the bitter divide between Wesson and Parks, two of the council's three African American members, who are already at odds over new proposed boundaries lines for the 15 council districts.

Parks, a budget hawk who had run the committee for eight years, did not show up for the Nov. 23 vote that made Wesson the council's newest president. Parks' spokesman said afterward that the councilman was ill. But Wesson said after that vote that he was disappointed.

Wesson also removed Councilwoman Jan Perry from her post as chairwoman of the Energy and Environment Committee, which reviews proposals for electricity and water rate hikes at the Department of Water and Power. Perry, like Parks, did not attend the council meeting where Wesson was elected president.

The changes could make it easier for Villaraigosa, a Wesson ally, to see some of his proposals win passage. Parks, a powerful voice on the city budget, had stalled or killed key Villaraigosa proposals while heading his committee. For example, he helped defeat a proposal to balance the budget by borrowing $\$ 43$ million over five years to pay for costs associated with an early retirement program offered to city employees.

Perry has been an obstacle to Villaraigosa's efforts to increase utility rates at the DWP. And both she and Parks have been critical of a proposal to borrow 27 years' worth of street construction funds to pay for a blitz of road repairs.
The budget committee will be headed by Councilman Paul Krekorian, who represents the San Fernando Valley. Parks is off the budget panel, while Perry is no longer on the energy committee.

Even before the committee assignments were made, Parks and Wesson had been at odds over new council district lines proposed by a 21 -member panel. Over the last week, Wes-
son's appointee on the Redistricting Commission pushed a plan -- now abandoned -- to strip most of Baldwin Hills, the neighborhood where Parks lives, from the South Los Angeles district he represents.
The proposed redistricting map, which was released Wednesday, takes Baldwin Vista and the residential section of Leimert Park out of Parks' 8th District. Parks responded by saying that his district was being treated like a "junkyard," with commissioners trying to remove different pieces of it.
The redistricting panel is run by a former Wesson aide, Andrew Westall, a key figure in a legal dispute over campaign funds that are owed by Parks' 2008 campaign for county supervisor. Parks opposed Westall's hiring when the commission was formed.

Wesson gave the top position on the energy committee to Councilman Jose Huizar, a close ally of the mayor. The redistricting proposal would shift most of downtown -- a powerful hub of campaign fundraising -- from Perry's district to Huizar's. Perry, a mayoral candidate, said the plan would leave her district dominated by pockets of poverty.
[Updated at 3:33 p.m.: The changes, which take effect Feb. 6, are part of a larger batch of committee assignments made by Wesson. Ed Johnson, Wesson's spokesman, said his boss would not comment on the committee assignments at any point Friday.
Perry said she saw a connection between her absence from the presidency vote and her removal from the energy committee. Nevertheless, she said she was happy to be placed on the council's Education and Neighborhoods Committee, which oversees neighborhood councils.
"It gives me a forum to reach out on a citywide basis on such things as redistricting, DWP rate hikes and issues like transparency, corruption and civic engagement," she said.
Parks also downplayed any hard feelings, saying he never felt entitled to any committee assignment. "I'm looking forward to having an extra 20 to 30 hours a week to focus on my district and my constituents," he said in a statement.]

ALSO:
Two men fatally shot in La Habra
2 sought in shooting at Long Beach apartment
Wayward Mercedes hoisted out of Verdugo Wash
-- David Zahniser at Los Angeles City Hall
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#### Abstract

Wesson engineers another shake-up at L.A. City Hall; New council president strips rival lawmakers Parks and Perry of key panel chairmanships.
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Newly installed Los Angeles City Council President Herb Wesson engineered another shake-up at City Hall on Friday, stripping rival lawmakers Bernard C. Parks and Jan Perry of key committee chairmanships that had major influence over the city budget crisis and utility rates.

The move is expected to widen the bitter divide between Wesson and the council's only other African American members, who are at odds with the council president over proposed new political district boundaries.

Parks, a fiscal hawk who led the powerful Budget and Finance Committee for eight years, was removed entirely from the five-member panel. Neither Parks nor Perry showed up for the November vote when Wesson was chosen as council's first black president. Parks' spokesman attributed the absence to illness, and Perry said she was excused from that day's meeting.
Wesson said afterward that both should have been there.
Perry was removed Friday as chairwoman of the Energy and Environment Committee, which reviews proposals for electricity and water rate increases at the Department of Water and Power.

The changes, part of a broader Wesson reorganization of lawmaker assignments, could make it easier for Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, a close Wesson ally, to get some of his spending proposals passed. Parks, an influential voice on the city budget, stalled or killed key Villaraigosa proposals in his committee, including one to balance the budget by borrowing $\$ 43$ million over five years to pay for an early retirement program for city employees.
Wesson had no comment on Friday's moves and Parks downplayed any hard feelings, saying committee assignments are not guaranteed. "I'm looking forward to having an extra 20 to 30 hours a week to focus on my district and my constituents," he said in a statement.

Perry has been an obstacle to the mayor's push to increase utility rates at the Department of Water and Power. She and Parks also criticized a Villaraigosa proposal, floated two months ago, to borrow 27 years' worth of transportation funds to pay for a blitz of road repairs.
Perry suggested that her removal from the energy committee was tied to her absence from the vote to make Wesson president. Nevertheless, she said she was "pleasantly surprised" with a new position on the council's Education and Neighborhoods Committee. She wants to take the panel into neighborhoods across the city to discuss "transparency, corruption and civic engagement."
"It's a great opportunity," said Perry, who is running for mayor.
The committee changes take effect Feb. 6. Councilman Jose Huizar, another Villaraigosa ally, will be in charge of the energy committee. The budget committee will be headed by Councilman Paul Krekorian, who praised Parks for his work on the budget.
"His fiscal discipline has helped keep the city afloat in incredibly stormy seas," said Krekorian, who represents part of the San Fernando Valley.
Even before the committee assignments were made, Parks and Wesson had been at odds over new council district lines proposed by a 21 -member panel. Over the last week, Wesson's appointee on the city Redistricting Commission pushed a plan -- since abandoned -to strip most of Baldwin Hills, the neighborhood where Parks lives, from the South Los Angeles district he represents.
The proposed redistricting map released Wednesday by the commission takes Baldwin Vista and the residential section of Leimert Park out of Parks' 8th District. Parks complained that his district was being treated like a "junkyard," picked over for parts to strengthen other lawmakers' political domains.
The redistricting panel's top executive, former Wesson aide Andrew Westall, was chosen over Parks' opposition. Westall has been a key figure in an unrelated legal dispute involving some of Parks' campaign funds.
Perry quit the council's No. 2 post three months ago, alleging that the drawing of new district boundaries -- and the negotiations over the selection of a new president -- were happening behind closed doors.
The proposed redistricting maps released this week also give Huizar the vast majority of downtown, considered a hub of campaign contributors. Much of that area is currently represented by Perry.
david.zahniser@latimes.com
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## EDITORIAL; <br> COUNCIL WILL STILL HAVE THE FINAL SAY ON HOW NEW REDISTRICTING MAPS ARE DRAWN
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SOME Los Angeles City Council members are pretty grumpy about the proposed maps their handpicked redistricting commission presented this week. Jan Perry feels robbed of her downtown constituents. Paul Koretz is unhappy to be pushed out of the San Fernando Valley. Tom LaBonge is wondering what compelled commissioners to reconfigure his district into a snaking collection of unrelated communities from Lake Balboa to Hollywood.
Paul Krekorian would lose Sunland-Tujunga and Dennis Zine won't even live in his district anymore.
The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission released its proposed maps this week. They are, as the commission's chairman noted, "a work in progress." And it is. What the grumbling belies is the fact that the council members themselves are the final mapmakers in this once-a-decade exercise in redrawing political lines. Unlike last year's state redistricting effort, the elected officials are not left out of the process; they are the process.
The commission is an advisory group whose members were appointed by the City Council. The council will have the final say on what maps are adopted.
But community input still does count. Now that the proposed maps are out, anyone who doesn't have the power to move the lines themselves can get their voice heard at a series of community meetings. The commission is taking comment on the proposed new district lines before it comes up with final maps by March 1.
Remapping hearing schedules
The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission is taking comment on the proposed new district lines in various city locations:

Wednesday, 6:30 p.m. Wilshire Ebell Theatre
Thursday, 6:30 p.m. Loyola Marymount University, Ahmanson Auditorium
Feb. 4, 11 a.m. Pierce College, Woodland Hills
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Feb. 6, 6:30 p.m. Occidental College, Thorn Hall
Feb. 8, 6:30 p.m. L.A. City Hall, council chambers
Feb. 9, 6:30 p.m. Walter Reed Middle School, Studio City
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## Politics: Proposed New City Council Map: Shakeups For Westchester, Watts, Hancock Park, But Ktown Still Split in 4

BYLINE: Adrian Glick Kudler

LENGTH: 405 words

Click here to view the full photogallery.
The LA Redistricting Commission released its proposed City Council District map today and there is already a good amount of outrage going on. The Commission redraws the map every ten years to split the city's 15 districts evenly among the population and to ensure minority representation. As the LA Times explains, "The draft maps were drawn by commissioners in a series of closed-door meetings by subcommittees who did not have to comply with the state's open meeting law." Here's some of what's on today's proposed maps :
-- Koreatown, despite lobbying, is still split among four districts.
-- CD4, currently repped by Tom LaBonge, creeps northwest into Sherman Oaks, Van Nuys, Encino, and Lake Balboa, taking over CD5 territory.
-- Meanwhile, CD5, currently repped by Paul Koretz, takes CD4 territory around Miracle Mile, Hancock Park, and Larchmont Village. LaBonge released a statement saying "This draft redistricting map weakens the political representation of the Santa Monica Mountains, fractures the community of Hollywood among three Council districts and dissolves the historic core of Council District 4 - the greater Wilshire area."
-- Despite lobbying, the San Fernando Valley did not get a sixth full-Valley district.
-- The eastern part of Westchester is out of CD11 (currently Bill Rosendahl's) and into CD8 (currently Bernard Parks's), while LAX stays in CD11. Rosendahl has already sent out a call to arms to constituents about the matter. Even Parks's chief of staff tells the LAT that separating Westchester from the airport makes no sense.
-- CD8 loses a big chunk of Leimert Park to CD10 (Herb Wesson), but keeps the Baldwin Hills neighborhood where Parks lives.
-- CD9 (currently repped by Jan Perry) loses a northern spur that included large parts of Downtown, but still has South Park.
-- A more unified Downtown (north of South Park) then falls into CD14 (currently Jose Huizar).
-- Watts moves from CD15 (currently repped by new guy Joe Buscaino and covering Harbor Gateway and the South Bay) to CD9.
If you want to find out where your house stands, the LAT has very handy before and after map overlays showing where districts currently lie and where the proposed new maps would put things.
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A proposed remapping of the 15 Los Angeles City Council districts was quickly denounced Wednesday by several unhappy council members - as well as some of the members of the very commission that drew up the plan.

The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission plan dramatically reshaped parts of the city, including consolidating districts in the San Fernando Valley.
Under the City Charter, the City Council district lines must be redrawn every 10 years. But few expected the dramatic revisions proposed by the all-volunteer 21-member commission Wednesday. The map still must be submitted to the City Council for confirmation.

The plan removes District 5 from the Valley. The area is now represented by Councilman Paul Koretz, whose district currently extends from the Pico-Robertson area to Encino.

Under the redrawn maps, Koretz's district is pushed down from the Valley, while just one district - Councilman Tom LaBonge's District 4 - is split between the Valley and the Hollywood Hills communities.

Currently, two districts straddle Mulholland Drive.
"I'm really disappointed to lose the Valley areas I represented," Koretz said.
Similar dismay was heard throughout City Hall as council members studied the proposed new lines.

Councilman Bernard Parks, claimed his district had been "junked" by the redrawn lines while Councilwoman Jan Perry said the redrawn maps represented "economic apartheid," creating a split between her South L.A. and downtown neighborhoods.
LaBonge expressed bewilderment at his newly redrawn district.
Under the draft map, his district would extend from Lake Balboa to Hollywood, stretching across the Valley in a puzzling pattern. In a statement, he claimed the newly drawn map "dissolves the historic core of Council District 4 - the greater Wilshire area, including the Miracle Mile, Larchmont Village, Windsor Square, Pan Pacific Park and Park La Brea."
"What disappoints me most is that the will of the people of the 4th District was seemingly ignored by this important process," he said.
"District 4 just goes all over the place," agreed Jill Banks Barad, chairwoman of the Valley Alliance of Neighborhood Councils, which represented 34 neighborhood councils in the Valley. "It makes no sense."

Even as Arturo Vargas, chairman of the redistricting commission, admitted at a Wednesday night meeting at Van Nuys City Hall that the maps are "a work in progress," a handful of commissioners criticized the re-drawn lines.
"Quite frankly, I am embarrassed to be associated with this product," said commissioner David Roberts, who argued the commission failed to consider communities of interest in creating the maps.
But some groups expressed initial enthusiasm for the maps.
Notably, the Valley Industry and Commerce Association supported the new maps because there is now only one district, not two, that straddles the Valley and the rest of Los Angeles.
The group prefers having fewer "split districts," particularly when a council member represents a minority of the Valley, VICA president Stuart Waldman said.
"We got what we wanted," Waldman said.
Additionally, Lisa Sarkin, president of the Land Use Committee for the Studio City Neighborhood Council, backed the new lines, arguing the neighborhood "is now whole."
In the weeks ahead, public comment will be accepted by the redistricting committee. In addition to the Valley, downtown and South L.A. changes, Koreatown is expected to be an area of ongoing contention for the commissioners.
At Wednesday's meeting, dozens of elderly Koreatown residents appeared in solidarity, upset that their district continues to be cut into two districts, rather than one.
dakota.smith@dailynews.com,
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Jan. 25--[http://graphics.latimes.com/la-council-redistricting/]
Los Angeles' Redistricting Commission released its proposed boundary lines for 15 City Council seats, pushing one district deeper into the San Fernando Valley, pulling another completely out of it and employing what Councilman Bill Rosendahl called an "outrageous case of gerrymandering" against his coastal district.
If approved, the draft map would move Councilman Tom LaBonge's 4th District west into such Valley neighborhoods as Sherman Oaks, Van Nuys, Encino and Lake Balboa, according to information released Wednesday by the 21-member commission. LaBonge would lose neighborhoods in and around Wilshire Boulevard, such as Miracle Mile, Hancock Park and Larchmont Village.

INTERACTIVE MAP: Current and proposed Los Angeles City Council districts [http://graphics.latimes.com/la-council-redistricting/]
LaBonge said he had not seen the boundaries but described them as "very odd." He voiced hope that the boundaries would be discussed in upcoming meetings.
"The citizen's commission will do its work and then the City Council will do its work," he said.

San Fernando Valley leaders had been pushing for their region to get a sixth council district that is entirely within the Valley. The proposal released Wednesday did not do that. But it did make LaBonge's district far more Valley focused, reaching across the 405 Freeway to west parts of the Valley. The map also pushed Councilman Paul Koretz's district south out of the Valley and into neighborhoods once represented by LaBonge.
Koretz said he liked the idea of picking up Hancock Park. But he voiced disappointment at losing Valley constituents. "I enjoy the areas I've represented. I have an excellent relationship with the community groups there," he said.
Among the most dramatic moves was a proposal to take part of Westchester out of Councilman Bill Rosendahl's district. Even before the maps were released, Rosendahl had fired off an email encouraging his constituents to sign a petition demanding that Westchester remain in his district.
"If you're proud of the sense of community we have on the Westside, and don't want anyone to mess with that, we need to mobilize and stop an outrageous case of gerrymandering that threatens our council district!" he wrote.

INTERACTIVE TABLE: Demographics of draft L.A. City Council districts [http://spreadsheets.latimes.com/demographics-draft-l-council-districts/]

The Redistricting Commission is charged with recommending changes to council boundaries based on shifts in the population Census figures from 2010 that show that Los Angeles is now $48.5 \%$ Latino, $28.6 \%$ white, $11.3 \%$ Asian and $9.2 \%$ black. Part of the panel's job is to ensure representation for a specific number of minority districts.

The draft maps were drawn by commissioners in a series of closed-door meetings by subcommittees who did not have to comply with the state's open meeting law. Other proposals in those maps include:
-- Councilwoman Jan Perry's district would be shifted south, causing her to lose much of downtown but keeping Staples Center and L.A. Live. Councilman Jose Huizar would pick up much of downtown, with Olympic Boulevard serving as the border;
-- Councilman Paul Krekorian would lose Sunland-Tujunga, which would be moved into to Councilman Richard Alarcon's district;
-- Councilman Bernard C. Parks would keep the Baldwin Hills neighborhood where he lives but lose the residential portion of Leimert Park to Council President Herb Wesson. Parks would also get the portion of Westchester lost by Rosendahl.

Bernard Parks Jr., who serves as Parks' chief of staff, said Westchester makes more sense in the 11th District represented by Rosendahl, since that is where LAX is.
"It's a great community. But how do you split Westchester from the airport?" he said.
ALSO:
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## Some L.A. residents pledge to fight new council district plan
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Hours after the public was given its first peek at draft maps showing new boundary lines for Los Angeles City Council districts, several dozen people showed up Wednesday at a tense Redistricting Commission meeting in Van Nuys to weigh in on the proposed changes.
Most of the crowd had traveled from Koreatown, where activists are angry that the commission's map calls for the neighborhood to be split between the districts of council members Herb Wesson and Eric Garcetti.

They want Koreatown to be united under a single district -- a desire made clear by more than 300 people from Koreatown at redistricting meetings, said Grace Yoo of the Los Angeles Korean American Assn.
"Obviously our voice has not been heard," Yoo said.
INTERACTIVE TABLE: See the racial and ethnic makeup of proposed council districts
The commission was expected to vote Wednesday on the maps recasting the city's 15 council districts, which will then be circulated for five weeks before a final version is sent to the City Council.
News of the proposed changes to the council districts rippled across the city Wednesday as some residents considered the possibility of being represented by a council member they didn't elect if the plan is adopted.

Residents in Sunland-Tujunga are upset about a proposed change that would move the community out of Councilman Paul Krekorian's district and into Councilman Richard Alarcon's district.
"People are going to flip out," said Sunland-Tujunga activist Joe Barrett.
INTERACTIVE MAP: L.A. City Council districts before and after the draft proposal
He said Alarcon is unpopular with many in the area because of his plan to create a truck driving academy atop a portion of a closed landfill.
"We've been pretty outspoken that that's the last thing we wanted," Barrett said. "We will fight this."

In downtown, developer Tom Gilmore said he was shocked that the redistricting panel proposed shifting Councilwoman Jan Perry's district south, causing her to lose much of the city's central core.
"It's so counter-intuitive," said Gilmore, who praised Perry for her role in bringing redevelopment to the area and who said "downtown unity" is key to future growth. "You finally have a downtown that after 30 years is moving ahead. I really have to question why all this incredible gerrymandering is going on to fix something that isn't broken."
Gilmore and other downtown leaders will appear with Perry at a rally Thursday to protest the changes, which would give Eastside Councilman Jose Huizar large parts of downtown.
In parts of the San Fernando Valley, some cheered the proposed maps. Although the proposal does not give the San Fernando Valley a sixth council district that is entirely within the Valley, as leaders there had hoped, it does make Councilman Tom LaBonge's 4th District far more Valley-focused.
Stuart Waldman, executive director of the Valley Industry and Commerce Assn., said that was enough.
"Having an elected official who lives in the Valley and has to live with our issues is important to us, rather than a representative who lives outside of the valley and just pops in once in a while," he said.
Waldman did note the odd shape of the proposed district, which reaches from east of the 101 Freeway into western parts of the Valley, stretching "from Silver Lake to Lake Balboa." Still, he said, "It's going to be a beautiful new 4th District," he said

ALSO:
Fresno mom very high on meth before family killing
Redistricting map shakes up L.A. political landscape
John Travolta's stolen classic Mercedes found chopped to pieces
-- Kate Linthicum and David Zahniser at City Hall
Twitter.com/klinthicum
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Jan. 25--[http://graphics.latimes.com/la-council-redistricting/]
Hours after the public was given its first peek at draft maps showing new boundary lines for Los Angeles City Council districts, several dozen people showed up Wednesday at a tense Redistricting Commission meeting in Van Nuys to weigh in on the proposed changes.
Most of the crowd had traveled from Koreatown, where activists are angry that the commission's map calls for the neighborhood to be split between the districts of council members Herb Wesson and Eric Garcetti.

They want Koreatown to be united under a single district -- a desire made clear by more than 300 people from Koreatown at redistricting meetings, said Grace Yoo of the Los Angeles Korean American Assn.
"Obviously our voice has not been heard," Yoo said.
INTERACTIVE TABLE: See the racial and ethnic makeup of proposed council districts [http://spreadsheets.latimes.com/demographics-draft-l-council-districts/]
The commission was expected to vote Wednesday on the maps recasting the city's 15 council districts, which will then be circulated for five weeks before a final version is sent to the City Council.

News of the proposed changes to the council districts rippled across the city Wednesday as some residents considered the possibility of being represented by a council member they didn't elect if the plan is adopted.
Residents in Sunland-Tujunga are upset about a proposed change that would move the community out of Councilman Paul Krekorian's district and into Councilman Richard Alarcon's district.
"People are going to flip out," said Sunland-Tujunga activist Joe Barrett.
INTERACTIVE MAP: L.A. City Council districts before and after the draft proposal [http://graphics.latimes.com/la-council-redistricting/]
He said Alarcon is unpopular with many in the area because of his plan to create a truck driving academy atop a portion of a closed landfill.
"We've been pretty outspoken that that's the last thing we wanted," Barrett said. "We will fight this."
In downtown, developer Tom Gilmore said he was shocked that the redistricting panel proposed shifting Councilwoman Jan Perry's district south, causing her to lose much of the city's central core.
"It's so counter-intuitive," said Gilmore, who praised Perry for her role in bringing redevelopment to the area and who said "downtown unity" is key to future growth. "You finally have a downtown that after 30 years is moving ahead. I really have to question why all this incredible gerrymandering is going on to fix something that isn't broken."
Gilmore and other downtown leaders will appear with Perry at a rally Thursday to protest the changes, which would give Eastside Councilman Jose Huizar large parts of downtown.
In parts of the San Fernando Valley, some cheered the proposed maps. Although the proposal does not give the San Fernando Valley a sixth council district that is entirely within the Valley, as leaders there had hoped, it does make Councilman Tom LaBonge's 4th District far more Valley-focused.
Stuart Waldman, executive director of the Valley Industry and Commerce Assn., said that was enough.
"Having an elected official who lives in the Valley and has to live with our issues is important to us, rather than a representative who lives outside of the valley and just pops in once in a while," he said.

Waldman did note the odd shape of the proposed district, which reaches from east of the 101 Freeway into western parts of the Valley, stretching "from Silver Lake to Lake Balboa." Still, he said, "It's going to be a beautiful new 4th District," he said
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-- Kate Linthicum and David Zahniser at City Hall
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## Strange New Territory: L.A.'s Council District Lines Redrawn
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A segment of the proposed redistricting map (Screenshot)
Redistricting is going on in the City of Los Angeles, and today, quite literally, the political landscape of local government has been rocked by the proposed boundary lines for our 15 Council Districts.

Councilman Tom LaBonge calls the boundaries, proposed by Los Angeles' Redistricting Commission, as being "very odd." L.A. Now summarizes a couple of the uprootings, as the new map would mean "pushing one district deeper into the San Fernando Valley [and] pulling another completely out of it," among the widespread alterations.
Councilmembers, like LaBonge, would find their territory more focused on a single region; for example, LaBonge's CD 4 would forsake areas near the Miracle Mile and Hancock Park, and give him instead more Valley neighborhoods, like Sherman Oaks. In turn, Paul Krekorian, of CD 2, would pick up a bit of what LaBonge loses, as would others.

Councilman Bill Rosendahl has already labeled the proposed changes an "outrageous case of gerrymandering" in regards to his district.
The L.A. Times has an interactive map feature showing the current district boundaries and the proposed ones. See if you'd be in another district where you live if these changes go through.
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Los Angeles' Redistricting Commission unveiled its proposed boundary changes for City Council seats Wednesday, setting the stage for a series of pitched battles over neighborhood identity, ethnic clout and raw political power.
The maps sent one council district deeper into the San Fernando Valley, pulled another completely out of it and, in a third, employed what Councilman Bill Rosendahl called an "outrageous case of gerrymandering."

Politicians, community advocates and neighborhood leaders quickly criticized the maps, saying they did not reflect the public testimony and community desires expressed at a series of hearings in recent weeks.
Koreatown activists, for example, complained that their request to keep their community in one district had been ignored.
Neighborhood volunteer Joe Barrett said members of his Sunland-Tujunga community would "flip out" over a plan to take it out of Councilman Paul Krekorian's district.
And Councilman Bernard C. Parks told a meeting of the 21-member commission that his South Los Angeles district had been treated like a junkyard, with commissioners "trying to find pieces" to fit into other districts.

Despite such comments, the commission voted 11 to 6 -- the bare minimum to proceed -- to begin circulating proposed new maps for the city's 15 council districts to the public.
Final boundaries must be approved by the commission on March 1 and then forwarded to the council for a vote.

Commission President Arturo Vargas, an appointee of Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, told audience members in Van Nuys that the proposal was "a very rough draft" that would be vetted during seven upcoming hearings.
"This is definitely a work in progress, and I can assure everybody in the city that the final product of this commission will not be the same product," he said.
A redistricting panel is convened by city officials every 10 years to adjust council district boundaries to reflect changes in population and ethnic makeup.
Part of that process is designed to ensure that Latinos, African Americans and other groups denied representation in the past have adequate opportunity to win office, as required under the federal Voting Rights Act.
New census data show that Los Angeles is now 48.5\% Latino, $28.6 \%$ white, $11.3 \%$ Asian and $9.2 \%$ black.
Redistricting officials have been trying to ensure that the city has a minimum of five council seats that are heavily Latino and three that have sizable concentrations of African Americans -- even though the black population has continued to decline.
Changes in district lines can boost or sap the clout of sitting council members -- including those who are seeking reelection or higher office -- and enhance or diminish the voting power of ethnic groups.
The commission's proposal would disrupt City Hall's political status quo in large and small ways.
Councilman Dennis Zine would live slightly outside his west San Fernando Valley district during his last year in office.
Councilwoman Jan Perry's district would be shifted south, causing her to lose much of downtown -- a coveted and resurgent hub of business and development -- while gaining Watts. Perry's downtown home would be outside her district.
Councilman Tom LaBonge's 4th District would see some of the most dramatic changes. His district would be extended from Silver Lake, where he lives, west to Bel-Air and then north to Encino.
And Rosendahl would see much of Westchester taken over by Parks.
"Do I like what they're trying to do to us? Absolutely not," said Denny Schneider, who complained that LAX and adjacent Westchester were being placed in separate districts.
Similar complaints could be heard in Sherman Oaks, which has been represented by Krekorian and Councilman Paul Koretz. "As much as I like Tom LaBonge, no one voted for him in the last election in Sherman Oaks," said Richard Close, president of the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Assn., who served on the redistricting commission 10 years ago.
The proposed maps were, in part, a response to demands from local business leaders for a sixth council district entirely or largely in the Valley.
But another factor may have been the fact that LaBonge's appointee on the redistricting commission was in France -- and has been participating via conference call.
"If you're not there to throw a few elbows and stare people down while the people in the room are doing the work, it's hard to get what you want," said one commissioner, who spoke on condition of anonymity because panelists were not supposed to discuss their deliberations.

LaBonge said the proposed boundaries were disappointing.
Perry's backers, meanwhile, organized a Thursday rally to protest efforts to shift much of downtown into Councilman Jose Huizar's district, which currently includes a smaller portion of downtown and stretches from Boyle Heights to Eagle Rock.
Tim Watkins, who lives near Watts and was on the redistricting commission a decade ago, warned the current boundary panel that the proposed changes would leave Perry's district dominated by the city's poor.
"You're turning it into a district that really encompasses all of the people that are living in ... desperation," he said.
The proposed district lines delighted Stuart Waldman, the president of the Valley Industry and Commerce Assn., a group that is pushing for a sixth council seat in the Valley.
"You listened to me," Waldman told the panel. "You listened to the neighborhood councils. You listened to the people of the San Fernando Valley."
david.zahniser@latimes.com
kate.linthicum@latimes.com
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CORRECTION: Redistricting vote: An article in Thursday's LATExtra about boundary changes proposed by the Los Angeles Redistricting Commission said the group voted 11-6 to circulate new City Council district maps. Officials later reported the tally was 12-6.
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Jan. 25--[http://opinion.latimes.com/.a/6a00d8341c7de353ef0168e6166f28970c-pi]What's the opposite of "I told you so"? Because whatever it is, I need to say it about the draft map proposals released Wednesday [http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2012/01/redistricting-los-angeles-city-maps-.html] by the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission [http://redistricting2011.lacity.org/]. Blogging on the recently concluded special election in Council District 15, I said there was just no way that Watts [http://opinion.latimes.com/opinionla/2011/12/buscaino-furutani-los-angeles-city-council-e ndorsement-15th-district.html] was ever going to be severed from the distant harbor.
But except for gaining or losing a few blocks at the far northern end, where Watts joins South Los Angeles and the central city, Council District 15 doesn't change. It can't, and it won't, because it has nowhere else to go. It's fenced in by the harbor on the south and the very strange shape of the city boundaries from there northward. Unless more territory is annexed to or detached from Los Angeles, this district will look pretty much the same in 50 years as it does today.

Never mind. The proposed map moves Watts out of the 15th and makes it part of a Council District 9 , which traditionally takes in most of downtown but now would go only as far north as Olympic Boulevard.
Is that good or bad? It's different, and it could be good, although l'd be interested to know what Watts residents think. I suspect that many of them might like to finally be severed from San Pedro, the harbor community that always controls the election of the 15th District council member because it's where most of the money and most of the votes reside.
Every council member from that district, going back at least to World War II, has been a San Pedro resident. And it must be extraordinarily hard for the District 15 members not to promote the interests of their neighborhood and its very distinct demographic -- families with roots in fishing, shipping, loading, unloading and moving freight, largely white with a strong Italian, Croatian and Greek ethnic identity -- as opposed to Watts [http://opinion.latimes.com/opinionla/2011/12/council-district-15-watts.html], with its distinct history and largely African American and Latino immigrant demographic, as well as environmental degradation, dense public housing problems and persistent gang crime.

Of course, not every community can have its own district. Communities must be joined with others that are like them -- or very unlike them. So would Watts now instead be pushed around by wealthy and gentrified downtown?
Perhaps not. The Bunker Hill and Flower Street office towers would be excluded, as would most of the 1920s bank buildings that are now condos and apartments. A lot of the conversation is going to focus on how the northern two-thirds of downtown would now be united as part of the same 14th District that includes Boyle Heights and far-away Eagle Rock. But the 9th District, in addition to Watts, would include downtown's Staples Center, L.A. Live and, assuming it gets built, Farmers Field football stadium.
So is this now the Anschutz Entertainment Group district, and will Watts now become the afterthought of AEG, instead of remaining the afterthought of the Port of Los Angeles? Could the AEG connection be better leveraged to help fund improvements in Watts?
Don't know the answer yet. Let's watch and listen.
ALSO:
Watts and Not-Watts
[http://opinion.latimes.com/opinionla/2011/12/council-district-15-watts.html]
Planned remapping of L.A. City Council districts draws fire [http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2012/01/redistricting-los-angeles-city-maps-.html]
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A draft map of new Los Angeles City Council district boundaries that will be in place for the next decade was released today, drawing an angry response from some council members who said the maps made little sense.
The district boundaries were released by the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission, a 21-member panel appointed by the city's elected officials to redraw the maps based on 2010 census data.
The City Council will have to approve the final versions of the newly drawn boundaries after a period of public comment and any revisions by the commission.
The most notable changes include the separation of Westchester from LAX and the disunion of most of downtown from South Los Angeles. The new maps would extend one central Los Angeles district further into the San Fernando Valley, and eliminate a Westside district's reach over the Santa Monica Mountains into the valley.
Among those most angered by the new maps was City Councilwoman Jan Perry, whose district covers an area of South Los Angeles. Perry described the commission's map-drawing as "economic apartheid."
Under the new boundaries, Perry would keep the successful L.A. Live complex and Staples Center, but would lose most of downtown and Little Tokyo and would pick up Watts. Councilman Jose Huizar would gain the lion's share of downtown, including Skid Row.
"The worst part of all this is that the commission has created an economic wasteland based on agreements between elected officials who have cut deals with the leadership in the City Council," Perry said. "Clearly this is a grab for assets."
Perry is mobilizing a group of downtown developers, Little Tokyo and downtown residents and community groups to oppose the new maps.
"This will hurt South L.A. To what end, I don't know," Perry said.
The LAX-adjacent community of Westchester, a neighborhood affected by the airport's noise, traffic, security issues and expansion, would be moved out of Councilman Bill Rosendahl's district, which includes the airport, into Councilman Bernard Parks' district to the east.
"That's an insult frankly, to the people engaged with an issue that impacts them. So that shows no respect for the people of Westchester," Rosendahl said. "Politicians are basically looking out for their best interests."
Bernard Parks Jr., Councilman Parks' chief of staff, agreed that moving Westchester into his father's district was drastic and said it does not make sense.
"Why are we all of the sudden adding areas that we have no relationship with and taking away areas that we have deep relationships with?" Parks Jr. said. "We believe Westchester is a great community, but we believe it's a perfect fit with the councilman that represents it currently."
The commission also moved much of Lemeirt Park Village, an historic black cultural center, out of Parks' district into City Council President Herb Wesson's district.
"It's like having peanut butter and no jelly," Parks Jr. said. "You can't have the business community separate from the park that sits right in front of it. Very simple common sense would have told these commissioners that."
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## Redistricting map shakes up L.A. political landscape

BYLINE: Rich Connell

LENGTH: 640 words

Los Angeles' Redistricting Commission released its proposed boundary lines for 15 City Council seats, pushing one district deeper into the San Fernando Valley, pulling another completely out of it and employing what Councilman Bill Rosendahl called an "outrageous case of gerrymandering" against his coastal district.
If approved, the draft map would move Councilman Tom LaBonge's 4th District west into such Valley neighborhoods as Sherman Oaks, Van Nuys, Encino and Lake Balboa, according to information released Wednesday by the 21-member commission. LaBonge would lose neighborhoods in and around Wilshire Boulevard, such as Miracle Mile, Hancock Park and Larchmont Village.

INTERACTIVE MAP: Current and proposed Los Angeles City Council districts
LaBonge said he had not seen the boundaries but described them as "very odd." He voiced hope that the boundaries would be discussed in upcoming meetings.
"The citizen's commission will do its work and then the City Council will do its work," he said.
San Fernando Valley leaders had been pushing for their region to get a sixth council district that is entirely within the Valley. The proposal released Wednesday did not do that. But it did make LaBonge's district far more Valley focused, reaching across the 405 Freeway to west parts of the Valley. The map also pushed Councilman Paul Koretz's district south out of the Valley and into neighborhoods once represented by LaBonge.
Koretz said he liked the idea of picking up Hancock Park. But he voiced disappointment at losing Valley constituents. "I enjoy the areas I've represented. I have an excellent relationship with the community groups there," he said.
Among the most dramatic moves was a proposal to take part of Westchester out of Councilman Bill Rosendahl's district. Even before the maps were released, Rosendahl had fired off an email encouraging his constituents to sign a petition demanding that Westchester remain in his district.
"If you're proud of the sense of community we have on the Westside, and don't want anyone to mess with that, we need to mobilize and stop an outrageous case of gerrymandering that threatens our council district!" he wrote.

The Redistricting Commission is charged with recommending changes to council boundaries based on shifts in the population Census figures from 2010 that show that Los Angeles is now $48.5 \%$ Latino, $28.6 \%$ white, $11.3 \%$ Asian and $9.2 \%$ black. Part of the panel's job is to ensure representation for a specific number of minority districts.
The draft maps were drawn by commissioners in a series of closed-door meetings by subcommittees who did not have to comply with the state's open meeting law. Other proposals in those maps include:
-- Councilwoman Jan Perry's district would be shifted south, causing her to lose much of downtown but keeping Staples Center and L.A. Live. Councilman Jose Huizar would pick up much of downtown, with Olympic Boulevard serving as the border;
-- Councilman Paul Krekorian would lose Sunland-Tujunga, which would be moved into to Councilman Richard Alarcon's district;
-- Councilman Bernard C. Parks would keep the Baldwin Hills neighborhood where he lives but lose the residential portion of Leimert Park to Council President Herb Wesson. Parks would also get the portion of Westchester lost by Rosendahl.

Bernard Parks Jr., who serves as Parks' chief of staff, said Westchester makes more sense in the 11th District represented by Rosendahl, since that is where LAX is.
"It's a great community. But how do you split Westchester from the airport?" he said.
ALSO:
Paramedics rush to Demi Moore's home
L.A. mayor signs landmark porn condom law

Millionaire who lived 'poor' leaves windfall to Salvation Army
-- David Zahniser at Los Angeles City Hall
Image: New proposed Los Angeles City Council districts. Credit: Los Angeles City Council
Redistricting Commission
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## L.A. redistricting plan to be released after closed-door session

BYLINE: Amanda Covarrubias
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The Los Angeles Redistricting Commission plans to release Wednesday a draft set of boundaries for 15 City Council districts.
But a proposal made Tuesday night by one of the commission's secret subcommittees is already causing an uproar on the Westside. A 10-member panel that met past 9 p.m. Tuesday drafted a plan to move Westchester out of the coastal district represented by Councilman Bill Rosendahl.

The plan would let LAX, which is just south of Westchester, remain in Rosendahl's district.
Rosendahl said Westchester is more affected by the airport than any other neighborhood in Los Angeles and should not be separated from it. He said he learned of the proposal from his appointee on the Redistricting Commission, who attended Tuesday night's meeting.
"I will fight this all the way to the City Council," he said.
The Redistricting Commission was scheduled to meet at 4 p.m. Wednesday and could vote to circulate a draft map for the entire city.
In recent weeks, the commission created three seven-member committees to meet behind closed doors to draw up district boundaries for different regions of the city.
On Tuesday night, the commission had a 10-member committee work out differences among commission appointees for neighborhoods stretching from downtown to Rosendahl's district.

The Times asked if it could attend that meeting and was told it was not open to the public.
"To me, it's outrageous. It's ridiculous. I want all these meetings to be in public," Rosendahl said. "Frankly, I don't understand why they're in closed-door session."

Redistricting commissioners told The Times they are not supposed to speak to the public about the subcommittee meetings.
ALSO:
High winds flip big rig on Cajon Pass, killing driver
Man pounded puppy on floor like 'bag of sand,' friend says

Police to search landfill for gun in high school goalie slaying
-- David Zahniser at Los Angeles City Hall
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## Tense fight over council boundaries;

Lawmakers battle for downtown and South L.A. before the new districts are proposed.

BYLINE: David Zahniser, Kate Linthicum, Stephen Ceasar
SECTION: LATEXTRA; Metro Desk; Part AA; Pg. 1
LENGTH: 779 words

Los Angeles Councilwoman and mayoral hopeful Jan Perry is fighting to hang on to the downtown business district -- a key base of support and generous source of campaign funds.

Councilman Bernard C. Parks doesn't want to lose Baldwin Hills, the upscale, predominantly African American neighborhood where he lives. And Councilman Bill Rosendahl, who represents a Westside district, is determined to keep Los Angeles International Airport under his purview.
Those are just a few of the behind-the-scenes City Hall battles brewing as part of the once-in-a-decade process used to redraw the political districts of Los Angeles' 15 lawmakers. On Wednesday, the struggles could break into the open, as a 21-member redistricting panel unveils its proposed boundary changes.
The public will have five weeks to review the maps and comment before the panel's final vote and the selected plan goes to the City Council for consideration. But there has already been intense closed-door debate by three secret subcommittees not covered by the state's open-meetings law.

One panel has been reviewing a plan to shift Leimert Park -- the cultural heart of black Los Angeles -- from Parks' district to one represented by Council President Herb Wesson. The plan would leave Parks with just a sliver of Baldwin Hills -- basically the street that he lives on, according to emails obtained by The Times.

Another group of commissioners is pushing for Councilman Jose Huizar's Eastside district to absorb a much larger part of downtown -- including Bunker Hill and Little Tokyo. The Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, an advocacy group, has gone further, recommending that all of downtown go to Huizar's district.

Perry, who represents a district stretching from downtown to South L.A., said that would leave her district dominated by low-income neighborhoods.
"If you split downtown L.A. and South L.A., you condemn South L.A. to a form of economic apartheid," she said.
Redistricting commissioners contacted by The Times declined to comment, saying they had been advised not to discuss their deliberations. But Steven Ochoa, redistricting coordinator for MALDEF, the Mexican American advocacy group, said his group's proposal would make it possible to preserve three African American seats -- and avert a conflict between blacks and Latinos over political clout.
Changes in district boundaries, required to balance shifts in populations after each federal census, can have huge consequences for lawmakers, particularly those running for reelection or higher office.
A decade ago, the council redrew the maps in a way that sent Councilwoman Ruth Galanter, a Venice resident, to represent Panorama City during her last year in office. The outcomes can also rearrange the voting power wielded by ethnic, religious and neighborhood groups.
Central to this year's debate is Koreatown, which community advocates complain has been spread across too many districts.
Grace Yoo, executive director of the Korean American Coalition, said she thinks the debate has been too focused on council members' political interests.
Yoo's group is among dozens of ethnic, gay and neighborhood organizations that have submitted proposals for new district boundaries. The Los Angeles chapter of the Log Cabin Republicans wants Councilman Eric Garcetti's Echo Park-to-Hollywood district redrawn to increase the chances for a gay politician to win office.
Business leaders from the San Fernando Valley want a sixth council district located entirely in the Valley. But that could divide a concentration of Orthodox Jews that straddles the Valley and the Westside.
Over the last week, seven redistricting commissioners have privately debated the shape of the districts represented by Parks and Wesson -- two African American councilmen who have had strained relations.
Wesson's appointee, Christopher Ellison, backed a plan to give most of Baldwin Hills to Wesson. He complained in an email that a competing map, which would strip Wesson of Koreatown, was "disrespectful" to Wesson, leaving him with "scraps" from other districts.
Helen Kim, an appointee of City Controller Wendy Greuel, responded by saying the two districts should have an equitable distribution of the "jewels" of South L.A., including USC and Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza.

MALDEF called for LAX to be moved into Parks' district. That idea drew the anger of Rosendahl, who represents the airport area and has focused on aviation issues.
Taking LAX out of his district would be "democracy at its worst," Rosendahl said. "I would go ballistic if someone tried to take the airport."
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## The Gay Agenda: Log Cabin Republicans Lobby for a Gay City Council District

LENGTH: 222 words

Photo by essygie via Flickr.
It's redistricting season in the city of Los Angeles, and the Log Cabin Republicans want to have their say in how city council district lines get redrawn.

The local chapter is lobbying for gays to have their own district. Right now the neighborhoods that (anecdotally at least) have the highest concentration of gays are split up. Log Cabin is making the case that the case that gays in Studio City, West Hollywood-adjacent and Silver Lake should have one city council person who will take their interests into account.
"Grouping together communities with common interests is one of the guidelines for redistricting," said Scott Schmidt, a Log Cabin spokesperson told Studio City Patch. "Creating a gay district would help make sure gay interests are represented."
Today Curbed LA posted the map of what a gerrymandered gay district would look like. Log Cabins argue that their redistricting proposal preserves all the other important district lines in the rest of the city, including minority-heavy districts, people who live by the Grove, downtowners and the folks living by LAX. The Redistricting Commission will hold public hearings on redistricting through February 11 and will vote on the new districts in July.
Related: We caught up with Schmidt last year when he ran for West Hollywood City Council.
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## VALLEY LEADERS URGE COUNCIL MAP CHANGES; PANEL CALLED ON TO CREATE SIX DISTRICTS THAT DON'T GO OVER HILL \{SUBHEAD\} Panel called on to create six districts that don't go over hill
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LENGTH: 566 words

Seeking a greater political voice for the San Fernando Valley, dozens of local leaders called for a major re-do of the city's council district map at a Tuesday night hearing.

Representatives from Sherman Oaks, Sun Valley and Granada Hills spoke in favor of creating six districts contained wholly in the Valley. The region currently has seven districts, but two stretch over the Santa Monica mountains into Hollywood and West Los Angeles.
"Someone from Los Angeles presiding over the hill can't possibly understand Valley concerns," said Cherie Mann, a member of the Granada Hills Neighborhood Council. "It's a whole other planet, really."
By creating six Valley districts, backers say, council members would be more attentive to Valley needs, and no longer distracted by the demands of Westside and Hollywood homeowners.
"We ask that you keep the Valley whole and if you have to go over the hill, do it with one district, not two," Stuart Waldman, president of the Valley Industry and Commerce Association told the commission.

Additionally, numerous groups, including the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association (SOHA), are seeking to reshape their neighborhood into one district. Currently, Sherman Oaks falls into two districts, one that is represented by City Councilman Paul Koretz and is largely made up of non-Valley communities, including the Westside and Century City.
"I think Koretz doesn't have our back completely," said Bob Anderson, who serves on the board of directors at SOHA, noting that his neighborhood was disappointed with the councilman's decision to support a controversial design for a Ralphs store on Ventura Boulevard.
While Koretz said he'd consider an all Sherman Oaks district, the councilman was not convinced that six Valley districts will help residents.

VALLEY LEADERS URGE COUNCIL MAP CHANGES; PANEL CALLED ON TO CREATE SIX DISTRICTS
THAT DON'T GO OVER HILL \{SUBHEAD\} Panel called on to create six districts that don't go over hill The Daily News of Los Angeles January 4, 2012 Wednesday
"I think they may get less representation that way," said Koretz. "If there are more members that have a piece of the Valley, there are more people that are concerned (about the region)."
Tuesday's hearing was held by the 21-member volunteer redistricting committee, which will submit new district maps to the City Council by the end of February.
The council has until July 1 to vote on the final maps.
During the citywide public hearings on redistricting over the last month, there were some recurring themes, according to Arturo Vargas, chairman of the redistricting commission.
"First, people generally like their council district," Vargas said. Additionally, numerous neighborhood councils have requested to be kept in a single council district.

During the last redistricting go-around in 2002, a new Valley district was created - one stretching from Lake Balboa through Van Nuys to North Hollywood and Sun Valley.
That district, now represented by Councilman Tony Cardenas, was created by moving the district of then-Councilwoman Ruth Galanter from the Westchester-Venice area.
Whether such dramatic redrawings occur this year remains to be seen given that some Valley districts present puzzling challenges to the redistricting commissioners.
"I have one of the most severely gerrymandered districts in the city," said City Councilman Paul Krekorian, speaking at the hearing. His district, dramatically redrawn two decades ago, extends from Sunland-Tujunga to Sherman Oaks.
"There's a lot of work ahead of the commission," Krekorian said. "There are many different communities of interest."
dakota.smith@dailynews.com
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## EDITORIAL; <br> REWRITING POLITICAL MAP; <br> LOS ANGELES RESIDENTS NEED TO SPEAK LOUDLY \{SUBHEAD\} Los Angeles residents need to speak loudly
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THERE are valid reasons for Los Angeles residents to worry about City Hall's approach to redrawing City Council district lines. This makes it all the more important that concerned citizens exert their influence.

Unlike the state of California, whose new approach employs a citizens commission protected as much as possible from conflicts of interest, L.A. will use a commission that is appointed by city officials and includes one-time political staffers. What's more, whatever kind of map the panel comes up with for the 15 council districts, the council members themselves will have months to change it. Many will, in effect, be choosing the constituents who will vote on their re-election bids in 2013.
Leaders of the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission argue that it's worthwhile for affected politicians to be allowed to share their knowledge.

That's debatable. What's hard to dispute is commissioners' assertion that residents should take advantage of opportunities to get involved in the process.
"The degree to which they engage makes it very difficult for city officials to ignore what they want," Jackie Dupont-Walker, one of the 21 commissioners, said last week in a meeting with editorial writers from this newspaper.
The commission is holding public hearings all over the city before it adopts a draft plan later this month, and will hold a second round of hearings before submitting a final plan by March 1.

A hearing today at 6:30 p.m. at Van Nuys City Hall deserves to be well-attended. The San Fernando Valley has a lot at stake in city redistricting. Valley leaders would like to increase the influence of the region of 1.7 million Angelenos by adding to the number of council districts resting entirely in the Valley - currently five, with two others partly in the Valley.

There are other big issues: Latinos are calling for a third Latino-majority seat in the Valley. Asian-Americans would like to see an Asian elected to the council, somewhere in the vast city, for the first time in two decades. Advocates for the homeless, for people displaced by foreclosure, and for new (perhaps undocumented) residents, want to make sure those populations are adequately counted.
(If those questions aren't challenging enough, there's the matter of how to get more women elected on the council, of which Jan Perry now is the lone female member. It's hard to see how redistricting can help there.)

Like the state and L.A. county redistricting commissions before it, the L.A. city group must adhere to federal voting-rights laws, the need to create districts of roughly equal populations, and a priority on maintaining "communities of interest."

Of course, for many residents, those legal, mathematical and philosophical aspects are all secondary. Many just want to be represented by this or that councilman, or grouped with this or that neighborhood. Commissioners say they've heard from citizens who don't want to be thrown in with "poor people" or "non-equestrian people."

Redistricting is a once-a-decade process of adjusting the political map to account for population growth and shifts. Since 2001, it has become easier for a commission like L.A.'s to follow through on its promise to listen to the public, thanks to the growth of the Internet and neighborhood-council organizations.
Now it's up to the public to take advantage. If you worry that elected officials have too big a voice in this process, be sure to speak as loudly as they do.
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SOHA wants an end to divided districts
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When it comes to political representation, the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association believes that less is more.

Or at the least, more cohesive if it keeps its community as one.
In its recommendation to the Los Angles Citizens Redistricting Commission, the association - one of the more powerful in the city - is asking that it no longer be divided between Council District 2 and 5 (Paul Krekorian and Paul Koretz).
It also believes that the San Fernando Valley, with 38 percent of the total city population, should have six completely Valley-based districts, with only a small portion of the East Valley included in a crossover district.

Bob Anderson, chair of SOHA's redistricting committee, said it fought hard to have Sherman Oaks included in one district for state and federal representation and wants the same for the city.
The group submitted its own map, which would have Sherman Oaks included in the 5th Council District and move the 2nd Council District north and east.

The redistricting commission is holding a public hearing at 6:30 p.m. Tuesday at Van Nuys City Hall, 14410 Sylvan St., Van Nuys.
The panel is holding hearings in every Council district before it draws its maps and is planning another series of hearings after it develops its proposal to submit to the City Council.
City Controller Wendy Greuel is planning to hit the new year running in her campaign for mayor in 2013.

As controller, Greuel announced she will be holding a series of town halls around the city to ... cough, cough, listen to Angelenos.
Actually, it sounds like Greuel will be doing much of the talking as she plans to "update Angelenos on the state of the city's finances and recent audits."

The first town hall will be at 6 p.m. Wednesday, Jan. 25, at the Encino Community Center, 4935 Balboa Blvd., with other sessions to be held citywide over the coming months.
Greuel also is jumping in to the special election on Jan. 17 for the 15th Council District, endorsing police officer Joe Buscaino against Assemblyman Warren Furutani, D-Torrance.
Greuel is the first major mayoral candidate to endorse Buscaino, joining with a number of City Council members who have endorsed him.
The state Supreme Court ruling last week upholding the power of the state to abolish redevelopment agencies did not end the battle.
With some $\$ 1.7$ billion at stake, the California Community Redevelopment Association said it plans to go back to the state Legislature to try to get a new law passed that will keep them in business.

Julio Fuentes, president of the association, said they will seek to have legislation introduced to allow the agencies to remain in business.
"Without immediate legislative action to fix this adverse decision, this ruling is a tremendous blow to local job creation and economic advancement," Fuentes said.

The issue has sharply divided local officials, with school boards and counties hailing the decision for its potential windfall and cities complaining about the loss of money.

Gov. Jerry Brown, who used redevelopment when he was mayor of Oakland, proposed the elimination of the agencies to get more tax revenue as part of an overall effort to balance the budget.

CRAs freeze property taxes in a designated area where they are allowed to keep any higher property tax money to fund its programs.
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## Redistricting Commission Media Director Resigns

## BYLINE: RICHIE DUCHON
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The media director for the commission that will recommend City Council district boundaries for the next decade resigned over the weekend, citing concerns by some commissioners that she was a registered lobbyist and was not properly qualified for the position.
City News Service first reported Friday that Vanessa Rodriguez has been registered as a lobbyist with the city since 2007, currently with Mercury Public Affairs. Mercury lobbies city officials for the California Restaurant Association, HMS Host Corp. and towing company HP Tow, according to the most recent city Ethics Commission reports.
Rodriguez was eligible to be paid up to $\$ 20,000$ for leading the media campaign to engage the public to participate in the redistricting process.
Los Angeles Redistricting Commission Executive Director Andrew Westall worked for one of the partners at Mercury, former California Assembly Speaker Fabian Nunez, when he was in the Assembly.
Commissioner Jose Cornejo said Friday that the board should have been made aware of Rodriguez's background.
"Although my commitment to this city and this commission remain strong, I am choosing to honor the concerns expressed by Commissioner Cornejo and therefore resign my position," Rodriguez said in a letter to Westall.
The 21-member L.A. City Council Redistricting Commission is charged with drawing boundaries for the 15 City Council Districts that will stay in effect until after the 2020 census. The commission voted last month to give Westall authority to select a media director after Dakota Communications and Cerrell Associates dropped their bids for the contract when reports surfaced that they had lobbying clients at City Hall.

Westall defended his hiring of Rodriguez as media director in an email to commissioners over the weekend. There is nothing barring the commission from hiring a lobbyist registered with the city unless the person has clients with business before the city or a financial relationship with a commissioner, Westall said in the email.
Out of four applicants for the media director position, he wrote, three worked for firms with registered lobbyists on staff or were lobbyists themselves.
Of the three others that bid for the job, one withdrew, one was not immediately available and the third submitted the most expensive bid of the four applicants.
He said Rodriguez did very little work for the city and he determined after consulting the City Attorney's Office and Ethics Commission that "there was no legal conflict with her being under contract for the commission."
"It was important for the commission to have the best possible expertise in media relations for the best value, and that was the basis of my decision and (Rodriguez's) selection," Westall wrote.

He added that he would continue looking for a new media director "with real media expertise to gain the positive traction we need."

Redistricting Commission Chair Arturo Vargas declined to comment on Rodriguez's selection, calling the issue "moot," but adding that no commissioners raised any concerns about the hiring to him.
"We're going to do everything we can to make sure public is engaged in this process," Vargas added.

He said meetings over the weekend were well attended, including about 100 attendees at a meeting in the 9th District near downtown and 75 attendees at another hearing in Pacoima. The commission is scheduled to hold 11 more public hearings across the city between now and Jan. 10.

Information about the process and a schedule of public meetings can be found at http://redistricting2011.lacity.org/.
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Redistricting panel to use own staffers for outreach;

## BIDDING: Commission has $\$ 95,000$ to hire nonprofits to aid in public relations.

## SECTION: NEWS; Pg. A3
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After failing to hire private public relations firms, the Los Angeles City Redistricting Commission agreed on Monday to have its own staff conduct outreach for a series of public hearings.

The commission instructed Executive Director Andrew Westall to have the panel's staff do the outreach to generate interest in the effort to draw new political boundaries for the City Council before its 2013 elections.

The commission last week failed to reach agreement with private firms, who subsequently withdrew their bids.
The commission said the $\$ 95,000$ to be used for that contract can be redirected to hiring nonprofits or smaller firms to assist in the outreach.
An ambitious public hearing schedule also was adopted with the first hearing set for 7 p.m., next Monday in the San Fernando Valley at the LAPD Devonshire Youth Center, 8721 Wilbur Ave., Northridge.

The hearings are designed to take testimony on communities of interest and other issues before any maps are drawn. A second round of hearings around the city will be held when the first maps are drawn and before they are submitted to the City Council on March 1.
Other Valley hearings scheduled are for:
11 a.m., Saturday, Dec. 10, Alicia Broadous-Duncan Senior Center, 11200 Glenoaks Blvd., Pacoima

6:30 p.m., on Monday, Dec. 12, at the North Valley City Hall, 7747 Foothill Blvd., Tujunga
11 a.m., Saturday, Dec. 17, at the West Valley Christian Church, 22450 Sherman Way, West Hills
6:30 p.m. Saturday, Dec. 17, at the Van Nuys City Hall, 14410 Sylvan St., Van Nuys
6:30 p.m. Wednesday, Jan. 4, at the Friendship Auditorium, 3201 Riverside Drive, Los Angeles.
rick.orlov@dailynews.com,
213-978-0390
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A story out of Los Angeles City Hall this week underscores one of the things that's wrong with local and state government.

The story noted that two of the city's most influential lobbying firms - Cerrell Associates and Dakota Communications - decided to withdraw their bids for a $\$ 95,000$ contract to do public relations for the city's redistricting commission. The city has recently begun its once-a-decade redistricting of City Council seats.
The reasons for the withdrawals (mainly tight timelines and resources) aren't what's troubling; the fact that a city government agency is planning to hire spin doctors as part of its legislative redistricting process surely is.
The contract would include organizing a series of 15 town hall meetings. It's hard to believe that a city with hundreds of political staff can't organize a few town hall meetings without relegating the task to local lobbyists for a nearly six-figure payday.
The city's redistricting process has already run into concerns over conflicts of interest in the appointment of the 21-panel commission. Many of the appointees are political insiders and former council aides - some very recently. A stark example is the appointment of Andrew Westall as the redistricting commission's executive director earlier this month. To do so, he had to leave his job as deputy to Herb Wesson, the councilman who will soon take over the council presidency.

Now this.
We're with Redistricting Commissioner Michael Trujillo, who said "I don't think one penny of taxpayer dollars should go to a private firm."
The city and its elected representatives have plenty of resources to reach out to the public if they wanted. They don't have the need - or the money - to keep outsourcing their responsibility for public service to private firms.
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The top two firms competing to secure a $\$ 100,000$ public relations contract from the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission abruptly dropped out of the running Tuesday, throwing the panel's work into turmoil.
Dakota Communications and Cerrell Associates withdrew their proposals shortly before the 21 -member commission was scheduled to vote. They did so the same day The Times reported that they have an array of lobbying clients at City Hall, including airport concessions and shopping malls -- a fact that irritated some neighborhood activists and advocacy groups.
Cerrell gave the commission 30 minutes' notice of its decision, officials said. In a statement, Cerrell President Lisa Gritzner said her firm pulled out because it did not want the commission to experience "unnecessary distractions."

The third-place candidate was disqualified by the city's lawyers because it has financial ties to political consultant Michael Trujillo, one of the commission's members.
The commission is charged with drawing new boundaries for the City Council's 15 districts, work that will have major implications for elected officials and the public. The panel is under the gun to hold several hearings before Christmas and more next year.
Commissioner Jose Cornejo, former chief of staff to Councilman Tony Cardenas, urged the panel to find another company. But others voiced doubts that they could accomplish a proper recruitment effort with the clock running out.
"It's not like we've got a lot of time," said Commissioner Julie Downey, who was appointed by City Atty. Carmen Trutanich.
The panel voted to have its existing staff develop an alternative public relations strategy and canceled four hearings slated Dec. 3-12-- deciding to reschedule them later.

The commission already was off to a turbulent start. Some on the council, including Councilman Bernard C. Parks, expressed displeasure with the panel's decision to hire Andrew Westall, who until recently was a legislative deputy to Councilman Herb Wesson, as its executive director. Critics had questioned whether Westall would be inclined to draw district lines in a way favored by Wesson and his allies.
Meanwhile, neighborhood activists and advocacy groups had complained about the notion of lobbying firms handling part of the outreach to the public.
Dakota has represented such clients as Home Depot, Playa Vista and Providence Holy Cross Medical Center. Cerrell has 22 clients at City Hall, including Fresh and Easy, a grocery company that has been trying to expand in various neighborhoods across the city, including the district where Westall was a legislative staffer.
Rick Taylor, a partner with Dakota, said his firm lacked the resources to work on so many hearings before the holidays. "We dropped out because we did not think it's realistic," he said.
david.zahniser@latimes.com
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Lobbying firms with an array of clients needing help from Los Angeles City Hall are vying for a consulting contract on a matter near to City Council members' hearts: redrawing the political boundaries that can affect their power -- and their reelection chances.
The council's 21 -member Redistricting Commission is slated to vote Tuesday to pay a public relations consultant up to $\$ 100,000$ to inform residents of the plan to draw new borders for the council's 15 districts.

The top three finalists are registered as lobbyists at City Hall, representing such interests as shopping malls, renewable energy developers and at least one billboard company. That has led some to question whether the tangle of interests between consultants and lawmakers will create a perception problem.
"I don't think this will be viewed as a positive development," said Councilwoman Jan Perry, who alleged earlier this month that new maps were being drawn out of public view.
Andrew Westall, the commission's executive director, said nothing legally bars the panel from hiring lobbyists to perform public outreach. Still, redistricting Commissioner Helen Kim said she wished she had known about the lobbying connections before she and her colleagues put forward their recommendations on the consultants Monday.
"It would have been nice if someone raised that issue," she said.
The redistricting panel is looking for someone to craft a media strategy and get the word out -- in multiple languages -- to scores of neighborhoods. The panel is charged with redrawing council districts to account for population changes reported in the 2010 census.
How the lines are shifted can help or hurt council members, depending on whether they gain or lose supportive constituencies capable of generating votes and campaign cash. Eleven public hearings are scheduled over the next month.

On Monday, three members of the commission's search committee backed Cerrell Associates, a firm with 22 lobbying clients, ranging from restaurants at L.A. International Airport to billboard company Van Wagner. The other three backed Dakota Communications, whose clients include Westfield, which is seeking council approval of a 31-acre complex in Woodland Hills.

A third company, Diverse Strategies for Organizing, was not recommended. Three commissioners said they felt company representatives had not been forthcoming about a company affiliate's financial ties to redistricting Commissioner Michael Trujillo.
Trujillo is a consultant to California Strategies, a subcontractor of Diverse Strategies. He said he would have recused himself had the proposal come up for a vote. Michael Bustamante, a principal with California Strategies, said he was surprised that Trujillo's work was an issue for the commissioners.
"If I thought it would be, it would have been very easy to disclose. I was surprised that they even asked the question," he said.

Robert Stern, former president of the Center for Governmental Studies, a watchdog group, doubted the contract would create a conflict of interest for the lobbying firms. But their involvement shows the redistricting process at City Hall is an insider's game, he said. "I guess the question is, aren't there any other PR firms that aren't registered lobbyists?" he added. "It is a big city."
Rick Taylor, a partner with Dakota, said his firm devotes no more than 10\% of its time to lobbying. Lisa Gritz- ner, president of Cerrell, said she sees no connection between her firm's lobbying work and the public relations contract. "There's no agenda other than making sure that folks in Los Angeles have access to the redistricting conversation," she said.
As part of its lobbying work, Cerrell recently bused backers of a Fresh and Easy grocery store in South Los Angeles to City Hall to testify. Dakota shuttled supporters of a proposed Home Depot in Sunland-Tujunga to the council chambers.
Joe Barrett, co-director of the Sunland-Tujunga Alliance, which fought the Home Depot proposal, said he would be unhappy to see Dakota representing the redistricting process. "Dakota has a horrible reputation with our community," he said.
Larry Gross, executive director of the Coalition for Economic Survival, an advocacy group that represents tenants, voiced dismay that one of Cerrell's clients is the L.A. chapter of the California Apartment Assn., which has opposed new limits on rent hikes by landlords.
"A firm that represents landlords and has been fighting against rent control ... is going to have difficulty winning the trust of renters, who make up more than $60 \%$ of L.A. residents," he said.
david.zahniser@latimes.com
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SHE might be guilty of grandstanding, but Jan Perry deserves credit for drawing attention to serious concerns about the Los Angeles City Council's redistricting process.
Perry, the councilwoman from downtown, announced last week that she has stepped down as the council's president pro tem, saying she is frustrated by colleagues' backroom deals on new district lines. Perry, also a candidate for mayor, said on a television interview that leaving a leadership position will allow her to "be less diplomatic." Yet she has declined to get specific about who is making which deals, saying, "I don't want to be petty about it."
Even without specifics, Los Angeles residents know enough to realize the method by which the city makes once-a-decade adjustments in council district maps is a long way from ideal.
The closest to ideal in recent experience is the way California did it earlier this year. A citizens commission, selected to minimize conflicts of interest, redrew state legislative and congressional districts for the 2012 elections and beyond with an emphasis on communities of interest and local geography. The surest sign that the state commission did its job well is that the results drew gripes from a wide variety of interest groups.
Latinos complained that they didn't get enough Latino-dominated legislative districts; conservatives were disappointed not to wind up with a more Republican-friendly landscape; and liberals didn't like how some popular incumbents such as San Fernando Valley Congressmen Howard Berman and Brad Sherman ended up in the same district.
If political independence is vital for the people establishing the political playing field, the message failed to reach Los Angeles county and city officials.
The L.A. County supervisors continued their practice of setting their own district maps. In September, they voted to keep boundaries essentially the same for 2012. They made the right decision, rejecting a push to give more power to Latinos by taking it away from Valley residents, but only after fighting off political pressures.

EDITORIAL; REDISTRICTING FEARS; CITY REDRAWING NOT AS INDEPENDENT AS THAT OF STATE
CITIZENS COMMISSION \{SUBHEAD\} City redrawing not as independent as that of state citizens commission The Daily News of Los Angeles November 15, 2011 Tuesday
Now, the L.A. City Council is working on the districts that will be in play in the 2013 election. For the second time, it will use a 21-member panel created in the new City Charter in 1999. Ostensibly, the panel takes redistricting power out of the hands of politicians - but does it really?

Chosen as they are by city officials, the commissioners include some with worrisome connections to people whose electoral futures their map-drawing may influence. At least one is expected to run for a council seat himself.
In the latest development to raise conflict-of-interest concerns, the council appointed Andrew Westall as the redistricting commission's executive director. To serve, Westall will have to leave his job as a deputy to Councilman Herb Wesson. He also is a witness in a lawsuit that involved Councilman Bernard Parks.

The city's redistricting commission - like the county's before it - is doing some things that remind us of the state panel. It is, for instance, planning to gather residents' input by breaking into three teams of seven panel members and holding one public hearing in each of the 15 council districts. Angelenos should take advantage of the chance to tell commissioners what changes, if any, are needed.

Ultimately, the City Council will vote on the new maps. This includes five members who will run up against term limits in the 2013. This led Councilman Richard Alarcon, who is one of the five, to say: "It allows us to be more objective."

Which leaves 10 to be influenced by self-interest.
The redistricting commission must submit new maps by March 1. It faces several big issues, including the positioning of Valley districts, Latinos' call for a third Latino-majority seat in the Valley, and Asians' wish for an Asian on the council for the first time in two decades.
Let's hope the panel tries its best to make decisions in the open, independent of pressure by officeholders and candidates, and observing the bumper-sticker precept: Voters should choose their representatives, not vice versa.
Jan Perry isn't the only one who fears it won't work that well.
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Jan Perry is shocked! "Shocked!" she says, to discover there is gambling in Casablanca.
The L.A. City Council member and mayoral wannabe resigned as president pro tem, the council's second-highest position, in high dudgeon after discovering deals are being cut behind closed doors.

Deals she's not part of - and that is what really offends her.
Can you imagine such a thing?
"We have drifted away from the kind of openness and frank discussion that has characterized this council," deadpanned Perry in her resignation letter.
Oh that Jan! What a cutup.
Apparently Jan got the jitters after discovering the backroom at City Hall where she had been cutting deals for years actually has its own backroom where an even more covert coven of uber dealmakers - the Spring Street Skull and Bones - meet.
What a blow it must have been for Perry to learn the inner circle has its own inner circle and she's a square peg.
Of course, Ms. Perry doesn't name names. That would be an unpardonable breach of City Hall etiquette. What happens in the backroom stays in the backroom - until the taxpayers of Los Angeles have to pay for the consequences.
But Perry's allegations, while vague enough to have come from City Attorney Carmen Trutanich, are worth considering.
Perry resigned ostensibly over the Citizen's Redistricting Commission, a 21-member panel tasked with re-redrawing the city's 15 council districts. Perry alleges before the commission has even been formed that secret maps have been drawn and deals cut behind closed doors.
In other words, the Citizen's Redistricting Commission is a dog-and-pony show while the real clout lies with the usual suspects who are carving up L.A. for their own personal gain.

Perry's right. This is how City Hall works.
The big money interests, the unions and developers and their water carriers in the council horseshoe, aren't about to let 21 appointed gadflies gum up the machine. If council districts need to be re-drawn, they plan on holding the crayons.
As right as she may be, it's hard not to wonder if Ms. Perry's indignation might have been tempered if the top candidate to chair the commission was one of her lieutenants rather than Andrew Westall, a Herb Wesson flunky, if you can imagine such a thing.
Perry's resignation as pro tem was a temper tantrum disguised as principle. It was really just a cheap publicity stunt designed to position Perry as a whistle-blower and reformer as she makes her bid to be the city's next mayor.

Nobody's buying that.
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The No. 2-ranking official on the Los Angeles City Council resigned from her leadership post Friday, saying she was troubled by what she described as behind-the-scenes maneuvering over redistricting and the council presidency.
Jan Perry, the council's president pro tempore since 2009, voiced dismay that "private" talks had been held over replacing Councilman Eric Garcetti as president. She also suggested that new boundary lines for the council's 15 districts are being redrawn in secret, even though a 21-member commission is charged with doing that job in public.
"There are allegations that maps have already been drawn and seen before the executive director position was even filled" for the council's Redistricting Commission, said Perry, who is running for mayor in 2013.
Council members and their aides have assumed for months that Councilman Herb Wesson would replace Garcetti, a Perry ally and also a mayoral candidate. But they have not known when.

Garcetti spokeswoman Julie Wong said her boss plans to step down from the presidency at the end of the year, giving him more time for his own mayoral bid. But she said Garcetti was unaware of behind-the-scenes boundary talks. "We have not seen any maps," Wong added.

Wesson said it was premature for him to discuss the presidency. But Councilmen Bill Rosendahl and Paul Krekorian said Wesson, whose district includes Koreatown and the Crenshaw Corridor, had already asked for their support.
"It's a general feeling among all of us that he would make a great president," Rosendahl said.

While Wesson has been wooing his colleagues, one of his high-level aides has been in talks to run the Redistricting Commission. Last week, that panel voted unanimously to recruit Wesson legislative aide Andrew Westall as its new executive director.

Westall, an expert on electoral mapmaking, would not comment. But Robert Stern, former president of the Center for Governmental Studies, warned in recent weeks that the hiring raised questions about whether Westall would give Wesson preferential treatment in the boundary recommendations.
"Who does he owe his loyalties to?" Stern asked. "My guess is that Wesson would come first."
District lines are in play for downtown, Koreatown and on the Westside, according to officials familiar with the process. Also in question is whether the San Fernando Valley will get a sixth district and whether South Los Angeles will retain three districts that have significant concentrations of African American voters.

Perry and Councilman Bernard Parks also introduced a motion Friday that, if approved by the council, would require members of the Redistricting Commission to divulge the names of any group or elected official who speaks with them to discuss proposed district boundaries.
"These important issues should be discussed in the public record," Perry said.
--
david.zahniser@latimes.com
Times staff writer Kate Linthicum contributed to this report.
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## City, LAUSD get ready to redraw lines;

VOTING: Citizen-led panels are tasked with forming new council and board of education seats.
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The two commissions redrawing political boundaries for the city of Los Angeles and the school district are mixing old-fashioned grass-roots politics with new technology to reach out to the public for the expected controversial process.
The two panels - 21 members for the city and 15 for the school district - are charged with developing new City Council and school district maps by March 1, 2012.
"We are going to do more outreach than ever before," said Arturo Vargas, chairman of the city redistricting panel. "We will be breaking up into three teams of seven members each and hold 15 hearings, one in each council district before we even have maps.
"Then, I want the entire commission to go to parts of the city so they see the impact of the boundaries on communities."
Vargas said after a map is drawn, the panel will hold another round of hearings throughout the city to get input from the public.
While similar panels drawing new lines for Congress, the state Legislature and the county Board of Supervisors have already completed their redistricting, the city and LAUSD committees are just starting now because the next municipal election is not until 2013.
Ultimately, the committees will have to resolve a range of political conflicts. Among them is the push by some activists to add a sixth district with a majority of its territory in the Valley, rather than having two districts that straddle the Valley and other parts of L.A.
Also, because of population growth, there is pressure to create another Latino City Council district in the Valley as well as one in South Los Angeles.
The city redistricting commission is negotiating with Andrew Westall, a deputy to Councilman Herb Wesson, to serve as its executive director. Westall was a staff member to the panel 10 years ago.
The LAUSD board is expected to review applications it has received for the executive director spot. It plans to make the appointment in mid-November.

The LAUSD commission also is planning to have extensive public outreach as it redraws the seven districts for the school board.
Assistant Legislative Analyst Charles Modica, who is staffing the LAUSD panel, said it will follow a similar scheduled for a round of hearings before maps are drawn and then a second set before a final map is adopted.
Both the city and LAUSD panels are also making use of high tech programs that will allow any citizen to look at the census data and draw their own maps. The information will be at www.redistricting2011.lacity.org.
Also at that site are all documents provided the commission.
One commissioner, Leroy Chase from the San Fernando Valley, also suggested the committee make use of streaming video technology and create remote sites around the city where residents can testify to the commission.
"We have all this new technology and I think we ought to take advantage of it," Chase said.
The two panels were created in the new City Charter in 1999, to take the matter of drawing boundaries out of the hands of politicians.
While both the City Council and school board have final say on their own boundaries, there were virtually no changes when the panels met for the first time 10 years ago.
Out of that process, the two bodies generally approved the map that had been presented to them.

And at that time, the panel bent to political pressure from San Fernando Valley activists and created a fifth district wholly in the Valley.
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Now that Los Angeles County has wrapped up the first round in its redrawing of political boundaries, the redistricting battle shifts to the city, where issues ranging from Latino power to San Fernando Valley representation will dominate the debate.
Two of the questions officials will wrestle with are whether to create a sixth City Council district wholly in the Valley and, separately, a third Latino-dominated district in the Valley.
The Northeast Valley's 7th District already has the highest Latino population in the entire city, at 79.5 percent - up from 73.7 percent a decade ago. But some experts say that demographic's growth over the last decade merits expanded representation, which would only take some slight reconfiguring of existing districts.
"It could be done," said Alan Clayton, an expert in reapportionment who has worked for the Los Angeles County Chicano Employees Association. "There has been growth among Latinos throughout the Valley and you could draw a clear line in the northern area to create a third district."

Given the controversy that ensued when Los Angeles County considered creating a second Latino supervisorial district, the city issue has the potential to be explosive. Some 1,300 people showed up at the Sept. 27 Board of Supervisors meeting to debate the issue; ultimately the board decided to only make minor shifts to the status quo, but Latino groups are expected to file lawsuits.
Still, other Valley activists say it doesn't matter as much to them whether the region gets another Latino City Council seat, as much as whether it gets another district overall.
Currently five of the 15 City Council districts are wholly within the Valley and two are shared with other parts of Los Angeles.
"We aren't interested if it is a Latino seat or some other group," said Stuart Waldman, president of the Valley Industry and Commerce Association. "What we believe is that the Valley needs another council district fully within the Valley and not shared with any other part of the city."

With the numbers still considered in the preliminary stage, it is not known if population growth has been enough to support an entire sixth district wholly in the Valley.
If that can't happen, then VICA and others have argued that at least one of the two partial districts - the 5th now held by Councilman Paul Koretz and the 4th, held by Councilman Tom LaBonge - should shift more to the Valley.

But Koretz, whose district includes Encino and parts of Sherman Oaks, and LaBonge, whose district includes Toluca Lake and North Hollywood, both said they would like to stay close to their current boundaries.

The city's overall population grew slightly over the past decade, from an estimated 3.69 million to 3.79 million. That means each council district will grow to about 252,000 people, up from the current 246,000.

The redistricting debate also could have an impact on the number of African-Americans on the council.

Three districts - the 8th with Councilman Bernard Parks; the 9th with Councilwoman Jan Perry and the 10th with Councilman Herb Wesson - have been the three traditional Afri-can-American seats.

But because of Latino growth, particularly in the downtown area, the 9th District already is a Latino majority district, with 75 percent of the population.
"We will be watching to see the integrity of the African-American population remains as it is," said Leon Jenkins, president of the Los Angeles NAACP.
"We would not like to see our populations divided so that our votes are diminished. It is not a black versus Hispanic thing. We want to see that all groups are represented fairly.
"It is not about losing a seat if the districts are fairly drawn and equitable to all concerned. It is the integrity of the process that is important."
Another potential voice this year could come from the Asian-American community, which has not had a representative since Councilman Michael Woo gave up his seat in 1993 to run for mayor.
The Asian population has grown dramatically throughout the city, but more so around the downtown area since 2000. Asians now represent 17.1 percent of the population in the district represented by Councilman Ed Reyes and 15.4 percent in Wesson's district, which includes Koreatown.

Deanna Kitamura, state redistricting official with the Asian Pacific American Legal Center, said her organization is reviewing the city data and will be involved in the process.
"It's too early for us to say what we will be proposing," Kitamura said. "But we are definitely interested in what the city does.

Because five of the 15 council members are termed out over the next two years, city officials have a little more flexibility in redrawing the lines this time than they had a decade ago.
"It allows us to be more objective," said Councilman Richard Alarcon, who is termed out in 2013. "What is interesting is all the factors that need to be considered and are at play."

Members of the reapportionment committees who are drafting the maps for the City Council and the Los Angeles Unified School District are not expected to make as dramatic shifts this year when compared with the 2000 plans.
In that case, the panel was under more pressure to give the Valley another council district and create one with a majority Latino vote. As a result, the 6th Council District, then represented by Councilwoman Ruth Galanter, was moved from the area around Los Angeles International Airport to the central San Fernando Valley and is now represented by Councilman Tony Cardenas.
The commissions for City Council and LAUSD are supposed to submit their proposed maps by March, to take effect for the 2013 elections.
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## L.A. redistricting process under way;

## POLITICS: Valley areas are expected to be key in the creation of new boundaries.

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. A5
LENGTH: 398 words

Launching a process potentially fraught with controversy, the 21-member Los Angeles Redistricting Commission began work Friday to draw new voting boundaries for the City Council and school district.

Based on data from the 2010 census, the panel has until March 1 to hold public meetings and develop boundaries for the 15 council and seven school board seats.
"This is politics at its most raw," City Council President Eric Garcetti told the panel as it held its first meeting at the Los Angeles Police Administration Building.
Garcetti said the commission is charged with developing district maps that reflect the city.
"It's often said when you visit Los Angeles, you are visiting the world," Garcetti said. "When I travel, I feel comfortable anywhere in the world because of my experiences in Los Angeles.
"You will get the most basic lesson in politics - the lesson on the need to listen to the public."
Among the panel's first chores will be naming a chairman and hiring an executive director to staff the panel and coordinate its activities. The city also plans to create a page on its website, lacity.org, to post information for the public.
The creating of new voting districts is certain to spark debate over efforts to establish a political advantage. The battlegrounds are expected to include the San Fernando Valley, where the creation of a third predominently Latino district is likely to be proposed.
Two other districts in the Valley are now primarily Latino, the 6th District represented by Councilman Tony Cardenas, and the 7th District of Councilman Richard Alarcon.
Alan Clayton, a retired redistricting expert, said the growth of the Latino population from Pacoima through Arleta could result in the creation of a district that would carve up the 2nd Council District area now represented by Paul Krekorian.
"All the numbers are still being developed, but it is an area to be looked at," said Clayton, who worked for the Los Angeles County Chicano Employees Association and has been involved in numerous court battles over reapportionment.

There is also expected to be pressure on the panel from business and homeowner groups to increase the Valley's clout in two districts that cross over into the Los Angeles basin.

Those are the districts now represented by Councilman Tom LaBonge in the East Valley and Councilman Paul Koretz in the West Valley.
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## LACCRC Blogs Post \& Electronic Journals

## 1. City redistricting battle may head to the courts - The South Los ...

4 hours ago by Cebusandman
Listen to an audio story from Annenberg Radio News:After an eight-hour meeting, The Los Angeles City
Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) approved a "Final Map Recommendation" just before midnight Wednesday on a vote of 16 to 5 .Los Angeles ... It will also claim that the districts are being re-drawn along racial lines, which is prohibited under the VRA unless studies are conducted which prove that voting is so strictly polarized by race that elections are not competitive.
http://cebusandman.typepad.com/philippines travel news/

## 2. Lisa Sarkin Reports about the Next Step for Redistricting - Studio ...

4 hours ago
Next week, during the Redistricting Commission's meeting on Wednesday, Feb. 29, at City Hall, 200 Spring Street at 4 p.m., these adjustments will be reviewed and sent on to the Rules, Elections and Intergovernmental Relations Committee, ... http://studiocity.patch.com/search/articles

## 3. Opponents of new LA political boundaries vow to take their fight to ...

19 hours ago by Frank Stoltze | KPCC
Councilwoman Jan Perry is among others who disapprove of the new redistricting map. Expect another fight over political boundaries in the Los Angeles. The L.A. City Council Redistricting Commission approved new boundaries Wednesday, ...
http://www.scpr.org/

## 4. Maven's Morning Coffee - The City Maven

1 day ago by The Maven
89.3 KPCC • Boulevard Sentinel • CityWatch • Curbed LA • Daily Breeze • Daily Journal • Daily News • Downey Beat • Eastern Group Publications • Emma's Memos • Jewish Journal • L.A. Business Journal • L.A. Downtown News • LA City Workers • La Opinion • LA Weekly • LAist • LAObserved • Larchmont Chronicle • Los Angeles Sentinel • Los Angeles Times • Los ... 10:30 a.m. Los Angeles City Council members Jose Huizar and Jan Perry are expected to showcase Ace Beverage Co.
http://www.thecitymaven.com/

## 5. Updated: Redistricting commission approves City Council maps, but ... 1 day ago <br> After a nearly eight-hour hearing and tense debate Wednesday night, the city's redistricting commission approved new City Council district boundaries. ... The LA City Council Redistricting Commission Draft Map Proposal Public Input Hearing • Redistricting commission votes on council districts: New map, same problems • L.A. City Council redistricting discussions turn nasty ... <br> http://loku.com/cities/Los\%20Angeles

## 6. Council District 9 Redistricting - A Community Discussion | Judy ... 1 day ago by JudyMontero New council district boundaries can have an immediate impact on your neighborhood and how you are represented on the City Council. For more information on the City's redistricting process, please contact our office at 720-337-7709 or visit ... <br> http://iudymontero9.com/

## 7. United and Feels so Good SouthLA

2 days ago by southla
Coalition for Fairness in Redistricting presented their version of the map for South LA districts CD8, CD9, and CD10 (Herb Wesson) and downtown-East LA CD14 (Jose Huizar), with boundaries distinctly different from the maps proposed by NAACP, MALDEF and APALC, in that they keep Council District 8 and 9 virtually unchanged. For example, the map proposed ... Baldwin Vista and Leimert Park are both split between CD8 and CD10 in the current City Council lines. Absent from the ...
http://southla.wordpress.com/

## 8. New council maps could get vote Wednesday - LA Daily News

4 days ago by Daily News
The citizens commission redrawing the City Council district lines is expected to discuss and possibly vote Wednesday on a final draft of maps that are expected to leave activists from the San Fernando Valley to South Los Angeles unhappy. ... The 21-member Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission released its latest map proposal late Friday. The plan splits two districts ... Councilman Bill Rosendahl, however, was generally pleased with the new boundaries. He was glad to ...
http://www.dailynews.com/news/
9. Adjusted Draft Map Puts Greater Wilshire in CD4 | Larchmont Buzz

6 days ago by Elizabeth Fuller
The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) released its adjusted draft map, which places almost all of the Greater Wilshire area in CD4. The first draft map of new city council boundaries, released on January 25, had ...
http://www.larchmontbuzz.com/

## 10. UPDATE Redistricting Commission Releases Adjusted Draft Map ...

6 days ago by Bill Rosendahl
UPDATE: Los Angeles Redistricting Commission Adjusted Draft Map. What is going on with LA City Redistricting? Every ten years, after the results of the federal census are released, the City needs to redraw the lines of its council districts to make sure the population of districts are roughly even, and to make sure that the City complies with the Voting Rights Act by making sure that the ... Redrawing political boundaries is always controversial, and this year has been no exception. http://billrosendahl.wordpress.com/
11. Redistricting commission votes on council districts: New map, same ...

Feb 16, 2012 by Hayley Fox
This is the initial draft map. It will be updated and changed based on amendments passed at last night's council meeting. DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES - Last night the L.A. redistricting commission voted (for more than nine hours) on 75 proposed changes to the draft council district map. The changes that passed ... Then, the commission will meet again to discuss a final round of amendments and adjustments before the City Council votes on its final approval. Perry said the last time ...
http://blogdowntown.com/

## 12. Jewish Journal Post: Redistricting

Feb 15, 2012 by webmaster@jewishjournal.com
Advertise | Subscribe | Email Alerts | Site Map. Username Password. The Jewish Journal ... Jewish population of L.A., Valley districts • City redistricting plan has potential to affect Asian-Americans ... Russia approved four rounds of sanctions in the U.N. Security Council in recent years, but says sanctions have exhausted their potential and criticizes the United States and European Union for imposing further punishments on Tehran.
"The result of these sanctions is, in the end, zero," ...
http://www.jewishjournal.com/

## 13. L.A. City Council redistricting discussions turn nasty | MashWatch <br> Feb 15, 2012 by Malachute

The once-a-decade ritual to redraw Los Angeles City Council district lines has become an increasingly messy and acrimonious bit of political theater as lawmakers and community groups jockey for favored positions. Councilman Bernard C. ... Herb Wesson. Tongues also were wagging last week about a widely circulated email that said downtowners had a deal to speak out in favor of a map sought by Councilman Jose Huizar in exchange for a funding meeting with a top Huizar aide.
http://mashwatch.com/

## 14. LA Redistricting Panel Unveils Proposed Council Boundaries

Feb 15, 2012 by Golden Poppy AV
L.A. Redistricting Panel Unveils Proposed Council Boundaries. Los Angeles' Redistricting Commission unveiled its proposed boundary changes for City Council seats Wednesday, setting the stage for a series of pitched battles over ...
http://www.goldenpoppyscv.com/

## 15. Reminder: Redistricting Information and Draw Your Own Map ...

Feb 15, 2012 by Mary Ann
What: Join us for a hands-on learning experience on redistricting. For the first time, you will have the power to draw and propose your own redistricting maps for Minneapolis City Council. This event will show you how to draw lines that are ...
http://site.webbercamden.org/

## 16. Mayor Villaraigosa's Deafening Silence on Redistricting - Friendly Fire

 Feb 9, 2012 by Earl Ofari HutchinsonThe outcry about the proposed redistricting proposals has been long and loud. The charges are by now well ... Both are among the poorest, almost exclusively minority, and were the epicenter of the 1992 L.A. riots. Take Perry's first. Under the ... A redistricting panel is convened by city officials every 10 years to adjust council district boundaries to reflect changes in population and ethnic makeup. Part of that process is ... Site Map | RSS • MNG Corporate Site Map | Newspaper Media Kit ...
http://www.insidesocal.com/friendlyfire/

## 17. Earl Ofari Hutchinson: Where's Mayor Villaraigosa on redistricting ...

Feb 9, 2012 by By Earl Ofari Hutchinson
The outcry against the new Los Angeles city redistricting proposals has been long and loud. The charges are by now well known. The plan will rip whole chunks of neighborhoods out of one district and stuff them into wildly disparate districts.
http://www.dailynews.com/opinions/

## 18. City Commission Map Would Change Toluca Lake's Councilman ...

Feb 9, 2012 by Staff
In a move that has Toluca Lake community organizations shaking their heads in disbelief, the Los Angeles
Redistricting Commission has proposed moving Toluca Lake away from Council District Four, represented by Councilmember Tom ...
http://tolucantimes.info/

## 19. Residents Voice Anger of Redistricting Maps | Park Labrea News ...

Feb 9, 2012 by Edwin Folven
Using descriptions such as "crazy" and "completely inappropriate", dozens of residents spoke out against the initial council district maps released by the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission at a meeting on Feb. ... The commission's vice chair, Jackie Dupont-Walker, said the comments from all seven meetings will be considered in redrawing the final proposed maps, and said the district boundaries will likely change dramatically once the final versions are released.
http://parklabreanewsbeverlypress.com/news/

## 20. LA Latino disunity causing political ambivalence? - Voxxi <br> Feb 7, 2012 by VOXXI

The L.A. redistricting commission handed over their map for public scrutiny and it doesn't reflect the growth of the Latino community, which today is close to half of the city's population.
http://voxxi.com/

## 21. A Dire Warning. Here in Van Nuys <br> Feb 7, 2012 by Here in Van Nuys

There is something going in Los Angeles right now called proposed redistricting and a dire warning flyer, from one of my neighbors, arrived on my doorstep this morning warning that if these new changes go through "Van Nuys will start at Victory BI. and be lumped in with Panorama ... If prostitution, gangs, garbage and fat, short women dressed in skintight black spandex have not lowered my property values yet, then I doubt that my new city council boundary will make much difference.
http://hereinvannuys.wordpress.com/

## 22. Final Redistricting Public Input Hearings

Feb 7, 2012 by admin
Draft boundaries have been drawn for all 15 Los Angeles City Council districts. You may view the draft maps here: http://redistricting2011.lacity.org/LACITY/draftMap.html. The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission is holding ...
http://lakebalboanc.org/

## 23. Final Redistricting Public Input Hearing | Panorama City ...

Feb 7, 2012 by admin
Draft boundaries have been drawn for all 15 Los Angeles City Council districts. You may view the draft maps here: http://redistricting2011.lacity.org/LACITY/draftMap.html. The Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission is holding ...
http://www.panoramacitync.org/

## 24. Chatsworth Patch: Redistricting

## Feb 5, 2012 by Chatsworth Patch

They make recommendations on a redistricting plan to the City Council on the District boundaries. The testimony and input of Los Angeles residents is critical to creating a redistricting plan that provides fair and effective representation for all ...
http://chatsworth.patch.com/search/articles

## 25. Hundreds Pack Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Hearing in ...

Feb 4, 2012 by admin
The draft maps that will change the boundaries of Los Angeles City Council districts as part of the redistricting process have "inadvertent errors" throughout the city, including the proposal to remove parts of Westchester from City Councilman ... http://lakersreport.info/
26. The Planning Lady: Preliminary Redistricting Maps made available ...

Feb 2, 2012 by Secretary
by Christine Peters After many weeks of deliberating and holding public hearings, the volunteer Redistricting Commission has revealed its recommendation for the new boundaries for our city's 15 Council Districts. ... There are two meetings coming up regarding the redistricting recommendations: Downtown Region Wednesday, February 8, 2012 at 6:30 pm. Los Angeles City Hall John Ferraro Council Chambers 200 N. Spring Street, Room 340, Los Angeles, CA 90012. East Region ...
http://www.epia-echopark.org/

## 27. Valley ANCA Urges Participation in Redistricting Hearing| Asbarez ... <br> Feb 2, 2012 by Contributor

The Armenian National Committee of America-San Fernando Valley chapter issued an appeal to the community Wednesday urging community participation in a hearing regarding redistricting of Los Angeles City Council districts.
http://www.asbarez.com/

## 28. Rosendahl on Redistricting Commission Draft Map |facebook meeting <br> Feb 2, 2012 by swave <br> WESTCHESTER- Today(February 2, 2012), Councilmembers Bernard C. Parks and Bill Rosendahl and hundreds of residents from both of their districts are calling on the Los Angeles Redistricting Commission. http://facebook.cosmomate.com/wordpress/

## 29. Letter From the Publisher - Los Feliz Ledger

Feb 2, 2012 by twygg
It was also a bit shocking to see what the Los Angeles Redistricting Commission has come up with for new boundaries for Los Angeles City Council District 4 (LaBonge's) district, see our story on page 9 and our website for the proposed map; ...
http://www.losfelizledger.com/

## 30. Koreatown Residents Blast L.A. City Council District Split | Neon ...

 Feb 1, 2012 by faughndeThirty-year-old attorney Ben Juhn works in Koreatown and, like many in the community, he is angry about the recently drafted map proposed by the L.A. City Council Redistricting Commission. The drafted ... Redistricting commission member Chris Ellison, who was appointed to represent the 10th district in the negotiations, asked if there hadn't been an agreement reached between the Latino, Bengladeshi and Korean communities on the boundaries of Koreatown a couple years ago.
http://stage.neontommy.com/

## 31. Rosendahl on Redistricting Commission | Yo! Venice!

## Jan 31, 2012 by Bret

In addition to signing the petition, I urge you to attend the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission meeting which will take place in our district on Thursday, February 2nd, 6:30 p.m., at the Westchester Recreation Center, 7000 West Manchester Avenue, Los Angeles, 90045 (directions). Why is this important? The 11th City Council District of Los Angeles is a unified, compact district with natural and sensible boundaries. It makes no sense to divide its communities, rip apart ...
http://www.yovenice.com/
32. Armenians hope new districts give them a voice on Pasadena ... Jan 29, 2012 by By Brian Charles, Staff Writer
... be the big winners in the ongoing effort to divide the Pasadena Unified School District board into seven geographic voting districts, according to Chris Chahinian, Armenian community leader and a member of the PUSD redistricting task force.
http://www.pasadenastarnews.com/education/

## 33. Draft Maps of New City Council Districts Anger Some Members ... <br> Jan 27, 2012 by yamamotojk <br> CITY NEWS SERVICE. A draft map of new Los Angeles City Council district boundaries that will be in place for the next decade was released Wednesday, drawing an angry response from some council members who said the maps made little sense. The district boundaries were released by the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission, a 21-member panel appointed by the city's elected officials to redraw the maps based on 2010 census data. The City Council will have to ... <br> http://rafu.com/news/

## 34. Open Discussion: What new City Council ... - The Eastsider LA

Jan 27, 2012 by The Eastsider
By Christine Peters After many weeks of deliberating and holding public hearings, the Volunteer Redistricting Commission has revealed their recommendation for the new boundaries for our cities 15 Council Districts. The Commission is ...
http://www.theeastsiderla.com/

## 35. Redistricting the Council: The Pieces Don't Add Up to a Plan | Where ...

Jan 27, 2012 by dj Waldie
Slicing and dicing Los Angeles into new city council districts isn't going to be pretty, easy or even fair. As Jessica Levinson noted at 1st and Spring, the special commission set up to draw new boundaries voted a bare majority to release a proposed map that would make - and break - political ambitions at City Hall. And that has everyone wondering how the puzzle pieces ... as Redistricting Comes to L.A.. by Jessica Levinson • Redistricting, Round Two: Drawing Local Legislative Lines ...
http://www.kcet.org/events/
36. APALC Proposes Los Angeles Redistricting Plan |(simple)|8Asians ...

Jan 27, 2012 by Lily
... (APALC) submitted a citywide redistricting plan to LA's City Council Redistricting Commission that would help keep Asian American neighborhoods intact and strengthen Asian American voices as the city looks to redraw its electoral lines.
http://www.8asians.com/

## 37. LA's Redistricting Jigsaw Puzzle from Hell - City Watch [ [Bytes 64]

Jan 26, 2012 by los angeles small business - Google News
Los Angeles TimesLA's Redistricting Jigsaw Puzzle from HellCity WatchThat should have been the guiding principle communicated to the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission as it commenced redrawing the political lines of the ...
http://bytes64.com/

## 38. Proposed Council District Boundaries on www.nohoartsdistrict.com ...

 Jan 26, 2012"A city commission has proposed changes to the lines that define Los Angeles City Council districts. The public will have five weeks to review the maps and comment before the panel's ... show how the changes compare to the current map." - Los Angeles Times. Here's an interactive map provided by the L.A. Times that will show the proposed council districts for all of Los Angeles, including our own neighborhood of North Hollywood. http://graphics.latimes.com/la-council-redistricting/ ... http://nohoartsdistrict.posterous.com/
39. L.A. redistricting panel unveils proposed council boundaries | Para ... Jan 26, 2012 by rickymartino
Los Angeles' Redistricting Commission unveiled its proposed boundary changes for City Council seats Wednesday, setting the stage for a series of pitched battles over neighborhood identity, ethnic clout and raw political power. L.A. Times ...

[^16]
## 41. Redistricting Commission gets an earful at Van ... - LM Los Angeles

Jan 25, 2012 by iwannago.co
0 Comments 26 January 2012. Kicking off a fierce battle over the political, cultural and ethnic lines of the city, the Los Angeles Redistricting Commission voted late Wednesday to release the first batch of council district maps. Read the full story ...
http://vmlosangeles.com/
42. City Council Redistricting Announcement Draws Ire From Council ...

Jan 25, 2012 by Molly Chance
Los Angeles City Council members expressed frustration Wednesday when a draft map was released of new district boundaries that will be in place for the next decade.
http://losangeles.cbslocal.com/
43. Redistricting map shakes up LA political ... - US Job Recovery News

Jan 25, 2012 by Jobs8
Redistricting map shakes up L.A. political landscape. Los Angeles' Redistricting Commission released its proposed boundary lines for 15 City Council seats, pushing one district deeper into the San Fernando Valley, pulling another completely ...
http://usjobrecovery.net/

## 44. Redistricting News - Draft Maps To Be Released \& February ...

Jan 24, 2012
Van Nuys City Hall (In Person) Downtown City Hall (Teleconference). Second Floor Council Chambers John
Ferraro Council Chambers. 14410 Sylvan Street 200 North Spring Street. Van Nuys, CA 91401 Los Angeles, CA 90012. Draft maps ...
http://mincla.org/
45. LA City Redistricting 2012 - Northridge South Neighborhood Council ...

Jan 24, 2012 by Northridge South
LA City Redistricting 2012 - Draft Maps To Be Released! On 01.24.12, In ... Commissioners are set to release draft maps for all 15 City Council districts tomorrow. Be the first to ... meeting in person tomorrow at the Van Nuys City Hall. You can ...
http://www.northridgesouth.org/

## 46. KRC Urges Community to Demand a United Koreatown - Korean ...

Jan 23, 2012 by Yongho Kim
Over the past weeks, community members and organizations have attended and spoken out in force at the four Los Angeles City redistricting hearings that cover Koreatown. As a result, some maps presented have included Koreatown in one ...
http://krcla.org/
47. Check Out LA's Mega "Gayborhood" Redistricting Proposal | RENWL

Jan 18, 2012 by Derrick Mathis
STUDIO CITY/SILVER LAKE/WEHO-ADJACENT: Last week we found out that the Los Angeles Chapter of the Log Cabin Republicans, the gay Republican group, is lobbying for a gay-focused City Council district. The Redistricting Commission ...
http://www.renwl.org/
48. L.A. City Council redistricting discussions turn nasty | Progressive ...

Feb 15, 2012 by By David Zahniser, Los Angeles Times
Old rivalries resurface, fraud is alleged and activists renew their efforts as the deadline nears for approving a new high-stakes map of City Council districts. The once-a-decade ritual to redraw Los Angeles City Council district lines has become ..
http://progressivevoices.com/

## 49. APIs Urged to Let Voices Be Heard in Redistricting - New America ...

Jan 15, 2012 by Rafu Shimpo
Every 10 years Los Angeles City Council lines are redrawn to account for changes in the population as tabulated in the U.S. Census. The goal is to have equal population in each of the 15 districts. The new district map must also comply with ...
http://newamericamedia.org/

## 50. NEXT PHASE OF CITY COUNCIL REDISTRICTING PLAN « 10th ...

Jan 14, 2012 by Charles L. Freeman
January 14, 2012. Earlier this week, the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission (LACCRC) completed its first round of public hearings with nearly 2000 Angelenos, from all 15 City Council Districts! Next week, on Wednesday, Jan.
http://10thcouncildistrictmeeting.wordpress.com/

## 51. L.A. City Redistricting Commission to tour areas with disputed ...

Jan 13, 2012 by By Rick Orlov, Staff Writer
In preparation for drawing new City Council seat maps, the Los Angeles City Redistricting Commission is taking a citywide tour today to explore communities that have complained about their district ... ... Posted on 14 January 2012 by By Rick Orlov, Staff Writer. In preparation for drawing new City Council seat maps, the Los Angeles City Redistricting Commission is taking a citywide tour today to explore communities that have complained about their district boundaries. Full Story at By ...
http://herald247.com/

## 52. Local GOP Group Calls for Creation of Gay City Council District

Jan 9, 2012 by admin
As the Los Angeles City Council invites public discussion on redrawing its district boundaries, one group is advocating for a district committed to its LGBT constituents. The founding L.A. chapter of the nation's preeminent gay GOP group, the Log Cabin Republicans, is pushing for the City Council's Redistricting Commission to create a council district that would cover Silver Lake to West Hollywood to Studio City—areas that historically have had a higher concentration of gay residents.
http://mitoaviles.com/

## 53. Council District 13 Redistricting Public Hearing, Monday Jan 9 at ...

Jan 8, 2012 by ehnc
Every 10 years, our City Council boundaries get re-drawn. ... The public hearing for the LA City Council
Redistricting for the 13th Council District will be right here in East Hollywood on Monday night - at L.A. City
College's Camino Theatre.
http://easthollywood.net/dev/

## 54. Mark your calendars: Redistricting meetings tomorrow and Monday ...

 Jan 6, 2012 by KellyPublic comments can also be submitted ahead of time by downloading this PDF, and email the form to redistricting.lacity@lacity.org. You can also follow the Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission on Facebook and Twitter.
http://www.echoparknow.com/

## 55. Update on Los Angeles City Council Redistricting - Korean ...

Jan 5, 2012 by Dayne Lee
After holding a series of public hearings and meetings, the 21 members of the LA City Redistricting Commission will be proposing a map to the LA City Council by March 1st. The Korean Resource Center is working with a coalition of Korean ...
http://krcla.org/blog/

## 56. Redistricting K-Town |iamkoream

Jan 5, 2012 by Emily Kim
Proposed L.A. council redistricting map leaves many dissatisfied http://t.co/kVN7ooal via @lanow.
@HoneBls Our site often loads very slowly and occasionally our servers shut down. We are working on the issue. NJ Man Kills Girlfriend With ...
http://iamkoream.com/

## 57. On the Record, or Why Redistricting Matters to Artists » Cindy Marie ...

Dec 30, 2011 by admin
Tell them if you have ideas for re-drawing the map lines to include more of a community for the arts. Ask them questions - anything, just: speak about art on the record. Don't feel weird if you don't know a lot about Redistricting, either. Here's the gist: Every ten years the city of LA forms ... FULL DISCLOSURE: [updated 1/12/2012] At the time I wrote this entry, I was part of the outreach team for the LA City Council Redistricting Commission. Share. Email. Earn. By Lockerz. Tags: advocacy ... http://cindymariejenkins.com/

## 58. Queen Anne Park - LA City Redistricting Commission Hearing

Dec 27, 2011 by admin
LA City Redistricting Commission Hearing. HERB J. WESSON, Jr. Councilmember, 10th District. Dear Community Stakeholder: Every 10 years City Council district boundaries are re-drawn to account for population changes. The Redistricting ...
http://www.queenannepark.com/

## 59. Redistricting Commission Hears Pleas to Keep Council Districts ...

Dec 17, 2011 by admin
Los Angeles City Councilman Bill Rosendahl addresses the meeting. A small crowd of about 40 people came out Thursday night to the Iman Cultural Center in Palms to give their input on how new Los Angeles City Council District lines should ...
http://www.venicebeachrealestate90291.com/

## 60. LA Redistricting Commission Comes to S-T « Sunland-Tujunga ...

Dec 12, 2011 by STA
There were also attendees from La Tuna Canyon, Shadow Hills, Lakeview Terrace, Sun Valley and even some of our friends from the south part of the district (Studio City). Council District 2 must lose around 12500 residents in order to keep ...
http://stai.wordpress.com/

## 61. Perry to testify at D9 redistricting hearing - The South Los Angeles ...

Dec 9, 2011
The Redistricting Commission makes recommendations to the City Council that will help establish new boundaries for City Council districts. ... OpEd: L.A. radio show's Whitney 'crack ho' comment should be wake-up call to Black America ...
http://www.intersectionssouthla.org/
62. Concerns raised over firms vying for work on LA redistricting - Los ...

Nov 22, 2011 by admin
Los Angeles Times Lobbying firms with an array of clients needing help from Los Angeles City Hall are vying for a consulting contract on a matter near to City Council members' hearts: redrawing the political boundaries that can ... and more »...
http://news.voterfactory.com/

## 63. Marine Local | Redistricted!

Nov 11, 2011 by hollywoodland
LA City Council Redistricting Commission Adjusted Draft Proposal. This new map reflects changes to the initial draft that received a majority approval from the Redistricting Commission on February 15, 2012 .
Tomorrow FINAL Public Hearing ...
http://www.hollywoodland.org/

## 64. Marine Local | Westchester Redistricting

Nov 8, 2011
Sparks fly over L.A. City Council redistricting proposal for Westchester - A proposed redistricting plan that would shift most of Westchester away from Los Angeles City Councilman Bill Rosendahl's 11th District drew angry reactions Wednesday from local leaders, while a planned change for the Harbor Area district was far less controversial.
http://maine.local-look.com/
65. Jan Perry resigns from council leadership post: 'I have a mouth. It ...

Nov 4, 2011 by KPCC wire services
... Jan Perry, the No. 2-ranking official on the Los Angeles City Council said today she is resigning from her leadership post out of "disgust" with what she described as behind-the-scenes maneuvering over redistricting and the council presidency. ... Perry also suggested that new boundary lines for the council's 15 districts are already being redrawn in secret, even though a 21 -member commission has been charged with doing that job in public. "In recent months, I have felt that we have ...
http://podcasts.scpr.org/news

## 66. TIGERTAIL TRAILS | Westside Today

Sep 22, 2011
The neighborhoods of Brentwood have some of the most beautiful gardens in the city and are particularly stunning in the late summer and early fall, when the intense colors of thick flower beds, climbing roses and bougainvillea burst out against lush ... Brentwood Weekly Crime Report: January 22, 2012 to January 28, 2012 - The LA City Council Redistricting Commission Draft Map Proposal Public Input Hearing • Brentwood Weekly Crime Report: January 15, 2012 to January 21, 2012 ...
http://www.westsidetoday.com/

# Appendix I: List of Commission Hearings and Meetings 

LA City Council Redistricting Commission 09/09/2011
LA City Council Redistricting Commission 09/27/2011
LA City Council Redistricting Commission 10/12/2011
LA City Council Redistricting Commission 10/26/2011
LA City Council Redistricting Commission 11/09/2011
LA City Council Redistricting Commission 11/22/2011
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting 11/28/2011
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting - (Public Input Hearing) CD 12 12/05/2011
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meetings - (Public Input Hearing) CD 15 12/08/2011
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting - (Public Input Hearing) - CD 9 12/10/2011
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - CD 7 12/10/2011
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - CD 2 12/12/2011
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - CD 14 12/13/2011
LA City Council Redistricting Commission 12/14/2011
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - CD 11 12/15/2011
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - CD 3 12/17/2011
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - CD 10 01/03/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - CD 6 01/03/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - CD 4 01/04/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - CD 5 01/05/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - CD 1 01/07/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - CD 13 01/09/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - CD 8 01/10/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission 01/11/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Bus Tour Press Conference) 01/14/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Bus Tour Lunch Discussion) 01/14/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission (CANCELED) 01/17/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission 01/18/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission 01/25/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - Central Region 02/01/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - Western Region 02/02/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting Agenda 02/04/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - West Valley 02/04/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - East Region 02/06/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - Downtown Region 02/08/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - East Valley 02/09/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission - Special Meeting (Public Input Hearing) - South Region 02/11/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission 02/15/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission 02/22/2012
LA City Council Redistricting Commission 02/29/2012

## Appendix J: Additional Communities Identified by the City of Los Angeles

- Sherman Oaks Addition (Council File Number 08-2758)
- Rose Hill (Council File Number 11-2057)
- Little Ethiopia (Council File Number 02-1641)
- Koreatown (Council File Number 09-0606)
- Little Bangladesh (Council File Number 08-2885)
- Thai Town (Council File Number 99-2007)
- Historic Filipinotown (Council File Number 02-1559)
- Little Armenia (Council File Number 00-1958)
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To All Interested Parties:

The City Council adopted the actions), as attached, under Council file No. 08-2758 , at its meeting held July 14, 2009.


City Clerk
OS

Your

# EDUCATION AND NEIGHBORHOODS COMMITTEE 

reports as follows:
EDUCATION AND NEIGHBORHOODS COMMITTEE REPORT relative to an application to rename a community Sherman Oaks.

Recommendations for Council action:

1. APPROVE the application relative to renaming a community Sherman Oaks, roughly located in a neighborhood north of Burbank Boulevard, south of Oxnard Street, east of Sepulveda Boulevard and west of Hazeltine Avenue, with the following boundaries:
a. Eastern Boundary - North side of Burbank Boulevard, West side of Hazeltine, North side of Califa/Tiara.
b. Northern Boundary - North side of Califa/Tiara. This boundary includes the residences on Vesper Street which may have addresses on Oxnard Boulevard. Califa Street is located along the Western end of the North Boundary. The street does not have passage through to Sepulveda Boulevard which is the Western boundary. The applicants request that a boundary line is extended from the North West corner of the intersection of Califa and Halbrent to Sepulveda Boulevard to the West.
c. Exclusion - East and West side of Van Nus Boulevard consistent with the current exclusion from Magnolia Boulevard through Burbank Boulevard.
d. Western Boundary - East side of the 405 Freeway.
2. INSTRUCT all relevant departments to perform the necessary requirements to effectuate the renaming of this community, including but not limited to, the installation of signs.

Fiscal Impact Statement: Neither the Chief Legislative Analyst nor the City Administrative Officer has completed a financial analysis of this report.

Community Impact Statement: Yes
Against Proposal: Van Nuys Neighborhood Council
Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council

## SUMMARY

At its regular meeting held on June 23, 2009, the Education and Neighborhoods Committee considered an application filed by Laurette Mealy requesting to change a community name to Sherman Oaks. This community is roughly located in a neighborhood north of Burbank Boulevard, south of Oxnard Street, east of Sepulveda Boulevard and west of Hazeltine Avenue. The properties petitioning for a name change are comprised of approximately 1,855 parcels and are located within two postal zip code areas; 91411 and 91401.

The Office of the City Clerk provided a summary of the application chronology which is attached to the Council file. The application was filed on September 23, 2008 and, after City Clerk staff verified the requisite number of signatures on the petition accompanying the application, it was approved for processing on October 8, 2008. The Department of Neighborhood Empowerment reports that the Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council, the Van Nuys Neighborhood Council, Lake Balboa Neighborhood Council and Greater Valley Glen Council were all notified of the proposal to rename a portion of Van Nuys to Sherman Oaks. The Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council and Van Nuys Neighborhood Council held public hearings on January 9, 2009 and January 14, 2009, respectively, and voted to oppose the proposed name change from Van Nuys to Sherman Oaks. Both Neighborhood Councils submitted Community Impact Statements to the Council file. The Lake Balboa Neighborhood Council and the Greater Valley Glen Council did not hold hearings on the subject. Additionally, the City Clerk, Records Management Division, and the Public Works, Bureau of Engineering, submitted reports relative to the application.

During the discussion of this matter, the applicant briefly presented background information concerning the community and addressed related questions from the Committee members. Since the proposed community is located within the boundaries of Council District Two, staff representing Councilmember Wendy Greuel addressed the Committee. The representative of Councilmember Greuel's Office spoke in support of the application and petition to officially rename the community Sherman Oaks and requested a technical amendment to describe the western boundary as the east side of the 405 Freeway. After an opportunity for public comment, the Committee recommended to approve the application to rename a community Sherman Oaks as amended to describe the western boundary as the east side of the 405 Freeway. This matter is now forwarded to the Council for its consideration.

Respectfully submitted,
EDUCATION AND NEIGHBORHOODS COMMITTEE


- Not Official Until Council Acts -



## MOTION

The community of Rose Hills has been in existence for hundreds of years since the colonial Spanish era previously known as Rosa de Castilla Spanish for "Rose of Castile".

Rose Hills as this community is currently identified by local residents is in the process of restoring its rightful place among several communities surrounding the El Sereno area. Because of its place in history the Bureau of Engineering has determined that this community could be grandfathered, allowing the installation of community signs.

Leaders of Rose Hills and residents have collected signatures and the approval of its local neighborhood council and adjacent communities for the posting of community signs.

1 THEREFORE MOVE that the City Council direct the Department of Transportation to put up signs for the existing community of Rose Hills in Council District 14 in Northeast Los Angeles at the following locations:

- Monterey Road North on the west side, south of Monterey Road before entering the Community of Hermon at the Monterey Road Pass.
- The corner of Huntington Dr. North and Collis; on the second light pole in the center median south of Collis.
- Soto Street North on the eastside of Soto Street North and Mission; before the Soto Street Bridge.

PRESENTED BY:


SECONDED BY:



## Council File Number

02-1641

## Title

LITTLE ETHIOPIA

## Subject

Motion - The City of Los Angeles comprises a variety of communities that make up our rich existence as a multi-cultural metropolis. The City has recognized this for many years and has periodically designated certain geographic areas with names based upon historical significance, current cultural attributes, location and other unique characteristics. Within Council District Ten on Fairfax Avenue between Pico Boulevard and Olympic Boulevard there is a large recent influx of Ethiopian identity businesses and residents. In fact most, if not all of the businesses in this area are owned and operated by people of Ethiopian cultural identity. Several residents, community members, and community organizations have requested the City to officially designate a specific area as "Little Ethiopia." There has been overwhelming support by the community and a commitment to work towards the positive development of the area, once designated as "Little Ethiopia." In order to proceed with this designation, action is needed to approve it and to direct the Department of Public Works (Bureau of Engineering) and Department of Transportation to provide the necessary resources to implement the designation of "Little Ethiopia." THEREFORE MOVE that Fairfax Avenue between Pico boulevard and Olympic Boulevard in Council District Ten be designated as "Little Ethiopia." FURTHER MOVE that the Department of Public Works be directed to implement the designation of "Little Ethiopia." FURTHER MOVE that the Department of Transportation be instructed to design and install signs at appropriate locations in order to identify "Little Ethiopia."

## Last Change Date

08/12/2002

## Council District

## 10

## Mover

NATE HOLDEN

Second<br>ERIC GARCETTI<br>JANICE HAHN<br>TOM LABONGE

## Archive History

7-31-02 - This days Council session
7-31-02 - File to Calendar Clerk for placement on next available Council agenda
8-7-02 - Motion ADOPTED
8-12-02 - File in files

## City of Los Angeles

JUNE LAGMAY

## To All Interested Parties:

The City Council adopted the action(s), as attached, under Council file No. 09-0606, at its meeting held August 20, 2010.


City Clerk
srb

TO: LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL
FROM: COUNCILMEMBER PAUL KREKORIAN, CHAIR EDUCATION AND NEIGHBORHOODS COMMITTEE

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR, EDUCATION AND NEIGHBORHOODS COMMITTEE relative to an application to name a community Koreatown.

Recommendations for Council action:

1. APPROVE the application relative to naming a community Koreatown, bounded roughly by Olympic Boulevard from Western Avenue to Vermont Avenue on the south, Vermont Avenue from Olympic Boulevard to Third Street on the east, Third Street from Vermont Avenue to Western Avenue on the north, Western Avenue from Third Street to Olympic Boulevard, including a business corridor along Western Avenue from Third Street to Rosewood Avenue situated inside the East Hollywood area on the west. The proposed boundaries include both sides of the street.
2. INSTRUCT all relevant departments to perform the necessary requirements to effectuate the naming of this community, including, but not limited to, the installation of signs.

Fiscal Impact Statement: Neither the Chief Legislative Analyst nor the City Administrative Officer have completed a financial analysis of this report.

Community Impact Statement: None

## SUMMARY

In the application submitted on February 10, 2009, the community boundaries were listed as Melrose Avenue on the north, Pico Boulevard on the south, Vermont Avenue and Hoover Street on the east, and Crenshaw Boulevard and Wilton Place on the west. In a transmittal dated May 18, 2009, the Bureau of Engineering stated that the area described in the application is a part of Country Club Park, Koreatown, Pico Union, Wilshire Center, Hancock Park and Melrose community areas. The Bureau also noted that the proposed area extends into the Olympic Park Neighborhood Council (NC), Pico Union NC, MacArthur Park NC, Greater Wilshire NC, Olympic Park NC, and Wilshire Center - Koreatown NC areas.

On April 13, 2010, this matter was considered by the Committee. Members of the community were opposed to the community naming request. The Committee continued this matter in order to give the various parties an opportunity to discuss their concerns and to develop a resolution.

At a regular meeting held on August 11, 2010, the Education and Neighborhood Committee revisited the application request. Members from the community and the applicant informed the Committee that after extensive discussions, a compromise was reached, and requested that the Committee approve the revised boundaries for the Koreatown community to be as follows: Olympic Boulevard from Western Avenue to Vermont Avenue on the south, Vermont Avenue from Olympic Boulevard to Third Street on the east, Third Street from Vermont Avenue to Western Avenue on the north, Western Avenue from Third Street to Olympic Boulevard,
including a business corridor along Western Avenue from Third Street to Rosewood Avenue situated inside the East Hollywood area on the west.

An opportunity for public comment was held. The Chief Legislative Analyst provided background information for the Committee. After the discussion, the Committee recommended Council approve the application with the amended boundaries. This matter is now forwarded to the Council for its consideration.

Respectfully submitted,


PAUL KREKORIAN, CHAIR EDUCATION AND NEIGHBORHOODS COMMITTEE

| MEMBER | VOTE |
| :--- | :--- |
| KREKORIAN: | YES |
| ZINE: | ABSENT |
| HAHN: | ABSENT |

## ADOPTED

aug 20 zulo
LOS ANGELES CTI counch
FORTHWITH

## To All Interested Parties:

The City Council adopted the actions), as attached, under Council file No. 08-2885, at its meeting held August 20, 2010.


City Clerk arb

TO: LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL
FILE NO. 08-2885
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { FROM: } & \text { COUNCILMEMBER PAUL KREKORIAN, CHAIR } \\ & \text { EDUCATION AND NEIGHBORHOODS COMMMITTEE }\end{array}$
COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR, EDUCATION AND NEIGHBORHOODS COMMITTEE relative to an application to name a community Little Bangladesh.

Recommendations for Council action:

1. APPROVE the application relative to naming a community Little Bangladesh, roughly located in Koreatown along West Third Street between South New Hampshire Avenue and South Alexandria Avenue.
2. INSTRUCT all relevant departments to perform the necessary requirements to effectuate the naming of this community, including, but not limited to, the installation of signs.

Fiscal Impact Statement: Neither the Chief Legislative Analyst nor the City Administrative Officer have completed a financial analysis of this report.

Community Impact Statement: Yes, by Wilshire Center - Koreatown Neighborhood Council

## SUMMARY

In the application submitted on October 23, 2008, the community boundaries were listed as Third Street on the north, Wilshire Boulevard on the south, Vermont Avenue on the east and Western Avenue on the west. In a transmittal dated February 11, 2009, the Bureau of Engineering stated that the area described in the application is a part of Koreatown and Wilshire Center and is in the Wilshire Center - Koreatown Neighborhood Council area.

On April 13, 2010, this matter was considered by the Committee. Members of the community, including the Wilshire Center - Koreatown Neighborhood Council, were opposed to the community naming request. The Committee continued this matter in order to give the various parties an opportunity to discuss their concerns and to develop a resolution.

At a regular meeting held on August 11, 2010, the Education and Neighborhood Committee revisited the application request. Members from the community, including the Wilshire Center Koreatown Neighborhood Council, and the applicant informed the Committee that after extensive discussions, a compromise was reached, and requested that the Committee approve the revised boundaries for the Little Bangladesh community to be as follows: the area in Koreatown along West Third Street between South New Hampshire Avenue and South Alexandria Avenue.

An opportunity for public comment was held. The Chief Legislative Analyst provided background information for the Committee. The Councilmember of the Fourth District expressed support for the application. After the discussion, the Committee recommended Council approve the application with the amended boundaries. This matter is now forwarded to the Council for its consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL KREKORIAN, CHAIR
EDUCATION AND NEIGHBORHOODS COMMITTEE

\#OB/O8-2885_rpt_en_8-11-10.doc

## ADOPTED

AUG 202010
LOS ANGELES CIT COLUCHI
FORTHWITH

## Council File Number

99-2007

## Title

THAI COMMUNITY OF LOS ANGELES

## Subject

Motion - The City of Los Angeles comprises a variety of communities that make up our rich tapestry of cultures. Periodically, the City designates a certain geographic area with a name based upon historical significance, location and other unique Characteristics. Within Council District Thirteen (13) in the east Hollywood section, there is an area that is a major economic and cultural hub for the Thai Community of Los Angeles. There is a high concentration of Thai businesses and residents in east Hollywood. This area has also been the site of the annual Thai Cultural Day Parade for the last few years. According to a needs assessment survey in 1992 conducted by the non-profit Thai Community Development Corporation yielding 600 responses, there was overwhelming support for an official "Thai Town" designation by the City of Los Angeles. In 1998, a Thai Town Formation Committee was formed consisting of diverse members from different sectors of the Thai community. The Committee formulated a community development, business improvement, and neighborhood beautification plan, which includes a recommendation that the City adopt the official "Thai Town" designation. In 1999, organizers canvassed local residents, merchants, and property owners, and again discovered there is road-based community support for an official designation. The significance of an official "Thai Town" designation would be the promotion of neighborhood pride, multi-cultural/ethnic exchange, and tourism giving the Tai community a greater voice in Southern California. It is important that the Council support this endeavor by directing the Department of Public Works (Bureau of Engineering) and Department of Transportation to provide the necessary resources to implement the designation of "Thai Town." THEREFORE MOVE that the area of Hollywood Boulevard between Normandie Avenue and Western Avenue be designated as "Thai Town". FURTHER MOVE that the Department of Public Works implement the designation of "Thai Town." FURTHER MOVE that the Department of Transportation be instructed to design and install signs at appropriate locations in order to identify "Thai Town."

## Last Change Date

12/02/2005

## Council District

13

## Mover <br> JACKIE GOLDBERG

## Second

JOHN FERRARO

## Archive History

10-20-99 - This days Council session
10-20-99 - File to Calendar Clerk for placement on next available Council agenda
10-27-99 - Motion ADOPTED
11-1-99 - File in files
7-11-00 - File to Gerald Gubatan - Council District Thirteen (13) - 53353
$8-1-00$ - File in files

## Council File Number

02-1559

## Title

HISTORIC FILIPINOTOWN

## Subject

Motion - The City of Los Angeles comprises a variety of communities that make up our rich existence as a multi-cultural metropolis. The City has recognized this for many years and has periodically designated certain geographic areas with names based upon historical significance, current cultural attributes, location and other unique characteristics. Within Council District Thirteen there is a significant population of persons of Filipino ancestry and Filipino-Americans who call the district home. In particular, there is a high concentration of persons of Filipino ancestry in the area commonly referred to as the Temple-Beverly corridor. Person of Filipino origin have populated and continue to populate this area ever since the first large-scale immigration and migration of Filipinos in the early twentieth century. Today, persons of Filipino background comprise the second largest group of Asian origin people in Los Angeles County with 261,794 residing in the county. Within this corridor and its proximity, there are several Filipino businesses, restaurants, churches, community organizations, social services, and health clinics. It is a community of Filipino homeowners and renters as well. Several residents, community members, and community organizations have requested the City to officially designate a specific area as "Historic Filipinotown." Council District Thirteen has worked with key residents, community members, and organizations to form an "Historic Filipinotown" Committee to look at the official designation of an "Historic Filipinotown." This effort has included reaching out to the community through community consultative groups to receive their reaction and vision of an "Historic Filipinotown." There has been overwhelming support by the community and a commitment to work towards the positive development of the area, once designated as "Historic Filipinotown." In order to proceed with this designation, action is needed to approve it and to direct the Department of Public Works (Bureau of Engineering) and Department of Transportation to provide the necessary resources to implement the designation of "Historic Filipinotown." THEREFORE MOVE that the area bounded on the east by Glendale Boulevard, on the north by the 101 Freeway, on the west by Hoover Street, and the south by Beverly Boulevard be designated as "Historic Filipinotown." FURTHER MOVE that the Department of Public Works be directed to implement the designation of "Historic Filipinotown." FURTHER MOVE that the Department of Transportation be instructed to design and install signs at appropriate locations in order to identify "Historic Filipinotown."

## Last Change Date

01/29/2003

## Council District

13

## Mover

ERIC GARCETTI

## Archive History

Second
NICK PACHECO ED REYES

7-19-02 - This days Council session
7-19-02 - File to Calendar Clerk for placement on next available Council agenda
7-26-02 - Meeting Cancelled
7-30-02 - Motion RECEIVED and FILED
7-30-02 - Substitute Motion - Garcetti Mover 2002 / Pacheco / Reyes - ADOPTED IN-LIEU OF ORIGINAL MOTION - The City of Los Angeles comprises a variety of communities that make up our rich existence as a multi-cultural metropolis. The City has recognized this for many years and has periodically designated certain geographic areas with names based upon historical significance, current cultural attributes, location and other unique characteristics.
Within Council District Thirteen there is a significant population of persons of Filipino ancestry and Filipino-Americans who call the district home. In particular, there is a high concentration of persons of Filipino ancestry in the area commonly referred to as the Temple-Beverly corridor. Today, persons of Filipino background comprise the second largest group of Asian origin people in Los Angeles County with 261,794 residing in the county.
Within this corridor and its proximity, there are several Filipino businesses, restaurants, churches, community organizations, social services, and health clinics. It is a community of Filipino homeowners and renters as well.
Several residents, community members, and community organizations have requested the City to officially designate a specific area as "Historic Filipinotown." Council District Thirteen has worked with key residents, community members, and organizations to form an "Historic Filipinotown" Committee to look at the official designation of an "Historic Filipinotown." This effort has included reaching out to the community through community consultative groups to receive their reaction and vision of an "Historic Filipinotown." There has been overwhelming support by the community and a commitment to work towards the positive development of the area, once designated as "Historic Filipinotown."
In order to proceed with this designation, action is needed to approve it and to direct the Department of Public Works (Bureau of Engineering) and Department of Transportation to provide the necessary resources to implement the designation of "Historic Filipinotown."
THEREFORE MOVE that the area bounded on the east by Glendale Boulevard, on the north by the 101 Freeway, on the west by Hoover Street, and the south by Beverly Boulevard be designated as "Historic Filipinotown."
FURTHER MOVE that the Department of Public Works be directed to implement the designation of "Historic Filipinotown."
FURTHER MOVE that the Department of Transportation be instructed to design and install signs at appropriate locations in order to identify "Historic Filipinotown."
8-6-02 - File in files

## Council File Number

00-1958

## Title

LITTLE ARMENIA

## Subject

Motion - The City of Los Angeles comprises a variety of communities that make up our rich tapestry of cultures. In recognition of this diversity the City occasionally designates a certain geographic area with a name based upon historical significance, location and other unique characteristics. Within Council District Thirteen (13) in the East Hollywood section, there is an area that is the traditional birthplace of the Armenian community of Los Angeles and a major economic and cultural hub for the Armenian community. This area contains a high concentration of Armenian businesses and residents and social and cultural institutions including schools, churches, social and athletic organizations. The Armenian business and residential community in this area has indicated an overwhelming support for an official "Little Armenia" designation by the City of Los Angeles. Organizers have canvassed local residents, merchants, and property owners, and have confirmed that there is broad-based community support for an official designation. The significance of an official "Little Armenia" designation would be the promotion of neighborhood pride, multi-cultural/ethnic exchange, and tourism giving the Armenian community a more identifiable presence and voice in Los Angeles. In order to proceed with this designation, action is needed to approve it and to direct the Department of Public Works (Bureau of Engineering) and Department of Transportation (DOT) to provide the necessary resources to implement the designation of "Little America." THEREFORE MOVE that the area bounded on the north by Hollywood Boulevard between the 101 Freeway and Vermont Avenue, on the east by Vermont Avenue from Hollywood Boulevard to Santa Monica Boulevard, on the south by Santa Monica Boulevard between Vermont Ave and the 101 Freeway and on the west by the 101 Freeway from Santa Monica Boulevard to Hollywood Boulevard be designated as "Little Armenia." FURTHER MOVE that the Department of Public Works be directed to implement the designation of "Little Armenia." FURTHER MOVE that the Department of Transportation (DOT) be instructed to design and install signs at appropriate locations in order to identify "Little Armenia."

## Last Change Date

02/19/2002

## Council District

13

## Mover <br> JACKIE GOLDBERG

## Second

LAURA CHICK

## Archive History

9-29-00 - This days Council session
9-29-00 - File to Calendar Clerk for placement on next available Council agenda
10-6-00 - Motion ADOPTED
10-11-00 - File in files

## Appendix K: Overview of Documents Comprising the Historical Record of Commission Proceedings

- Agendas
- Business Meeting Minutes (with the exception of September 9, 2011 of which no record is found)
- Public Hearing Transcripts (22)
- Agenda Materials for Business Meetings
- Audio and/or Video podcasts of all meetings (with the exception of September 9, 2011)
- Public Hearing Flyers in nine Languages
- Press Releases
- Handout materials of various types
- District Maps and Data for the Initial and Adjusted Draft Maps
- District Maps and Data for the 14 Amendments proposed on February 22, 2012
- Proposed List of 75 Adjustments, as amended to include 5 additional Adjustments
- Voting Records for the February 15, 2012 and February 22, 2012 meetings
- Sign-in Sheets
- Letters, Faxes, Emails, and other Written Forms of Public Testimony Received by the Commission and its staff
- Public Map Submissions by Individuals and Organizations
- Commission Staff Reports and Presentations
- City Attorney Reports and Presentations
- Regular Meeting Schedule
- Public Hearing Schedule (both Pre-Draft Map and Pre-Final Map)
- Ad Hoc Committee, Chair, and Chair and Vice Chair Reports
- RFP for Media and Outreach Strategies
- Working Timeline
- Public Hearing Rules
- Working Budget
- 2001-02 Commission Report
- FAQ Sheet in nine Languages
- Public Hearing Materials in nine Languages
- Contracts and Financial Records of the Commission
- Public Service Announcements
- Public Comment Cards from all Meetings


[^0]:    - Citywide Map - Neighborhood Councils Intact - Barry Johnson 01/13/2012
    - Keeps the Westchester-Playa Del Rey Neighborhood Council whole in CD 11
    - $\quad$ Citywide Map - Asian Pacific American Legal Center 01/17/2012
    - Keeps the Westchester-Playa Del Rey Neighborhood Council whole in CD 8
    - Citywide Map (without CDs 8, 9, and 10) - Dr. Tom Williams 01/17/2012
    - Splits the Westchester-Playa Del Rey Neighborhood Council between CD 11 and another District at La Cienega Boulevard.
    - $\quad$ Council Districts 8, 9, and 10 - Historic South Central - NAACP 01/18/2012
    - Keeps the Westchester-Playa Del Rey Neighborhood Council whole in CD 8
    - Citywide Map - Log Cabin Los Angeles 01/18/2012
    - Keeps the Westchester-Playa Del Rey Neighborhood Council whole in CD 8
    - Council District 10 or Council District 8 - United Community Associations 01/18/2012
    - Keeps the Westchester-Playa Del Rey Neighborhood Council whole in CD 8
    - $\quad$ South LA-Westchester District - Damien Goodmon 01/18/2012
    - Keeps the Westchester-Playa Del Rey Neighborhood Council whole in CD 8
    - Citywide Map - MALDEF 01/19/2012
    - Keeps the Westchester-Playa Del Rey Neighborhood Council whole in CD 8
    - Council Districts 8, 9, 10, and 15 - South LA Redistricting Collaborative 01/19/2012
    - Keeps the Westchester-Playa Del Rey Neighborhood Council whole in CD 8

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ The City is not a covered jurisdiction under Section 5 of the federal Voting Rights Act and therefore is not required to seek Department of Justice preclearance of its redistricting plan. (See 42 U.S.C. § 1973c.)

[^2]:    Make your voice heard, as the Sunland-Tujunga Public Relations Council did in 1956 when they organized this protest urging the widening of Sunland Boulevard
    | Photo: L.A. Public Library Digital Archives

[^3]:    ED) Forward to a Friend

[^4]:    ** This meeting is also noticed as a special meeting of the LA City Redistricting Commission because there might be a quorum ( 11 members) of the Commission present during the course of this meeting.

[^5]:    ** This meeting is also noticed as a special meeting of the LA City Redistricting Commission because there might be a quorum ( 11 members) of the Commission present during the course of this meeting.

[^6]:    Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
    www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
    200 N. Spring Street, Room 275
    Los Angeles, CA 90012
    Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707
    email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

[^7]:    ** This meeting is also noticed as a special meeting of the LA City Redistricting Commission because there might be a quorum ( 11 members) of the Commission present during the course of this meeting.

[^8]:    Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
    www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
    200 N. Spring Street, Room 275
    Los Angeles, CA 90012
    Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707
    email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

[^9]:    ** This meeting is also noticed as a special meeting of the LA City Redistricting Commission because there might be a quorum ( 11 members) of the Commission present during the course of this meeting.

[^10]:    Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commission
    www.redistricting2011.lacity.org
    200 N. Spring Street, Room 275
    Los Angeles, CA 90012
    Phone: (213) 922-7740 / Fax: (213) 922-7707
    email: redistricting.lacity@lacity.org

[^11]:    ขอขอบคุณ

[^12]:    Los Angeles City Council Redistricting Commissioners
    David Trujillo (CD1) * Craig Miller (CD2) * David Ford (CD3) * Grover McKean (CD4) * David Roberti (CD5) * Jose Cornejo (CD6) * Michael Trujillo (CD7) * Bobbie Jean Anderson (CD8) * David Roberts (CD9) * Chris Ellison (CD10) * Rob Kadota (CD11) * Ken Sampson (CD12) * Jackie Dupont-Walker (CD13) * Robert Ahn (CD13) * Antonio Sanchez (CD14) * Jerry Gaines (CD15) * Arturo Vargas (Mayor) * LeRoy Chase (Mayor) *Mona Soo Hoo (Mayor) * Helen Kim (Controller) * Julie Downey (City Attorney)

[^13]:    * Please Note: (For/ Against/ Not Sure/ Did Not Indicate) totals only represent the totals for speakers who spoke at hearings and do not include any totals for physical testimony

[^14]:    * Please Note: (For/ Against/ Not Sure/ Did Not Indicate) totals only represent the totals for speakers who spoke at hearings and do not include any totals for physical testimony

[^15]:    * Please Note: (For/ Against/ Not Sure/ Did Not Indicate) totals only represent the totals for speakers who spoke at hearings and do not include any totals for physical testimony

[^16]:    40. Let the redistricting fun begin - LA Observed

    Jan 25, 2012 by Kevin Roderick
    LA Observed: Los Angeles media, politics and sense of place since 2003. Front page •LA Biz • Media • Politics • Books • Our ... The secret City Council district maps drawn by City Hall's handpicked commission were released publicly today, revealing whose ox is being gored. As she pretty much foreshadowed, councilwoman and ... The LA Times data desk put together a nifty side-by-side comparison of the current districts and the new map. And a demographic table, showing that ...
    http://laobserved.com/?q=Save+Us+From+Berlusconi

