

EXHIBIT E

DESCRIPTION OF INITIAL CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES AND FINDINGS ON ESTABLISHMENT OF INITIAL CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES

In accordance with Government Code section 56852.7, the initial City Council district boundaries are established as set forth in Attachment 1 hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

Under the legislative districting plan establishing the initial City Council boundaries adopted by the Commission, there shall be fourteen City Council Districts, each of which contains approximately equal population.

In so establishing said City Council district boundaries, the Commission finds that:

1. A preliminary districting plan (“Preliminary Plan”) was developed using Census 2000 data, including total population and voting age population, along with San Fernando Valley voter registration data (as of March 2001). The redistricting units forming the basis of the Preliminary Plan were derived from Census 2000 tracts and were part of a countywide set used by the County of Los Angeles in its 2001 supervisorial redistricting.
2. On or about November 16, 2001, a written report on the Preliminary Plan, prepared by the Commission’s consultants, was issued and made available for public review and comment.
3. During the period of December, 2001, through January, 2002, the Commission conducted public hearings to elicit input from communities throughout the Special Reorganization Area. Community leaders, groups and residents participated in those meetings.
4. As a result of public input, the Executive Officer of the Commission directed the Commission’s consultants to make adjustments to the Preliminary Plan in response to public comments and to retain various communities of interest within the same legislative districts to the extent feasible. On or about January 14, 2002 a written report prepared by the consultants documenting these revisions to the plan was issued and made available for public review. Thereafter, on or about March 20, 2002, the

Executive Officer of the Commission requested the Consultants prepare a final plan including the addition of three small portions of Tract 1437 to District 14. Accordingly, on or about April 10, 2002, a written report on the districting plan recommended by the Commission's consultants ("Consultant Plan") was issued and made available for public review and comment.

5. In January, 2002, Mr. Alan Clayton, on behalf of the California Latino Redistricting Coalition, submitted an alternative districting plan ("Clayton 1 Plan") for consideration by the Commission. This plan was first introduced by Mr. Clayton before the Commission on or about December 12, 2001; however, at that time, Mr. Clayton provided only a limited number of copies of the map and did not submit data that would allow any meaningful review and analysis of the plan.
6. On or about April 23, 2002, a written report on the Clayton 1 Plan, prepared by the Commission's consultants, was issued and made available for public review and comment.
7. On or about May 8, 2002, Mr. Alan Clayton, on behalf of the California Latino Redistricting Coalition, appeared before the Commission at its public meeting and presented a revised alternative districting plan ("Clayton 2 Plan") for consideration by the Commission.
8. At its public hearing held on or about May 14, 2002, the Commission received a written report and oral testimony by Stephen P. Klein, Ph.D., regarding the success of candidates preferred by Hispanic voters in the Special Reorganization Area under each of the districting plans submitted to the Commission.
9. At its public hearing held on or about May 14, 2002, the Commission received a written supplemental report on the Clayton 1 Plan, dated May 9, 2002, prepared by the Commission's consultants, which was made available for public review and comment.
10. On or about May 14, 2002, the Commission received a written report from the County Counsel on the Recommended Plan and the Clayton 1 Plan, which was made available for public review and comment.
11. On or about May 20, 2002, a written report on the Clayton 2 Plan, prepared by the Commission's consultants, was issued and made available for public review and comment.

12. On or about May 20, 2002, a revised written report, prepared by Dr. Klein, regarding the success of candidates preferred by Hispanic voters in the Special Reorganization Area under each of the districting plans submitted to the Commission, was issued and made available for public review and comment.
13. On or about May 20, 2002, the Commission received a written report from the County Counsel regarding the Clayton 2 Plan and the adoption of a districting plan for a new city in the Special Reorganization Area, which was made available for public review and comment.
14. After holding public hearings to discuss and consider the districting plans under consideration and receive testimony from members of the public and the Commission's consultants and advice from the County Counsel, and after consideration of the districting plans before it, along with the testimony received at its public meetings and the reports and analysis submitted by its consultants and counsel, the Commission voted to adopt the Clayton 2 Plan at its public hearing held on May 22, 2002.
15. In adopting the legislative districting plan establishing the initial City Council districts for the Special Reorganization Area, the Commission considered and evaluated all of the following:
 - a. The requirement of population equality among legislative districts as required by state and federal law.
 - b. Districting criteria as provided by state and federal law, including topography; geography; cohesiveness, contiguity, integrity, and compactness of territory; and respect for communities of interest.
 - c. The ability of the Hispanic population within the Special Reorganization Area to participate in the political process and elect candidates of their choice.
 - d. Testimony provided by members of the public, the petitioners, and the Commission's consultants, and advice provided by the County Counsel, regarding placement of district boundaries, communities of interest, and interests of the Hispanic population in the designation of district boundaries.
 - e. Written reports dated November 16, 2001, January 14, 2002, April 10, 2002, April 23, 2002, May 9, 2002, May 14, 2002, May 16, 2002, and May 20, 2002, provided by the Commission's consultants and the County Counsel regarding the districting process and districting plans under consideration.
16. In adopting the legislative districting plan establishing the initial City Council districts for the Special Reorganization Area, the Commission ultimately preferred the Clayton 2 Plan over other plans under consideration for the following reasons:

- a. The reports and testimony before the Commission indicate that, on balance, differences between the Clayton 2 Plan and the Consultant Plan were not significant so that either plan was clearly superior to the other.
 - b. The total population deviation of the Clayton 2 Plan of 4.524 percent is only slightly higher than the total population deviation of 4.313 percent under the Consultant Plan.
 - c. Overall, the districts designated in the Clayton 2 Plan are not significantly more or less compact, cohesive, or contiguous than those set forth in the Consultant Plan.
 - d. There was testimony before the Commission indicating that the development of the Clayton 2 Plan was based upon consideration of the one-person, one-vote principle and traditional districting criteria such as topography, geography, compactness, cohesiveness and respect for communities of interest, as well as consideration of the ability of Hispanic voters in the Special Reorganization Area to participate in the political process and elect candidates of their choice.
 - e. The Commission's consultants concluded that absent sufficient information to the contrary, the Clayton 1 Plan appeared to have used race as the predominant factor in establishing the districts.
 - f. Mr. Clayton advised the Commission that he wished to withdraw the Clayton 1 Plan and substitute the Clayton 2 Plan in its stead for consideration by the Commission. Based on this representation, the Clayton 1 Plan was withdrawn from consideration and no further review or analysis was performed as to said plan.
 - g. Expert analysis of certain elections conducted in the Special Reorganization Area concluded that under any of the plans being considered by the Commission, there did not appear to be a significant difference in the ability of the Hispanic population in the Special Reorganization Area to participate in the political process and elect representatives of their choice.
 - h. The adoption of the Clayton 2 Plan was supported by Valley Vote, the proponents of the petition for special reorganization.
 - i. There was no opposition stated at any time to the adoption of the Clayton 2 Plan by the Commission.
17. Based upon all of the foregoing, the Commission adopted the Clayton 2 Plan as the legislative districting plan establishing the initial City Council districts for the Special Reorganization Area.