

Letter B

Subject: Re: Redistricting in the Coachella Valley

From:

Date: Fri, 24 Jun 2011 23:57:53 -0400 (EDT)

To:

From:

To:

Sent: 6/24/2011 10:23:46 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time

Subj: Urgent-Need Letters on redistricting!

Hello all,

We have just found out that the Republicans are flooding the redistricting commission with letters against having Imperial County with Coachella Valley in the Congressional, Assembly and Senate seats.

WE NEED YOU TO WRITE LETTERS NOW!

Send letters via email to: votersfirstact@crc.ca.gov

We have until Tuesday to get letters in. They don't have to be long, but need to emphasize that as a resident of the Coachella Valley or Imperial County you want to see a Congressional District that includes both Imperial County and Coachella Valley, two Assembly districts, one including Imperial County and Eastern Coachella Valley and the other containing western Coachella Valley through the pass to Beaumont and Banning, and the State Senate district including both Assembly districts.

I have pasted a couple letters I and others have written below for talking points. Please encourage others within Coachella Valley and Imperial County to send these in as well. Again we only have until Tuesday.

Please do not put this call out to distribution lists-only send to people you know will write.

Call or email me if you have any questions. Thank you!!!!

Greg

Greg Lucas Rodriguez
Palm Springs, CA 92262

← On Board of Palm Springs Democratic Club.
Executive Board member of CA Democratic Party.
Has worked for current AD 80 incumbent.
Political consultant and activist.

Boilerplate letters
attached →

Boilerplate #1

Letter #1

Dear Redistricting Commissioners,

I first of all want to thank you for your efforts in this very tedious process. Your professionalism and openness are to be highly commended. I also want to apologize on behalf of some of the public who seem to attack you in personal ways that are not warranted for the task you have taken on.

I am writing you today to offer some answers and observations to some of the questions that arose at both the San Bernardino and San Diego public hearings this past week. For your reference I was speaker number 32 in San Bernardino and was speaker number 3 at the Palm Springs public testimony held in May.

During my testimony in San Bernardino I made a suggestion that the map makers should think about starting their drawing process from the eastern border of California and move west. I am actually very serious about this suggestion. After hearing the testimonies in San Bernardino and San Diego, I believe this would help address a lot of the concerns voiced by not just eastern Riverside County, but the communities of San Diego and San Bernardino/Redlands area.

During my testimony in Palm Springs I included a power point presentation (I have reattached to this email as a pdf for you) that included maps for your consideration. I strongly believe that if you use these maps, especially those for the 45th Congressional, 80th and 65th Assembly Districts and the 40th Senate Seat, this will allow you to address the concerns of the citizens of Imperial County, Eastern Coachella Valley, and the eastern portions of Riverside County.

I also believe that by following these maps, you can utilize the current cities and communities in the first draft maps to accommodate the changes desired in the San Bernardino Redlands area and the areas of San Diego that were spoken about on Monday night. The cities that are included in the first draft maps that border the western portion of the maps I proposed at the Palm Springs hearing could be used to make up for the population shifts required to satisfy the eastern portions of San Diego County, but especially the communities of San Bernardino and Redlands and the western areas of Riverside County.

I would just like to close reemphasizing the overwhelming testimony you have heard in our area about including Imperial County with the Coachella Valley. Including both of these areas in the Congressional District should satisfy the Voting Rights Act as well as the numerous communities of interest expressed throughout all the hearings. Creating an Assembly District with Imperial County and the Eastern portions of Coachella Valley will also accomplish these two objectives.

I know that there were questions from commissioners about including Palm Springs in this AD, but that would not be the case if you look at the proposed maps I submitted in Palm Springs. I am suggesting that the 65th AD extend from the western portions of the Coachella Valley to the Beaumont Banning area which again share many commonalities expressed during public testimony. The dividing line would be Bob Hope Street which divides the eastern and western portions of the Coachella Valley.

In San Diego there seemed to be a recurring theme about the affluence of Palm Springs.

While it is true that there are some affluent people in the Palm Springs area, the majority of our full-time residents do not fit that criterion. One only has to look at the statistics for the Palm Springs Unified School District which encompasses the cities of Palm Springs, Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Desert Hot Springs and Thousand Palms that show 85% of our children are on free and reduced lunch.

Finally, as I expressed at the conclusion of my testimony in San Bernardino, the proposed Senate seat does not satisfy the nesting requirements and includes communities that have absolutely no common interests with each other. Once again, I refer you to the original maps I proposed that would nest the 80th and 65th AD's into the 40th Senate seat.

Letter #2

Round II-Comments on Tentative Maps

I am a resident of the city of _____, in the Coachella Valley portion of eastern Riverside County. I have resided here for _____ years. I am disappointed in the tentative maps released by the Commission on June 10th as they appear to perpetuate the cannibalization of Riverside County that has been the pattern under previous decades' redistricting through the Legislature.

Riverside County has a population of over 2 million people and is the fastest growing County in the State of California, yet the frame of reference or starting point for the drawing of legislative district boundaries seems to ignore this growth and significant size of the County and appears to start at the Pacific Coast, moving inland to accommodate districts based in populations in Los Angeles, Orange and San Diego Counties: once again treating the Inland Counties of Imperial and Riverside as afterthoughts.

Riverside County is diverse and has unique challenges that cannot be met if our Legislative representation is combined with coastal communities. Our population is lower income, suburban and rural, with large communities of retired people. The County is about 50% Latino with small populations of African-Americans and Asians.

A more just and effective starting point for delineating Riverside County districts is the eastern border of the State (the Colorado River) which is also the eastern border of Riverside County. A more in-depth analysis of the populations in the inland portion of California shows the community of interest shared by Imperial County and eastern Riverside County. The climate, the economies and the population demographics of eastern Riverside County (the eastern half of the Coachella Valley) and Imperial County are identical. In addition, these communities are contained within the political boundaries of the Imperial Irrigation District and are part of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) statutory planning area for transportation, housing and air quality. The boundary between Imperial and Riverside County is entirely man-made while the boundaries between Imperial and San Diego on the one-hand and the Coachella Valley and western Riverside County on the other hand are physical, natural mountain ranges that separate populations on either side, preventing economic, social and physical interaction. The boundary between Riverside and Imperial Counties also divides the Salton Sea—an environmental challenge contained in the State's largest inland body of water. The communities around the Sea need to work together to mitigate impending air quality disasters and splitting the legislative representation among six (6) different state and federal legislators will not facilitate the solution need to avoid catastrophe when the Sea begins to dry up in 2017.

The appropriate districts to meet the population targets required by law would create an Assembly District that includes all of Imperial County, the communities of the Palo Verde Valley at the border (Blythe, Palo Verde, Ripley) and the eastern Coachella Valley from Palm Desert east. These communities consist entirely of cities no larger than 80,000, with economies based on tourism, retirement and agriculture. They all accommodate "snow-bird" populations that spend the winters but are not full-time residents. This phenomenon supports hospitality, retail and health-care based local economies.

A second Assembly District would start at the political boundaries separating the city of Rancho Mirage from Palm Desert which is also the boundary between Palm Springs Unified School District and Desert Sands Unified School District, and move west to include the communities of Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Thousand Palms, Palm Springs and the Banning/Beaumont Pass area to the northwestern county line. While these communities share a number of characteristics with the eastern valley, their economies are not based on agriculture and emphasize conventions, tourism, retirement and health care to a greater extent. In past years, when the community newspaper was locally owned, one version—the Desert Sun—covered the western portion of the Coachella Valley and the Pass while the Indio Daily News covered the eastern portion of the valley. The valley was only unified by the media with the entry of national media companies purchasing local outlets. If these two Assembly Districts are then nested in a single Senate district, the result is a cohesive district with economic, geographic, demographic and social communities of interest. All of the

continued, but not copied.

7/13
Sac.

Public Comment from Vicki Medina – Executive Director, Antelope Valley Board of Trade

I'm Vicki Medina with the Antelope Valley Board of Trade, I spoke to you in Lancaster about the importance of creating two high desert Assembly seats, one for the Antelope Valley covering Lancaster, Palmdale, Rosamond and California City, and one centered in the Victor Valley communities of Adelanto, Hesperia, Victorville and Apple Valley. Those districts should be combined into one Senate district.

In your first draft maps, you did just about a perfect job. Senate District MISKL totally protected our high desert community of interest. Please do not replace it with the district not one person has asked for that was visualized just last week. The recent visualization combining the San Fernando Valley, Pacoima, Santa Clarita and splitting the Antelope Valley in Lancaster and Palmdale not only rips apart our community of interest, but it also ignores the public testimony from East Ventura, Santa Clarita, the Antelope Valley and the Victor Valley.

Combining the East Ventura Assembly District with the Santa Clarita Assembly district is what those communities have asked for, and what you've directed Q2 to produce. Please hold them accountable to your instructions.

That districts borders dovetail perfectly with our high desert community of interest you did such a good job of drawing in first draft MISKL

Within MISKL, you drew two great Assembly Districts, LAAVV covering Lancaster, Palmdale and Adelanto and MISBK covering Mono and Inyo County, East Kern, Apple Valley, Hesperia and Victorville. Just last week when going over these Assembly Districts, Commissioners lamented that Adelanto was split from the Victor Valley cities.

There is an easy fix for this: the Mayor of Adelanto and the Rosamond Municipal Advisory Council (their elected town council) in East Kern have both written letters in support of swapping Adelanto and East Kern between these two districts. It preserves both our Antelope Valley/East Kern community of interest and the Victor Valley community of interest. Please direct Q2 to make this change and preserve our unified High Desert Senate seat, and ensure they follow through with your direction.

Thank you. Attached are the letters from Adelanto and Rosamond as well as maps of your original MISKL Senate District, and proposed changes to the underlying Assembly District.



Cari Thomas
Mayor

Ed Camargo
Mayor Pro Tem

Steven R. Baisden
Council Member

Trinidad Perez
Council Member

Charles S. Valvo
Council Member

D. James Hart, Ph.D.
City Manager

June 24, 2011

Citizens Redistricting Commission
901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Commissioners,

The maps you have developed for the High Desert communities of eastern Kern County, northern Los Angeles County, northern San Bernardino County and Inyo County are very good. We appreciate greatly your diligence in keeping our unique communities together.

We do however request your consideration for one minor change in the Assembly lines, which can easily be accomplished affecting only two districts nested within the same Senate districts in your first draft of maps.

In the LAAVV Assembly District, the City of Adelanto is included with the population centers of Lancaster and Palmdale, and split from the MISBK district with the population centers of Apple Valley, Hesperia and Victorville. The MISBK Assembly District also includes the eastern Kern County High Desert communities of California City, Rosamond, Mojave and Boron.

Please consider moving Adelanto and additional portions of San Bernardino out of LAAVV and into MISBK. Adelanto is a San Bernardino County city directly adjacent to Victorville and the population centers of the MISBK district. Our residents work, shop, travel through and recreate throughout the Victor Valley cities. We have joint powers authorities, a shared water basin, and many joint projects with our neighbors in the MISBK district. These are relationships that we do not have as strongly with the population centers of LAAVV in Lancaster and Palmdale.

The population can be made even by moving all of the Kern County portion of MISBK into LAAVV. This area of Kern County is far closer to the Lancaster and Palmdale population centers, making it a more compact district. Additionally, the focus on aerospace industries is shared between northern Los Angeles and eastern Kern, but not as much as with the Victor Valley. We have attached maps which accomplish this change.

We realize you have a difficult task. Fortunately, accomplishing this task should be relatively easy, as it does not affect any other neighboring Assembly District. Additionally, since MISBK and LAAVV are, wisely, in the same Senate District (MISKL) it would not change the Senate lines whatsoever.

We believe this change serves everyone better and are working with our neighbors in eastern Kern, northern Los Angeles and northern San Bernardino. We're confident you'll receive support for this change from all areas. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Cari Thomas, Mayor

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Cari Thomas". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

cc: City Council
Mayor Ryan McEachron, Victorville
Mayor Mike Leonard, Hesperia
Mayor Scott Nissif, Apple Valley
Supervisor Brad Mitzelfelt, San Bernardino County

From: Olaf [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2011 3:42 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] 'Jim Payne'; [REDACTED] 'Shoffner, Dennis G Civ USAF AFMC 95 ABW/PA'; [REDACTED] 'kathy spoor'; [REDACTED] 'Shoffner, Dennis G Civ USAF AFMC 95 ABW/PA'; 'Daniel Landsgaard'; 'Olaf'; 'Webb, Rick'; [REDACTED]
Subject: Support of Adelanto proposal to realign LAAVV and MISBK Assembly District

Citizens Redistricting Commission

901 P Street, Suite 154-A
Sacramento, CA 95814

Via email: votersfirstact@crc.ca.gov

June 27, 2011

RE: Support of Adelanto proposal to realign LAAVV and MISBK Assembly Districts

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for the maps you have developed for the High Desert communities of eastern Kern County, northern Los Angeles County, northern San Bernardino County and Inyo County. They are very good. We appreciate greatly your diligence in keeping our unique communities together.

Please consider one minor change in the Assembly lines, which can easily be accomplished affecting only two districts nested within the same Senate districts in your first draft of maps.

In the LAAVV Assembly District, the City of Adelanto is included with the population centers of Lancaster and Palmdale, and split from the MISBK district with the population centers of Apple Valley, Hesperia and Victorville. The MISBK Assembly District includes Rosamond, a community of 18,000 that is but 7 miles from the City of Lancaster. The MISBK Assembly District also includes our smaller eastern Kern County High Desert communities of California City, Mojave and Boron.

Please consider moving the entire Kern County portion of MISBK into LAAVV. This area of Kern County is far closer to the Lancaster and Palmdale population centers in LAAVV than it is to the population centers in MISBK, making it a more compact district. Additionally, the aerospace industry is our main economic engine creating a Community of Interest between northern Los Angeles and eastern Kern counties, but not with the Victor Valley.

Population can be equalized by moving Adelanto and additional portions of San Bernardino out of LAAVV and into MISBK. Adelanto is a San Bernardino County city directly adjacent to Victorville and the population centers of the MISBK district. Their residents work, shop, travel through and recreate throughout the Victor Valley cities. They have joint powers authorities, a shared water basin, and many joint projects with their neighbors in the MISBK district.

Likewise, eastern Kern has greater connection to the Palmdale/Lancaster, Highway 14 corridor communities.


Accomplishing this task should be relatively easy, as it does not affect any other neighboring Assembly District. Additionally, since MISBK and LAAVV are, wisely, in the same Senate District (MISKL) it would not change the Senate lines whatsoever.

Sincerely,


Olaf Landsgaard


Secretary, Rosamond Municipal Advisory Council

California State Senate - MISKL



Field	Value
District	LA4W
Population	470799
% Deviation	5.09%
% NH	37.5%
% Black	13.9%
% Asian	5.7%
% Hispanic Origin	42.28%
% NH18+ WHI	42.81%
% 18+ BK	12.94%
% 18+ Asn	4.14%
% 18+ Pop	37.73%
% African American	13.2%
% CVAP_Aslan	3.34%
% Hispanic or Latino	27.74%





Field	Value
District	MISBK
Population	463225
Deviation	-44%
% Deviation	-0.1%
% NH_Whi	45.99%
% Black	9.45%
% Asian	2.6%
% Hispanic Origin	38.26%
% NH18+_Whi	52.08%
% 18+_Blk	8.7%
% 18+_Asn	2.88%
% H18+_Pop	33%
AP_African American	6.78%
% CVAP_Asian	2.16%
AP_Hispanic or Latino	24.1%

7/13
Sec.

Public Comment at the Citizens Redistricting Commission Business Meeting

July 13, 2011

I. Self-Introduction

- Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Armando de la Libertad.
- I serve as CEO of the Delhi Center – a 41-year old non-profit community development organization that focuses on self-sufficiency of the individual through programs in health, education, and financial stability.
- We are based in Santa Ana and have over 32,000 visitors from throughout Orange County each year.
- I provided testimony on June 18, 2011 at your California State University, Fullerton (CSUF) public input hearing.

II. Thank you for your efforts to keep neighborhoods with similarities together when drawing assembly and congressional districts. Please reconsider apparent plans for the Senate.

- An overwhelming number of speakers at the June 18 public input hearing requested that you keep all of Santa Ana and the “flatlands” of Anaheim together whenever possible. Many speakers also suggested inclusion of south Fullerton, east Garden Grove, and/or southwest Orange within these same districts.
- You responded affirmatively with Visualization Maps for both the State Assembly (SNANA) and Congress (WESTG) that, generally speaking, align with the requests.
- Thank you.
- As for the Senate visualization maps, I strongly oppose the WSTAN map because it spans at least two counties and possibly three, while the CSTIV map connects working class Santa Ana with the much wealthier communities of Villa Park and the Orange hills. In addition, landlocked Santa Ana is linked with the very different beach cities of Seal Beach and Huntington Beach.

III. Please pair the ‘SNANA’ and ‘ANAFL’ assembly districts to nest them within a senate district that encompasses the similar communities of Santa Ana, Anaheim, Fullerton, Buena Park and Stanton.

- Such a district is compact, preserves city boundaries, is wholly enclosed within Orange County, and respects communities of interest.
- Nesting SNANA and ANAFL districts makes sense from a historical perspective. According to retired U.C. Irvine Professor Gilbert Gonzalez, in the early 20th century Orange County was home to over 75,000 acres of orange groves in Anaheim, Fullerton and beyond. The historical evolution of these communities mirrors that of Santa Ana’s core where, for example, the Delhi Center was established 41 years ago to support the unique needs of Mexican and Mexican American agricultural workers. These neighborhoods with similar low-income and working class roots share cultural connections and also similar linguistic isolation challenges, similar family income statistics, and similar housing, job training, small business development, and health and human service needs.
- Nesting SNANA and ANAFL districts makes sense when considering the needs of children. According to the 2009 American Communities Survey and the Orange County Health Care Agency, Santa Ana and Fullerton are the two cities in all of Orange County with the highest percentages of uninsured children, 20.1% and 17.5% respectively. There are 34 jurisdictions in Orange County.

- Nesting SNANA and ANAFL districts makes sense when considering income disparities and the financial stability challenges of families. For example, Santa Ana and Stanton are the two Orange County cities that have the highest percentage of individuals in poverty, 17.27% and 15.23% respectively (according to the 2005-2009 American Community Survey, income of individuals in the last 12 months below poverty).
- Nesting SNANA and ANAFL makes sense when considering household sizes which has implications for specific housing and transportation needs. Santa Ana, Buena Park, Stanton, and Anaheim have 4 of the 5 highest household sizes in the county. The county's average household size is 3.0 persons, while these cities have higher household sizes of 4.5, 3.6, 3.4, and 3.4 respectively. (source: 2011 Orange County Indicators Project – an effort sponsored by the Orange County Business Council, the Children and Families Commission, the County of Orange, and the Urban Land Institute).

IV. Please join Santa Ana and the “flatlands” of Anaheim together within the ‘WESTG’ congressional district.

- I was unable to watch the entire Business Meeting streamed live this past Saturday. However, it's my understanding that there may have been some discussion around the possibility of separating Santa Ana and Anaheim into two separate and distinct congressional districts.
- I am here to reiterate the sentiment shared at CSUF, by many that not doing so would, in effect, dilute the ability of a cohesive group from selecting candidates of choice.
- For your perusal, I have submitted socio-economic statistics on Santa Ana and Anaheim that underscore the need to maintain both Santa Ana and Anaheim “flatlands” within the same congressional district due to their very similar characteristics that are unique within most all of Orange County. The statistics include facts in the fields of housing, transportation, small business development, and more.

V. Summary

- Please pair the ‘SNANA’ and ‘ANAFL’ assembly districts to nest them within a senate district.
- Please pair Santa Ana and the Anaheim “flatlands” within the same congressional district.
- Your support for my requests will support the preferences of the vast majority present at your June 18, 2011 public input hearing, respects communities of interest, avoids the pairing of dissimilar communities like Villa Park and Santa Ana, and safeguards basic principles of democracy.


Thank you for listening. And thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 13, 2011

Armando de la Libertad

Orange County GEOGRAPHIC HEALTH PROFILE



Orange County
HEALTH CARE AGENCY

Research and Planning
2011

David L. Riley
Director

Uninsured in Orange County

Despite recent gains in enrolling OC residents in publicly funded health insurance programs, according to the 2009 American Community Survey (ACS), over half a million people in the county do not have health insurance (535,173 or 17.7% of the population). One in ten children does not have insurance (10.4%) which corresponds to 78,738 under 18 years of age. By far, adults 18 to 64 years of age have the highest number (448,175) and percentage of uninsured in the county at 23.4%. About 2% of seniors (8,260) do not have health insurance.

Uninsured in Orange County	Number	Percent
Children (0-17)	78,738	10.4%
Adults (18-64)	448,175	23.4%
Seniors (65+)	8,260	2.4%
ALL	535,173	17.7%

The following table and maps present the percent of uninsured by age group within each city with a population of at least 65,000 that were included in the 2009 American Community Survey.

Percent Uninsured by City of Residence and Age Group

City (Population)	All Ages	Children (< 18 yrs)	Adults (18 to 64 yrs)	Seniors (65+ yrs)
ANAHEIM (336,118)	23.4%	11.8%	31.3%	4.6%
BUENA PARK (79,132)	17.5%	9.4%	23.3%	3.9%
COSTA MESA (110,221)	22.3%	11.5%	27.7%	1.7%
FULLERTON (131,837)	21.7%	17.5%	26.7%	0.6%
GARDEN GROVE (165,164)	25.8%	13.0%	34.6%	5.9%
HUNTINGTON BEACH (192,234)	11.7%	4.9%	16.0%	2.0%
IRVINE (208,190)	9.7%	7.2%	10.8%	6.3%
LAKE FOREST (75,675)	9.6%	5.9%	11.3%	6.8%
MISSION VIEJO (93,340)	7.7%	2.5%	11.6%	0.0%
NEWPORT BEACH (80,870)	6.6%	0.8%	9.8%	0.8%
ORANGE (134,740)	21.0%	11.6%	28.0%	0.0%
SANTA ANA (336,276)	36.1%	20.1%	47.4%	4.4%
TUSTIN (72,536)	17.8%	8.0%	23.7%	4.5%
WESTMINSTER (89,032)	15.3%	8.8%	21.1%	0.8%
YORBA LINDA (66,111)	5.5%	2.5%	7.7%	0.0%
Countywide (3,016,541)	17.7%	10.4%	23.4%	2.4%

Source: American Community Survey 2009

The cities with the highest percentages of uninsured children included Santa Ana (20.1%) and Fullerton (17.5%). Other cities with high rates of children who do not have health insurance include Garden Grove (13%), Anaheim (11.8%), and Orange (11.6%).

2005-2009 ACS

COUNTY	PLACE	Census Pop	ACS Pop	Poverty	%
Orange	Santa Ana	324,528	329,300	56,858	17.27%
Orange	Stanton	38,186	37,300	5,682	15.23%
Orange	Garden Grove	170,883	162,962	21,335	13.09%
Orange	Anaheim	336,265	328,612	42,594	12.96%
Orange	Costa Mesa	109,960	106,563	13,552	12.72%
Orange	Westminster	89,701	88,081	9,258	10.51%
Orange	Fullerton	135,161	129,273	13,585	10.51%
Orange	La Habra	60,239	58,466	6,113	10.46%
Orange	Buena Park	80,530	78,023	7,412	9.50%
Orange	Irvine	212,375	185,997	17,460	9.39%
Orange	Laguna Hills	30,344	31,364	2,904	9.26%
Orange	Placentia	50,533	49,084	4,530	9.23%
Orange	San Juan Capistrano	34,593	33,950	3,125	9.20%
Orange	Laguna Woods	16,192	17,890	1,585	8.86%
Orange	Orange	136,416	130,114	11,295	8.68%
Orange	Tustin	75,540	69,938	6,006	8.59%
Orange	Los Alamitos	11,449	11,028	814	7.38%
Orange	San Clemente	63,522	60,298	4,339	7.20%
Orange	Cypress	47,802	46,694	3,205	6.86%
Orange	Laguna Beach	22,723	23,830	1,599	6.71%
Orange	Huntington Beach	189,992	190,935	11,828	6.19%
Orange	Dana Point	33,351	35,214	2,129	6.05%
Orange	Newport Beach	85,186	79,939	4,734	5.92%
Orange	Fountain Valley	55,313	54,843	3,212	5.86%
Orange	La Palma	15,568	15,348	893	5.82%
Orange	Laguna Niguel	62,979	63,727	3,300	5.18%
Orange	Brea	39,282	37,971	1,920	5.06%
Orange	Seal Beach	24,168	23,764	1,187	4.99%
Orange	Lake Forest	77,264	74,799	3,711	4.96%
Orange	Mission Viejo	93,305	93,714	3,778	4.03%
Orange	North Tustin	24,917	29,144	1,055	3.62%
Orange	Aliso Viejo	47,823	40,888	1,471	3.60%
Orange	Rancho Santa Margarita	47,853	48,902	1,579	3.23%
Orange	Rossmoor	10,244	12,410	333	2.68%
Orange	Yorba Linda	64,234	64,684	1,360	2.10%
Orange	Las Flores	5,971	7,025	135	1.92%
Orange	Villa Park	5,812	5,937	108	1.82%
Orange	Coto de Caza	14,866	17,891	186	1.04%