

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

972



**FROM:** Executive Office


**SUBMITTAL DATE:**  
June 8, 2011

**SUBJECT:** Supervisorial Redistricting Plan

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:** That the Board of Supervisors: 1) receive and file the attached recommendations by the Redistricting Steering Committee; and 2) set for public hearing on June 28, 2011 the attached proposed Supervisorial Redistricting Plans to adjust the boundaries of the Districts.

**BACKGROUND:** Under California Elections Code § 21500, the Board of Supervisors is required to adjust Supervisorial District boundaries following each decennial federal census, using the census numbers as a basis. The general goal of the "One Person One Vote Rule" mandated by the Federal and State Constitutions is to produce Districts which shall be as nearly equal in populations as may be, although Federal Court decisions have indicated that a maximum deviation from population equality of less than ten percent between Districts is generally permissible.

Continued

  
Tina Grande, Principal Management Analyst

**FINANCIAL DATA**


Current F.Y. Total Cost:	\$ N/A	In Current Year Budget:	N/A
Current F.Y. Net County Cost:	\$ N/A	Budget Adjustment:	N/A
Annual Net County Cost:	\$ N/A	For Fiscal Year:	N/A

**SOURCE OF FUNDS:** N/A

Positions To Be Deleted Per A-30	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requires 4/5 Vote	<input type="checkbox"/>

**C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:**

APPROVE


BY:   
Jay E. Orr

County Executive Office Signature

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

On motion of Supervisor Buster, seconded by Supervisor Benoit and duly carried by unanimous vote, IT WAS ORDERED that the above matter is approved as recommended, and is set for public hearing on Tuesday, June 28, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

Ayes: Buster, Tavaglione, Stone, Benoit and Ashley  
Nays: None  
Absent: None  
Date: June 14, 2011 10:00 AM  
xc: EO, CWB

Kecia Harper-Ihem  
Clerk of the Board  
By:   
Deputy

Prev. Agn. Ref.: 3.100 (8/31/10), District: All Agenda Number:  
3.9 (9/28/10)

9.1

Departmental Concurrence

Consent  
 Policy  
 Consent  
 Policy  
 Dept't Recomm.:  
 Per Exec. Ofc.:

California Elections Code § 21500 also requires that the adjustment of Supervisorial District boundaries must comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act as well as give consideration to the following factors: a) topography, b) geography, c) cohesiveness, contiguity, integrity, and compactness of territory, and d) communities of interests of the districts.

Federal Census data released in March 2011, reveal the following population by Supervisorial District: 1<sup>st</sup> District, 422,327; 2<sup>nd</sup> District, 407,271; 3<sup>rd</sup> District, 517,853; 4<sup>th</sup> District, 396,579; and, 5<sup>th</sup> District, 445,611. An equal distribution of the County's total population of 2,189,641 would put 437,928 residents in each Supervisorial District.

Per Agenda Item 3.9 on September 28, 2010, the Executive Office created a Redistricting Steering Committee. The Committee is comprised of County Assessor Larry Ward, Assistant CEO Jay Orr, and the chief of staff to each of the five members of the Board of Supervisors. The Committee is supported by staff from the Executive Office, County Counsel, Transportation Land Management Agency (TLMA), Registrar of Voters, and the Economic Development Agency.

Beginning on October 26, 2010, the Committee held a total of fourteen meetings, including three evening public outreach forums. The outreach forums allowed the public who were unable to attend the daytime meetings an opportunity to observe first-hand the progress of the Committee and provide input in-person to the Committee. Moreover, two of the outreach forums were held in outlying communities where it was more convenient for the attendance of members of the public from the Desert and Southwest areas of the County. Input was also provided via email, the redistricting website, the U.S. Postal Service, and in-person at the daytime redistricting meetings held at the County Administrative Center. Additional outreach efforts were conducted through the website, weekly updates by Supervisor Ashley at the Board of Supervisor meetings, and through press releases.

The initial meetings were spent finalizing the work plan, determining which specialized mapping software should be purchased, and discussing the legal criteria governing Supervisorial District boundary changes. The updated census population numbers were received by the County in March 2011. Once the numbers were received and the target population of 437,928 for each district was calculated, the Committee began the task of developing one or more Supervisorial Redistricting Plans that would include new boundary lines.

The Committee decided that each district representative should meet with TLMA:GIS staff and develop individual district maps to present to the entire Committee. Upon the completion of all five individual maps, TLMA:GIS staff was able to combine the individual efforts together into one map which identified areas of agreement and few areas labeled undecided. Draft versions of each individual effort, and the consolidated map, were ultimately presented in the public outreach forums.

After considering public input, the Committee was able to make decisions as to most of the undecided areas. The Committee gave particular emphasis to avoiding the division of cities and other communities of interests throughout the County with the exception of the City of Riverside due to its size and population. Despite the Committee's general consensus from a countywide perspective, the boundary between District 1 and District 2 could not win unanimous approval due primarily to differences as to where the boundary lines are drawn within the City of Riverside. As a result, the Committee decided it was most appropriate to recommend the two attached Supervisorial Redistricting Plan proposals to the Board of Supervisors for its review.

The action today will set a public hearing for June 28, 2011. At least two public hearings are required to be held on any redistricting plan proposal before it can be adopted. The tentative work plan included the dates of July 12, 2011 and July 26, 2011, for additional public hearings. At the conclusion of the last public hearing, the Board of Supervisors may approve a Supervisorial Redistricting Plan. The county surveyor will then prepare a legal description that conforms to the boundaries of the new supervisorial districts referenced in the approved Supervisorial Redistricting Plan. It is anticipated that Survey's legal description task will be completed by the end of August. An implementing ordinance enacting the approved Supervisorial Redistricting Plan must be adopted by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors no later than September 30, 2011 in order for the necessary boundary adjustments to be effective before November 1, 2011 as required by California Elections Code § 21501.

If the Board of Supervisors fails to complete the redistricting process before November 1, 2011 then a redistricting commission composed of the district attorney, the county assessor, and the county superintendent of schools will have until December 30, 2011 to make the adjustment.

The recommended motion today is for the Board of Supervisors to set for future public hearing the two recommended Supervisorial Redistricting Plan proposals; however, the Board is not limited to these proposals and it may consider alternative redistricting plan proposals to be reviewed as part of the public hearing process.

ATTACHMENT

The target population for each district is **437,928** people.

Existing Supervisory District Boundary	CENSUS 2010		
	Population 2010	Gain or Loss To Target	% Gain or Loss Needed
1	422,327	+15,601	+3.56%
2	407,271	+30,657	+7.00%
3	517,853	-79,925	-18.25%
4	396,579	+41,349	+9.44%
5	445,611	-7,683	-1.75%
County Total	2,189,641	-	-



# MEMORANDUM

EXECUTIVE OFFICE, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

**Bill Luna**

County Executive Officer

**Jay E. Orr**

Assistant County Executive Officer

**TO:** Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** Tina Grande, Principal Management Analyst  
David Huff, Deputy County Counsel  
Tom Mullen II, Deputy Director TLMA

**DATE:** June 28, 2011

**RE:** **Submittals for the Public Record**

---

This memo contains several attachments and some descriptive narrative for review and consideration by the Board of Supervisors, and at the same time to be included in the public record.

The county received the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) in March 2011. The data received included population demographic information categorized by race and ethnicity, age over 18 based on these same factors, and housing occupancy status (vacant or occupied). Attachment 1 is a summary table, based on this source data, broken out by existing supervisorial district boundaries.

On June 14, 2011, the 2011 Riverside County Redistricting Steering Committee submitted two proposals for consideration to the Riverside County Board of Supervisors. The district boundaries within each proposal, identified as Proposals A and B, generally share identical boundaries across most of the county. The differences between the two proposals are the location of the dividing boundary between the First and Second Supervisorial Districts within the City of Riverside. All district boundaries generally (with the exception of the City of Riverside due to its size and population) follow city boundaries or Census Designated Places such as Homeland or Highgrove and respect known communities of interest, major roads or freeways, and geographic landmasses, including the San Jacinto Mountains, the Pass Area, the Coachella Valley and the hills west of San Jacinto and Hemet to define each supervisorial district. Some segments of district boundaries, particularly those defining the Third, Fourth and Fifth Supervisorial Districts follow historic townships and other defined survey boundaries, generally separating sparsely populated unincorporated areas of the county.

Attachment 2 and Attachment 3 include summary tables based on the census source data for Proposal A and Proposal B respectively. Also included in the attachments are maps depicting the racial and ethnic majority per census block, topography for each of the proposals, and population over age 18, based on the source data.

Attachment 4 is an exhibit of the boundary differences in the two proposals. Proposal A promotes the inclusion of an area north of Arlington Avenue within the City of Riverside to the Second District, while retaining an area between the 91 freeway and the University of California, Riverside (UCR) within the First District. Proposal B is the inverse of A, moving the area generally between the 91 freeway and UCR into the Second District and retaining the area north of Arlington Avenue in the First District.

Maps showing the boundaries created in the 1981, 1991, and 2001 supervisorial redistricting processes are included in Attachment 5. This attachment also contains census reports that include demographic information from 1990 and 2000.

Attachment 6 includes the public submittals addressed to the Riverside County Redistricting Steering Committee. These submittals were received via the redistricting website, email, U.S. Postal Service, or in person. The documents were distributed to the Committee for consideration; however, one dated June 7, 2011 was received after the deadline, so it is being submitted to the Board of Supervisors for the first review. Attachment 7 contains the minutes from all of the 14 Steering Committee meetings, including minutes from the three public forums held in Riverside, Menifee, and Desert Hot Springs.

#### Attachments

# Attachment 1

# Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Existing Supervisorial Districts

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

DISTRICTS	POPULATION										HOUSING		
	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	American Indian and Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Total Population	Age 18 and Over	Total Housing Units	Occupied Units	Vacant Units
<b>1st District</b>	160,840	24,359	193,145	1,642	30,451	1,213	852	9,825	422,327	304,421	134,460	124,952	9,508
Percentage (%)	38.08%	5.77%	45.73%	0.39%	7.21%	0.29%	0.20%	2.33%		72.1%		92.9%	7.1%
<b>2nd District</b>	139,714	22,992	199,743	1,375	33,156	1,164	695	8,432	407,271	288,102	122,141	115,183	6,958
Percentage (%)	34.30%	5.65%	49.04%	0.34%	8.14%	0.29%	0.17%	2.07%		70.7%		94.3%	5.7%
<b>3rd District</b>	283,019	24,175	156,208	3,880	32,264	1,602	748	15,957	517,853	369,548	195,657	173,008	22,649
Percentage (%)	54.65%	4.67%	30.16%	0.75%	6.23%	0.31%	0.14%	3.08%		71.4%		88.4%	11.6%
<b>4th District</b>	165,016	8,976	206,072	1,462	9,920	305	635	4,193	396,579	299,804	202,557	143,594	58,963
Percentage (%)	41.61%	2.26%	51.96%	0.37%	2.50%	0.08%	0.16%	1.06%		75.6%		70.9%	29.1%
<b>5th District</b>	120,479	50,321	240,089	2,572	20,130	1,565	752	9,703	445,611	307,658	145,892	129,523	16,369
Percentage (%)	27.04%	11.29%	53.88%	0.58%	4.52%	0.35%	0.17%	2.18%		69.0%		88.8%	11.2%
<b>County Total</b>	869,068	130,823	995,257	10,931	125,921	5,849	3,682	48,110	2,189,641	1,569,533	800,707	686,260	114,447
Percentage (%)	39.69%	5.97%	45.45%	0.50%	5.75%	0.27%	0.17%	2.20%		71.7%		85.7%	14.3%

**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Existing Supervisorial Districts**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

	DISTRICT					
	1	2	3	4	5	
	SUPERVISOR					
	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	COUNTY TOTALS
<b>RACE [71]</b>						
Universe: Total population	422,327	407,271	517,853	396,579	445,611	2,189,641
Total	400,760	387,528	489,362	384,527	422,800	2,084,977
Population of one race:	249,646	232,075	361,956	265,907	225,563	1,335,147
White alone	26,195	24,604	26,121	10,291	53,332	140,543
Black or African American alone	4,248	3,703	6,804	3,434	5,521	23,710
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	31,309	34,067	33,330	10,661	21,101	130,468
Asian alone	1,454	1,373	1,855	397	1,795	6,874
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	87,908	91,706	59,296	93,837	115,488	448,235
Some Other Race alone	21,567	19,743	28,491	12,052	22,811	104,664
Two or More Races:	19,990	18,321	26,037	11,423	21,051	96,822
Population of two races:	2,616	2,030	3,763	1,232	3,379	13,020
White; Black or African American	2,346	2,034	3,811	1,432	2,216	11,839
White; American Indian and Alaska Native	3,870	3,577	6,994	1,702	2,738	18,881
White; Asian	526	452	858	168	345	2,349
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	7,265	7,085	6,669	5,120	7,858	33,997
White; Some Other Race	420	287	432	120	701	1,960
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	402	405	741	94	655	2,297
Black or African American; Asian	86	50	109	19	157	421
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	747	608	623	411	1,171	3,560
Black or African American; Some Other Race	94	127	152	46	109	528
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	16	25	22	20	17	100
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	392	351	374	266	520	1,903
American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	301	300	492	132	235	1,460
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	714	815	833	542	755	3,659
Asian; Some Other Race	195	175	164	119	195	848
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	1,460	1,319	2,240	594	1,596	7,209
Population of three races:	345	317	455	143	454	1,714
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	139	129	306	50	789	3,560
White; Black or African American; Asian	41	21	65	4	143	174
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	160	115	160	48	172	655
White; Black or African American; Some Other Race	128	91	225	53	123	620
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	12	8	31	9	5	65
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	97	98	155	63	105	518
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	232	190	419	81	168	1,090
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	172	195	225	80	161	833
White; Asian; Some Other Race	34	47	45	16	27	169
Black; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	23	15	28	1	32	99
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	6	5	1	1	13	26
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	14	11	13	3	29	70
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	11	17	16	11	29	84
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	15	22	40	5	24	106
Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race	0	4	1	4	4	13
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	5	5	10	1	1	22
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	6	10	9	4	15	44
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	1	3	15	7	1	27
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	19	17	21	10	25	91
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	100	97	186	34	140	557
Population of four races:	28	34	42	7	44	155
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	10	4	12	0	9	35
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	26	7	17	12	45	107
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	4	7	41	3	11	66
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	6	13	18	4	0	41

**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Existing Supervisorial Districts**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

	DISTRICT					COUNTY TOTALS
	1	2	3	4	5	
	SUPERVISOR					
	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	1	1	1	0	7	10
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	12	16	27	6	10	71
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	6	4	5	1	3	19
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	1	0	1	0	2	4
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	5	6	21	1	0	33
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1	1	0	0	3	5
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	1	0	4	5
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	1	1
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	4	0	0	0	4
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	14	5	28	1	23	71
Population of five races:						
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	9	5	22	1	14	51
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	2	0	9	11
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	5	0	0	0	0	5
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	4	0	0	4
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of six races:	3	1	0	0	1	5
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	3	1	0	0	1	5
<b>HISPANIC OR LATINO, AND NOT HISPANIC OR LATINO BY RACE [73]</b>						
Universe: Total population						
Total:	422,327	407,271	517,853	396,579	445,611	2,189,641
Hispanic or Latino	193,145	199,743	156,208	206,072	240,089	995,257
Not Hispanic or Latino:	229,182	207,528	361,645	190,507	205,522	1,194,384
Population of one race:	219,357	199,096	345,688	186,314	195,819	1,146,274
White alone	160,840	139,714	283,019	165,016	120,479	869,068
Black or African American alone	24,359	22,992	24,175	8,976	50,321	130,823
Asian alone	1,642	1,375	3,880	1,462	2,572	10,931
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	30,451	33,156	32,264	9,920	20,130	125,921
Some Other Race alone	1,213	1,164	1,602	305	1,565	5,849
Two or More Races:	852	695	748	635	752	3,682
Population of two races:	9,825	8,432	15,957	4,193	9,703	48,110
White; Black or African American	8,966	7,707	14,573	3,891	8,734	43,871
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	2,105	1,562	3,062	874	2,755	10,358
White; American Indian and Alaska Native	1,423	1,115	2,568	896	1,336	7,338
White; Asian	3,251	2,983	5,843	1,357	2,229	15,663
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	414	356	731	133	253	1,887
White; Some Other Race	283	274	351	175	190	1,273
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	333	237	611	101	611	1,632
Black or African American; Asian	359	376	681	73	567	2,056
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	80	39	104	14	133	370
Black or African American; Some Other Race	143	87	99	26	197	562
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	54	86	111	17	60	328
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	13	12	18	18	8	69
American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	5	9	22	10	21	67
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	271	281	433	78	194	1,292
Asian; Some Other Race	182	268	185	171	884	884
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	50	22	15	6	9	102
Population of three races:	803	670	1,263	284	900	3,920
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	260	240	333	111	356	1,300
White; Black or African American; Asian	118	110	247	33	132	640
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	33	18	55	4	41	151
White; Black or African American; Some Other Race	29	11	28	12	28	108

**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Existing Supervisorial Districts**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

	DISTRICT					COUNTY TOTALS
	1	2	3	4	5	
	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	
	SUPERVISOR					
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	91	50	136	31	96	404
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	8	8	22	4	4	46
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	7	8	19	10	11	55
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	186	152	330	53	137	858
White; Asian; Some Other Race	30	21	32	8	18	109
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	1	5	1	1	8
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	16	12	15	1	23	67
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	5	4	4	0	11	21
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	1	6	4	0	8	19
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	10	11	13	10	24	68
Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race	7	6	10	3	3	29
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	2	0	0	2	4
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	1	5	7	1	0	14
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	1	3	0	0	4
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	1	0	1	0	0	2
Population of four races:	0	4	3	1	5	13
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	54	52	107	17	66	296
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	18	24	28	6	28	104
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	8	3	11	0	5	27
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	12	4	11	4	12	42
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	4	7	30	1	8	50
White; Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race	2	9	1	3	0	15
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	1	1
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	9	5	20	3	8	45
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	1	0	5	0	1	7
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	2	2
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	1	1
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	1	0	0	0	1
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of five races:	2	3	14	1	2	22
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	2	3	10	1	2	18
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	1	0	0	0	1
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of six races:	2	3	14	1	2	22
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	2	3	10	1	2	18
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	4	0	0	4
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of six races:	0	0	0	0	1	1
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	1	1
<b>RACE FOR THE POPULATION 18 YEARS AND OVER [71]</b>						
Universe: Total population 18 years and over	304,421	288,102	369,548	299,804	307,658	1,569,533
Total:	292,948	277,852	356,595	292,817	295,728	1,515,940
Population of one race:	186,473	171,311	270,144	214,223	166,782	1,008,933
White alone	19,493	18,102	17,879	8,023	36,034	99,531
Black or African American alone	2,992	2,729	4,551	2,427	3,762	16,461
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	25,872	25,719	24,540	8,425	16,473	101,029
Asian alone	1,016	993	1,289	310	1,177	4,785
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	57,102	58,998	38,192	59,409	71,500	285,201
Some Other Race alone	11,473	10,250	12,953	6,987	11,930	53,593
Two or More Races	10,714	9,650	12,081	6,653	11,108	50,206
Population of two races:						

**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Existing Supervisorial Districts**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

DISTRICT	1	2	3	4	5	COUNTY TOTALS
SUPERVISOR	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	
White; Black or African American	1,002	768	1,164	462	1,200	4,596
White; American Indian and Alaska Native	1,606	1,364	2,432	1,020	1,502	7,924
White; Asian	2,007	1,685	2,877	889	1,432	8,890
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	265	220	400	108	189	1,182
White; Some Other Race	3,972	3,896	3,271	3,110	4,445	18,694
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	271	211	266	93	462	1,303
Black or African American; Asian	196	156	301	36	278	967
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	37	17	29	13	61	157
Black or African American; Some Other Race	292	243	253	166	441	1,395
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	64	76	81	35	59	315
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	9	15	10	9	8	51
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	252	214	214	169	323	1,210
American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	229	223	325	114	173	1,064
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	389	428	374	342	427	1,960
Asian; Some Other Race	123	96	84	87	108	498
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	691	560	795	311	743	3,100
Population of three races:	215	173	224	95	272	979
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	45	33	67	11	49	205
White; Black or African American; Asian	8	5	10	1	12	36
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	53	36	40	18	44	191
White; Black or African American; Some Other Race	65	38	72	27	68	270
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	4	5	14	7	3	33
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	61	49	62	41	49	262
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	125	88	152	42	82	489
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	54	58	63	32	65	272
White; Asian; Some Other Race	16	19	20	9	13	77
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	10	7	14	1	19	51
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	1	3	1	0	8	13
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	8	7	7	1	20	43
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	5	4	7	1	6	23
Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race	3	10	15	5	8	41
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	4	1	4	2	11
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	3	5	5	1	0	14
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	6	6	7	2	8	29
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	1	0	4	7	1	13
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	8	10	10	6	14	48
Asian; Some Other Race	60	38	67	22	64	251
Population of four races:	14	16	17	6	18	71
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	7	1	4	0	5	17
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	17	4	11	9	21	62
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	1	2	7	3	4	17
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	4	6	6	0	0	16
White; Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race	1	1	0	0	3	5
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	8	6	14	3	6	37
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	4	0	0	1	1	6
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	1	0	1	0	2	4
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	3	0	6	0	0	9
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	3
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0	0	1	0	1	2
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	2	0	0	0	2
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	8	1	10	1	14	34
Population of five races:	6	1	9	1	10	27
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander						

**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Existing Supervisorial Districts**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

	DISTRICT					COUNTY TOTALS
	1	2	3	4	5	
	SUPERVISOR					
	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	4	4
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	2	0	0	0	0	2
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	1	0	0	1
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of six races:	0	1	0	0	1	2
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	1	0	0	1	2
<b>HISPANIC OR LATINO, AND NOT HISPANIC OR LATINO BY RACE FOR THE POPULATION 18 YEARS AND OVER [73]</b>						
Universe: Total population 18 years and over	304,421	288,102	369,548	299,804	307,658	1,569,533
Total:						
Hispanic or Latino	122,929	127,292	96,176	131,601	147,845	625,843
Not Hispanic or Latino.	181,492	160,810	273,372	168,203	159,813	943,690
Population of one race:	175,943	156,256	265,787	165,668	154,594	918,248
White alone	129,396	111,328	220,560	148,500	100,685	710,469
Black or African American alone	18,504	17,286	16,887	7,370	34,580	94,627
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	1,222	1,100	2,751	1,138	1,879	8,090
Asian alone	25,366	25,208	23,977	7,967	15,894	98,412
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	873	871	1,148	250	1,057	4,199
Some Other Race alone	582	463	464	443	499	2,451
Two or More Races	5,549	4,554	7,585	2,535	5,219	25,442
	5,075	4,198	7,009	2,358	4,693	23,333
Population of two races:	826	608	999	352	1,008	3,793
White; Black or African American	1,081	840	1,768	734	5,431	5,431
White; American Indian and Alaska Native	1,793	1,490	2,549	728	1,234	7,794
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	225	191	362	93	151	1,022
White; Some Other Race	188	165	209	115	120	797
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	232	181	232	83	417	1,145
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	175	147	286	31	250	889
Black or African American; Asian	34	17	28	10	54	143
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	80	61	58	20	110	329
Black or African American; Some Other Race	40	60	63	14	37	214
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	7	9	10	8	3	37
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	3	8	17	9	17	54
American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	210	212	293	98	148	961
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	145	195	125	61	127	653
Asian; Some Other Race	36	14	10	2	9	71
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	435	327	525	162	488	1,937
Population of three races	170	142	178	78	235	803
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	42	28	52	5	41	168
White; Black or African American; Asian	6	3	10	1	11	31
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	12	5	17	6	12	52
White; Black or African American; Some Other Race	50	20	54	19	55	198
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	3	5	12	2	3	25
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	5	6	11	6	9	37
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	105	79	128	30	68	410
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	21	8	19	7	9	64
White; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	5	1	1	7
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	9	6	10	1	15	41
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	1	3	0	0	8	12
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1	5	4	0	7	17
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	5	4	7	1	5	22
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	3	3	9	3	3	21
Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race	0	2	0	0	2	4
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race						


**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Existing Supervisorial Districts**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

	DISTRICT	1	2	3	4	5	COUNTY TOTALS
	SUPERVISOR	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		1	5	3	1	0	10
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		0	1	3	0	0	4
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	1
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	2	3	1	4	10
Population of four races:		38	29	46	14	35	162
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian		11	15	11	6	11	54
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		7	0	3	0	5	15
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race		12	2	8	4	7	33
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		1	2	5	1	2	11
White; Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race		1	6	0	0	0	7
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	1	1
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		5	3	13	3	5	29
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	1	0	0	1
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		1	0	5	0	0	6
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		0	0	0	0	2	2
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	1	1
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	1	0	0	0	1
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of five races:		1	1	5	1	2	9
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		1	0	4	1	2	8
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	1	0	0	1
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of six races:		0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	1	1
<b>OCCUPANCY STATUS [3]</b>							
Universe: Housing units							
Total		134,460	122,141	195,657	202,557	145,892	800,707
Occupied		124,952	115,183	173,008	143,594	129,523	686,260
Vacant		9,508	6,958	22,649	58,963	16,369	114,447

# Percentage of Population Age 18 and Over by Census Tract

## 2001 Supervisorial District Boundaries



### 2010 Percent of Population Age 18 and Over

- 57% - 65%
- 66% - 75%
- 76% - 85%
- 86% - 95%
- 96% - 100%

- 2001 Supervisorial District Boundaries
- Cities



**Disclaimer:** Maps and data are to be used for reference purposes only. Map features are approximate, and are not necessarily accurate to surveying or engineering standards. The County of Riverside makes no warranty or guarantee as to the content (the source is often third party), accuracy, timeliness, or completeness of any of the data provided, and assumes no legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user.

File: \\agency\limgis\Projects\Redistricting 2011\Maps\Age 18 and Over by Census Tract 2001 Districts.mxd

Projection: NAD\_1983\_StatePlane\_California\_VI\_FIPS\_0406\_Feet Lambert Conformal Conic

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census Redistricting Data [PL 94-171]

Map Created on June 21, 2011

# Attachment 2

# Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Proposal A

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

DISTRICTS	POPULATION										HOUSING		
	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	American Indian and Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Total Population	Age 18 and Over	Total Housing Units	Occupied Units	Vacant Units
<b>1st District</b>	169,541	24,717	194,410	1,691	30,247	1,232	865	10,019	432,722	312,568	139,279	128,800	10,479
Percentage (%)	39.18%	5.71%	44.93%	0.39%	6.99%	0.28%	0.20%	2.32%		72.2%		92.5%	7.5%
<b>2nd District</b>	145,122	23,769	214,816	1,438	33,883	1,224	722	8,747	429,721	303,581	128,504	121,188	7,316
Percentage (%)	33.77%	5.53%	49.99%	0.33%	7.88%	0.28%	0.17%	2.04%		70.6%		94.3%	5.7%
<b>3rd District</b>	235,909	20,596	135,233	3,569	28,581	1,316	605	13,793	439,602	310,725	164,151	144,530	19,621
Percentage (%)	53.66%	4.69%	30.76%	0.81%	6.50%	0.30%	0.14%	3.14%		70.7%		88.0%	12.0%
<b>4th District</b>	181,686	12,025	229,243	1,738	11,023	387	693	5,000	441,795	332,155	223,661	159,666	63,995
Percentage (%)	41.12%	2.72%	51.89%	0.39%	2.50%	0.09%	0.16%	1.13%		75.2%		71.4%	28.6%
<b>5th District</b>	136,810	49,716	221,555	2,495	22,187	1,690	797	10,551	445,801	310,504	145,112	132,076	13,036
Percentage (%)	30.69%	11.15%	49.70%	0.56%	4.98%	0.38%	0.18%	2.37%		69.7%		91.0%	9.0%
<b>County Total</b>	869,068	130,823	995,257	10,931	125,921	5,849	3,682	48,110	2,189,641	1,569,533	800,707	686,260	114,447
Percentage (%)	39.69%	5.97%	45.45%	0.50%	5.75%	0.27%	0.17%	2.20%		71.7%		85.7%	14.3%

**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Proposal A**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

	DISTRICT	1	2	3	4	5	COUNTY TOTALS
	SUPERVISOR	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	
<b>RACE [71]</b>							
Universe: Total population		432,722	429,721	439,602	441,795	445,801	2,189,841
Total:		411,111	408,788	414,822	427,791	422,465	2,084,977
Population of one race		259,107	243,737	302,704	293,032	236,567	1,335,147
White alone		26,585	25,482	22,334	13,602	52,540	140,543
Black or African American alone		4,262	3,959	6,198	4,014	5,277	23,710
American Indian and Alaska Native alone		31,090	34,842	29,496	11,861	23,179	130,468
Asian alone		1,469	1,443	1,542	502	1,918	6,874
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone		88,598	99,325	52,548	104,780	102,984	448,235
Some Other Race alone		21,611	20,933	24,780	14,004	23,336	104,664
Two or More Races:		20,029	19,449	22,627	13,219	21,498	96,822
Population of two races:		2,652	2,112	3,319	1,552	3,385	13,020
White; Black or African American		2,417	2,145	3,222	1,662	2,393	11,839
White; American Indian and Alaska Native		3,897	3,688	6,131	1,867	3,298	18,881
White; Asian		539	471	703	198	438	2,349
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		7,169	7,699	5,815	5,793	7,521	33,997
White; Some Other Race		429	305	376	155	695	1,960
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native		407	419	632	118	721	2,297
Black or African American; Asian		91	51	83	28	168	421
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		723	653	555	497	1,132	3,560
Black or African American; Some Other Race		95	129	116	65	123	528
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian		14	27	20	21	18	100
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		381	398	351	326	447	1,903
American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race		305	318	429	156	252	1,460
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		719	853	731	619	737	3,659
Asian; Some Other Race		191	181	144	162	170	848
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		1,471	1,373	1,966	738	1,661	7,209
Population of three races:		355	326	413	170	450	1,714
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native		142	133	255	59	200	789
White; Black or African American; Asian		41	23	53	4	53	174
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		154	125	140	66	170	655
White; Black or African American; Some Other Race		129	97	192	65	137	620
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian		12	8	30	9	6	65
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		99	101	143	67	108	518
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race		233	193	372	110	182	1,090
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		168	204	193	105	163	833
White; Asian; Some Other Race		37	52	39	22	19	169
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		25	15	26	5	28	99
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian		6	5	1	1	13	26
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		13	12	10	4	31	70
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race		11	17	14	15	27	84
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		14	24	35	5	28	106
Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race		0	4	1	5	3	13
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		5	5	10	1	1	22
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		6	10	8	7	13	44
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		1	3	15	7	7	1
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		20	16	16	11	28	91
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		97	102	163	43	152	557
Population of four races:		27	35	37	10	46	155
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian		10	4	12	0	9	35
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		24	9	14	13	47	107
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race		5	7	37	7	10	66
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		5	14	15	4	3	41

**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Proposal A**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

	DISTRICT	1	2	3	4	5	COUNTY TOTALS
	SUPERVISOR	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		1	2	0	0	7	10
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		12	16	22	6	15	71
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		6	4	5	1	3	19
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		1	0	0	1	2	4
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		5	6	20	1	1	33
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		1	1	0	0	3	5
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		0	0	1	0	4	5
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	1	1
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	4	0	0	0	4
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	1
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		14	5	24	4	24	71
Population of five races:							
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		9	5	22	4	11	51
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		0	0	2	0	9	11
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		5	0	0	0	0	5
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	4	4
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of six races:							
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	4	0	0	1	5
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	4	0	0	1	5
<b>HISPANIC OR LATINO, AND NOT HISPANIC OR LATINO BY RACE [73]</b>							
Universe: Total population							
Total:							
Hispanic or Latino		432,722	429,721	439,602	441,795	445,801	2,189,641
Not Hispanic or Latino:		194,410	214,816	135,233	229,243	221,555	995,257
Population of one race:		238,312	214,905	304,369	212,552	224,246	1,194,384
White alone		228,293	206,158	290,576	207,552	213,695	1,146,274
Black or African American alone		169,541	145,122	235,909	181,686	136,810	869,068
American Indian and Alaska Native alone		24,717	23,769	20,596	12,025	49,716	130,823
Asian alone		1,691	1,438	3,569	1,738	2,495	10,931
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone		30,247	33,883	28,581	11,023	22,187	125,921
Some Other Race alone		1,232	1,224	1,316	387	1,690	5,849
Two or More Races		865	722	605	693	797	3,682
Population of two races:							
White; Black or African American		10,019	8,747	13,793	5,000	10,551	48,110
White; American Indian and Alaska Native		9,157	7,989	12,610	4,621	9,494	43,871
White; Some Other Race		2,134	1,628	2,694	1,134	2,768	10,358
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native		1,499	1,187	2,176	1,046	1,430	7,338
Black or African American; Asian		3,295	3,053	5,166	1,506	2,643	15,663
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		423	374	593	156	341	1,887
Black or African American; Some Other Race		296	283	272	190	232	1,273
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native		347	247	300	132	606	1,632
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		359	389	577	93	638	2,056
Black or African American; Some Other Race		82	39	78	22	149	370
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian		143	89	85	40	195	552
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		54	88	86	29	71	328
American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race		12	13	18	19	7	69
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		3	11	18	13	22	67
Asian; American Indian and Alaska Native		280	290	380	131	211	1,292
Asian; Some Other Race		180	276	156	102	170	884
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		50	22	11	8	11	102
Population of three races:							
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native		810	699	1,081	355	975	3,920
White; Black or African American; Asian		271	247	300	130	352	1,300
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		121	114	200	38	167	640
White; Black or African American; Some Other Race		33	20	43	4	51	151
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native		30	11	23	15	29	108

**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Proposal A**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

	DISTRICT	1	2	3	4	5	COUNTY TOTALS
	SUPERVISOR	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian		87	56	112	40	109	404
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		8	8	22	4	4	46
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race		7	8	16	11	13	55
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		187	155	289	78	149	858
White; Asian; Some Other Race		25	26	25	9	24	109
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	1	5	1	1	8
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian		18	12	14	5	18	67
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		5	4	0	1	11	21
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race		1	6	1	0	11	19
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		10	11	11	13	23	68
Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race		5	8	8	3	5	29
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	2	0	0	2	4
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		1	5	7	1	0	14
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		1	0	1	0	2	4
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		1	0	1	0	0	2
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	4	3	2	4	13
Population of four races		50	56	92	23	75	296
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian		17	25	23	7	32	104
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		8	3	11	0	5	27
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race		10	5	9	5	13	42
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		4	7	26	4	9	50
White; Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race		1	10	1	3	0	15
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	1	1
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		9	5	18	3	10	45
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		0	0	0	1	1	2
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		1	0	4	0	0	6
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		0	0	0	0	2	2
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	1	1
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	1	0	0	0	1
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of five races		2	3	10	1	6	22
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		2	3	10	1	2	18
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	4	0	0	4	4
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of six races		0	0	0	0	0	1
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	1	1
<b>RACE FOR THE POPULATION 18 YEARS AND OVER [71]</b>							
Universe: Total population 18 years and over							
Total:		312,568	303,581	310,725	332,155	310,504	1,569,533
Population of one race:		301,075	292,659	299,601	324,117	298,488	1,515,940
White alone		194,070	179,779	224,055	235,223	175,806	1,008,933
American Indian and Alaska Native alone		19,754	18,749	15,084	10,178	35,766	99,531
Asian alone		3,017	2,908	4,082	2,803	3,651	16,461
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone		25,739	26,334	21,617	9,398	17,941	101,029
Some Other Race alone		1,031	1,041	1,052	385	1,276	4,785
Two or More Races:		57,464	63,848	33,711	66,130	64,048	285,201
Population of two races:		11,493	10,922	11,124	8,038	12,016	53,593
		10,743	10,289	10,352	7,619	11,203	50,206

**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Proposal A**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

	DISTRICT	1	2	3	4	5	COUNTY TOTALS
	SUPERVISOR	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	
White; Black or African American		1,018	797	1,018	570	1,193	4,596
White; American Indian and Alaska Native		1,676	1,434	2,039	1,182	1,593	7,924
White; Asian		2,009	1,751	2,488	984	1,658	8,890
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		272	229	321	126	234	1,182
White; Some Other Race		3,907	4,244	2,844	3,487	4,212	18,694
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native		284	220	221	118	460	1,303
Black or African American; Asian		200	163	250	46	308	967
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		39	17	22	17	62	157
Black or African American; Some Other Race		279	263	219	194	440	1,395
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian		64	78	66	47	60	315
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		7	17	10	10	7	51
American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race		235	290	193	203	289	1,210
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		231	236	273	136	188	1,064
Asian; Some Other Race		403	449	317	386	405	1,960
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		119	101	71	113	94	498
Population of three races:		684	590	707	388	731	3,100
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native		221	176	204	115	263	979
White; Black or African American; Asian		47	33	60	14	51	205
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		7	6	9	1	13	36
White; Black or African American; Some Other Race		49	40	31	27	44	191
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian		61	43	67	35	64	270
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		4	5	14	7	3	33
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race		63	51	56	43	49	262
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		122	91	135	61	80	489
White; Asian; Some Other Race		48	66	52	38	68	272
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		16	21	19	12	17	77
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian		11	7	12	4	17	51
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		1	3	1	0	8	13
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race		7	8	4	1	23	43
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		5	4	7	2	5	23
Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race		3	11	13	5	9	41
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	4	1	4	2	11
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		3	5	5	1	14	14
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		6	6	5	4	8	29
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		1	10	4	7	1	13
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		9	10	8	7	14	48
Population of four races:		58	41	56	27	69	251
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian		14	16	14	7	20	71
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		7	1	4	0	5	17
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race		15	6	8	10	23	62
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		2	2	7	5	1	17
White; Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race		4	6	5	0	1	16
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	2	0	0	3	5
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		8	6	12	3	8	37
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		4	0	0	1	1	6
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		1	0	0	1	2	4
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		3	0	5	0	1	9
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		0	0	0	0	3	3
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	1	2
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	2	0	0	0	2
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of five races:		8	1	9	4	12	34
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		6	1	1	4	7	27

**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Proposal A**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

	DISTRICT					COUNTY TOTALS
	1	2	3	4	5	
	SUPERVISOR					
	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	4	4
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	2	0	0	0	0	2
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	1	1
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of six races	0	1	0	0	1	2
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	1	0	0	1	2
<b>HISPANIC OR LATINO, AND NOT HISPANIC OR LATINO BY RACE FOR THE POPULATION 18 YEARS AND OVER [73]</b>						
Universe: Total population 18 years and over						
Total:	312,568	303,581	310,725	332,155	310,504	1,569,533
Hispanic or Latino	123,678	136,787	82,855	145,657	136,866	625,843
Not Hispanic or Latino:	188,890	166,794	227,870	186,498	173,638	943,690
Population of one race:	183,215	162,065	221,414	183,515	168,039	918,248
White alone	136,479	115,844	182,301	163,095	112,750	710,469
Black or African American alone	18,742	17,890	14,201	9,407	34,387	94,627
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	1,268	1,152	2,486	1,330	8,090	8,090
Asian alone	25,237	25,789	21,136	8,883	17,367	98,412
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	892	911	926	315	1,155	4,199
Some Other Race alone	597	479	364	485	526	2,451
Two or More Races	5,675	4,729	6,456	2,983	5,599	25,442
Population of two races:	5,208	4,353	5,951	2,756	5,065	23,333
White; Black or African American	838	630	866	436	1,023	3,793
White; American Indian and Alaska Native	1,157	886	1,486	850	1,052	5,431
White; Asian	1,801	1,537	2,225	816	1,415	7,794
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	232	199	287	108	196	1,022
White; Some Other Race	196	171	157	123	150	797
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	245	187	190	106	417	1,145
Black or African American; Asian	176	153	237	41	282	889
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	35	17	21	14	56	143
Black or African American; Some Other Race	82	61	49	27	110	329
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	40	62	51	23	38	214
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	6	10	10	9	2	37
American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	3	8	14	12	17	54
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	216	217	249	114	165	961
Asian; Some Other Race	145	201	102	73	132	653
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	36	14	7	4	10	71
Population of three races:	430	345	464	209	489	1,937
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	176	145	161	94	227	803
White; Black or African American; Asian	44	28	48	7	41	168
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	5	4	9	1	12	31
White; Black or African American; Some Other Race	12	5	13	7	15	52
White; American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian	46	25	50	24	53	198
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	3	5	12	2	3	25
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	5	6	9	7	10	37
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	102	82	111	46	69	410
White; Asian; Some Other Race	16	13	15	8	12	64
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	5	1	1	7
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	10	6	9	4	12	41
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1	3	0	0	8	12
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	1	5	1	1	10	17
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	5	4	7	2	4	22
Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race	2	4	7	3	5	21
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	2	0	0	2	4


**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Proposal A**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

	DISTRICT	1	2	3	4	5	COUNTY TOTALS
	SUPERVISOR	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		1	5	3	1	0	10
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		0	1	1	0	2	4
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		1	0	0	1	0	1
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	2	3	2	3	10
Population of four races:		36	31	37	17	41	162
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian		11	15	8	6	14	54
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		7	0	3	0	5	15
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race		10	4	6	5	8	33
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		1	2	5	2	1	11
White; Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race		1	6	0	0	0	1
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	1	1
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		5	3	11	3	7	29
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		1	0	4	1	1	2
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		1	0	0	0	1	6
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		0	0	0	0	0	2
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	1	1
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	1	0	0	0	1
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of five races:		1	3	4	1	3	9
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		1	0	4	1	2	8
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	1	1
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of six races:		0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race		0	0	0	0	1	1
<b>OCCUPANCY STATUS [3]</b>							
Universe: Housing units							
Total:		139,279	128,504	164,151	223,661	145,112	800,707
Occupied		128,800	121,188	144,530	159,666	132,076	686,260
Vacant		10,479	7,316	19,621	63,995	13,036	114,447

# Racial and Ethnic Majority Distribution by 2010 Census Block

## Proposal A



Racial and Ethnicity	Number of Census Blocks
Hispanic or Latino	9,818
White	12,901
Black or African American	223
Asian	332
American Indian and Alaska Native	74
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	11
Some Other Race	1
Two or More Races	66
No Racial and Ethnic Majority	488
No population	
2011 Supervisorial Redistricting Proposal A	
Cities	



**Disclaimer:** Maps and data are to be used for reference purposes only. Map features are approximate, and are not necessarily accurate to surveying or engineering standards. The County of Riverside makes no warranty or guarantee as to the content (the source is often third party), accuracy, timeliness, or completeness of any of the data provided, and assumes no legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user.


File: \\agency\limgis\Projects\Redistricting 2011\Maps\Race\_Ethnicity\Racial and Ethnic Majority Distribution Proposal A.mxd

Projection: NAD\_1983\_StatePlane\_California\_VI\_FIPS\_0406\_Feet Lambert\_Conformal\_Conic

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census Redistricting Data [PL 94-171]

Map Created on June 21, 2011


# 2011 RIVERSIDE COUNTY REDISTRICTING PROPOSAL "A"



- Proposal "A" Boundary
- Current Supervisorial District
- Township
- Highway
- City Boundaries

# Percentage of Population Age 18 and Over by Census Tract

## Proposal A



### 2010 Percent of Population Age 18 and Over

- 57% - 65%
- 66% - 75%
- 76% - 85%
- 86% - 95%
- 96% - 100%

2011 Supervisorial Redistricting Proposal A

Cities



**Disclaimer:** Maps and data are to be used for reference purposes only. Map features are approximate, and are not necessarily accurate to surveying or engineering standards. The County of Riverside makes no warranty or guarantee as to the content (the source is often third party), accuracy, timeliness, or completeness of any of the data provided, and assumes no legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user.

File: \\agency\limgis\Projects\Redistricting 2011\Maps\Age 18 and Over by Census Tract Proposal A.mxd

Projection: NAD\_1983\_StatePlane\_California\_VI\_FIPS\_0406\_Feet Lambert\_Conformal\_Conic

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census Redistricting Data [PL 94-171]

Map Created on June 21, 2011

# Attachment 3

# Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Proposal B

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

DISTRICTS	POPULATION										HOUSING		
	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	American Indian and Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Total Population	Age 18 and Over	Total Housing Units	Occupied Units	Vacant Units
<b>1st District</b>	170,553	23,346	190,688	1,668	30,166	1,195	841	9,961	428,418	309,949	137,756	127,612	10,144
Percentage (%)	39.81%	5.45%	44.51%	0.39%	7.04%	0.28%	0.20%	2.33%		72.3%		92.6%	7.4%
<b>2nd District</b>	144,110	25,140	218,538	1,461	33,964	1,261	746	8,805	434,025	306,200	130,027	122,376	7,651
Percentage (%)	33.20%	5.79%	50.35%	0.34%	7.83%	0.29%	0.17%	2.03%		70.5%		94.1%	5.9%
<b>3rd District</b>	235,909	20,596	135,233	3,569	28,581	1,316	605	13,793	439,602	310,725	164,151	144,530	19,621
Percentage (%)	53.66%	4.69%	30.76%	0.81%	6.50%	0.30%	0.14%	3.14%		70.7%		88.0%	12.0%
<b>4th District</b>	181,686	12,025	229,243	1,738	11,023	387	693	5,000	441,795	332,155	223,661	159,666	63,995
Percentage (%)	41.12%	2.72%	51.89%	0.39%	2.50%	0.09%	0.16%	1.13%		75.2%		71.4%	28.6%
<b>5th District</b>	136,810	49,716	221,555	2,495	22,187	1,690	797	10,551	445,801	310,504	145,112	132,076	13,036
Percentage (%)	30.69%	11.15%	49.70%	0.56%	4.98%	0.38%	0.18%	2.37%		69.7%		91.0%	9.0%
<b>County Total</b>	869,068	130,823	995,257	10,931	125,921	5,849	3,682	48,110	2,189,641	1,569,533	800,707	686,260	114,447
Percentage (%)	39.69%	5.97%	45.45%	0.50%	5.75%	0.27%	0.17%	2.20%		71.7%		85.7%	14.3%

**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Proposal B**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

RACE (7-1)	DISTRICT					COUNTY TOTALS
	1	2	3	4	5	
UNIVERSE: Total population	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	
Total	SUPERVISOR					
Population of one race:						
White alone	428,418	434,025	439,602	441,795	445,801	2,189,641
Black or African American alone	406,929	412,970	414,822	427,791	422,465	2,084,977
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	258,488	244,356	302,704	293,032	238,567	1,335,147
Asian alone	25,133	26,934	22,334	13,602	52,540	140,543
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	4,194	4,027	6,198	4,014	5,277	23,710
Some Other Race alone	31,004	34,928	29,496	11,861	23,179	130,468
Two or More Races:	1,436	1,476	1,542	502	1,918	6,874
Population of two races:	86,674	101,249	52,548	104,780	102,984	448,235
White; Black or African American	21,489	21,055	24,780	14,004	23,336	104,664
White; American Indian and Alaska Native	19,918	19,560	22,627	13,219	21,498	96,822
White; Asian	2,581	2,183	3,319	1,552	3,385	13,020
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	2,404	2,158	3,222	1,662	2,393	11,839
White; Some Other Race	3,925	3,660	6,131	1,867	3,298	18,881
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	546	464	703	198	438	2,349
Black or African American; Asian	7,111	7,757	5,815	5,793	7,521	33,997
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	415	319	376	155	695	1,960
Black or African American; Some Other Race	399	427	632	118	721	2,297
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	89	53	83	28	168	421
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	723	653	555	497	1,132	3,560
Black or African American; Some Other Race	92	132	116	65	123	528
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	16	25	20	21	18	100
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	396	383	351	326	447	1,903
American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	314	309	429	156	252	1,460
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	717	855	731	619	737	3,659
Asian; Some Other Race	190	182	144	162	170	848
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	1,456	1,388	1,966	738	1,661	7,209
Population of three races:	346	335	413	170	450	1,714
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	140	135	255	59	200	789
White; Black or African American; Asian	41	23	53	4	53	174
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	152	127	140	66	170	655
White; Black or African American; Some Other Race	128	98	192	65	137	620
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	12	8	30	9	6	65
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	96	104	143	67	108	518
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	234	192	372	110	182	1,090
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	170	202	193	105	163	833
White; Asian; Some Other Race	36	53	39	22	19	169
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	25	15	26	5	28	99
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	6	5	1	1	13	26
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	14	11	10	4	31	70
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	11	17	14	15	27	84
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	16	22	35	5	28	106
Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race	0	4	1	5	3	13
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	5	5	10	1	1	22
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	6	10	8	7	13	44
American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	0	4	15	7	1	27
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	18	18	16	11	28	91
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	98	101	163	43	152	557
Population of four races:	25	37	37	10	46	155
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	10	4	12	0	9	35
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	25	8	14	13	47	107
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	5	7	37	7	10	66
White; Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race	6	13	15	4	3	41

**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Proposal B**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

	DISTRICT						
	1	2	3	4	5		
	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	COUNTY TOTALS	
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	2	1	0	0	7	10	
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	12	16	22	6	15	71	
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	6	4	5	1	3	19	
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	1	0	0	1	4	2	
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	5	6	20	1	1	33	
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1	1	0	0	3	5	
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	1	0	4	5	
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	4	0	0	0	1	
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	4	0	0	4	4	
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Population of five races	14	5	24	4	24	71	
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	9	5	22	4	11	51	
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	2	0	9	11	
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	5	0	0	0	0	5	
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0	
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	4	4	
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Population of six races:	3	1	0	0	1	5	
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	3	1	0	0	1	5	
<b>HISPANIC OR LATINO, AND NOT HISPANIC OR LATINO BY RACE [73]</b>							
Universe: Total population	428,418	434,025	439,602	441,795	445,801	2,189,641	
Total	190,688	218,538	135,233	229,243	221,555	995,257	
Hispanic or Latino	237,730	215,487	304,369	212,552	224,246	1,194,384	
Not Hispanic or Latino:	227,769	206,662	290,576	207,552	213,695	1,146,274	
Population of one race:	170,553	144,110	235,909	181,686	136,810	869,068	
White alone	23,346	25,140	20,596	12,025	49,716	130,823	
Black or African American alone	1,668	1,461	3,569	1,738	2,495	10,931	
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	30,166	33,964	28,581	11,023	22,187	125,921	
Asian alone	1,195	1,261	1,316	387	1,690	5,849	
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	841	746	605	693	797	3,682	
Some Other Race alone	9,961	8,805	13,793	5,000	10,551	48,110	
Two or More Races	9,102	8,044	12,610	4,621	9,494	43,871	
Population of two races:	2,081	1,681	2,694	1,134	2,768	10,358	
White; Black or African American	1,506	1,180	2,176	1,046	1,430	7,338	
White; American Indian and Alaska Native	3,316	3,032	5,166	1,506	2,643	15,663	
White; Asian	432	365	593	156	341	1,887	
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	286	272	272	190	232	1,273	
White; Some Other Race	330	264	300	132	606	1,632	
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	351	397	577	93	638	2,056	
Black or African American; Asian	79	42	78	22	149	370	
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	130	102	85	40	195	552	
Black or African American; Some Other Race	56	86	86	29	71	328	
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	13	12	18	19	69	271	
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	5	9	18	13	22	67	
American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	281	289	380	131	211	1,292	
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	186	270	156	102	170	884	
Asian; Some Other Race	50	22	11	8	11	102	
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	804	705	1,081	355	975	3,920	
Population of three races:	119	253	300	130	352	1,300	
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	34	19	43	4	51	151	
White; Black or African American; Asian	25	16	23	15	29	108	
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander							
White; Black or African American; Some Other Race							

**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Proposal B**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

SUPERVISOR	DISTRICT					COUNTY TOTALS
	1	2	3	4	5	
	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	87	56	112	40	109	404
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	8	8	22	4	4	46
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	7	8	16	11	13	55
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	189	153	289	78	149	858
White; Asian; Some Other Race	28	23	25	9	24	109
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	1	5	1	8	15
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	18	12	14	5	18	67
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	5	4	4	1	11	21
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1	6	1	0	11	19
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	10	11	11	13	23	68
Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race	7	6	8	3	5	29
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	2	0	0	2	4
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1	5	7	1	1	14
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	1	1	0	2	4
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	1	1	0	0	2
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	4	3	2	4	13
Population of four races:	53	53	92	23	75	296
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	17	25	23	7	32	104
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	8	3	11	0	5	27
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	12	3	9	5	13	42
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	4	7	26	4	9	50
White; Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race	2	9	1	3	15	30
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	1	1
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	9	5	18	3	10	45
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	1	1
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	1	0	4	0	1	2
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	2	2
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	1	1
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	1	0	0	0	1
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of five races:	2	3	10	1	6	22
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	2	3	10	1	2	18
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	4	4
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of six races:	0	0	0	0	1	1
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	1	1
RACE FOR THE POPULATION 18 YEARS AND OVER [71]						
Universe: Total population 18 years and over						
Total:	309,949	306,200	310,725	332,155	310,504	1,569,533
Population of one race:	298,566	295,168	299,601	324,117	298,488	1,515,940
White alone	193,973	179,876	224,055	235,223	175,806	1,008,933
Black or African American alone	18,646	19,857	15,084	10,178	35,766	99,531
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	2,975	2,950	4,082	2,803	3,651	16,461
Asian alone	25,596	26,477	21,617	9,398	17,941	101,029
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	1,018	1,054	1,052	365	1,276	4,785
Some Other Race alone	56,358	64,954	33,711	66,130	64,048	285,201
Two or More Races	11,383	11,032	11,124	8,038	12,016	53,593
Population of two races:	10,841	10,391	10,352	7,619	11,203	50,206

**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Proposal B**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

	DISTRICT					
	1	2	3	4	5	
	SUPERVISOR					
	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	COUNTY TOTALS
White; Black or African American	985	830	1,018	570	1,193	4,596
White; American Indian and Alaska Native	1,654	1,456	2,039	1,182	1,593	7,924
White; Asian	2,014	1,746	2,488	984	1,658	8,890
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	276	225	321	126	234	1,182
White; Some Other Race	3,850	4,301	2,844	3,487	4,212	18,694
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	273	231	221	118	460	1,303
Black or African American; Asian	190	173	250	46	308	967
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	38	18	22	17	62	157
Black or African American; Some Other Race	278	264	219	194	440	1,395
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	61	81	66	47	60	315
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	9	15	10	10	7	51
American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	255	270	193	203	289	1,210
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	236	231	273	136	188	1,064
Asian; Some Other Race	405	447	317	386	405	1,960
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	117	103	71	113	94	498
Population of three races:	676	598	707	388	731	3,100
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	210	187	204	115	263	979
White; Black or African American; Asian	47	33	60	14	51	205
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	7	6	9	1	13	36
White; Black or African American; Some Other Race	48	41	31	27	44	191
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	60	44	67	35	64	270
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	4	5	14	7	3	33
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	60	54	56	43	49	262
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	125	88	135	61	80	489
White; Asian; Some Other Race	53	61	52	38	68	272
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	16	21	19	12	9	77
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	11	7	12	4	17	51
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1	3	1	0	8	13
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	8	7	4	1	23	43
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	5	4	7	2	5	23
Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race	4	10	13	5	9	41
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	4	1	4	2	11
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	3	5	5	1	0	14
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	6	6	5	4	8	29
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	1	4	7	1	13
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	8	11	8	7	14	48
Population of four races:	58	41	56	27	69	251
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	12	18	14	7	20	71
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	7	1	4	0	5	17
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	16	5	8	10	23	62
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	2	2	7	5	1	17
White; Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race	4	6	5	0	1	16
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	1	1	0	0	3	5
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	8	6	12	3	8	37
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	4	0	0	1	1	6
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	1	0	0	1	2	4
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	3	0	5	0	1	9
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	3	3
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	0	0	0	1	0	2
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	2	0	0	0	2
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of five races:	8	1	9	4	12	34
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	6	1	9	4	7	27

**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Proposal B**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

	DISTRICT					
	1	2	3	4	5	
	SUPERVISOR					
	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	COUNTY TOTALS
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	4	4
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	2	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	1	1
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of six races:	0	1	0	0	1	2
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	1	0	0	1	2
<b>HISPANIC OR LATINO, AND NOT HISPANIC OR LATINO BY RACE FOR THE POPULATION 18 YEARS AND OVER [73]</b>						
Universe: Total population 18 years and over						
Total:						
Hispanic or Latino	309,949	306,200	310,725	332,155	310,504	1,569,533
Not Hispanic or Latino:	121,546	138,919	82,855	145,657	136,866	625,843
Population of one race:	188,403	167,281	227,870	186,498	173,638	943,690
White alone	182,779	162,501	221,414	183,515	168,039	918,248
Black or African American alone	137,289	115,034	182,301	163,095	112,750	710,469
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	17,683	18,949	14,201	9,407	34,387	94,627
Asian alone	1,252	1,168	2,486	1,330	1,854	8,090
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	25,102	25,924	21,136	8,883	17,367	98,412
Some Other Race alone	872	931	926	315	1,155	4,199
Two or More Races	581	495	364	485	526	2,451
Population of two races:	5,624	4,780	6,456	2,983	5,599	25,442
White; Black or African American	5,160	4,401	5,951	2,756	5,065	23,333
White; American Indian and Alaska Native	816	652	866	436	1,023	3,793
White; Asian	1,148	895	1,486	850	1,052	5,431
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1,809	1,529	2,225	816	1,415	7,794
White; Some Other Race	237	194	287	108	196	1,022
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	189	178	157	123	150	797
Black or African American; Asian	233	199	190	106	417	1,145
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	166	163	237	41	282	889
Black or African American; Some Other Race	34	18	21	14	56	143
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	74	69	49	27	110	329
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	42	60	51	23	38	214
American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	7	9	10	9	2	37
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	3	8	14	12	17	54
Asian; Some Other Race	214	219	249	114	165	961
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	152	194	102	73	132	653
Population of three races:	36	14	7	4	10	71
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native	426	349	464	209	489	1,937
White; Black or African American; Asian	168	153	161	94	227	803
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	44	28	48	7	12	168
White; Black or African American; Some Other Race	6	3	9	1	12	31
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	9	8	13	7	15	52
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	46	25	50	24	53	198
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	3	5	12	2	3	25
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	5	6	9	7	10	37
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	105	79	111	46	69	410
White; Asian; Some Other Race	19	10	15	8	12	64
White; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	5	1	1	7
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	10	6	9	4	12	41
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1	3	0	0	8	12
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	1	5	1	0	10	17
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	5	4	7	2	4	22
Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race	3	3	7	3	5	21
Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	2	0	0	2	4


**Public Law File (PL94-171) Demographic Data Applied to Proposal B**

Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File

	DISTRICT					
	1	2	3	4	5	
	BOB BUSTER	JOHN TAVAGLIONE	JEFF STONE	JOHN BENOIT	MARION ASHLEY	COUNTY TOTALS
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1	5	3	1	0	10
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	1	1	0	0	4
American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	1	0	0	0	2
Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	2	3	2	3	10
Population of four races:	37	30	37	17	41	162
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian	10	16	8	6	14	54
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	7	0	3	0	5	15
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Some Other Race	12	2	6	5	8	33
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1	2	5	2	1	11
White; Black or African American; Asian; Some Other Race	1	6	0	0	0	7
White; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	1	1
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	5	3	11	3	7	29
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	1	2
White; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	1	0	4	0	1	6
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	2	2
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	1	1
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	1	0	0	0	1
American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of five races:	1	1	4	1	3	9
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1	0	4	1	2	8
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	1	1
Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	0	0
Population of six races:	0	0	0	0	0	0
White; Black or African American; American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander; Some Other Race	0	0	0	0	1	1
<b>OCCUPANCY STATUS [3]</b>						
Universe: Housing units						
Total:	137,756	130,027	164,151	223,661	145,112	800,707
Occupied	127,612	122,376	144,530	159,666	132,076	686,260
Vacant	10,144	7,651	19,621	63,995	13,036	114,447

# Racial and Ethnic Majority Distribution by 2010 Census Block

## Proposal B



Racial and Ethnicity	Number of Census Blocks
Hispanic or Latino	9,818
White	12,901
Black or African American	223
Asian	332
American Indian and Alaska Native	74
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	11
Some Other Race	1
Two or More Races	66
No Racial and Ethnic Majority	488
No population	
2011 Supervisorial Redistricting Proposal B	
Cities	



**Disclaimer:** Maps and data are to be used for reference purposes only. Map features are approximate, and are not necessarily accurate to surveying or engineering standards. The County of Riverside makes no warranty or guarantee as to the content (the source is often third party), accuracy, timeliness, or completeness of any of the data provided, and assumes no legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user.


File: \\agency\it\magis\Projects\Redistricting 2011\Maps\Race\_Ethnicity\Racial and Ethnic Majority Distribution Proposal B.mxd

Projection: NAD\_1983\_StatePlane\_California\_VI\_FIPS\_0406\_Feet Lambert\_Conformal\_Conic

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census Redistricting Data [PL 94-171]

Map Created on June 21, 2011

# 2011 RIVERSIDE COUNTY REDISTRICTING PROPOSAL "B"




- Proposal "B" Boundary
- Current Supervisorial District
- Township
- Highway
- City Boundaries

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

SAN DIEGO COUNTY

# Percentage of Population Age 18 and Over by Census Tract

## Proposal B



### 2010 Percent of Population Age 18 and Over

- 57% - 65%
- 66% - 75%
- 76% - 85%
- 86% - 95%
- 96% - 100%

- 2011 Supervisorial Redistricting Proposal B
- Cities



**Disclaimer:** Maps and data are to be used for reference purposes only. Map features are approximate, and are not necessarily accurate to surveying or engineering standards. The County of Riverside makes no warranty or guarantee as to the content (the source is often third party), accuracy, timeliness, or completeness of any of the data provided, and assumes no legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user.

File: \\agency\limgis\Projects\Redistricting 2011\Maps\Age 18 and Over by Census Tract Proposal B.mxd

Projection: NAD\_1983\_StatePlane\_California\_VI\_FIPS\_0406\_Feet Lambert\_Conformal\_Conic

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census Redistricting Data [PL 94-171]

Map Created on June 21, 2011

# Attachment 4

# 2011 Redistricting Working Map


## Proposals A and B Overlapping Areas

Note: Districts 3, 4 and 5 stay constant in both Proposals A and B

Proposal B (by District 2):

District	Revised Population	Variance from Target	Change Needed to Reach Target
1	428,418	2.2%	9,510
2	434,025	0.9%	3,903

District	Revised Population	Variance from Target	Change Needed to Reach Target
3	439,602	-0.4%	-1,674
4	441,795	-0.9%	-3,867
5	445,801	-1.8%	-7,873



Proposals A and B Overlapping Areas  
 District 1 Proposal A  
 District 2 Proposal B  
 Cities



Proposal A (by District 1):

District	Revised Population	Variance from Target	Change Needed to Reach Target
1	432,722	1.2%	5,206
2	429,721	1.9%	8,207

# Racial and Ethnic Majority Distribution by 2010 Census Block


## Proposals A and B Overlapping Areas

Note: Districts 3, 4 and 5 stay constant in both Proposals A and B

Proposal B (by District 2):

District	Revised Population	Variance from Target	Change Needed to Reach Target
1	428,418	2.2%	9,510
2	434,025	0.9%	3,903

District	Revised Population	Variance from Target	Change Needed to Reach Target
3	439,602	-0.4%	-1,674
4	441,795	-0.9%	-3,867
5	445,801	-1.8%	-7,873



Proposal A (by District 1):

District	Revised Population	Variance from Target	Change Needed to Reach Target
1	432,722	1.2%	5,206
2	429,721	1.9%	8,207

# Attachment 5

**Census 2000 Statistical Report of  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICTS**  
As Introduced by County Ordinance No. 813  
August 7, 2001

*Census 2000 Population by Supervisorial District:*

SUPERVISOR	RATIO	POPULATION	OVER/UNDER*	AREA(sq.mi)
1st District - Bob Buster	20.14%	311,253	2,176	459.07
2nd District - John Tavaglione	20.06%	310,017	940	157.23
3rd District - Jim Venable	20.17%	311,762	2,685	1150.27
4th District - Roy Wilson	20.03%	309,553	476	4878.79
5th District - Tom Mullen	19.59%	302,802	-6,275	650.21
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,545,387</b>		<b>7295.57</b>


*Population By Ethnicity:*

DISTRICT	WHITE	BLACK OR AFRICAN AMERICAN	HISPANIC	AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKA NATIVE	ASIAN	PACIFIC ISLANDER	SOME OTHER RACE	TWO OR MORE RACES
1st - Bob Buster	153,203	19,866	111,429	1,743	15,585	904	602	7,921
% Ethnicity	49.22%	6.38%	35.80%	0.56%	5.01%	0.29%	0.19%	2.54%
2nd - John Tavaglione	148,871	17,569	119,922	1,560	13,376	764	555	7,400
% Ethnicity	48.02%	5.67%	38.68%	0.50%	4.31%	0.25%	0.18%	2.39%
3rd - Jim Venable	221,095	7,630	64,062	2,958	8,118	515	357	7,027
% Ethnicity	70.92%	2.45%	20.55%	0.95%	2.60%	0.17%	0.11%	2.25%
4th - Roy Wilson	144,115	7,663	146,323	1,497	5,968	225	399	3,363
% Ethnicity	46.56%	2.48%	47.27%	0.48%	1.93%	0.07%	0.13%	1.09%
5th - Tom Mullen	121,547	39,675	117,839	2,377	12,152	876	512	7,824
% Ethnicity	40.14%	13.10%	38.92%	0.79%	4.01%	0.29%	0.17%	2.58%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>788,831</b>	<b>92,403</b>	<b>559,575</b>	<b>10,135</b>	<b>55,199</b>	<b>3,284</b>	<b>2,425</b>	<b>33,535</b>

\*Over/Under 309,077 people per district.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau April 2001 Census 2000 Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, County of Riverside.

# 2001 Supervisorial District Boundaries



**Disclaimer:** Maps and data are to be used for reference purposes only. Map features are approximate, and are not necessarily accurate to surveying or engineering standards. The County of Riverside makes no warranty or guarantee as to the content (the source is often third party), accuracy, timeliness, or completeness of any of the data provided, and assumes no legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user.

Projection: NAD\_1983\_StatePlane\_California\_VI\_FIPS\_0406\_Feet  
Lambert\_Conformal\_Conic

File: \\agency\limgis\Projects\Redistricting 2011\Maps\Historic\2001 District Boundaries.mxd

Map Created on June 20, 2011

**1990 Statistical Report of  
RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICTS**

As Adopted by County Ordinance No. 714

*Census 1990 Population by Supervisorial District:*


<b>SUPERVISOR</b>	<b>RATIO</b>	<b>POPULATION</b>	<b>HOUSES</b>	<b>AREA(sq.mi)</b>
Walt Abraham - 1st District	19.62%	229,656	83,473	510.6
Melba Dunlap - 2nd District	20.57%	240,783	77,808	155.4
Kay Cenicerros - 3rd District	19.94%	233,316	110,092	1400.2
Corky Larson - 4th District	20.04%	234,579	131,653	5012
Norton Younglove - 5th District	19.83%	232,079	80,821	224.1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1,170,413</b>	<b>483,847</b>	<b>7302.3</b>

*Population By Ethnicity:*

<b>DISTRICT</b>	<b>WHITE</b>	<b>BLACK</b>	<b>HISPANIC</b>	<b>AMERICAN INDIAN</b>	<b>ASIAN/PACIFIC</b>	<b>OTHER</b>
<b>1ST</b>	160,725	10,133	48,575	1,723	8,092	408
Walt Abraham	70%	4%	21%	1%	4%	0%
<b>2ND</b>	140,100	13,318	76,181	1,364	9,357	463
Melba Dunlap	58%	6%	32%	1%	4%	0%
<b>3RD</b>	184,801	4,206	37,507	2,837	3,729	236
Kay Cenicerros	79%	2%	16%	1%	2%	0%
<b>4TH</b>	128,688	6,339	93,917	1,223	3,981	431
Corky Larson	55%	3%	40%	1%	2%	0%
<b>5TH</b>	139,826	25,970	51,334	1,246	13,190	513
Norton Younglove	60%	11%	22%	1%	6%	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>754,140</b>	<b>59,966</b>	<b>307,514</b>	<b>8,393</b>	<b>38,349</b>	<b>2,051</b>

Source: U.S. Census Data, April 1990

# 1991 Supervisorial District Boundaries




**Disclaimer:** Maps and data are to be used for reference purposes only. Map features are approximate, and are not necessarily accurate to surveying or engineering standards. The County of Riverside makes no warranty or guarantee as to the content (the source is often third party), accuracy, timeliness, or completeness of any of the data provided, and assumes no legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user.

Projection: NAD\_1983\_StatePlane\_California\_VI\_FIPS\_0406\_Feet Lambert\_Conformal\_Conic

File: \\agency\limgis\Projects\Redistricting 2011\Maps\Historic\1991 District Boundaries.mxd

Map Created on June 20, 2011

# 1981 Supervisorial District Boundaries



**Disclaimer:** Maps and data are to be used for reference purposes only. Map features are approximate, and are not necessarily accurate to surveying or engineering standards. The County of Riverside makes no warranty or guarantee as to the content (the source is often third party), accuracy, timeliness, or completeness of any of the data provided, and assumes no legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user.

Projection: NAD\_1983\_StatePlane\_California\_VI\_FIPS\_0406\_Feet  
Lambert\_Conformal\_Conic

File: \\agency\limgis\Projects\Redistricting 2011\Maps\Historic\1981  
District Boundaries.mxd

Map Created on June 20, 2011

# Attachment 6

**Laning, Damian J.**

---

**From:** cekrause@msn.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 07, 2011 9:29 PM  
**To:** Redistricting Submittal  
**Subject:** A Plan has been submitted

Name: C E Krause

Address: 51884 Avenida Obregon, La Quinta, CA 92253

Phone:

File: \\webnetprod\redistrictplans\201106072128577522.docx

*(see attached)*

06.06.11

### Redistricting Steering Committee

I am an Artist and retired Teacher living in La Quinta for the last 10 years or so. I attended both Hearings on April 27 in Desert Hot Springs and on May 12 in Palm Springs, and would like to extend Comments I made publicly to the Committee on the 12<sup>th</sup>.

I agree with those who favor keeping the Desert united in one district – District 4:

Bordered on the West by the Santa Rosa/San Jacinto Mts, thus  
Including Thermal, Coachella, Palm Desert, Palm Springs, Cathedral City  
Bordered on the East by Blythe, and on the NE by Desert Hot Springs, and  
Including 29 Palms, Joshua Tree, Yucca Valley, Morongo Valley to the NE  
Bordered on the South by the US-Mexican Border (including Calexico, etc)  
Excluding Cabazon, Banning, Beaumont, Hemet, Idyllwild, Moreno Valley

The Committee heard many good reasons for drawing these boundaries to encompass the contiguous areas of the Coachella and Imperial Valleys and the entire Salton Sea, *inter alia*, and I would like to add another dimension for your consideration:

As an Artist, I am grateful for the vibrant artistic communities and the vitality and variety of artistic cultures in the Upper and Lower Deserts. Artists from around the world have long been visually attracted by our expansive desert vistas, brilliant cactus blooms and subtle colors of native flora, rugged snow-capped mountains and oases lush with palms. Native American Artists show us the depth of the Desert Soul through their Tribal Arts and Crafts; and Early California Natives bring to the Desert Art Scene a spicy flair from South of the Border.

La Quinta and Palm Springs are well known for their world class Art Festivals, including VillageFest, Plein Air Art Show, La Quinta Arts Festival, Art Under the Umbrellas, Southwestern Art Festival, *inter alia*; and in Palm Desert there's the COD Fair every weekend. The Palm Springs Museum of Art hosts major traveling shows; and other art museums, historical museums, cultural museums and galleries of classic and contemporary artists abound throughout the Desert. I'm personally very interested in the burgeoning Art Scenes in Indio and Joshua Tree, which have begun to draw widespread attention. The Desert is as exciting a place for Artists as it is for Art lovers.

Much, much more can be said from an Artistic Perspective. But for the sake of brevity, I'll forego further discourse and trust instead the imagination and Art appreciation skills of the Committee. I thank you kindly for your consideration.

Sincerely and PAX, Carolyn


C E Krause  
51884 Avenida Obregon, La Quinta 92253  
760.564.4408 cekrause@msn.com

CERTIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA     )  
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE    ) ss.  
CITY OF MORENO VALLEY    )

I, JANE HALSTEAD, City Clerk of the City of Moreno Valley, California, do hereby certify and attest the foregoing to be a true and correct copy of the original Resolution No. 2011-35 on file in my office.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of Moreno Valley, this 26th day of May, 2011.

  
Jane Halstead, CMC, City Clerk  
City of Moreno Valley

(SEAL)

CITY OF MORENO VALLEY  
RESOLUTION NO. 2011-35

CITY OF PERRIS  
RESOLUTION NO. 4392

A JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF MORENO VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, AND THE  
CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PERRIS, CALIFORNIA  
REGARDING THE REDISTRICTING OF THE RIVERSIDE  
COUNTY SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICTS

WHEREAS, the Supervisors of Riverside County are elected from five districts within the County; and

WHEREAS, § 21500 of the California Elections Code provides that following each decennial federal census each county must adjust the boundaries of any or all supervisorial districts of the county so that the districts shall be as nearly equal in population as may be and shall comply with the applicable provisions of Section 1973 of Title 42 of the United States Code, as amended; and

WHEREAS, in an effort to ensure a fair and orderly process for redrawing the district boundaries and to promote public confidence in the process the County Board of Supervisors has created the Redistricting Steering Committee 2011 to determine how to redraw district lines based on the 2010 United States Census; and

WHEREAS, the Cities of Moreno Valley and Perris are geographically connected and share a common city limit; and

WHEREAS, the City of Perris contracts with the City of Moreno Valley for Animal Sheltering Services and the City of Moreno Valley participates in animal control activities in the City of Perris; and

WHEREAS, the Cities of Moreno Valley and Perris share common interest in March Air Reserve both geographically and politically and have a desire to remain in the same district to assure continued cohesiveness within this geographic area;

WHEREAS, the Cities of Moreno Valley and Perris share a community of interest in Moreno Valley College; and

WHEREAS, the Val Verde Unified School District oversees schools in both the Cities of Moreno Valley and Perris; and

WHEREAS, the Cities of Moreno Valley and Perris have jointly shared the funding of fire department personnel at the College Park Fire Station from 2003-2006; and


WHEREAS, the 2010 Census population has determined the population for Riverside County is such that there will be a need for redistricting among the five supervisorial districts; and

WHEREAS, the Cities of Moreno Valley and Perris recognize the importance of remaining in the same supervisorial district due to the common community of interests of both cities as well as the importance of that district to the cohesiveness and integrity of both communities;


NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCILS OF THE CITIES OF MORENO VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, AND PERRIS, CALIFORNIA DO HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

1. That Moreno Valley and Perris intensely support any effort to preserve both cities in their current supervisorial districts in Riverside County for the purposes of the 2011 redistricting.
2. That Moreno Valley and Perris strongly support their cities being completely incorporated into one supervisorial district and not split between two supervisorial districts for the 2011 redistricting.
3. That Moreno Valley and Perris formally oppose removing either City, whether partially or completely, from Riverside County Board of Supervisors District 5 in the 2011 redistricting.
4. That Moreno Valley and Perris authorizes their respective Councils and their city staffs to communicate their support for both cities to remain in the same supervisorial district in the 2011 redistricting.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 26 day of April, 2011.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor of the City of Moreno Valley


ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk of the City of Moreno Valley


APPROVED AS TO FORM:


  
\_\_\_\_\_  
City Attorney of the City of Moreno Valley



  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor of the City of Perris  
Daryl R. Busch

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk of the City of Perris  
Judy L. Haughney, C.M.C.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
City Attorney of the City of Perris  
Eric L. Dunn

**RESOLUTION JURAT**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA        )  
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE       ) ss.  
CITY OF MORENO VALLEY     )


I, Jane Halstead, City Clerk of the City of Moreno Valley, California, do hereby certify that Resolution No. 2011-35 was duly and regularly adopted by the City Council of the City of Moreno Valley at a regular meeting thereof held on the 26<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2011 by the following vote:

AYES:        Council Members Hastings, Batey, Mayor Pro Tem Molina and Mayor Stewart

NOES:        None

ABSENT:     Council Member Co

ABSTAIN:    None

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY CLERK

(SEAL)

## Katchadoorian, Donna

---

**From:** Grande, Tina  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 25, 2011 5:44 PM  
**To:** DeArmond, Michelle; Field, John; Grande, Tina; Hastings, Robin; Lauritzen, Verne; Smith, Raymond; Stahovich, Dave; Ward, Larry; Orr, Jay  
**Cc:** Mullen II, Tom; Johnson, George; Katchadoorian, Donna; Huff, David  
**Subject:** FW: 2011 Riverside County Redistricting

Please see the public comment below forwarded by TLMA from the redistricting website.

### *Tina Grande*

Principal Management Analyst  
Executive Office, County of Riverside  
4080 Lemon Street, 4th Floor  
Riverside, California 92501  
(951) 955-1110  
(951) 955-1105 fax  
[tgrande@rceo.org](mailto:tgrande@rceo.org)

-----Original Message-----

From: [ud2@ccuw.org](mailto:ud2@ccuw.org) [<mailto:ud2@ccuw.org>]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 25, 2011 12:05 PM  
To: Redistricting Questions  
Subject: Public Comment - Menifee Action Group

The Menifee Action Group, as part of the public comment process, would like to express its support for the redistricting scenario that keeps Menifee together as one community. We feel strongly that we must consciously work to bring Menifee together as one City with tightly focused and broadly shared goals for building a unified and successful City. Certainly, being in one Supervisorial District will further our goal of bringing our citizens and businesses together as one City.

We also want to clearly express our delight that we will be in the 5th District. We owe 4th District Supervisor Stone a deep felt thank you for his firm support of our Cityhood process and his constant concern and assistance with our development as a City. We also understand how new census data forces everyone to make choices that may not be made if the data were different. With that understanding and our thanks we are convinced that Supervisor Stone knows he is handing us off to very capable hands. Supervisor Ashley has been a positive force in Menifee for many years and has demonstrated an affinity for our community and our citizens. It is Menifee Action Group's intention to support Supervisor Ashley and his efforts to assist our City Council and our citizens as we deal with the tough issues facing any new City. And we strongly support moving the City of Menifee into Supervisor Ashley's District.

Bob Duistermars, President  
Menifee Action Group

---

Please note: The County Administrative Center will be closed every Friday per order of the Board of Supervisors. Business hours for the County Executive Office are Monday through Thursday, 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.



# City of Banning

## Office of the City Council

April 14, 2011

Redistricting Committee  
County of Riverside  
Co. Administration Center  
4080 Lemon Street  
Riverside, CA 92501

SUBJECT: Redistricting

To Whom It May Concern:

The Banning City Council at their meeting of April 12, 2011 adopted Resolution No. 2011-28, Pertaining to Any Consideration for the Pass and Redistricting.

Enclosed is a certified copy for your use.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Marie A. Calderon'.

Marie A. Calderon  
City Clerk

Enclosure

RESOLUTION NO. 2011-28

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BANNING  
PERTAINING TO ANY CONSIDERATION FOR THE PASS AND REDISTRICTING.

WHEREAS, the Pass Area consisting of the Cities of Banning, Beaumont and Calimesa and the County areas of Cabazon and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians are geographically connected and in close proximity to one another; and

WHEREAS, the Cities of Banning, Beaumont and Calimesa and the County areas of Cabazon and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians are looking at the possibility of regional sharing of services; and

WHEREAS, the Cities of Banning, Beaumont and Calimesa currently share Animal Control Services; and

WHEREAS, the Cities of Banning, Beaumont and Calimesa currently share Fire Services; and

WHEREAS, the Cities of Banning, Beaumont and Calimesa and the County areas of Cabazon and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians share borders and meet regularly; and

WHEREAS, the Cities of Banning, Beaumont and Calimesa and the County areas of Cabazon and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians share common interests in the Pass both politically and geographically and have a desire to remain in the same district to assure continued cohesiveness within these geographic areas; and

WHEREAS, the 2010 Census population has determined the population for Riverside County is such that there will be a need for redistricting among the five supervisorial districts; and


WHEREAS, the Cities of Banning, Beaumont and Calimesa and the County areas of Cabazon and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians have a desire to remain within their current Riverside County Supervisorial District; and

WHEREAS, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors will have to take on additional residents or less in order to redistrict.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF BANNING, AS FOLLOWS:

The City Council of the City of Banning adopts Resolution No. 2011-28, "A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Banning Pertaining to any Consideration for the Pass and Redistricting."

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 12<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2011.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Barbara Hanna, Mayor  
City of Banning

ATTEST



Marie A. Calderon, City Clerk  
City of Banning

APPROVED AS TO FORM  
AND LEGAL CONTENT:



David J. Aleshire, City Attorney  
Aleshire & Wynder, LLP

CERTIFICATION:

I, Marie A. Calderon, City Clerk of the City of Banning, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2011-28 was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Banning, California, at a regular meeting held on the 12<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2011, by the following to wit:

AYES: Councilmembers Botts, Franklin, Machisic, Robinson, Mayor Hanna

NOES: None


ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None



Marie A. Calderon, City Clerk  
City of Banning, California

CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE AND CORRECT  
COPY OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT ON  
FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK.

BY   
TITLE *City Clerk*  
DATE *4-14-11*



**City of Banning**  
**Office of the City Council**

*RODIEH*  
*GIVE TO*  
*REDISTRICTING*  
*COMMITTEE*  
*MAN*

April 13, 2011

Marion Ashley, Supervisor – 5<sup>th</sup> District  
4080 Lemon Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Riverside, CA 92502

SUBJECT: Redistricting

Dear Supervisor Ashley:

The Banning City Council at their meeting of April 12, 2011 adopted Resolution No. 2011-28, Pertaining to Any Consideration for the Pass and Redistricting.

Enclosed is a copy for your use.

Sincerely,

Marie A. Calderon  
City Clerk

Enclosure

**RESOLUTION NO. 2011-28**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BANNING  
PERTAINING TO ANY CONSIDERATION FOR THE PASS AND REDISTRICTING.**

**WHEREAS**, the Pass Area consisting of the Cities of Banning, Beaumont and Calimesa and the County areas of Cabazon and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians are geographically connected and in close proximity to one another; and

**WHEREAS**, the Cities of Banning, Beaumont and Calimesa and the County areas of Cabazon and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians are looking at the possibility of regional sharing of services; and

**WHEREAS**, the Cities of Banning, Beaumont and Calimesa currently share Animal Control Services; and

**WHEREAS**, the Cities of Banning, Beaumont and Calimesa currently share Fire Services; and

**WHEREAS**, the Cities of Banning, Beaumont and Calimesa and the County areas of Cabazon and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians share borders and meet regularly; and

**WHEREAS**, the Cities of Banning, Beaumont and Calimesa and the County areas of Cabazon and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians share common interests in the Pass both politically and geographically and have a desire to remain in the same district to assure continued cohesiveness within these geographic areas; and

**WHEREAS**, the 2010 Census population has determined the population for Riverside County is such that there will be a need for redistricting among the five supervisorial districts; and


**WHEREAS**, the Cities of Banning, Beaumont and Calimesa and the County areas of Cabazon and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians have a desire to remain within their current Riverside County Supervisorial District; and

**WHEREAS**, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors will have to take on additional residents or less in order to redistrict.

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BANNING, AS FOLLOWS:**

The City Council of the City of Banning adopts Resolution No. 2011-28, "A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Banning Pertaining to any Consideration for the Pass and Redistricting."

**PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED** this 12<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2011.

  
Barbara Hanna, Mayor  
City of Banning

**ATTEST**



Marie A. Calderon, City Clerk  
City of Banning

**APPROVED AS TO FORM  
AND LEGAL CONTENT:**



David J. Aleshire, City Attorney  
Aleshire & Wynder, LLP

**CERTIFICATION:**

I, Marie A. Calderon, City Clerk of the City of Banning, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2011-28 was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Banning, California, at a regular meeting held on the 12<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2011, by the following to wit:

AYES: Councilmembers Botts, Franklin, Machisic, Robinson, Mayor Hanna

NOES: None


ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None



Marie A. Calderon, City Clerk  
City of Banning, California

CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE AND CORRECT  
COPY OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT ON  
FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK.

BY   
TITLE *City Clerk*  
DATE *4-13-11*

Hemet San Jacinto Action Group reply 4-12-11.txt

From: Mullen II, Tom  
Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2011 12:00 PM  
To: 'egosch@yahoo.com'

Greetings,

We have received your two redistricting plan submissions dated April 12, 2011 and recognize the second (in pptx file format) is an update to the first (in ppt format).

Thank you for your continued interest and participation in the supervisorial redistricting process.

Best regards,

Tom Mullen II  
TLMA Deputy Director  
Riverside County  
4080 Lemon Street, 14th Floor  
PO Box 1605  
Riverside, CA 92502-1605

-----Original Message-----

From: egosch@yahoo.com [mailto:egosch@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2011 11:52 AM  
To: Redistricting Questions  
Subject: Revised Submission of Redistricting Plan by Hemet-San Jacinto Action Group

Attached is the latest revision with more data on the spreadsheet.

Thank you  
Eric Gosch

-----Original Message-----

From: egosch@yahoo.com [mailto:egosch@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2011 11:37 AM  
To: Redistricting Questions  
Subject: Submission of Redistricting Plan by Hemet-San Jacinto Action Group

Dear Steering Committee:

The Hemet-San Jacinto Action Group has submitted via the Committee's website a redistricting plan developed by Doug Johnson of the Rose Institute that meets the objectives of balancing districts that also maintain logical "communities of interest".

As you know the city councils of both Hemet and San Jacinto have passed resolutions requesting our valley remain in one supervisorial district.

Thank you for your consideration of our submitted plan.


Eric Gosch  
President  
Hemet-San Jacinto Action Group

# Riverside County Supervisory Redistricting: A 2011 forecast & scenario

Hemet-San Jacinto Action Group

*Updated April 12, 2011*

*Prepared by National Demographics*




# Project Goals

1. Balance district populations
2. Keep Hemet/San Jacinto Valley united

## Notes:

- ▶ This update uses 2010 Census block population counts
- ▶ Actual 2010 Census numbers vary from earlier projections


# Current Boundaries and Population Deviations



# Population by Proposed District


District / Supervisor	2010 Census Population	Needed Changes	Population Deviation	Proposed Population	Proposed Population Deviation	Proposed Percent Deviation
1 / Bob Buster	421,403	<b>+16,525</b>	-3.8%	438,910	+982	+0.22%
2 / John Tavaglione	408,776	<b>+29,152</b>	-6.7%	444,573	+6,645	+1.52%
3 / Jeff Stone	518,590	<b>-80,662</b>	18.4%	441,450	+3,522	+0.8%
4 / John Benoit	396,478	<b>+41,450</b>	-9.5%	434,490	-3,438	-0.79%
5 / Marion Ashley	444,394	<b>-6,466</b>	1.5%	430,218	-7,710	-1.76%
Total	2,189,641		27.9%	2,189,641		

# 2011 Proposed Map



Maps Prepared by National Demographics Corporation

# Key Changes from Current Districts



Maps Prepared by National Demographics Corporation

**RIVERSIDE COUNTY  
SUPERVISORIAL REDISTRICTING:  
A 2011 FORECAST & SCENARIO**

Hemet-San Jacinto Action Group

*(updated April 12, 2011)*


# PROJECT GOALS

1. Balance district populations
2. Keep Hemet/San Jacinto Valley united

## Notes:

- This update uses 2010 Census block population counts
- Actual 2010 Census numbers vary from earlier projections


# 2011 PROPOSED MAP



## POPULATION BY PROPOSED DISTRICT

District / Supervisor	Population	Population Deviation	Percent Deviation
1 / Bob Buster	438,910	+982	+0.22%
2 / John Tavaglione	444,573	+6,645	+1.52%
3 / Jeff Stone	441,450	+3,522	+0.8%
4 / John Benoit	434,490	-3,438	-0.79%
5 / Marion Ashley	430,218	-7,710	-1.76%
Total	2,189,641		

# KEY CHANGES FROM CURRENT DISTRICTS



**Grande, Tina**

---

**From:** Mullen II, Tom  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 05, 2011 7:24 AM  
**To:** 'greg@gregrodriguez.com'

Good morning,

Currently we do not have an email service for the Riverside County redistricting effort. We will retain your contact information and add you to the list should one be created.

Thank you for your interest.

Best regards,

Tom Mullen II  
TLMA Deputy Director  
Riverside County  
4080 Lemon Street, 14th Floor  
PO Box 1605  
Riverside, CA 92502-1605

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [greg@gregrodriguez.com](mailto:greg@gregrodriguez.com) [<mailto:greg@gregrodriguez.com>]  
**Date:** Monday, April 04, 2011 4:02 PM  
**Re:** Redistricting Questions  
**Subject:** Email notifications

Hello,

I am wondering if you have an email update list you are doing to keep citizens informed of the redistricting process?

If so, I would like to be placed on that list.

Thank you,

Greg

**Grande, Tina**

---

**From:** Mullen II, Tom  
**Date:** Monday, April 04, 2011 2:56 PM  
**To:** 'plewin2003@earthlink.net'

Greetings,

The time and place for the April public community meetings have yet to be determined. Please check the redistricting website for updates as they become available.

<http://www.rivcoredistricting.org>

Thank you,

Tom Mullen II  
TLMA Deputy Director  
Riverside County  
4080 Lemon Street, 14th Floor  
PO Box 1605  
Riverside, CA 92502-1605

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [plewin2003@earthlink.net](mailto:plewin2003@earthlink.net) [<mailto:plewin2003@earthlink.net>]  
**Date:** Thursday, March 31, 2011 9:24 AM  
**Re:** Redistricting Questions  
**Subject:** 4/20/11 meeting & other dates

Hello,

What time is the April 20th meeting, and where will it be located?

Thank you

-P

Laning, Damian J.

---

**From:** Rugby4NeilMat@netscape.net  
**ent:** Sunday, March 27, 2011 3:07 PM  
**o:** Redistricting Questions  
**Subject:** City of Menifee

Good Afternoon,

I am a resident of Menifee that currently falls under Supervisorial District 3. We reside in the Tierra Shores PUD in eastern Menifee and would prefer to be represented by District 5. We feel that the unique issues that confront a newly incorporated City such as Menifee would be best served by being added to Supervisor Ashley's district to attain parity.

Regards,  
Neil Mathews  
Tierra Shores

Laning, Damian J.

---

**From:** kenohyatt@verizon.net  
**ant:** Wednesday, March 16, 2011 10:52 AM  
**io:** Redistricting Questions  
**Subject:** Pass area Banning, Beaumont and Calimesa

This message is a request to keep the Pass area in one district. Currently we are in the 5th District and over the years have been in the 3rd and 5th. This is important for regional planning issues and I-10/60 Highway/Freeway improvements. Thank you, Jim Hyatt, Calimesa

Laning, Damian J.

---

From: Rugby4NeilMat@netscape.net  
ent: Wednesday, March 16, 2011 8:53 AM  
fo: Redistricting Questions  
Subject: Menifee

Will the committee be holding public meetings to get constituent input regarding redistricting or may commencts be submitted in writing?

Regards,  
Neil Mathews  
District III resident

# Attachment 7

---

# REDISTRICTING STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

---

## MINUTES OF MEETING

October 26, 2010

11:00 a.m.

County Executive Office  
4080 Lemon Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Conference Room C

### Members Present:

Larry Ward  
Jay Orr  
Michelle DeArmond  
John Field  
Robin Hastings  
Verne Lauritzen  
Dave Stahovich

Chair, Assessor-Clerk Recorder  
Co-Chair, Executive Office  
4<sup>th</sup> District  
2<sup>nd</sup> District  
5<sup>th</sup> District  
3<sup>rd</sup> District  
1<sup>st</sup> District

### Staff and Guests Present:

Dean Deines  
Barbara Dunmore  
Tina Grande  
David Huff  
George Johnson  
Damian Laning  
JiHong McDermott  
Tom Mullen II  
Donna Katchadoorian

Executive Office  
Registrar of Voters  
Executive Office  
County Counsel  
TLMA  
TLMA  
TLMA  
TLMA  
Executive Office

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

The Redistricting Committee Meeting was called to order at 11:09 a.m.

**2. ROLL CALL:**

The sign in sheet will be used as the official roll call for the committee.

**3. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR:**

Larry Ward requested clarification on the names of the current members.

Dean Deines stated that the committee is comprised of the Executive Office, Jay Orr, Larry Ward, Vern Lauritzen, Michelle DeArmond, Robin Hastings, John Field, and Dave Stahovich.

**MOTION: Jay Orr moved to appoint Larry Ward to act as Chairman of the Redistricting Committee.**

**Seconded by: John Field**

**Motion approved unanimously**

**MOTION: John Field moved to appoint Jay Orr to act as Co-Chair.**

**Seconded by: Vern Lauritzen**

**Motion approved unanimously**

**4. MONTHLY MEETING SCHEDULE:**

Dean Deines explained that this is a Brown Act Committee. The committee will be required to identify a day and time to meet each month on a regular basis.

David Huff pointed out that this committee is within the perimeters of the Brown Act. The regular meeting schedule should include a meeting once a month. The agenda notice that is sent out must be posted 72 hours prior to each meeting. When the committee is required to hold special meetings, the agenda notice would need to be posted 24 hours in advance.

**MOTION: John Field moved to approve scheduling the Redistricting Steering Committee Meetings on the second Tuesday of each month at 2 p.m.**

**Seconded by: Vern Lauritzen**

**Motion approved unanimously**

**5. BACKGROUND ON REDISTRICTING:**

David Huff provided a brief overview of the role of the committee. The immediate task is spelled out within the Elections Code § 21500. "Each decennial federal census, and using that census as a basis, the board shall adjust the boundaries of any or all of the supervisorial districts of the county so that the districts shall be as nearly equal in population as may be and shall comply with the applicable provisions of Section 1973 of

Title 42 of the United States Code. In establishing the boundaries of the districts the board may give consideration to the following factors: a) topography, b) geography, c) cohesiveness, contiguity, integrity, and compactness of territory; and, d) community of interests of the districts.”

David Huff reported that the boundaries must be adjusted by the board by November 1 of the year following the year in which each decennial federal census is taken. The census was taken in April 2010. The board's task must be completed by November 1, 2011. If this does not occur, a supervisorial redistricting commission then takes over and would act before the December 31, 2011. The commission is comprised of the District Attorney, the County Assessor as well as the County Superintendent of Schools. There are issues such as equal protection of “one person one vote.” Also, there is the Federal Voting Rights Act, which is in place primarily to protect the rights of minorities. One area, in particular, is the degree of variance which is allowed between one district to the other. The U.S. Supreme Court, with regard to non-congressional redistricting, provides that there cannot be a variance between the districts population that is 10 percent or greater. In the past, the threshold has been to adhere to a lower number of five percent.

David Huff continued stating that the redistricting is ultimately accomplished through an ordinance that is adopted by the board. The ordinance is broken down by five districts and for each of those districts, a legal description would show the exact boundary contours of that district. At least two board sessions are required in order for the ordinance to be adopted. There is a requirement in the Elections Code that states before the public hearing in which the ordinance would be approved there should be at least one other public hearing. At a minimum, there should be two public hearings before the board can officially approve the redistricting plan. Under the Voter's Rights Law, there is a provision for the citizens to propose their plans to the board for consideration.

George Johnson mentioned that TLMA would provide the technical assistance using their GIS demographics. George introduced JiHong McDermott and Damian Lanning. Their role is to provide the technical work under Tom Mullen's leadership and guidance.

Tom Mullen provided a Power Point presentation which highlighted the role of TLMA:

- Provide the technical work, draw the maps, prepare the website, produce a timeline, and receive comments from the public.
- Release maps through the authorized process.

Tom Mullen discussed the two primary vendors being considered:

- Caliper is currently integrated with the Registrar of Voter's software. The configuration of the Caliper software would integrate with the current GIS system. Each license is approximately \$3,500. Caliper is the largest redistricting software that is available in the nation.

- 
- Citygate/ESRI software would not be ready until December and would cost approximately \$32,500.
  - TLMA also compared full feature online tools which are complex, expensive, and would require additional GIS training in order to use the software.

Dave Stahovich questioned whether this committee had budgetary authority to purchase the software? If this committee has budgetary authority, is this committee required to report budget items on a Form 700?

David Huff reported that this committee is a creation of the Executive Office. It is not a board created authorized committee. This committee does not have its own budget authority.

Dean Deines stated that \$200,000 has been budgeted for software and staff time.

Tom Mullen confirmed that there is money in the budget. When the budget was prepared last year money was set aside. The cost to purchase the software is approximately \$14,000 plus tax.

Tom Mullen continued summarizing the Power Point presentation:

- TLMA would build a website using the current Census website as a template. The content would include using existing boundary maps and would utilize proposed and existing draft maps, which the committee would be able to share with the public.
- Build out a web form which would allow the public to submit written and/or draft maps. This would allow the public to communicate to the committee their suggestions on how the districts should be drawn.
- Information and FAQ's would be posted on the web.
- Follow the Census block boundaries submitted by the U.S. Census.

Tina Grande proposed that the Redistricting Technical Committee consider doing triage work. Tina mentioned that she received a public comment from the Hemet Action Group. The Rose Institute prepared the study, but the Executive Office has not had an opportunity to validate their numbers. The submittal received from the Action Group would go into the public input file and when the criteria has been set it would be reviewed as appropriate. Tina offered to share the cover page which lists their members.

Dean Deines pointed out that the criteria would need to be set for the public to follow. The committee would be able to see their viable comments. TLMA would take the new numbers and incorporate them into existing boundaries as a starting point.

---

Tom Mullen suggested the committee consider the following items for future discussion:

- Who would release the authorization of the maps?
- Set up a process of keeping track of the maps.
- TLMA's recommendation is to have the committee Chair potentially authorize the release of all maps.
- Decide how the committee would interact and take comments from the public.
- Possibility of a GIS staff person to meet with the public on an appointment basis.

Current items to be completed are as follows:

- From now until the end of the year provide the committee with a demo of the software.
- Build out the website for the committee's consideration prior to publication.
- Census data would not be available until late March. Once it has been received, produce a map to show the actual data.
- Update pre-selected scenarios based upon the projections.
- Once the data has been approved by the committee, the information would be published at the direction of the committee.
- Input racial and ethnic group data into the system in late March 2011.

Tom Mullen announced that he would like to utilize the Riverside County 2010 projections that were approved by the Board of Supervisors in August. The projections were developed based on the Department of Finance estimates. Tom presented the committee with a map of the existing boundaries in 2000 and in 2010. The committee should think about possible changes to the boundaries in order to balance the districts appropriately.

Jay Orr suggested that TLMA provide the committee with a demo of the new software.

Vern Lauritzen stated, for the record, does anyone own any stock in Caliper?

No committee member stated that they own stock in Caliper.

Chairman Larry Ward suggested the committee agree to meet on November 9 for a 30 minute software demonstration. The committee agreed unanimously to meet on November 9 at 2 p.m.

**6. PRESENTATION AND APPROVAL OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE'S REDISTRICTING WORK PLAN:**

Dean Deines reviewed and informed the committee the order of the Redistricting work plan. This item went to the Board of Supervisors in September as an information item. The work plan maps out the steps this committee must complete. The Executive Office is responsible for organizing the Redistricting Committee. In September, the Board of Supervisors appointed Supervisor Ashley as the liaison between this committee and the board.

Dean Deines stated that Supervisor Ashley requested weekly updates on the agenda. There will be a budget update at the beginning of each board meeting, which would include a redistricting update to the board members. Bill Luna would provide the brief update. This would keep the public and the board updated on the progress of this committee. Status reports would be presented to the board with the cooperation of this committee. The committee should consider how to educate the public and the possibility of workshops, and/or provide a website to assist in interacting with the public. Supervisor Ashley also requested that this task be completed by August. In July/August, the maps should be presented to the Board of Supervisors for their final approval. A public hearing and a second public hearing would be necessary in order to approve the maps.

Tina Grande recommended that the committee approve work plan. The work plan will change as the committee continues through the process. Those changes would be provided to the committee at each meeting.

**MOTION: John Field moved to approve the work plan as submitted.**

**Seconded by: Robin Hastings**

**Motion approved unanimously**

**7. OTHER BUSINESS:**

No other business was discussed.

**8. NEXT MEETING:**

The next regularly scheduled Restricting Committee Meeting is set for Tuesday, November 9 at 2 p.m., in the County Executive Office, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Conference Room C.

**9. PUBLIC COMMENT:**

No members of the public presented comments.

With no further comments, Chairman Larry Ward adjourned the meeting at 12:14 p.m.

---

# REDISTRICTING STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

---

## MINUTES OF MEETING

November 9, 2010  
2 p.m.

County Executive Office  
4080 Lemon Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Conference Room C

### Members Present:

Larry Ward  
Michelle DeArmond  
John Field  
Robin Hastings  
Verne Lauritzen

Chair, Assessor-Clerk Recorder  
4<sup>th</sup> District  
2<sup>nd</sup> District  
5<sup>th</sup> District  
3<sup>rd</sup> District

### Members Absent:

Jay Orr  
Dave Stahovich

Co-Chair, Executive Office  
1<sup>st</sup> District

### Staff and Guests Present:

Olivia Barnes  
Dean Deines  
David Huff  
George Johnson  
John Kavorinos  
Damian Laning  
JiHong McDermott  
Donna Katchadoorian

3<sup>rd</sup> District  
Executive Office  
County Counsel  
TLMA  
TLMA  
TLMA  
TLMA  
Executive Office

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

The Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. Self-introductions were given by those present.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 26, 2010:**

**MOTION: Verne Lauritzen moved to approve the October 26, 2010 minutes as stated.**

**Seconded by: Robin Hastings**

**Motion approved unanimously**

**3. REDISTRICTING SOFTWARE PRESENTATION (TLMA):**

Chairman Larry Ward introduced Damian Laning and JiHong McDermott, from TLMA.

Damian Laning presented the committee with an overview of the redistricting software. The software is an ESRI product which uses the existing functionality of the GIS software currently in place. The software will enable the use of the current aerial imagery and the existing supervisorial boundaries. For demonstration purposes, Damian used the 2000 census data for his presentation. The software has a wide variety of reporting and allows up to 10 variables.

JiHong McDermott provided the committee with a copy of the Summary Tables Outline Report, which noted 291 variables. Reports can be generated based on the attributes provided by the census data.

Verne Lauritzen questioned whether ethnicity would be factored into the report?

David Huff pointed out that ethnicity does play a role. David mentioned a prominent case in Los Angeles County. Because of the unique characteristics, Los Angeles County has a sizable ethnic community which was formed into a supervisorial district. This case may not be applicable to other counties where the population is more evenly mixed, but it is a factor to consider. David mentioned the voting rights act, which protects minorities.

Damian Laning announced that Citygate/ESRI was the other vendor under consideration, but pointed out that the software would not be released until the end of next month. Citygate was twice the price of Caliper. Damian noted that approximately three or four licenses would be required. The licensing fee for Caliper is \$3,500. The licensing fee for Citygate is \$6,800.

Dean Deines informed the committee that a recommendation is necessary from the committee to direct TLMA and the Executive Office to proceed with the purchase of the software.

**MOTION: Robin Hastings moved to recommend the purchase of the Caliper Software.**

**Seconded by John Field**

**Motion approved unanimously**

**4. OTHER BUSINESS:**

Dean Deines suggested that the next agenda should include a recommendation to develop criteria for the boundary changes. Provide a report to the BOS, which would include the committee's recommendation to proceed with the purchase of the Caliper Software.

**5. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA:**

No members of the public presented comments.

**6. ADJOURNMENT:**

The next regularly scheduled Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 14, 2010 at 2 p.m.

With no further comments, Chairman Larry Ward adjourned the meeting at 2:25 p.m.

---

# REDISTRICTING STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

---

## MINUTES OF MEETING

December 14, 2010  
2 p.m.

County Executive Office  
4080 Lemon Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Conference Room C

### Members Present:

Larry Ward  
Michelle DeArmond  
John Field  
Verne Lauritzen  
Dave Stahovich

Chair, Assessor-Clerk Recorder  
4<sup>th</sup> District  
2<sup>nd</sup> District  
3<sup>rd</sup> District  
1<sup>st</sup> District

### Members Absent:

Jay Orr  
Robin Hastings

Co-Chair, Executive Office  
5<sup>th</sup> District

### Staff and Guests Present:

Dean Deines  
David Huff  
George Johnson  
Damian Laning  
JiHong McDermott  
Tom Mullen II  
Donna Katchadoorian

Executive Office  
County Counsel  
TLMA  
TLMA  
TLMA  
TLMA  
Executive Office

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

The Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m. Donna Katchadoorian conducted the roll call.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 9, 2010:**

**MOTION:** John Field moved to approve the November 9, 2010 minutes as stated.

**Seconded by:** Verne Lauritzen

**Motion approved unanimously**

**3. DEVELOP CRITERIA FOR BOUNDARY CHANGES:**

Chairman Larry Ward announced that David Huff would provide the committee with an overview of the Criteria to Guide the Redistricting.

David Huff outlined the legal criteria that the law requires under state and federal law. The Elections Code § 21500 states: "Following each federal decennial census, and using that census as a basis, the Board shall adjust the boundaries of any or all of the supervisorial districts of the county so that the districts shall be nearly equal in population."

David Huff explained another component the "One Person One Vote Rule." This is based on equal protection principles so that citizens regardless of which district they reside in their vote is equal in weight to any other citizen within that jurisdiction. The rule states that there cannot be a maximum deviation on population equality that is 10 percent or more. The federal Voting Rights Act interprets the specific breakdown between Section 2 and Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. The Act was amended in 1982 to provide for a "results" test where a challenging plaintiff does not need to show a discriminatory motive or purpose in order to establish a violation.

David Huff pointed out when establishing the boundaries of the districts, the board may give consideration to topography, geography, cohesiveness, contiguity, integrity, compactness of territory, and communities of interest of each district. David discussed the Shaw v. Reno case. This case was a classic example of what not to do when establishing a district. Another example was the California Supreme Court case in Legislature v. Reinecke. It is important to try and keep cities intact when drawing the lines. Race may not be a predominant factor in defining a community of interest.

In addition, David Huff discussed the DeBaca v. County of San Diego which involved challenges with the Latinos, African-Americans and Asian-American citizens who banded together and brought a class action suit alleging that San Diego County's plan violated the protection rights as well as the Voting Rights Act. The plaintiffs failed to show that the three minority groups constituted one politically cohesive minority group and were unable to show that racially polarized voting existed on the part of the white

majority. In the Garza v. County of Los Angeles the plaintiffs were able to show that the plan was in violation of their Constitutional equal protection rights as well as the Voting Rights Act.

Verne Lauritzen suggested that the legal grounds criteria be kept as simple and basic to the legal process as possible.

Michelle DeArmond asked for clarification on the Elections Code, Board-appointed study committee.

David Huff explained that Elections Code § 21505 states that the Board of Supervisors may appoint an advisory committee composed of county residents and that the committee is required to present a report to the Board with its findings and recommendations within six months after the final census figures have been released. Typically the figures are released at the end of March or first of April, but no later than August 1. After the August 1 date, the committee has no ability to act.

David Huff further stated that the non-board appointed staff advisory committee is not created by the Board of Supervisors, but by the action of the Executive Office. The difference is the non-board appointed staff advisory committee has more latitude than the August 1 date. Both committees are subject to compliance with the Brown Act.

Tom Mullen summarized the mechanics of the census data breakdown. The data that is received from the U.S. Census Bureau is at the block level. This block is the smallest geographic unit used by the United States Census Bureau for tabulation of population data. If a block must be split, it is recommended that the split be shown in the latest draft version of any plans being considered. There are 288 racial and ethnic groups and three occupancy groups for a total of 291 total data components which will be coming from the U.S. Census in late March. The 2000 census will be used as a point of reference to identify the ethnic groups which have been tracked through the process.

Tom Mullen informed the committee that once the census data comes in a report will be generated which shows the 2000 data v. the 2010 data. The report will include actual discrepancies and the growth which has occurred. Another key element is identifying the total population over 18 years of age in each district.

Chairman Larry Ward announced receiving a recent request presented from the public. This information needs to be included and reviewed. The website should outline how the public can bring comments to the committee for consideration. There should also be a timeframe included on the website.

Tom Mullen confirmed that the software has been loaded into the system. Tom agreed to provide the committee with a presentation and an update on the software the first meeting in February.

---

**MOTION: Verne Lauritzen moved to accept the criteria as the legal guide to redistricting.**

**Seconded by: Michelle DeArmond**

**Motion carried unanimously**

John Field suggested the committee not adopt the criteria until February.

Dave Stahovich agreed with John Field that the committee should not adopt the criteria at this meeting.

Verne Lauritzen withdrew his motion.

Dean Deines explained that the actual work will begin in March. Dean suggested that Tom provide a presentation of the new software in January and in February the committee can finalize the criteria.

**4. UPDATE ON THE REDISTRICTING WEBSITE:**

Tom Mullen presented the committee with a draft copy of the County Redistricting Committee website home page. The intent is to create a simple navigation, highlight the redistricting maps with the new information, share basic data, and to create a vehicle for the public to provide comment.

Michelle DeArmond questioned whether the links would include the election codes? Michelle suggested using a different color scheme for the web page.

Chairman Larry Ward suggested that the colors on the web page be changed and sent out as a draft to the committee for their comments and recommendations.

David Huff suggested including in the website a mailing address, an e-mail contact, and a phone number. The information received from the public would need to be logged into the system. All information would be kept on file as public record.

**5. OTHER BUSINESS:**

No other business was discussed at this time.

**6. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA:**

No members of the public presented comments.

**7. ADJOURNMENT:**

The next regularly scheduled Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 11, 2011 at 2 p.m. In January if there are no items for discussion, the January meeting may be canceled until Tuesday, February 8, 2011 at 2 p.m.

With no further comments, Chairman Larry Ward adjourned the meeting at 3:25 p.m.

---

---

# REDISTRICTING STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

---

---

## MINUTES OF MEETING

February 8, 2011  
2 p.m.

County Executive Office  
4080 Lemon Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Conference Room C

### Members Present:

Larry Ward  
Jay Orr  
Michelle DeArmond  
John Field  
Robin Hastings  
Verne Lauritzen  
Dave Stahovich

Chair, Assessor-Clerk Recorder  
Co-Chair, Executive Office  
4<sup>th</sup> District  
2<sup>nd</sup> District  
5<sup>th</sup> District  
3<sup>rd</sup> District  
1<sup>st</sup> District

### Staff and Guests Present:

Olivia Barnes  
Amalia Deaztlan  
Tizoc Deaztlan  
Dean Deines  
David Huff  
George Johnson  
Damian Laning  
JiHong McDermott  
Tom Mullen II  
Daryl Terrell  
Curtis Wright  
Donna Katchadoorian

3<sup>rd</sup> District  
Deaztlan Consulting  
Deaztlan Consulting  
Executive Office  
County Counsel  
TLMA  
TLMA  
TLMA  
TLMA  
Resident  
Best, Best & Krieger  
Executive Office

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

The Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. The roll call was conducted by Donna Katchadorian.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 14, 2010:**

**MOTION: Verne Lauritzen moved to approve the December 14, 2010 minutes as stated.**

**Seconded by: John Field**

**Motion approved unanimously**

**3. REDISTRICTING WEBSITE PRESENTATION:**

Tom Mullen presented an overview of the new redistricting website. The website has not yet been published. The website will include the following information: The past/current minutes and agendas, important calendar dates, FAQ's, links concerning the Election's Code Voting Rights Act, and a link to the U.S. Census Bureau. In addition, the website will also include supervisorial district maps for each district, public notices, and a section for the public to distribute information to the committee for consideration. The web address is available at <http://www.rivcoredistricting.org/> and will be officially launched around the first couple of weeks in March. Tom reported that the census will be releasing numbers by the end of March.

Tom Mullen mentioned working on developing the analysis tools to introduce the data once the file is received from Caliper. Once the data has been released, Tom will provide a report which will show the actual U.S. Census data changes from 2000 to 2010.

Robin Hastings pointed out that the website is a great communication tool for receiving and sharing information. Robin suggested that David Huff provide a legal timeline when items are due.

Michelle DeArmond questioned how Tom planned on getting the word out to the media and the public?

Tom Mullen indicated that he would be working with Ray Smith, the Public Information Officer, to coordinate the announcements for the press release.

Chairman Larry Ward explained that there are specific timelines that need to be addressed and included on the website. The following original timeline provided by the Executive Office should be included on the website:

April – July 2011

- Develop proposed Redistricting Plans, and accept plans from the public.
- Once plans are developed and accepted, the Redistricting Steering Committee will begin to evaluate all plans.
- The Executive Office to provide status reports to the Board of Supervisors.

---

July – August 2011

- Continue to provide status reports to the Board of Supervisors.
- The preferred plans would be brought forward and would be selected.
- The Board of Supervisors would hold a public hearing to consider any proposal to adjust the boundaries of a district.
- At the second public hearing, the Board of Supervisors would be asked to:
  - Approve a preferred redistricting plan.
  - Direct Survey to create the appropriate legal description.
  - Adopt the appropriate ordinance.
- A final public hearing will need to take place. It cannot occur any later than the last week in October in order to meet the deadline of November 1, 2011.

David Huff noted that the Board of Supervisors will need to take final action on the plan prior to November 1. At least two board hearings are required and a minimum of two public hearings are necessary before the board can officially adopt the ordinance that contains the legal description of the boundaries for each district.

Dave Stahovich suggested that the committee check with the Clerk of the Board and see what potential public hearing dates are available and start with the November date and work backwards. After the data starts coming in then the hearing dates can be set.

Dean Deines reminded the committee that Supervisor Ashley is the liaison of this committee and Dean will brief him on the website and ask for his input as to available hearing dates.

#### **4. OTHER BUSINESS:**

Chairman Larry Ward mentioned at the last meeting Verne Lauritzen moved to accept the criteria as the legal guide to redistricting. The motion was later withdrawn. John Field suggested that the committee adopt the criteria in February. Items for consideration are: population, equalization, boundaries, and the One Person One Vote Rule. Also taking into consideration are topography, cohesiveness, integrity, and the compactness of territory.

David Huff noted that these are guidelines that the Board of Supervisors will be required to consider before adopting the plan. David Huff clarified that the committee needs to be aware of the criteria, but the committee is not required to adopt the legal criteria. No action was taken.

#### **5. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA:**

Amalia Deaztlan mentioned working for the Census Bureau in the Counties of Riverside and San Bernardino. Amalia informed the committee that public meetings should be properly noticed by the media. She indicated that Riverside and San Bernardino Counties have a large Latino population and questioned whether the new website would be available in Spanish?

---

Tom Mullen mentioned that a Spanish website had not been discussed.

Daryl Tarrell, a local resident, suggested that the public hearings be held in each supervisorial district. Daryl recommended the committee consider holding town hall outreach meetings.

Chairman Larry Ward noted that this committee has an advisory role. Recommendations are presented to the board and the board decides to either accept or reject those decisions. Both suggestions would be presented to the supervisor.

**6. ADJOURNMENT:**

The Committee decided to cancel the regularly scheduled Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting on Tuesday, March 8, 2011 and schedule a "Special" Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting to be held on Tuesday, March 15, 2011 at 2 p.m.

---

# REDISTRICTING STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

---

## MINUTES OF MEETING

### “Special Meeting”

March 15, 2011  
2 p.m.

County Executive Office  
4080 Lemon Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Conference Room C

#### Members Present:

Larry Ward  
Jay Orr  
Michelle DeArmond  
John Field  
Robin Hastings  
Verne Lauritzen  
Dave Stahovich

Chair, Assessor-Clerk Recorder  
Co-Chair, Executive Office  
4<sup>th</sup> District  
2<sup>nd</sup> District  
5<sup>th</sup> District  
3<sup>rd</sup> District  
1<sup>st</sup> District

#### Staff and Guests Present:

Olivia Barnes  
Dean Deines  
Dave Downey  
Duane Gang  
Tina Grande  
David Huff  
George Johnson  
Darcy Kuenzi  
Damian Laning  
JiHong McDermott  
Tom Mullen II  
Ray Smith  
Kari Verjil  
Donna Katchadoorian

3<sup>rd</sup> District  
Executive Office  
The Californian  
The Press-Enterprise  
Executive Office  
County Counsel  
TLMA  
5<sup>th</sup> District  
TLMA  
TLMA  
TLMA  
Executive Office  
Registrar of Voters  
Executive Office

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

The Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m. The roll call was conducted by Donna Katchadoorian.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 8, 2011:**

**MOTION:** Robin Hastings moved to approve the February 8, 2011 minutes as stated.

**Seconded by:** John Field

**Motion approved unanimously**

**3. WEBSITE STATUS AND LATEST INFORMATION:**

Tom Mullen announced that the website has been officially launched and is available at <http://www.rivcoredistricting.org/>. The website will continue to include past/current minutes and agendas, important calendar dates and FAQ's. At the last meeting, discussion focused on including a Spanish language translation software. TLMA is currently evaluating a couple of appropriate software packages to comply with the request for Spanish and other languages. The website is now ready to accept written comments, as well as separate components including GIS based files, TIF files, pdf files and additional formats. Tom agreed to work with Ray Smith, the Public Information Officer, to produce an appropriate press release after the meeting.

Dave Stahovich, from the 1<sup>st</sup> District and Ray Smith joined the meeting.

Tom Mullen provided a brief overview of the website. The U.S. Census data was released last week. The component for Riverside County was extracted last Tuesday. There has been a phenomenal growth within the county. In the year 2000, Riverside County had 1.5 million residents. In 2010 the population was 2,189,641 with a growth of 644,254 people. This is significant, because Riverside County grew more than L.A. and San Bernardino counties combined during the past 10 year cycle. The Hispanic/Latino population has grown numerically. The Asian population has grown at a greater rate. Additionally, the over 18 year old population increased substantially adding 493,000 to that age group. There has also been a significant growth in the high density areas, particularly in District 2 along the border of Eastvale, Jurupa Valley and the southern part of the county. In the year 2000 the target number per district was 309,077 people. Due to the growth throughout the decade the 2010 target number is 437,928 people. This is the amount of gain or loss that needs to occur in each district in order to achieve the recommended target number. This will enable a 2.5 percent target for each district so the variance is not more than 5 percent between districts.

**4. RELEASE OF THE 2010 CENSUS DATA:**

Tom Mullen indicated that the data files from Caliper are being loaded into the system. A training session is scheduled for Thursday and it is anticipated that the team will be fully functional and ready to go by Wednesday, March 23.

**5. REDISTRICTING TIMELINE:**

Chairman Larry Ward spoke with David Huff, from County Counsel, and requested that David provide a proposed timeline for the committee to consider adopting.

David Huff provided the committee with significant guidelines to follow for the timeline. On June 14, 2011 a Form 11 will be presented to the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors will set the initial public hearings to begin on June 28, 2011. There are a minimum of at least two public hearings on June 28, July 12 and July 26, 2011 that would allow for public testimony, submission of written comments and discussion by the Board of Supervisors with regards to the plan(s) under consideration. The last hearing date is the time the motion would be made to close the hearing and would include the appropriate redistricting plan and direct staff to prepare an implementing ordinance for introduction in August or September. The ordinance would be introduced on August 16 or September 13, depending on when the legal description information becomes available from the Transportation Survey staff. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the implementing ordinance no later than September 30, 2011 in order to meet the October 31, 2011 deadline. The ordinance becomes legally effective 30 days after adoption for adjustment of supervisorial district boundaries as indicated by California Elections Code Section 21501.

**MOTION: John Field moved to approve the 2011 Proposed Dates for the BOS Redistricting Timeline.**

**Seconded by: Dave Stahovich**

**Motion approved unanimously**

Dean Deines noted that the timeline will be incorporated into the website along with the maps provided by TLMA.

Dave Stahovich suggested that disclaimers be included on the website.

David Huff agreed to work with Tom Mullen to include the appropriate language for the disclaimers and appropriate format.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS – TIMING AND LOCATION OF COMMUNITY FORUMS:**

Chairman Larry Ward mentioned meeting with Jay Orr, David Huff and Supervisor Ashley, the liaison with the board, a couple of weeks ago. At the meeting, discussion focused on holding community meetings. Supervisor Ashley is in favor of community forums where this committee would meet with the public, provide an overview of the process, include a presentation of the redistricting maps, and David Huff would be available to discuss the legal issues that must be followed. The committee discussed holding the public forums at three separate locations.

Jay Orr suggested holding the town hall forums in Riverside, Menifee and Desert Hot Springs. The committee agreed to hold the forums on April 20, 21 and 27. Dean Deines will organize the times and locations for each meeting.

**MOTION:** Robin Hastings moved to adopt holding the town hall forums in Riverside, Menifee and Desert Hot Springs on April 20, 21 and 27.

**Seconded by Verne Lauritzen**

**Motion approved unanimously**

**7. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA:**

No members of the public presented comments.

Tom Mullen pointed out that the team will be prepared to begin drawing lines for the committee next week. Tom asked the committee for direction on how they wanted to interact with the software team.

Chairman Larry Ward suggested that the committee hold a "Special" Meeting on Tuesday, March 29, 2011. At this meeting, the data will be reviewed and the committee will see how the data is incorporated into the system.

**8. ADJOURNMENT:**

The Committee agreed to hold a "Special" Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting to be held on Tuesday, March 29 at 11:30 a.m. With no further discussion, the Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting was adjourned at 3:04 p.m.

---

# REDISTRICTING STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

---

## MINUTES OF MEETING

### “Special Meeting”

March 29, 2011  
11:30 a.m.

County Executive Office  
4080 Lemon Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Conference Room C

#### Members Present:

Larry Ward  
Jay Orr  
Michelle DeArmond  
John Field  
Robin Hastings  
Dave Stahovich  
Verne Lauritzen

Chair, Assessor-Clerk Recorder  
Co-Chair, Executive Office  
4<sup>th</sup> District  
2<sup>nd</sup> District  
5<sup>th</sup> District  
1<sup>st</sup> District  
3<sup>rd</sup> District

#### Staff and Guests Present:

Dean Deines	Executive Office
Tina Grande	Executive Office
Ray Smith	Executive Office
David Huff	County Counsel
George Johnson	TLMA
Damian Laning	TLMA
JiHong McDermott	TLMA
Tom Mullen II	TLMA
Jeremy Clark	TLMA
Emily Lee	TLMA
Dave Downey	The Californian
Duane Gang	The Press-Enterprise
Joe Daugherty	Menifee Action Group
Eric Gosch	Hemet-San Jacinto Action Group
Gilberto Esquivel	LULAC
Yolanda Esquivel	LULAC
Jana Roush	Executive Office

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

The Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting was called to order at 11:35 a.m. The roll call was conducted by Chairman Larry Ward.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR March 15, 2011:**

**MOTION:** Robin Hastings moved to approve the March 15, 2011 minutes as stated.

**Seconded by:** John Field

**Motion approved unanimously**

**3. PUBLIC FORUM UPDATE:**

Dean Deines reiterated that public forums are planned for April 20, 21, and 27. At the last meeting there was discussion regarding sites for the forums in Riverside, Menifee, and Desert Hot Springs. There is ample space in the Board Chambers for the forum here in Riverside. Dean contacted the Perris Union High School District about using the theatre at Heritage high school. There are some fees involved as one of their staff must be present during the forum. The theatre holds approximately 400 people. Perris high school requires proof of insurance. Dean will coordinate that with Risk Management. Dean has also been trying to reach someone at the Desert Hot Springs high school, and will continue to work on that. Larry Ward asked that a press release go out, once the sites have been secured.

Larry Ward informed everyone that the State's redistricting community meeting would be held that same evening from 6:00-9:00 p.m., at the Orange Terrace Community Center. Larry planned to attend to see the format they were using. The idea is to educate and solicit input.

Verne Lauritzen, from the 3<sup>rd</sup> District, joined the meeting.

**4. REVIEW PUBLIC SUBMITTALS:**

Dean Deines had one public request from the Hemet-San Jacinto Action Group, with a request to keep Hemet and San Jacinto in one Supervisorial District. It was submitted prior to the final census numbers coming out, so the numbers used in the request were projected numbers. Staff's recommendation was to return the submittal and invite a revamped submittal in the future.

Jay Orr suggested we set up a process where when we receive a submittal, staff writes a cover summary, and then it gets distributed to all voting members for their review.

Jay thought we would need a public comment cut-off date because if a document should come in at the last minute, we would not have the ability to distribute it to the members.

David Huff suggested the cut-off date be set in early May, not long after the community meetings.

Dave Stahovich indicated that we should encourage comments early. The earlier we get them the more time we have to consider them, so they can be given the full value they are due.

Robin Hastings suggested that we set a May 28 deadline, which is 30 days prior to the staff report going to the Board.

Larry Ward would like to see the information distributed to the committee as quickly as possible. Larry asked that Dean Deines vet it initially. If a staff report is needed, send it back; otherwise just forward it on to the committee.

Dean discussed the three emails that came in on the website. One asked, "Are we going to have public meetings?" Another requested that the pass area be in one District. The other asked that Menifee be in the 5<sup>th</sup> District. Dave Stahovich proposed that those types of comments/requests be included in the meeting packet. Dean agreed to have them included in the meeting packet for presentation at the meetings.

**5. ACTIVITY: MAPPING OF DISTRICT ALTERNATIVES:**

Tom Mullen directed the committee's attention to maps of the County that show the census districts, the cities, and census defined places (CDPs). One map was displayed onscreen, and a second hard copy was placed on the tabletop. Different colored grease pens were distributed to each Chief of Staff to assist them in marking up the tabletop map.

The map onscreen was interactive. The Current Districts were shown in bold lines. Larry Ward recommended that the mapping alternatives begin with the Fourth District, as there is only one way to move in that District. Tom Mullen suggested that only census Tracts be used to rework the lines, as census Blocks were too small on this map.

As the work progressed, it became apparent that there was too much to be done in one meeting. Tom Mullen invited the Chiefs of Staff to meet with TLMA staff to work on alternatives. TLMA can then provide a variety of maps to share at the next meeting.

Tom Mullen agreed to schedule sessions with each Chief of Staff, individually, to do their research on the mapping alternatives, prior to the next meeting on April 12.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS:**

No other business was discussed at this time.

**7. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA:**

Gilberto Esquivel, LULAC, asked whether he was in the right meeting. He thought he was attending a meeting for working on boundaries for assemblymen and senatorial districts. Larry Ward informed Mr. Esquivel that the State's Redistricting meeting would be held at the Orange Terrace Community Center that same evening.

**8. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MOTION: Jay Orr moved to adjourn the meeting.**

**Seconded by: Verne Lauritzen**

**Motion carried unanimously**

The next regular meeting of the Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting is set for Tuesday, April 12, 2011, at 2:00 p.m. With no further discussion, the Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting was adjourned at 12:18 p.m.

---

---

# REDISTRICTING STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

---

---

## MINUTES OF MEETING

April 12, 2011  
2 p.m.

County Executive Office  
4080 Lemon Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Conference Room C

**Members Present:**

Larry Ward  
Jay Orr  
Michelle DeArmond  
John Field  
Verne Lauritzen  
Dave Stahovich

Chair, Assessor-Clerk Recorder  
Co-Chair, Executive Office  
4<sup>th</sup> District  
2<sup>nd</sup> District  
3<sup>rd</sup> District  
1<sup>st</sup> District

**Members Absent:**

Robin Hastings

5<sup>th</sup> District

**Staff and Guests Present:**

Jeremy Clark  
Dean Deines  
Dave Downey  
Erica Felci  
Eric Gosch  
Tina Grande  
David Huff  
George Johnson  
John Kopp  
Damian Laning  
Emily Lee  
JiHong McDermott  
Tom Mullen II  
Tori Richardson  
Ray Smith  
Donna Katchadoorian

TLMA  
Executive Office  
The Californian  
The Desert Sun  
Hemet-San Jacinto Action Group  
Executive Office  
County Counsel  
TLMA  
Eastvale Resident  
TLMA  
TLMA  
TLMA  
TLMA  
Registrar of Voters  
Executive Office  
Executive Office

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

The Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. The roll call was conducted by Donna Katchadorian.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE "SPECIAL MEETING" ON MARCH 29, 2011:**

**MOTION: John Field moved to approve the March 29, 2011 minutes as stated.**

**Seconded by: Verne Lauritzen**

**Motion approved unanimously**

**3. PUBLIC FORUM UPDATE:**

Chairman Larry Ward informed the committee that the meetings for the evening forums have been scheduled.

Tina Grande announced the following dates and locations of the three meetings:

- Wednesday, April 20, the CAC Board Chambers.
- Thursday, April 21, the French Valley Airport in the terminal.
- Wednesday, April 27, the Desert Hot Springs Senior Center.

Tina Grande noted that all the meetings will be held from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. Setup time for staff will commence at 6 p.m. EDA has been assisting the Executive Office in setting up the meetings and there will be no cost to the county. EDA will be providing refreshments. The dates, times and locations for each meeting will be posted on the county redistricting website. The meetings will be recorded, but not transcribed.

Chairman Larry Ward requested that the Redistricting Steering Committee members try to attend all the meetings.

Chairman Larry Ward noted that he and Tom Mullen recently attended the State Redistricting Hearing in Orange Terrace. Legal issues and GIS programs were discussed. An attorney from Norco mentioned holding several forums with one in the desert and one in Riverside.

**4. REVIEW PUBLIC SUBMITTALS:**

Chairman Larry Ward mentioned receiving the e-mail notification for each submittal. One additional submittal came in late today. A copy of the submittal was distributed to the committee members.

Chairman Larry Ward suggested that since the information came in late that this item should be discussed at the next meeting. As submittals come in, Tina Grande will distribute copies to each committee member.

Jay Orr pointed out that it is not necessary to have comments and discussion on each submittal. The information will be distributed to the committee and if there are comments then the item can be discussed.

Chairman Larry Ward mentioned that it was determined at the March 29 meeting that each district would set up a meeting with Tom Mullen and his staff to discuss changes within their district.

Tom Mullen mentioned his meeting with each representative from the five districts. Each had an opportunity to build out independently an ideal district. Tom displayed the map on the table. Each independent effort has been included on an overlay to make one single map. The map depicts five independent builds of each district. These areas have been moved by one or more districts. The areas between Districts 4 and 5 shows a commonality of movement of the incorporated areas from the 5<sup>th</sup> District into the 4<sup>th</sup> District. Those suggestions have now been incorporated into the map and the border has been moved, which the map now shows the ramifications of that move. The same was done for the other districts. The interaction between the districts are now represented on the map. The areas on the map with hash marks show where they were moved by one district. Menifee was moved by both the 3<sup>rd</sup> District and the 5<sup>th</sup> District. Romoland, areas of Highgrove, and parts of the City of Riverside were left independent through individual efforts. These were left so the committee could determine how to move forward. The green areas on the map were moved twice. They were moved by one or more districts. They are sharing a border.

Tom Mullen provided the committee with a Working Assumptions chart, which shows each district as they look today, encompassing the green areas. The hashed areas are removed from District 1 through District 5. They are represented as unassigned. This shows the commonalities, and the areas that still need to be addressed.

Dave Stahovich pointed out that the chart was misleading. In District 1, the revised population is 410,936. The variance from the target is 6.2 percent and the change needed to reach the target is 437,928. Originally, the 1<sup>st</sup> District was 3.6 percent off. To reach the zero target, this chart shows District 1 is farther off than it was originally. Dave mentioned his meeting with Tom. The district remained the same, with the exception of picking up the Meadowbrook, the Good Hope area from the 5<sup>th</sup> District, and a small portion of the University City area, an unincorporated area between Moreno Valley/Riverside, along the 215 freeway.

Tom explained that there was consensus on the bordering districts shown in green. The non-consensus is shown in the hashed areas. The chart represents what is in the district. Tom indicated that the map shows the similarities and the differences between the individual efforts. The map is represented to allow you to review each district and provide input and discussion.

**5. ACTIVITY: MAPPING OF DISTRICT ALTERNATIVES:**

Michelle DeArmond mentioned District 4. The map shows the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Districts have consensus. The only logical way for the 4<sup>th</sup> District to add the 41,000 people would be to go to the west and pick up some incorporated areas, while leaving the 5<sup>th</sup> District with an unincorporated county piece in the Coachella Valley. This would keep Desert Hot Springs whole. Desert Hot Springs will flip from the 5<sup>th</sup> District to the 4<sup>th</sup> District. Michelle emphasized the importance of keeping communities of interest together.

Verne Lauritzen provided the committee with a couple of scenarios to consider. The first was to transfer Hemet/San Jacinto Valley into the 5<sup>th</sup> District, but the numbers were more than what was needed to lose and there would have been the need to make several adjustments to get that to work. The second is the area which includes Menifee/Canyon Lake and if that area stayed with the city boundaries of Menifee it was almost an exact wash. The object is to not separate the two.

Dave Stahovich explained that the 1<sup>st</sup> District needs to gain between 10,000 to 20,000 people. The 5<sup>th</sup> District needs to give up Highgrove, the Good Hope Meadowbrook area and Canyon Lake. The biggest concern is making major changes to the district if it is not necessary. Dave suggested the committee see a large map, which encompasses the whole county and then a district by district map that shows the current boundaries.

Chairman Larry Ward suggested that David Huff meet with Dave Stahovich to address any concerns. The chairman thanked Tom for meeting with each district and mentioned that the meetings have been very productive.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS:**

Tina Grande discussed the timeline. June 14 is the date that was previously set to present the plan or plans to the Board of Supervisors. The maps and submittals, along with the report, need to be completed by June 1 in order to ensure that the item is included on the board's agenda. Tina suggested the committee consider setting a deadline for presenting public submittals to the committee.

David Huff pointed out that the form 11 that is going to the June 14 board session is the form 11 that will be setting the matter for public hearing on June 28. The plans will need to be ready by June 14.

The Committee unanimously agreed that May 26, 2011 would be the deadline to receive submittals.

**7. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA:**

John Kopp, an Eastvale resident, mentioned residing in supervisorial District 2. John mentioned the March 15 and March 29 minutes and the various deadline dates. He indicated that the website should include these important dates. The public comments should also be included. The website and the calendar should be more user friendly in

terms of expressing when these dates are coming up. John suggested holding a weekend meeting for people that work.

**8. ADJOURNMENT:**

**MOTION:** Chairman Larry Ward moved to adjourn the meeting.

**Seconded by: Jay Orr seconded.**

**Motion carried unanimously**

A "Special Meeting" of the Redistricting Committee is set for April 18, 2011 at 2:30 p.m. in the Riverside County Administrative Center, 4080 Lemon Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Conference Room C. With no further discussion, the Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting was adjourned at 2:57 p.m.

---

# REDISTRICTING STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

---

## MINUTES OF MEETING

### “Special Meeting”

April 18, 2011  
2:30 p.m.

County Executive Office  
4080 Lemon Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Conference Room C

#### Members Present:

Jay Orr	Co-Chair, Executive Office
Michelle DeArmond	4 <sup>th</sup> District
John Field	2 <sup>nd</sup> District
Robin Hastings	5 <sup>th</sup> District
Verne Lauritzen	3 <sup>rd</sup> District

#### Members Absent:

Larry Ward	Chair, Assessor-Clerk Recorder
Dave Stahovich	1 <sup>st</sup> District

#### Staff and Guests Present:

Jeremy Clark	TLMA
Dave Downey	The Californian
Duane Gang	The Press-Enterprise
Tina Grande	Executive Office
Grace Guerriero	Resident
Nathan Guerriero	Resident
David Huff	County Counsel
Damian Laning	TLMA
Emily Lee	TLMA
Rebecca Ludwig	Resident
JiHong McDermott	TLMA
Tom Mullen II	TLMA
Ray Smith	Executive Office
Donna Katchadoorian	Executive Office

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

Due to the absence of Chairman, Larry Ward, Co-Chairman, Jay Orr, called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. The roll call was conducted by Donna Katchadoorian.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR APRIL 12, 2011:**

**MOTION: John Field moved to approve the April 12, 2011 minutes as stated.**

**Seconded by: Michelle DeArmond**

**Motion approved unanimously**

**3. PUBLIC FORUM PRESENTATION REVIEW:**

Jay Orr noted for the committee the dates and locations of the upcoming public forums:

- Wednesday, April 20, the County Administrative Center, Board Chambers.
- Thursday, April 21, the Kay Cenicerros Senior Center, Magnolia Room.
- Wednesday, April 27, the Desert Hot Springs, Carl May Building.

Each of the meetings referenced above will be held at 7:00 p.m. The meeting dates, times, and locations have been posted on the website.

Tina Grande provided an overview of the agenda, which will be presented at each of the public forums:

- Call to order, Chairman Larry Ward.
- Introduction of the committee, Chairman Larry Ward.
- Legal overview of the county supervisorial redistricting, David Huff, from County Counsel.
- Tom Mullen, from TLMA, will share the population numbers and will highlight the map presentation. Tom will post five individual district maps as well as a large consolidated county map. Tom will explain the maps and answer any questions concerning the maps and the redistricting process. Tom will provide a PowerPoint Presentation, which will include the six maps.
- Questions from the public. Tina suggested taking a 15 minute recess so the public will have an opportunity to review the maps.
- Other business.
- Public comment for items not listed on the agenda.
- Adjournment.

The committee unanimously agreed to receive and file this item.

**4. OTHER BUSINESS:**

Verne Lauritzen thanked staff for relocating the meeting from the French Valley Airport to the Kay Cenicerros Senior Center. Verne wanted to ensure that the public is informed that the maps displayed at the meetings are proposals, and will not be presented as the final maps.

Tina Grande noted that the map title has been changed to "Draft Scenario 1." This should reinforce that the map is a scenario, and that it has not been officially approved.

Michelle DeArmond questioned whether the five unassigned areas, mentioned at the last meeting, had been resolved?

Tom Mullen replied, no.

Jay Orr pointed out that there has been no closure on those issues.

Nathan Guerriero, a citizen, questioned whether this meeting was to discuss redistricting for the districts or was this meeting to discuss the general plan?

Verne Lauritzen explained that this meeting was to discuss county supervisorial district boundaries.

Jay Orr suggested that Mr. Guerriero meet with Tom Mullen after the meeting. Tom would be available to answer his questions.

**5. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA:**

No members of the public presented comments.

**6. ADJOURNMENT:**

A "Special" Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting is set for Wednesday, April 20 at 7:00 p.m. The meeting will take place at the County Administrative Center, 4080 Lemon Street, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, in the Board Chambers. With no further discussion, the Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

**MOTION: Robin Hastings moved to adjourn the meeting.**

**Seconded by: Verne Lauritzen**

**Motion carried unanimously**

---

---

# REDISTRICTING STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

---

---

## MINUTES OF MEETING

May 10, 2011  
2 p.m.

County Executive Office  
4080 Lemon Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Conference Room C

### Members Present:

Larry Ward  
Jay Orr  
Michelle DeArmond  
John Field  
Robin Hastings  
Verne Lauritzen  
Dave Stahovich

Chair, Assessor-Clerk Recorder  
Co-Chair, Executive Office  
4<sup>th</sup> District  
2<sup>nd</sup> District  
5<sup>th</sup> District  
3<sup>rd</sup> District  
1<sup>st</sup> District

### Staff and Guests Present:

Jeremy Clark  
Dave Downey  
Tina Grande  
Grace Guerriero  
Nathan Guerriero  
David Huff  
George Johnson  
JiHong McDermott  
Tom Mullen II  
Cindie Perry  
Tori Richardson  
Donna Katchadoorian

TLMA  
The Californian  
Executive Office  
Resident  
Resident  
County Counsel  
TLMA  
TLMA  
TLMA  
City of Riverside  
Registrar of Voters  
Executive Office

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

The Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. The roll call was conducted by Donna Katchadoorian.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE "SPECIAL" MEETING ON APRIL 18, 2011:**

**MOTION:** Robin Hastings moved to approve the April 18, 2011 minutes as stated.

**Seconded by:** John Field

**Motion approved unanimously**

**3. PUBLIC FORUM UPDATE:**

Chairman Larry Ward discussed the three recent public forums. The public was given an opportunity to see the maps, ask questions, and meet one-on-one with the committee members. Larry thanked the committee members and staff who attended each forum. He also thanked EDA for their technical expertise and for the refreshments.

Chairman Larry Ward mentioned attending the California Citizens Redistricting Commission with Supervisor Buster last Thursday at the Norco City Hall. The Commission was created by California voters to draw state Congressional, Assembly, Senate and Board of Equalization Districts. Next month their first redistricting map will be released. The final lines will be drawn by August 15.

Michelle DeArmond added that the California Citizens Redistricting Commission will be meeting next Thursday in Palm Springs at 6 p.m., at the Palm Springs City Hall. Supervisor Benoit will be attending this meeting.

**4. ACTIVITY: MAPPING OF DISTRICT ALTERNATIVES:**

Chairman Larry Ward noted there are undecided areas that need to be addressed. Larry asked for the committee to express their ideas and/or comments.

A couple of maps were displayed on the table for the committee to voice their comments.

John Field mentioned his meeting with Tom Mullen. John indicated that he has not met with Dave Stahovich. John suggested that Highgrove be moved into the 2<sup>nd</sup> District, which consists of portions of the City of Riverside, on the east side of the 91 Freeway, from Arlington north to Highgrove. A portion of Box Springs Mountain would remain in the 5<sup>th</sup> District. Highgrove would no longer be included in the 5<sup>th</sup> District. John agreed to meet with Dave Stahovich to review the changes.

*Minutes of Meeting*

---

Jay Orr asked Tom Mullen if the two maps were available for the committee members to review? Jay noted the importance of keeping the committee on track.

Tom Mullen advised Jay and the committee that he did not have the maps loaded into the system. Tom asked his staff to load the electronic file into the system.

Tom Mullen mentioned that if Homeland is included in the 5th District, the population in the 5<sup>th</sup> District would go to 451,000. If Homeland is included in the 3<sup>rd</sup> District, the population in the 5<sup>th</sup> District would then be 439,000.

Michelle DeArmond explained that they worked hard trying to keep all the cities whole. She suggested the small area of Temecula west of I-15 in question should go into the 3<sup>rd</sup> District.

Jay Orr requested that TLMA redraw the map to add the small area of Temecula in the 3<sup>rd</sup> District, and include the 57 people in the 3<sup>rd</sup> District. Jay also noted that Canyon Lake should be included in the 1<sup>st</sup> District.

Dave Stahovich joined the meeting.

Jay Orr summarized for Dave that a portion of Temecula and an unincorporated area of Temecula were moved into the 3<sup>rd</sup> District. The committee felt that Temecula, as a city, should be included in the same district. In addition, Canyon Lake would be included in District 1, and Homeland should be included in District 3.

Dave Stahovich expressed concern whether this would preclude them from ever doing future annexations.

Verne Lauritzen stated that it doesn't preclude them from any future annexations. However, it would take the present boundaries and spheres, and would put them in the same supervisorial district.

Dave Stahovich pointed out that he would not support that.

Chairman Larry Ward emphasized that the purpose of this committee is to put together a map that balances the One Person One Vote Rule; and, which balances as equally as possible the population.

David Huff explained the statutory law, which is the elections code. Basically, the Board shall adjust the boundaries of any or all of the supervisorial districts of the county so the districts will be nearly equal in population. David noted that the local districts, at the county level, is where the U.S. Supreme Court established the under 10 percent maximum deviation limitation. Thus, 9.9 percent is the upper maximum that is used in terms of district deviation.

Dave Stahovich stated that there was no problem coming within the self-imposed range. Dave provided the committee with a copy of his map. If the issue is the 57 people then there is no problem. If there are 10 or 15 other changes, then cumulative there is a

*Minutes of Meeting*

problem. Based on the comments at each of the public hearings, the Eastside, Casa Blanca and Arlanza communities should stay in the same district. All are currently in the 1<sup>st</sup> District. Canyon Lake liked being in the 3<sup>rd</sup> District, because they are closely associated with issues in Lake Elsinore. According to the comments, the 1<sup>st</sup> District would pick up Canyon Lake, Meadowbrook and Good Hope. Dave mentioned areas west of the City of Perris and the 215 Freeway, pieces of University City and the unincorporated area between the City of Moreno Valley and Riverside. This would straighten out a connection from the existing boundary of the 2<sup>nd</sup> District in Highgrove. This would straighten out an original area that was in dispute in the 2<sup>nd</sup> District. He further stated that this would also straighten out Arlington Avenue to the Norte Vista area. With this scenario, the 1<sup>st</sup> District population would be 432,596 or 1.2 percent from the target. The 2<sup>nd</sup> District would come in at 429,896 or 1.8 percent from the target. The 1<sup>st</sup> District would then include Canyon Lake.

Dave Stahovich further pointed out keeping Victoria Woods and the Eastside in the same area. Testimony from the public requested keeping the two together for purposes of an ethnic balance in the Casa Blanca and Arlanza areas. These two groups are currently in the 1<sup>st</sup> District. With these changes, the total changes are one-quarter of the district. It makes sense to follow the freeway down to the existing boundaries.

John Field provided the committee with an additional map. The main difference between John's map and Dave's map is the shift within the City of Riverside. It takes into account property that has historically been in the Tavaglione family for many years. It also covers Chicago Avenue and a small piece of the University of California to Highgrove. The numbers would shift to 441,771 or 9/10 of one percent, which is less than one percent off target.

Robin Hastings pointed out that there appears to be some questions on the large map. The areas that have commonality should be added to the map and then the committee could discuss the areas that have variances.

Dave Stahovich indicated that this is why Meadowbrook and the Good Hope areas are included in the 5<sup>th</sup> District. Dave noted that he was trying to balance out the comments that he heard at all the hearings. Dave expressed concern that the 1<sup>st</sup> District would end up with more of the unincorporated areas. Dave mentioned the growth potential in the Highgrove area. The city limits are somewhat fixed. If the development is all in the cities, then the county has a limited role in city services, such as fire, sheriff, and the county hospital. Dave was trying to use the freeways and existing boundaries to follow all the city limits and still provide a small amount of unincorporated areas and growth potential at the northeast corner.

Tina Grande suggested that Tom Mullen prepare a revised map and she will distribute the map to the committee before the next meeting.

Robin Hastings suggested using different colors for each district.

Tom Mullen clarified for the committee that he would provide at the next meeting a single map overlay of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Districts with various colors.

Tina Grande emphasized that May 26 should be the last day to submit public comments.

Chairman Larry Ward pointed out that two additional meetings have been scheduled for May 17 and May 26. On June 1, the maps and all the data should be completed and ready to go to the Board of Supervisors on June 14.

Chairman Larry Ward reminded the committee that the goal is to lay out the issues and come back next week with solutions to those issues.

**5. OTHER BUSINESS:**

No other business was discussed at this time.

**6. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA:**

Nathan Guerriero, a resident, thanked the committee for their hard work. He questioned when the county would be working on the general plan?

George Johnson mentioned that they are currently working on the general plan and would send him an invitation to the next meeting.

**7. ADJOURNMENT:**

A "Special" Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting is set for Tuesday, May 17, 2011 at 2 p.m., in the Riverside County Administrative Center, 4080 Lemon Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Executive Office, Conference Room C. With no further discussion, the Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

---

---

# REDISTRICTING STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

---

---

## MINUTES OF MEETING

### “Special Meeting”

May 17, 2011  
2:00 p.m.

County Executive Office  
4080 Lemon Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Conference Room C

#### Members Present:

Larry Ward  
Jay Orr  
Michelle DeArmond  
John Field  
Robin Hastings  
Verne Lauritzen  
Dave Stahovich

Chair, Assessor-Clerk Recorder  
Co-Chair, Executive Office  
4<sup>th</sup> District  
2<sup>nd</sup> District  
5<sup>th</sup> District  
3<sup>rd</sup> District  
1<sup>st</sup> District

#### Staff and Guests Present:

Jeremy Clark  
Dave Downey  
Duane Gang  
Tina Grande  
David Huff  
George Johnson  
Damian Laning  
JiHong McDermott  
Tom Mullen II  
Donna Katchadoorian

TLMA  
The Californian  
The Press-Enterprise  
Executive Office  
County Counsel  
TLMA  
TLMA  
TLMA  
TLMA  
Executive Office

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairman Larry Ward called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. The roll call was conducted by Donna Katchadoorian.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR MAY 10, 2011:**

Chairman Larry Ward noted one minor change on Page 3, in the third paragraph. The reference to the 3<sup>rd</sup> District should be changed to the 5<sup>th</sup> District.

**MOTION: Robin Hastings moved to approve the May 10, 2011 minutes with the correction noted.**

**Seconded by: Verne Lauritzen**

**Motion approved unanimously**

**3. ACTIVITY: MAPPING OF DISTRICT ALTERNATIVES:**

Chairman Larry Ward mentioned at the last meeting, Tom Mullen was asked to provide a single map with an overlay showing the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Districts in different colors.

Tom Mullen informed the committee that the map is being printed, and an electronic version will be presented once the equipment is available. Tom explained that the proposed map will show the combined areas.

John Field suggested that he meet with Dave Stahovich one more time to discuss minor changes. John indicated that they were pretty close.

Dave Stahovich advised the committee that they are making steps in the right direction.

Chairman Larry Ward announced that May 26 is the last day to submit public comment. Larry asked Tina if she had received any public comment this week.

Tina Grande stated that she had not received any additional public comment.

Chairman Larry Ward mentioned that the plan was to adopt a proposal(s) this week. Larry asked Tom if he would have enough time to prepare the maps.

Tom Mullen replied, yes. Tom pointed out if he could get the commonality for both districts, he would be able to provide maps by the close of business Wednesday, and would be able to send copies to the committee by Thursday.

Dave Stahovich explained that the map he presented last week hasn't changed. Dave indicated that John Field is working on a new map. Dave stated that this was the first time he has had a chance to review the revised map.

---

John Field explained the area in question. The 2<sup>nd</sup> District takes Highgrove and it goes to Chicago Avenue in the City of Riverside. The area includes part of the Citrus Groves near UCR, which two supervisors have a portion of the UCR property in their districts. It then follows Arroyo and Victoria Avenue to Arlington Avenue.

Dave Stahovich pointed out a couple of small differences. The population is 26,000 including Highgrove. This area is approximately 21,000 to 22,000. The other area is approximately 16,400.

Tom Mullen displayed the data charts for Districts 1 and 2.

Dave Stahovich advised that the total in District 1 goes to 433,500, and District 2 goes to 432,000 with a difference of 1,500.

Tina Grande noted a couple of items that needed to be addressed, which were to include all of Corona in the 2<sup>nd</sup> District, and to include the Retreat in the city boundary.

John Field informed the committee that the Retreat is currently split between two districts.

Dave Stahovich clarified that Proposal 1, is District 1, and Proposal 2, is District 2. The differences between the two maps are as follows: The 1<sup>st</sup> District is proposing that Arlington and everything north of Arlington Avenue go into the 2<sup>nd</sup> District. The 2<sup>nd</sup> District is proposing to leave that alone and go off Arlington to Victoria Avenue, north to Arroyo.

Jay Orr suggested that Dave Stahovich and John Field discuss the differences and come back next week with one or two maps.

The committee reached consensus on Districts 3, 4 and 5.

Chairman Larry Ward suggested holding a "Special" Meeting to resolve the differences between District 1 and District 2. The committee agreed to meet on Tuesday, May 24, 2011 at 8:30 a.m.

Tom Mullen explained that in order to prepare the maps by Tuesday morning, Tom would require input from Dave Stahovich and John Field by Monday morning.

**4. PRESENTATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:**

Chairman Larry Ward stated that the presentation is scheduled to go to the Board of Supervisors on June 14 with the proposal(s). Larry suggested they use the same format that was used during the public forums, which would include the proposal, an introduction, David Huff providing the legal presentation, and Tom Mullen explaining the proposal of the map(s) highlighting the areas that have changed.

David Huff clarified that the June 14 session will not be a public hearing. Staff recommendation would be to set the matter for public hearing two weeks later on June 28. At that point, the public hearing will be open. David explained that there needs to be at least two public hearings before the Board can take action on the plan. On June 14, the committee can present an overview of the plan(s) as recommended.

Tina Grande suggested that Chairman Larry Ward provide the introduction, David Huff present the legal portion, and Tom Mullen provide input on the maps. The information presented should be clear, concise and brief.

**5. OTHER BUSINESS:**

Dave Stahovich requested that Tom provide a couple of copies of the maps. Dave suggested that one map reference the east side street areas.

**6. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA:**

No members of the public offered comments.

**7. ADJOURNMENT:**

A "Special" Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting is set for Tuesday, May 24, 2011 at 8:30 a.m., in the Riverside County Administrative Center, 4080 Lemon Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Executive Office, Conference Room C. With no further discussion, the Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting was adjourned at 2:41 p.m.

---

# REDISTRICTING STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING FORUM 2011

---

## MINUTES OF MEETING

April 27, 2011  
7:00 p.m.

Desert Hot Springs, Carl May Bldg.  
11777 West Drive  
Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240

### Members Present:

Larry Ward  
Jay Orr  
Michelle DeArmond  
John Field  
Robin Hastings  
Dave Stahovich

Chair, Assessor-Clerk Recorder  
Co-Chair, Executive Office  
4<sup>th</sup> District  
2<sup>nd</sup> District  
5<sup>th</sup> District  
1<sup>st</sup> District

### Members Absent:

Verne Lauritzen

3<sup>rd</sup> District

### Guests Present:

Anthony Cuca  
Amalia Deaztlan  
Erica Felci  
Ron Gilbert  
Tina Grande  
Andrew Kotyuk  
C.E. Krause  
Yvonne Parks  
Janet Pfeiffer  
George Raymond  
Anna Schuman

Resident of Desert Hot Springs  
Resident  
Desert Sun  
Resident of Desert Hot Springs  
County Executive Office  
Vice Mayor for the City of San Jacinto  
Resident of Desert Hot Springs  
Mayor of Desert Hot Springs  
Resident  
Resident of Palm Springs  
Resident

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

The "Special" Redistricting Steering Committee Forum 2011 was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Co-Chair, Jay Orr, stated that so often the Pledge of Allegiance is taken for granted. Jay mentioned the soldiers serving in Afghanistan and seven of them were murdered today. Jay led the Pledge of Allegiance in honor of those soldiers serving in Afghanistan who gave their lives today. The roll call was conducted by Co-Chair, Jay Orr.

**2. INTRODUCTION OF THE MEETING:**

As Chairman of the County Redistricting Steering Committee Forum 2011, Chairman Larry Ward welcomed the guests and thanked them for attending the third of the three community meetings. The goal of these meetings is to provide information on the redistricting process, both from a legal, and a procedural perspective, provide an update of what has been completed so far, and most importantly, to provide Riverside County residents with an opportunity to provide input on the process.

Chairman Larry Ward mentioned the redistricting process occurs every 10 years based on the 2010 U.S. Census count. Riverside County is the fastest growing counties in the state, adding more than 644,000 residents from 2000 to 2010. To put that number in perspective, this was about 20,000 more people than the combined total of the second and third fastest growing counties in California, that being San Bernardino and Los Angeles.

Chairman Larry Ward mentioned that David Huff, County Counsel, will present the legal requirements for the Riverside County redistricting process. The Riverside County Executive Office established the Riverside County Redistricting Steering Committee. The first meeting was held in October 2010. The committee members are: Chairman Larry Ward, the County Assessor-Clerk and Recorder, the Co-Chair is Jay Orr, the Assistant County Executive Officer, all five supervisorial Chiefs of Staff. The County Executive Office, County Counsel, and the Transportation and Land Management Agency also support the committee. The Chairman thanked the Economic Development Agency for the refreshments in the back.

Chairman Larry Ward mentioned that the timeline for the U.S. Census data was released in the middle of March this year. In April, the first sets of the draft redistricting scenarios were prepared by the Steering Committee. This is the third of three public input outreach meetings. The first meeting was held in downtown Riverside. The second meeting is being held in Menifee and the third meeting is here, in Desert Hot Springs. May 26 is the last day that the public will be allowed to submit a proposal to the Steering Committee for consideration. On June 14 the committee will be submitting a proposal of the redistricting plan(s) to the Riverside Board of Supervisors. June 28 will be the first public hearing with the County Board of Supervisors. July 12 and 26 is the proposed second and third public hearings with the County Board of Supervisors. The

---

Supervisory Redistricting Plan to be approved by the Board at the conclusion of the last public hearing. In July and August of this year, County Survey will draft a legal description for the boundaries for the new supervisory districts. The introduction and subsequent adoption of the Riverside County Supervisory Redistricting Implementing Ordinance will occur in August and September by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors. David Huff, from County Counsel, will provide an overview of the legal and procedural perspective.

### **3. LEGAL OVERVIEW OF COUNTY SUPERVISORY REDISTRICTING:**

David Huff, from County Counsel, noted that this is a process that involves the Board of Supervisors that comes up every 10 years in connection with the federal decennial census. The primary focus is only on county supervisory districts and adjusting the lines as appropriate to balance the districts based on population. Not to be confused with the redistricting effort with regard to statewide legislative offices, such as the assembly, the senate or congressional districts. That has now been addressed under Proposition 11, and was approved by the voters in November 2008, which created a California Citizens Redistricting Commission. The focus is on the County Supervisor Office borders and their district lines. The governing law in this area is straightforward under the California Elections Code 21500. Reading verbatim from the statutory language it states: "Following each federal decennial census, and using that census as a basis, the Board of Supervisors shall adjust the boundaries of any or all of the supervisory districts of the county so that the districts shall be as nearly and equal in population as may be."

Mr. David Huff mentioned that the Supreme Court has interpreted that requirement. It is essentially, the One Person One Vote Rule. It basically states that the district shall be as nearly equal in population as it may be so there is some degree of variance allowed. The Supreme Court interpretation has indicated that each district can be less than the 10 percent variance from another district. However, the goal and objective is to try and get the population counts as close as possible to one another in each of the districts.

David Huff discussed the second criteria. The process has to comply with the federal Voting Rights Act. There are literally 100s of cases that interpret the Federal Voter Rights Act, which was originally put in place during the 1960s. The Elections Code stated that when establishing the boundaries of the districts, the Board may give consideration to several factors. The first one is topography. Topography can be natural topography such as a ridgeline, a mountain range, or a river. It can also take the form of artificial topography, such as an interstate freeway. Geography is another factor to be considered. When the districts are positioned, how do they layout in comparison to one another.

David Huff described the following four factors, which are closely tied to one another: Cohesiveness, contiguity, integrity and compactness of territory. Contiguity, for example, is an expectation that the district all be connected as part of one, as opposed to having little islands spun off in different areas. Compactness is basically a center of

---

gravity where there is a defined shape to it that is not terribly elongated. David mentioned a famous case that came out in 1993, Shaw v. Reno, this case involved a congressional district boundary effort in North Carolina and it was challenged by the U.S. Department of Justice, because the state tried to formulate a district that used 160 miles of interstate freeway featuring tentacles reaching out in different directions. David indicated that shape does matter in the eyes of the courts.

David Huff continued and noted that there is a consideration for communities of interest of the district. Communities of interest have been interpreted by the Supreme Court of California as well as the U.S. Supreme Court. A provision of the California Constitution focuses on areas that are common to urban areas, rural areas, industrial areas, agricultural areas, and those that are common areas in which people share similar living standards, use the same transportation facilities, have similar work opportunities, have access to the same media of communication relevant to the election process. The city can be a community of interest, which can also include unincorporated recognized communities. For example, El Cerrito, Mead Valley, Mira Loma, and many other areas located within the county. Sometimes it is very difficult to meet this, because the community in question might be too large. A classic example is the City of Riverside, because of its large population at times has been shared between three county supervisors and in the last few years, it has been divided between two supervisorial districts. David noted that they try to keep communities of interest together rather than split them up. These are the standards that the Board of Supervisors has to consider before they adopt the plan.

David Huff discussed the timeline. The last day to present the proposed plan for the Steering Committee consideration is on May 26, 2011. After that date, if additional plans come in, they would go directly to the Board of Supervisors, because by that time the committee's work will have been done. The Board is still free to take other proposals that may come in or may develop at the public hearings. In the Elections Code there is a requirement to hold at least two public hearings before the Board can adopt a redistricting plan. The critical deadline for the Board of Supervisors is that they have to take final action and have the new districting boundaries final and in place prior to November 1. If they do not have them in place by November 1, then the process is taken out of their hands by state law in Elections Code 21502. The process would then shift to a Supervisorial Redistricting Committee, which is composed of the District Attorney, the County Assessor-Clerk and Recorder, and the elected County Superintendent of Schools. It is anticipated that the Board of Supervisors will be able to get the job done prior to November 1. David Huff completed his presentation.

#### **4. POPULATION NUMBERS AND MAP PRESENTATION:**

Tom Mullen, Deputy Director of Transportation and Land Management, shared with the group the impacts of the United States Census 2010 on Riverside County. To begin, the county grew at a rate far exceeding any other county in the state. It grew roughly 42 percent between the year 2000 and 2010, adding 644,254 people. Again, to reemphasize, Riverside County grew faster than the next two largest counties

combined. L.A. County added 325,000 people, San Bernardino County added approximately 300,000, and combined for a total of 625,000 people.

Tom Mullen presented several maps and discussed in detail the growth for each district. In looking at the districts in total, the 3<sup>rd</sup> District grew faster than the other four districts, but there was positive growth throughout the entire county, ranging from 28 percent in the 4<sup>th</sup> District to 66 percent in the 3<sup>rd</sup> District. Looking at each district independently, the 1<sup>st</sup> District grew at approximately 111,000 people at a rate of 35.7 percent. The growth was in the southern part of the district through the cities of Lake Elsinore, the unincorporated areas south of Riverside. The 2<sup>nd</sup> supervisorial district grew by 97,254 people. The areas of Eastvale and north of Corona grew the fastest rate in the county, with some areas growing at over 1,100 percent. There was a phenomenal amount of growth in a very short amount of time resulting in the new City of Eastvale. The 3<sup>rd</sup> District has over 517,000 residents. The most growth throughout the district was along both the 215 Freeway up through the unincorporated areas of the cities and communities of Hemet and San Jacinto. In the 4<sup>th</sup> District, throughout the Coachella Valley, there was growth in many of these areas. In total, the district grew by 87,026 people at a rate of 28.1 percent between 2000 and 2010. In the 5<sup>th</sup> District there was growth all along the 60/10 Freeway corridor through the pass area with heavy growth in the region east of Moreno Valley down toward Perris, totaling 142,809 people.

Tom Mullen noted that the growth is throughout the entire county with a need to shift the population to balance it out to reach the ideal of One Person One Vote. The ideal target for each district to reach is 437,928 people. The law allows a variance of 10 percent. The committee has self-imposed a five percent target range to work within. As the committee looked at reshaping the county districts, Tom discussed five maps drawn independent of each other. The last map is a culmination overlay of the five districts and their independent efforts. As the maps are redrawn, the goal is to reach the ideal target within the range. The cities have been drawn to be encompassed within a single district with the exception of the City of Riverside, which continues to be split between two supervisorial districts. Under the current set of scenarios, it was proposed to put each city in the county within a single district respecting those city boundaries and communities that they represent.

Tom Mullen emphasized the importance that each district not stand alone and independent, but share common borders. The hatched areas in green represent areas that are yet to be determined. This is only as a result of five independent efforts and this is the first set of scenarios that have been developed. It is anticipated that these areas will be resolved prior to going to the Board of Supervisors for consideration. Ultimately, the goal of the committee was to try and create a balance between the districts and again, recognize the need for the One Person One Vote. Tom Mullen concluded his presentation on the maps.

Chairman Larry Ward reintroduced the Redistricting Steering Committee. Besides Jay Orr and Chairman Larry Ward, the chairman introduced representing Supervisor Buster in the 1<sup>st</sup> District, Dave Stahovich; representing Supervisor Tavaglione in the 2<sup>nd</sup> District,

---

John Field; representing Supervisor Stone in the 3<sup>rd</sup> District, Verne Lauritzen, who was not present this evening. Representing Supervisor Benoit in the 4<sup>th</sup> District, Michelle DeArmond; and representing the 5<sup>th</sup> District, for Supervisor Ashley is Robin Hastings.

Chairman Larry Ward suggested that everyone take a 15-minute break to have an opportunity to review the maps.

Chairman Larry Ward recalled the meeting to order.

## **5. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

Mayor Yvonne Parks, from Desert Hot Springs, indicated that she has been very happy in the 5<sup>th</sup> District. She noted they have great representation by Supervisor Ashley. She did mention that she is open to whatever changes are necessary. The city is aware that changes are going to happen. She did express concern that within the next five years the city is proposing another annexation from the area of Pierson, west to 62, and south of the I-10 Freeway. If the annexation were to occur before the next census, it would result in two supervisors for Desert Hot Springs. She was very concerned that the City of Desert Hot Springs not be split. She indicated that she had discussed the matter with Robin Hastings and Robin is aware of her concerns. She thanked the committee for their consideration.

Michelle DeArmond noted that they would consider the information stated and would look at the numbers. Michelle indicated, at this point, they are pretty close to where they need to be. Michelle mentioned that they are trying to keep communities of interest together.

Robin Hastings mentioned her discussion with Mayor Parks, and that they would love to keep the 5<sup>th</sup> District in its current configuration, but that is not the purpose of redistricting. She mentioned in the 5<sup>th</sup> District there are portions of five different cities, due to growth and annexation since the last census. Robin agreed to look at the numbers again.

Mr. Andrew Kotyuk, Vice Mayor for the City of San Jacinto, wanted to reiterate the city's wishes to keep the San Jacinto Valley intact. He noted an upcoming joint committee meeting with both cities and the county. He is currently making plans economically to develop and work together. He emphasized the importance that both cities stay together. He appreciated the time and energy put into the redistricting processing, and he thanked the committee for taking the time to listen to their comments.

Chairman Larry Ward thanked Vice Mayor Kotyuk for having a representative attend all three meetings.

Mr. George Raymond mentioned that he was new to the process. He questioned who would be representing his district as the district is carved from Palm Springs down to

---

Palm Desert? He questioned who are the congressional representatives for each district?

Tom Mullen stated that what is proposed for the county districts is to align all of the Coachella Valley cities into the 4<sup>th</sup> District, which is currently represented by Supervisor John Benoit. This is a 10-year process and it is impossible to say who the representative will be in the future. By district, it is proposed to keep all the cities intact from Desert Hot Springs, Palm Springs and Cathedral City in the 4<sup>th</sup> District, as proposed in scenario 1. The 5<sup>th</sup> District will pick up the unincorporated communities and the Banning pass area, which is currently in the 5<sup>th</sup> District, represented by Supervisor Marion Ashley.

Tom Mullen replied to George Raymond's comments concerning the congressional representatives. Tom indicated that this committee doesn't have any input directly in these processes. Tom mentioned visiting one of the local meetings approximately six weeks ago and the representatives indicated that they would be coming back to Riverside/San Bernardino County in the future. You can share your comments with them either through the website, or directly.

Mr. Anthony Cuca, a Desert Hot Springs resident, supported the comments made by the Mayor Yvonne Parks. He thanked the committee for their hard work.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS:**

No other business was presented at this time.

**7. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA:**

No other members of the public presented comments.

Chairman Larry Ward thanked everyone for coming out. The input is important to the committee to hear the comments from the people that we serve.

**8. ADJOURN:**

Adjournment to the regularly scheduled meeting set for May 10, 2011 at 2 p.m., in the Riverside County Administrative Center, 4080 Lemon Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Executive Office, Conference Room C.

---

# REDISTRICTING STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING FORUM 2011

---

## MINUTES OF MEETING

April 21, 2011  
7:00 p.m.

**Kay Cenicerros Senior Center – Palm Room  
29995 Evans Road  
Menifee (Sun City), CA 92586**

### **Members Present:**

Larry Ward	Chair, Assessor-Clerk Recorder
Jay Orr	Co-Chair, Executive Office
Michelle DeArmond	4 <sup>th</sup> District
Robin Hastings	5 <sup>th</sup> District
Dave Stahovich	1 <sup>st</sup> District

### **Members Absent:**

John Field	2 <sup>nd</sup> District
Verne Lauritzen	3 <sup>rd</sup> District

### **Guests Present:**

Roberta Alexander	Resident
Kelly Black	Bochanan Ingersoll
Betty Boures	Resident
John W. Corlett	Resident
Mary Craton	Council Member from Canyon Lake
Joe Daugherty	Resident
Wallace Edgerton	Mayor of the City of Menifee
Mike Emberton	Mayor of the City of San Jacinto
Eric Gosch	President, Hemet-San Jacinto Action Group
Tina Grande	County Executive Office
Nancy C. Horton	Council Member from Canyon Lake
Bob Johnson	City of Menifee
Louis Mazier	Resident
Lori Moss	City of Canyon Lake
Rosi Relrite	Resident
Barry Talbot	Mayor of the City of Canyon Lake
Julie Zimmerman	Resident

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairman Larry Ward called the "Special" Redistricting Steering Committee Forum 2011 to order at 7:00 p.m. Co-Chair, Jay Orr, led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2. INTRODUCTION OF THE MEETING:**

Chairman, Larry Ward, of the Riverside County Redistricting Steering Committee 2011, welcomed the guests and thanked them for attending the second of three community meetings. The goal of these meetings is to provide information on the redistricting process, both from a legal, and a procedural perspective, provide an update of what has been completed so far and, most importantly, to provide Riverside County residents with an opportunity to provide input on the process.

Chairman Larry Ward reported that redistricting occurs every 10 years based on the 2010 U.S. Census count. Riverside County is the fastest growing county in the state, adding more than 644,000 residents in the past 10 years. To put that number in perspective, this was about 20,000 more people than the combined total of the second and third fastest growing counties, that being San Bernardino and Los Angeles. The Riverside County Redistricting Steering Committee was established by the County Executive Office, and the first meeting was held in October of last year. The Committee membership includes: Chairman Larry Ward, the County Assessor-Clerk and Recorder, the Co-Chair is Jay Orr, the Assistant County Executive Officer, all five supervisorial Chiefs of Staff, including Dave Stahovich, 1<sup>st</sup> District; John Field, 2<sup>nd</sup> District; Verne Lauritzen, 3<sup>rd</sup> District; Michelle DeArmond, 4<sup>th</sup> District, and Robin Hastings from the 5<sup>th</sup> District. Also supporting this endeavor is the Executive Office, County Counsel and the Transportation and Land Management Agency.

Chairman Larry Ward discussed the redistricting timeline. The process must be completed by November 1 of this year. The Steering Committee was formed during the fall of 2010. In March, the U.S. Census data was released. In April of this year, the first set of drafts and redistricting scenario maps were prepared by the Steering Committee. The maps were displayed in the lobby for the public to review. This month, public input and outreach is now occurring. The next public meeting will be held in Desert Hot Springs next week. The last day to present the proposed plan for the Steering Committee consideration is on May 26, 2011. On June 14, the proposed presentation of the County Redistricting plan(s) will be presented to the Riverside County Board of Supervisors. He emphasized plan or plans. More than one plan may be submitted to the Board of Supervisors. On June 28, the first proposed public hearing will be held with the Riverside County Board of Supervisors. On July 12 and July 26, are the proposed second and third public hearings with the Riverside County Board of Supervisors. The supervisorial redistricting plans to be approved by the Board at the conclusion of the last public hearing. At each of these public hearings, the public is encouraged to attend and provide their input. In July and August of 2011, County Survey will draft a legal description for the boundaries of the new supervisorial districts.

---

The introduction and subsequent adoption of the Riverside County Supervisorial Redistricting Implementing Ordinance will occur in August and September by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors.

Robin Hastings, representing the 5<sup>th</sup> District, arrived at the meeting.

Chairman Larry Ward introduced David Huff, County Counsel. David Huff will provide the overview of the legal requirements, both on the state and federal level.

### **3. LEGAL OVERVIEW OF COUNTY SUPERVISORIAL REDISTRICTING:**

David Huff, from County Counsel, noted that redistricting involves a process that the Board of Supervisors has to go through every 10 years when the decennial census data is released from the Federal Census Bureau. The primary focus is only on county supervisorial districts and adjusting the lines as appropriate to balance the districts based on population. Not to be confused with the redistricting effort that is underway with regard to statewide legislative districts, such as assembly, senate or for congressional districts. That is within the jurisdictions of the newly created California Citizens Redistricting Commission, which was established via Proposition 11. Proposition 11 was approved by the voters in November 2008. The governing law in this area is straightforward under the California Elections Code Section 21500. It provides the following: "Following each federal decennial census, and using that census as a basis, the Board shall adjust the boundaries of any or all of the supervisorial districts of the county so that the districts shall be as nearly and equal in population as may be."

David Huff mentioned that the Supreme Court has interpreted that requirement. It is essentially, the One Person One Vote Rule. The Supreme Court interpretation has indicated that each district can be less than the 10 percent variance from another district. It is always prudent to try to get the population counts as close as possible to one another in each of the districts.

David Huff mentioned another requirement that redistricting must comply with are applicable provisions of the Federal Voting Rights Act. The Federal Voting Rights Act was originally put in place in the mid 1960s. The Federal Voting Rights Act has been amended several times. The committee must be in compliance with the federal requirements.

David Huff discussed the Elections Code. In establishing the boundaries for each of the districts, the Board will give consideration to the following factors: The first one is topography. Topography can show up in a variety of ways, but typically, it divides between an artificial topographical feature, such as a freeway and a natural topographical feature, such as a river or mountain ranges. There can also be artificial topography, such as a freeway or an interstate. This can be used as a dividing point between the districts. Another factor is geography. How the district lays out in the overall scheme of the agency's jurisdiction.

David Huff described the following four factors, which are closely tied together: Cohesiveness, contiguity, integrity, and compactness of territory. Essentially, what these do is consider the shape of the district. Something that has a uniform or close to uniform shape is preferred to something that looks very convoluted. David mentioned a famous case that came out in 1993, Shaw v. Reno, this is a case that involved a congressional district boundary effort in North Carolina and it was challenged by the U.S. Department of Justice, because the state tried to formulate a district that used 160 miles of interstate freeway featuring tentacles reaching out in different directions. David indicated that shape does matter in the eyes of the courts.

David Huff pointed out that compactness, integrity, contiguity, and cohesiveness are very important factors. The last factor is community of interests of the districts. The California Supreme Court, as well as the Constitution, indicate that examples of such interest include commonalities to an urban area, a rural area, an industrial area, agricultural areas, and those areas in which people share similar living standards, such as the same transportation facilities, similar work opportunities, or have access to the same media of communications relevant to the election process. This also includes the cities. The city can be a community of interest, which can also include unincorporated recognized communities. For example, El Cerrito, Mira Loma, Mead Valley, Meadowbrook, and many other areas located within the county. In the past, the City of Riverside was so large that it had to be divided between three supervisors. For example, the City of L.A. was too large to be included within one supervisorial district. Those factors would need to be reviewed using the Elections Code as a guideline.

David Huff clarified that before the Board of Supervisors could adopt the redistricting plan, there is a requirement to hold at least two public hearings, which are forecast for the end of June and first of July. The Redistricting Plan must be approved and in place prior to November 1 of this year. If for some reason the Board of Supervisors is not able to accomplish the task before November 1, then there is a provision in state law Section 21502 of the Elections Code that provides that there be a Supervisorial Redistricting Commission composed of the District Attorney, the County Assessor, and the elected County Superintendent of Schools. This group would carry out the task that the Board of Supervisors attempted to accomplish. David Huff concluded the overview for the county supervisorial process.

#### **4. POPULATION NUMBERS AND MAP PRESENTATION:**

Tom Mullen, Deputy Director of Transportation and Land Management, shared with the group the impacts of the United States Census 2010 in Riverside County and the redistricting process. There has been an impressive amount of growth in relationship to the rest of the nation in the state as a whole. The map presented represents the population growth as a percentage throughout the various census tracts in Riverside. The county grew at a rate of 644,254 people in the past 10 years. Riverside County is just shy of 41.7 percent. Riverside County grew faster than San Bernardino County and Los Angeles County. Combined they grew 625,000 people.

Tom Mullen discussed the growth within each individual district. The 1<sup>st</sup> District grew by approximately 111,000 people. There has been significant growth in this part of the county as well as along the southern border of the City of Corona, along the 15 Freeway between Corona and Lake Elsinore with growth in the 1<sup>st</sup> District of 35.5 percent. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> District, Eastvale grew faster than any other area in the county. This area grew over 600 percent. Overall, the district grew by 97,000 people with 31.4 percent. The 3<sup>rd</sup> District, saw the greatest amount of growth in any single district. The district grew by 206,000 people. In the 4<sup>th</sup> District, there is growth throughout the Coachella Valley with the district increasing overall by 87,000. There has been double digit growth throughout the entire county. In the 5<sup>th</sup> Supervisorial District, there is strong growth between the cities of Moreno Valley, Calimesa, Banning and Beaumont. Strong growth occurred between the 215 Freeway through Perris and Moreno Valley, along the 60 corridor and through the pass. The district grew by 142,000 people or 47.2 percent.

There has been tremendous growth led by the 3<sup>rd</sup> District as of the 2010 U.S. Census. The smallest district is the 4<sup>th</sup> District at 386,579 people. Tom explained that the maps are culminated individual maps, which have been put together into a single map, to show areas where there is commonality. The areas, which are hatched, are areas that are not common between their individual efforts. This is the culmination of the individual efforts and is the first scenario in a draft format. These maps have been posted for the public to review. Tom indicated that he would be available during the break to answer any questions.

Chairman Larry Ward suggested everyone take a 15-minute break to look at the maps.

Chairman Larry Ward recalled the meeting to order.

## **5. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

Chairman Larry Ward introduced Ms. Nancy Horton.

Ms. Nancy Horton, Councilwoman from Canyon Lake, thanked the committee for holding the event. She mentioned she has been very happy in the 3<sup>rd</sup> District. She is aware that Supervisor Stone will have to lose some territory and population, and other supervisors will have to gain. Speaking as a citizen and as the Mayor Pro-Tem for the City of Canyon Lake, Nancy mentioned six cities that formed a coalition, called the Southwest Riverside Coalition, which includes the cities of Temecula, Canyon Lake, Murrieta, Wildomar, Lake Elsinore, and Menifee. She mentioned they have mutual concerns from Highway 15 and 215 corridors. She mentioned the hospitals in her area and economic concerns that are shared between Canyon Lake and Lake Elsinore. They currently share educational institutions. Most significantly, they share a recently opened animal shelter. As part of the City Council, Nancy is the Director of LESJWA. Canyon Lake is connected and contributes water to the City of Lake Elsinore. She mentioned she would be attending a water summit to take place in Lake Elsinore to share the history of Lake Elsinore from the Clean Water Act of 2000 to the present. Nancy mentioned if Canyon Lake were placed in any other district, they would have little in

---

common in the 5<sup>th</sup> District. Nancy requested that Canyon Lake be put in the 1<sup>st</sup> District, if they are moved from the 3<sup>rd</sup> District.

Mary Craton, Councilmember from Canyon Lake, stated that Nancy worded it extremely well. Mary wanted to emphasize commonality of interests. There is no commonality in the 5<sup>th</sup> District. Mary requested that they be placed in the 1<sup>st</sup> District.

Mr. Wallace Edgerton, Mayor of the City of Menifee, thanked the committee for their great job. Mr. Edgerton is a Professor of Political Science where he started teaching back in the 1960s. Nancy and Mary nailed it from the standpoint of community interest to the degree that there is a legal nexus. He strongly agreed with Nancy and Mary's comments. When Menifee was brought into incorporation, there was an agreement that Perris thought that they had with Menifee. He mentioned a couple of legal considerations with the City of Perris he is trying to resolve. He requested that Menifee stay in the 3<sup>rd</sup> District.

Mr. Eric Gosch, President of the Hemet-San Jacinto Action Group, was formed in the early 1980s. Eric thanked the committee for their hard work. Eric agreed that the maps of the communities are logical and that they keep communities of interest together. Hemet and San Jacinto Councils are the only two in the county to have passed resolutions stating their desire to remain together in one district. Eric appreciated the comments of the committee at their previous meetings. The primary focus is to stay in the same district.

Mr. Barry Talbot, Mayor of the City of Canyon Lake, spoke as the Mayor and resident of Canyon Lake. He indicated that Canyon Lake is a small city. They have worked very hard to establish a relationship with southwest Riverside cities and, as a small city, that effort has been extremely important to achieving the type of success that they have to make their community healthier and better for all of their citizens. If moved to the 5<sup>th</sup> District it would put them in a distinct disadvantage on any kind of negotiations that may come up in the future. Mayor Talbot emphasized that Canyon Lake remain in the 3<sup>rd</sup> District.

Mike Emberton, Mayor of the City of San Jacinto, echoed Mr. Gosch's comments. They are excited to stay together as they are sister cities and both are jointly working on many of the same efforts within the valley. He requested that the committee consider keeping the two cities together. He thanked the committee.

Mr. Louis Mazei, a resident of Menifee, concurred with Mayor Edgerton and the representatives from Canyon Lake. As a Menifee resident, he indicated that the City of Menifee would have more in common with Canyon Lake, Murrieta, and Temecula. He felt that San Jacinto and Hemet would want to be in the 5<sup>th</sup> District, because they share the Ramona Corridor with Perris and it connects to I-15. He recommended that Menifee stay in the 3<sup>rd</sup> District.

---

Robin Hastings indicated that his comments were considered and the population of San Jacinto, Hemet, and Soboba, who are all part of that resolution, was not a number that could be absorbed into the 5<sup>th</sup> District. The population is too large, and the 3<sup>rd</sup> District is the one that needs to lose the most population. Moving 100,000 people into the 5<sup>th</sup> District would mean it would not be balanced.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS:**

Dave Stahovich addressed the audience and noted how represented they were for a small city. Dave indicated that the comments that were raised will be given careful consideration. Dave thanked the group for coming out and thanked them for their comments.

**7. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA:**

No other members of the public presented comments.

**8. ADJOURN:**

The meeting was adjourned to the "Special" Meeting set for April 27, 2011, at 7:00 p.m., at the Desert Hot Springs, Carl May Bldg., 11777 West Drive., Desert Hot Springs, CA 92204.

---

# REDISTRICTING STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING FORUM 2011

---

## MINUTES OF MEETING

April 20, 2011  
7:00 p.m.

County Administrative Center  
4080 Lemon Street  
Board Chambers, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
Riverside, CA 92501

### Members Present:

Larry Ward  
Jay Orr  
Michelle DeArmond  
John Field  
Robin Hastings  
Verne Lauritzen  
Dave Stahovich

Chair, Assessor-Clerk Recorder  
Co-Chair, Executive Office  
4<sup>th</sup> District  
2<sup>nd</sup> District  
5<sup>th</sup> District  
3<sup>rd</sup> District  
1<sup>st</sup> District

### Guests Present:

Tina Grande  
Rick Hoffman  
Alvin C. Horn  
John Kopp  
Morris Mendoza  
Victoria Mendoza  
Larry Smith

County Executive Office  
Resident  
Resident  
Resident  
Resident  
Resident  
Resident

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairman Larry Ward called the "Special" Redistricting Steering Committee Forum 2011 to order at 7:00 p.m. The roll call was conducted by Chairman Larry Ward.

**2. INTRODUCTION OF THE MEETING:**

As Chairman of the County Redistricting Steering Committee Forum 2011, Chairman, Larry Ward, welcomed the guests and thanked them for attending the first of three community meetings. The goal of these meetings is to provide information on the redistricting process, both from a legal, and procedural perspective, provide an update of what has been completed so far, and most importantly, to provide Riverside County residents with an opportunity to provide input on the process.

Chairman Larry Ward explained that the Redistricting process takes place every 10 years based on the 2010 U.S. Census. Riverside County is the fastest growing county in the state, which added over 644,000 residents in the past 10 years. To put that number in perspective, that is about 20,000 more people than the combined total of the second and third fastest growing counties, that being San Bernardino and Los Angeles. The guiding principles of the redistricting are set in state and federal law. David Huff will present legal requirements for the Riverside County Redistricting process.

Chairman Larry Ward indicated that the Riverside County Executive Office established the Riverside County Redistricting Steering Committee. The committee members are: Chairman Larry Ward, the County Assessor-Clerk and Recorder, the Co-Chair is Jay Orr, the Assistant County Executive Officer, all five supervisorial Chiefs of Staff, including Dave Stahovich, 1<sup>st</sup> District; John Field, 2<sup>nd</sup> District; Verne Lauritzen, 3<sup>rd</sup> District; Michelle DeArmond, 4<sup>th</sup> District, and Robin Hastings from the 5<sup>th</sup> District. Also supporting this endeavor is the Executive Office, County Counsel, and the Transportation and Land Management.

Chairman Larry Ward discussed the redistricting timeline. The Steering Committee was established during the fall of 2010, and the first meeting was held on October 26 of 2010. The U.S. Census data was released in March of 2011. In April of this year, the first set of drafts and redistricting scenario maps were prepared by the Steering Committee, and are displayed in the lobby for your review. This month, public input and outreach is occurring. The last day to present a proposed plan for the Steering Committee for consideration is May 26, 2011. On June 14, the proposed presentation of the County Redistricting plan(s) will be presented to the Riverside County Board of Supervisors. Chairman Larry Ward emphasized plan or plans. More than one plan may be submitted to the Board of Supervisors. On June 28, the first proposed public hearing will be held with the Riverside County Board of Supervisors. On July 12 and July 26, the proposed second and third public hearings will be held with the Riverside County Board of Supervisors. The supervisorial redistricting plans to be approved by the Board at the conclusion of the last public hearing. At each of these public hearings, the public is encouraged to attend and provide their input. In July and August of 2011, County

---

Survey will draft a legal description for the boundaries of the new supervisorial districts. In August and September, the introduction and subsequent adoption of the Riverside County Supervisorial Redistricting Implementing Ordinance by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors will take place. Chairman Larry Ward introduced David Huff, County Counsel. David Huff will provide the overview of the legal requirements, from the state and federal level.

### **3. LEGAL OVERVIEW OF COUNTY SUPERVISORIAL REDISTRICTING:**

David Huff, from County Counsel, noted that redistricting involves a process that the Board of Supervisors has to go through every 10 years when the decennial census data is released from the Federal Census Bureau. The focus here is with regard to county supervisorial district lines and to clarify that this committee is not concerned with regard to statewide legislative offices, such as the assembly or the senate. This is governed under the Prop. 11, and was approved in November 2008, when the California Citizens Redistricting Commission was created. That is a separate process. The focus is on the County Supervisor Office borders and their district lines. As a result, the law in this area is fairly narrow under the California Elections Code 21500. The code provides the basis for the criteria in which the district lines are to be redrawn and it basically states: "Following each federal decennial census, and using that census as a basis, the Board shall adjust the boundaries of any or all of the supervisorial districts of the county so that the districts shall be as nearly and equal in population as may be."

David Huff presented another requirement that redistricting must be in compliance with the provisions of the Federal Voting Rights Act. When a county is looking at the redistricting process, they have to be in compliance with the requirements within the act and the cases which interpret the act. As it turns out, in the later portions of the Elections Code 21500, a list of a variety of factors is interpreted by many of these federal cases. The first factor being establishing the boundary of the districts, the Board must give consideration to topography. Topography can show up in a variety of ways, but typically it divides between an artificial topographical feature, such as a freeway and a natural topographical feature, such as a river or mountain range(s). Another factor is geography. Looking at the layout of the area to be divided, it would need to make sense from a geographical perspective.

David Huff described the following four factors, which are closely tied together: Cohesiveness, contiguity, integrity, and compactness of territory. Essentially, what these do is consider the shape of the district. Something that has a uniform or close to uniform share is preferred to something that looks convoluted. Compactness, integrity, contiguity, and cohesiveness are very important factors. David mentioned a famous case that came out in 1993, Shaw v. Reno, this is a case that involved a congressional district boundary effort in North Carolina and it was challenged by the U.S. Department of Justice, because the state tried to formulate a district that used 160 miles of interstate freeway featuring tentacles reaching out in different directions. David indicated that shape does matter in the eyes of the courts.

David pointed out that the last factor is community of interests of the districts. The California Supreme Court, as well as the Constitution, indicate that examples of such interest include commonalities to an urban area, a rural area, an industrial area, and agricultural areas. These areas are in which people share the similar living standards, use the same transportation facilities, similar work opportunities, or have access to the same media of communications relevant to the election process. This also includes the cities. The city can be a community of interest, which can also include unincorporated recognized communities. For example, El Cerrito, Mira Loma, Mead Valley and many other areas located in the county. In the past, the City of Riverside was so large that it had to be divided between three supervisors. For example, the City of L.A. was too large to be included within one supervisorial district. Those factors would need to be reviewed using the Elections Code as a guideline.

David Huff clarified that before the Board of Supervisors could adopt the redistricting plan, there is a requirement to hold at least two public hearings, which are forecast for the end of June and first of July. The redistricting plan must be approved and in place prior to November 1 of this year. If for some reason the Board of Supervisors is not able to accomplish the task before November 1, then there is a provision in state law Section 21502 of the Elections Code that provides that there be a Supervisorial Redistricting Commission composed of the District Attorney, the County Assessor, and the elected County Superintendent of Schools. This group would carry out the task that the Board of Supervisors attempted to accomplish. David Huff concluded the overview for the County Supervisorial process.

Chairman Larry Ward noted for the record, that 3<sup>rd</sup> District representative, Verne Lauritzen, arrived at the meeting.

Chairman Larry Ward introduced TLMA Deputy Director, Tom Mullen. Tom will provide the population numbers and the map presentation.

#### **4. POPULATION NUMBERS AND MAP PRESENTATION:**

Tom Mullen, Deputy Director of Transportation and Land Management, shared with the group the impacts of the United States Census 2010 in Riverside County and the redistricting process. The map presented the general changing population throughout the county with an overlay of the five existing supervisorial districts. The different colors depict the rate and growth by census tract. The county grew at a rate of 644,000 people, just shy of 42 percent. There has been a tremendous amount of growth throughout the county across all demographic groups, as well as all sectors of the county. The fastest growing district in the county was the 3<sup>rd</sup> District, growing at a rate of 66 percent and adding 206,000 people to the district. This brought the total population to over 517,000. The 1<sup>st</sup> District grew by approximately 35.5 percent. The non-White Hispanic Latino population has grown to 193,145 residents representing one of the largest single ethnic groups within the 1<sup>st</sup> District.

---

Tom Mullen noted that in the 2<sup>nd</sup> District, the fastest growth in the county was in the City of Eastvale along the northern border of Corona and Norco. This area grew faster than any other area in the county on a percentage basis. The non-white Hispanic Latino population is now being dominated in the 2<sup>nd</sup> District with roughly 200,000 residents.

Tom Mullen discussed the 3<sup>rd</sup> District and this district is the most populous district in the county. There are high rates of growth throughout the cities of San Jacinto, Hemet, Menifee, Murrieta, and the Temecula corridor along the I-215. What is interesting to note, is the tremendous growth on a percentage basis of the Asian population, growing almost 300 percent throughout the district. This has far overshadowed by the continued growth of the non-white Hispanic Latino population.

Tom Mullen indicated that the 4<sup>th</sup> District, is the largest district in the county, but relative to the other districts, this district saw less growth overall. There has been significant growth in minority population groups led by non-white Hispanic Latino reaching over 206,000 residents throughout the region. There is strong growth throughout the entire Coachella Valley in and around the cities along the primary corridors, which includes small growth out in the Blythe region.

Tom Mullen added that the 5<sup>th</sup> District, has had high density growth throughout the Banning/Beaumont pass area connecting into the City of Moreno Valley. There has been tremendous growth in the non-white Hispanic Latino population of over 240,000 residents. The current district boundaries are in-balanced in proportion to the residents to the core value of the One Person One Vote in equal representation. The districts need to amend their boundaries to better represent the population. Each district has prepared what they consider their first scenario.

Tom presented the map, which represents all five districts as well as the overlay of the consolidation of those individual efforts. Tom noted that the green areas are areas that are "proposed" moving between the districts under the current scenario. The hatched areas on the map are areas, which are unassigned to a district and continue to evolve. Each of the six maps were posted in the hallway for public viewing. Tom mentioned that during the break, he would be available to answer any questions.

Chairman Larry Ward explained that this is the first draft of what will be several maps. Chairman Larry Ward suggested everyone take a 10 or 15-minute break to have an opportunity to look at the maps and to allow the public the opportunity to ask questions.

Chairman Larry Ward recalled the meeting to order.

## **5. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

Chairman Larry Ward introduced Mr. John Kopp.

Mr. John Kopp, an Eastvale resident, mentioned the Voting Rights Act. He indicated that he knew the Citizens Redistricting Commission for the state, and the Voting Rights

---

Act Council. He questioned whether the county had engaged in this service? If so, who, and if not, why?

David Huff responded briefly stating that the county has not retained any outside law firm to advise the committee on county redistricting or received advice on the federal Voting Rights Act. David Huff, from County Counsel, has been representing the county and has advised the committee on matters that will ultimately go before the Board of Supervisors.

John Kopp questioned if a member of the public or group did challenge an issue that the advisory committee was recommending, would this committee seek advice from a specialist?

David Huff replied that it would be somewhat speculatively at this point. It would depend on the nature of the challenge and the complexity. The county would always have available options to see appropriate resources if necessary.

John Kopp suggested that the committee look at the Corona-Norco Unified School District. He thought that the entire school district was within the 2<sup>nd</sup> District. If it is not, there leaves a small section of Temescal Canyon. He suggested if the small section needs to be moved, the committee should consider keeping the entire school district within the 2<sup>nd</sup> District.

Mr. Morris Mendoza, a resident, commented that he was in favor of keeping the City of Riverside all in one district. Knowing your representative is important. He mentioned the importance of having a personal contact. The City of Riverside proposed a grant called GRACE. GRACE is a gang intervention grant, which targets areas of Eastvale, Casa Blanca and Arlanza. Under the 1<sup>st</sup> District, Eastside is part of the 1<sup>st</sup> District. The three communities are one of the most disadvantaged areas in the country. He suggested that these areas stay in one district.

Dave Stahovich assured Mr. Mendoza that the Arlanza, Casa Blanca and Eastside are each in the 1<sup>st</sup> District.

Mr. Larry Smith, City of Hemet Council Member, stated that he was happy with the first draft of the maps. He was diligently fighting to keep the cities of San Jacinto and Hemet together. He appreciated the support from Supervisor Stone's Office. This is a difficult task and he admired and appreciated all the hard work. He is fearful as the scenarios pop up that there may be some temptation to divide communities of interest. He is happy with his representation under Supervisor Stone.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS:**

No other business was discussed at this time.

**7. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA:**

No other members of the public presented comments.

**8. ADJOURN:**

Adjournment to the "Special" Redistricting Steering Committee Forum set for Thursday, April 21, 2011, at 7:00 p.m., at the Kay Cenicerros Senior Center – Palm Room, 29995 Evans Road, Menifee (Sun City), CA 92586.

---

# REDISTRICTING STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

---

## MINUTES OF MEETING

### “Special Meeting”

May 24, 2011  
8:30 a.m.

County Executive Office  
4080 Lemon Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Conference Room C

#### Members Present:

Larry Ward  
Jay Orr  
Michelle DeArmond  
John Field  
Robin Hastings  
Verne Lauritzen  
Dave Stahovich

Chair, Assessor-Clerk Recorder  
Co-Chair, Executive Office  
4<sup>th</sup> District  
2<sup>nd</sup> District  
5<sup>th</sup> District  
3<sup>rd</sup> District  
1<sup>st</sup> District

#### Staff and Guests Present:

Jeremy Clark  
Tina Grande  
Duane Gang  
David Huff  
George Johnson  
Emily Lee  
JiHong McDermott  
Tom Mullen II  
Donna Katchadoorian

TLMA  
Executive Office  
The Press-Enterprise  
County Counsel  
TLMA  
TLMA  
TLMA  
TLMA  
Executive Office

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

The Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. The roll call was conducted by Donna Katchadoorian.

**2. ACTIVITY: MAPPING OF DISTRICT ALTERNATIVES:**

TLMA presented a District 1 and District 2 proposed overlap - working map, which illustrated the modifications requested from the last meeting.

Dave Stahovich announced that he is requesting that two maps be presented to the Board of Supervisors. Dave addressed an area in the 1<sup>st</sup> District that required a minor revision. The area is east of Chicago by UCR, which includes a piece of the medical school, from Citrus to Canyon Crest. The area that needs to be split is from Iowa to Chicago, which would include Cranford Avenue. Dave noted that this area was not included on his map. Also, not included was a portion of Temescal Canyon, the Retreat, which should be included in the 1<sup>st</sup> District.

John Field stated that he was okay with taking a portion of the area back.

Dave Stahovich pointed out that he was in agreement with the other areas. Dave mentioned an unincorporated area pocket, a subdivision in the 1<sup>st</sup> District, and a small piece in the 2<sup>nd</sup> District. Dave clarified that he would keep the Casa Blanca and Arlanza areas. The Eastside is the area that needs to be modified.

John Field agreed with the modification of the small piece in the subdivision.

Tina Grande clarified for the committee. Dave is requesting two maps be presented to the Board of Supervisors, but they are not the maps presented today. The map should include a slight modification on both maps. Tina mentioned cleaning up a small area on Dave's map and showing a pull back of UCR on John's map. The Retreat would remain in the 1<sup>st</sup> District. Tina explained that new maps would be presented to the committee at the Thursday meeting with the changes included.

**MOTION: Co-Chair Jay Orr moved that TLMA make the necessary corrections and present the revised two maps at the next meeting.**

**Seconded by: John Field**

**Motion carried unanimously**

**3. OTHER BUSINESS:**

No other business was discussed at this time.

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA:**

No members of the public presented public comments.

5. **ADJOURNMENT TO THE "SPECIAL" MEETING SET FOR THURSDAY, MAY 26, 2011 AT 2 P.M., IN THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER, 4080 LEMON STREET, 4<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR, CONFERENCE ROOM C.**

The next "Special" Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting is set for Thursday, May 26, 2011 at 2 p.m. With no further discussion, Chairman Larry Ward adjourned the Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting at 8:44 a.m.

---

# REDISTRICTING STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

---

## MINUTES OF MEETING

### “Special Meeting”

May 26, 2011  
2:00 p.m.

County Executive Office  
4080 Lemon Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Conference Room C

**Members Present:**

Larry Ward  
Michelle DeArmond  
John Field  
Robin Hastings  
Dave Stahovich

Chair, Assessor-Clerk Recorder  
4<sup>th</sup> District  
2<sup>nd</sup> District  
5<sup>th</sup> District  
1<sup>st</sup> District

**Members Absent:**

Verne Lauritzen  
Jay Orr

3<sup>rd</sup> District  
Co-Chair, Executive Office

**Staff and Guests Present:**

Jeremy Clark  
Tina Grande  
David Huff  
Damian Laning  
JiHong McDermott  
Tom Mullen II  
Tori Richardson  
Donna Katchadoorian

TLMA  
Executive Office  
County Counsel  
TLMA  
TLMA  
TLMA  
Registrar of Voters  
Executive Office

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

The Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. The roll call was conducted by Donna Katchadoorian.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR APRIL 20, 2011, APRIL 21, 2011 AND APRIL 27, 2011 PUBLIC FORUMS, AND MINUTES FOR THE "SPECIAL" MEETINGS ON MAY 17, 2011 AND MAY 24, 2011:**

**MOTION:** Robin Hastings moved to approve all the minutes.

**Seconded by:** Dave Stahovich

**Motion carried unanimously**

**3. ACTIVITY: MAPPING OF DISTRICT ALTERNATIVES:**

Chairman Larry Ward mentioned receiving an e-mail from the Menifee Action Group requesting that the City of Menifee stay together. Chairman Larry Ward advised the committee that Tina Grande received a Joint Resolution from the City of Moreno Valley and the City of Perris. Tina provided copies to the committee for their review.

Tom Mullen presented the committee with two revised scenario maps.

Dave Stahovich suggested that Tom Mullen label the maps as Proposal A and Proposal B, and highlight the areas to show the differences.

The committee discussed the revised maps.

Chairman Larry Ward requested that once the maps have been revised that copies be sent out to the committee for review.

Dave Stahovich pointed out that the changes should be noted by using a different color.

Tom Mullen emphasized that he wasn't trying to show the differences between the two, but show the differences overall.

Chairman Larry Ward clarified that Tom Mullen would label the maps Proposal A and Proposal B, and highlight the areas of contention in different colors.

Dave Stahovich informed the committee that the maps presented today would remain the same. A third map would be presented to show the two areas in question.

**MOTION:** Dave Stahovich moved to approve the mapping of alternatives once the two existing maps were labeled as Proposal A and Proposal B, provide a third map to show the differences between the two maps, and present three maps to the Board of Supervisors on June 14, 2011.

**Seconded by:** John Field

**Motion carried unanimously**

**4. PRESENTATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:**

Tina Grande informed the committee that she has been working with David Huff on the Form 11 for the June 14, 2011 Board of Supervisors' meeting. Staff is currently working on the outline. Tina advised the committee that Chairman Larry Ward, David Huff and Tom Mullen will be the speakers at the presentation to the Board of Supervisors.

**5. OTHER BUSINESS:**

No other business was presented at this time.

**6. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA:**

No members of the public presented public comments.

Chairman Larry Ward indicated that meetings have been scheduled through September. The committee will meet on an "as needed" basis depending on the feedback from the Board of Supervisors.

David Huff reported that the Board of Supervisors could require the committee to review an item. If this is the case, the committee would hold a special meeting or meet on one of the pre-set regular monthly meetings scheduled through September. If there is no need for a meeting, a cancellation notice would be distributed.

Chairman Larry Ward thanked the committee for all their hard work.

**7. ADJOURNMENT:**

The Redistricting Steering Committee Meeting was adjourned at 2:16 p.m.