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 ☐

Requires 4/5 Vote ☐

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE

BY: Jay E. Orr

County Executive Office Signature

Departmental Concurrence

☒ Policy ☐ Consent

☒ Policy ☐ Consent

Dep't Recomm.:

Per Exec. Ofc.:

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 14, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

Ayes: Buster, Tavaglione, Stone, Benoit and Ashley
Nays: None
Absent: None
Date: June 14, 2011
xc: EO, COB

Kecia Harper-Ihem
Clerk of the Board
By: Deputy

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

District: All

Agenda Number: 9.1

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: 1st District, 422,327; 2nd District, 407,271; 3rd District, 517,853; 4th District, 396,579; and, 5th 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 Supervisorial 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	-	-

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 12th.

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 26th 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

-----Original Message-----
From: 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

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,

Marie A. Calderon
City Clerk

Enclosure

99 E. Ramsey St. • P.O. Box 998 • Banning, CA 92220-0998 • (951) 922-3146 • Fax (951) 922-3128

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 12th day of April, 2011.

Barbara Hanna

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 12th 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

RODIA
GIVE TO
REDISTRICTING
COMMITTEE
Mau

April 13, 2011

Marion Ashley, Supervisor – 5th District
4080 Lemon Street, 5th 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

Marie A. Calderon
City Clerk

Enclosure

99 E. Ramsey St. • P.O. Box 998 • Banning, CA 92220-0998 • (951) 922-3146 • Fax (951) 922-3128

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 12th day of April, 2011.

Barbara Hanna

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 12th 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

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, 2011and 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 Supervisorial 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



Maps Prepared by National Demographics Corporation

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	**+16,525**	-3.8%	438,910	+982	+0.22%
2 / John Tavaglione	408,776	**+29,152**	-6.7%	444,573	+6,645	+1.52%
3 / Jeff Stone	518,590	**-80,662**	18.4%	441,450	+3,522	+0.8%
4 / John Benoit	396,478	**+41,450**	-9.5%	434,490	-3,438	-0.79%
5 / Marion Ashley	444,394	**-6,466**	1.5%	430,218	-7,710	-1.76%
Total	2,189,641		27.9%	2,189,641		

Maps Prepared by National Demographics Corporation

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

›m:	Mullen II, Tom
ıt:	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]
ıt: Monday, April 04, 2011 4:02 PM
.o: 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

om: Mullen II, Tom
nt: 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]
nt: Thursday, March 31, 2011 9:24 AM
o: 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
Sent: Sunday, March 27, 2011 3:07 PM
To: 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
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2011 10:52 AM
To: 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
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2011 8:53 AM
To: 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