

Region I, II, III Wrap-Up

Executive Summary delivered on May 18, 2011

The following is a summary of the major points that have been raised through public testimony about Regions I, II, and III. It is not an exhaustive list of every public comment; those are available in a MS Access Database. Also, there are no recommendations in this document. It is merely a summary of what was communicated and proposed by the public and any technical notes related to those proposals of which the Commission should be aware.

Norco: May 5, 2011

* *57 Input Hearing public speakers*

Santa Ana: May 6, 2011

* *59 Input Hearing public speakers*

Palm Springs: May 12, 2011

* *39 Input Hearing public speakers*

San Marcos: May 13, 2011

* *55 Input Hearing public speakers*

San Diego: May 14, 2011

* *62 Input Hearing public speakers*

272 total speakers at public input hearings held in these five locations (note that some individuals spoke at multiple meetings and are therefore counted at least 2-5 times in this total)

10 of the speakers indicated that they currently live outside Regions I, II, or III (in Ventura, Los Angeles, and Modoc Counties); 2 spoke about how districts in Region I, II, III might affect them, and 8 spoke about their region unrelated to Regions I, II, III. The wrap-ups for Regions IV, V, VI and IX will be updated with information from these hearings, just as they are being updated continuously with written comments submitted to the commission.

Publicly Submitted Written Comments on Region I: 14 (note: this is not 14 additional individuals because some of the hearing speakers also submitted written comments)

Publicly Submitted Written Comments on Region II: 46 (note: this is not 46 additional individuals because some of the hearing speakers also submitted written comments)

Publicly Submitted Written Comments on Region III: 28 (note: this is not 28 additional individuals because some of the hearing speakers also submitted written comments)

Note: The cut-off date for public comments to be incorporated in this document was submissions dated through May 14, 2011. Public comments received after this date will be included in subsequent Executive Summaries to the Commission.

Region II. Riverside and San Bernardino Counties

1. The Pomona Valley should not be split. The Pomona Valley includes the cities of Pomona (Los Angeles County) and at least Ontario, Montclair and Chino (San Bernardino County). (stated by 9 speakers in Norco)

* There were conflicting views of whether Chino Hills should be included in this grouping (at the Norco hearing, 4 speakers said to include Chino Hills, 3 speakers said not to include Chino Hills)

Technical Notes:

* This requires crossing the Los Angeles/San Bernardino County Border.

COI	Population	% Latino VAP	% Black VAP	% API VAP	AD Deviation	CD Deviation	SD Deviation
Pomona, Ontario, Montclair, Chino	440,745	62.00%	6.77%	8.98%	-24,929	-262,160	-490,604
Pomona, Ontario, Montclair, Chino, Chino Hills	515,544	56.74%	6.45%	12.40%	49,870	-187,361	-415,805

2. The cities of Riverside and Moreno Valley are major cities that should each be kept whole as much as possible. (stated by 7 speakers in Norco and 3 speakers in Palm Springs and 1 written comment)

- The Riverside and Moreno Valley area district should include March Air Reserve Base (ARB), and Perris or the new city of Jurupa Valley.
- There were differing opinions on whether Riverside and Moreno Valley should be in the same district.

Technical notes:

*The population of Riverside is: 303,871

*The population of Moreno Valley is: 193,365

(See table next page)

COI	Population	% Latino VAP	% Black VAP	% API VAP	AD Deviation	CD Deviation	SD Deviation
Moreno Valley, City of Riverside, March ARB	498,852	45.48%	11.15%	8.92%	33,178	-204,053	-432,497
Moreno Valley, City of Riverside, March ARB, Jurupa Valley	593,858	47.76%	10.03%	8.05%	128,184	-109,047	-337,491
Moreno Valley, City of Riverside, March ARB, Perris	567,238	47.96%	11.24%	8.46%	101,564	-135,667	-364,111

3. There should be a district along the I-15 highway corridor in Riverside County (stated by 3 speakers in Norco)

- Option (a): Mira Loma, Eastvale, Norco, Corona
- Option (b): Eastvale to French Valley

Technical Notes:

COI	Population	% Latino VAP	% Black VAP	% API VAP	AD Deviation	CD Deviation	SD Deviation
Eastvale, Norco, Corona, Mira Loma	255,035	39.45%	6.60%	13.00%	-210,639	-447,870	-676,314
Eastvale, Norco, Corona, Coronita, El Cerrito, Temescal Valley, Lake Elsinore, Wildomar, Murrieta, Temecula, French Valley	588,197	31.67%	5.80%	11.44%	122,523	-114,708	-343,152

4. Keep Riverside County intact as much as possible, divide only as needed to meet population requirements of districts (stated by 10 speakers in Norco and 5 speakers in Palm Springs and 1 written comment)

Technical Notes:

* The Total Population of Riverside county is: 2,189,641

* This is sufficient population for: 4.70 Assembly Districts, 2.35 Senate Districts, and 3.12 Congressional Districts.

5. Coachella Valley & Imperial Valley:

Definitions (as stated by one or more speakers in Palm Springs):

-Coachella Valley is the desert area in Riverside County from the Banning/Beaufort pass to the border with Imperial County.

-Imperial Valley is Imperial County from the border with Riverside to the border with Mexico. (Although several speakers in Palm Springs agreed that the Imperial Valley went all the way to the Mexican border, they spoke primarily about the area around the Salton Sea when talking about Imperial Valley.

Proposed Options:

- Keep Coachella Valley and Imperial Valley (Imperial Co) in same district. (stated by 11 speakers in Palm Springs and by 2 written comments)
- Keep Coachella Valley only within Riverside County and do not include Imperial Valley (stated by 5 speakers in Palm Springs and by 24 written comments); Imperial Valley belongs with San Diego County more than Riverside (stated by 4 speakers in San Diego)
- Coachella Valley, Imperial Valley and Palo Verde Valley are a COI. (stated by 4 speakers in Palm Springs)

Technical notes:

* Keeping the Coachella and Imperial Valleys together requires crossing the Riverside/Imperial County border.

* In the table below the Coachella Valley is defined as the “nine cities” from the Banning/Beaumont pass south to county line. Imperial Valley is defined as all of Imperial County.

COI	Population	% Latino VAP	% Black VAP	% API VAP	AD Deviation	CD Deviation	SD Deviation
Coachella Valley	420,748	43.34%	2.26%	3.13%	-44,926	-282,157	-510,601
Imperial County	174,528	76.89%	3.84%	1.63%	-291,146	-528,377	-756,821
Coachella Valley & Palo Verde Valley	443,996	43.78%	2.97%	3.04%	-21,678	-258,909	-487,353
Imperial County, Coachella and Palo Verde Valleys	618,524	52.72%	3.21%	2.66%	152,850	-84,381	-312,825

6. The city of San Bernardino and the cities around it should not be split up (stated by 5 speakers in Norco and 4 written comments)

- Option a): San Bernardino, Rialto, Highland, Redlands, Yucaipa, Bloomington
- Option b): San Bernardino, Rialto, Colton, Fontana

Technical notes:

COI	Population	% Latino VAP	% Black VAP	% API VAP	AD Deviation	CD Deviation	SD Deviation
San Bernardino, Rialto, Highland, Redlands, Yucaipa, Bloomington	538,310	48.31%	11.21%	5.29%	72,636	-164,595	-393,039
San Bernardino, Rialto, Fontana & Colton	575,835	59.91%	12.98%	5.73%	110,161	-127,070	-355,514

7. Hemet/San Jacinto area should stay whole and can be grouped with nearby towns, such as Valle Vista, Winchester, Perris (stated by 2 speakers in Norco and 3 speakers in Palm Springs and by 1 written comment)

Technical notes:

COI	Population	% Latino VAP	% Black VAP	% API VAP	AD Deviation	CD Deviation	SD Deviation
Hemet & San Jacinto	140,274	35.1%	5.48%	3.58%	-325,400	-562,631	-791,075
Hemet, San Jacinto, Valle Vista, Winchester	157,386	34.01%	5.11%	3.46%	-308,288	-545,519	-773,963
Hemet, San Jacinto, Perris, Winchester, Menifee, Valle Vista, Lakeview, Nuevo	321,300	39.76%	6.2%	4.20%	-144,374	-381,605	-610,049

8. Victor Valley in San Bernardino County forms a COI (discussed by 7 speakers in Lancaster on May 1, 2011)

Technical notes:

COI	Population	% Latino VAP	% Black VAP	% API VAP	AD Deviation	CD Deviation	SD Deviation
Victor Valley (Palmdale, Pinon Hills, Phelan, Mountain View Acres, Adelanto, Victorville, Apple Valley)	481,575	41.17%	12.30%	4.54%	15,901	-221,330	-449,774

Region III. Orange County:

1. Keep the Cities of Santa Ana & Anaheim together (5 speakers in Santa Ana and by 2 written comments)

Technical notes:

- * The population of Santa Ana is: 324,528
- * This is sufficient population for: 0.70 Assembly Districts, 0.35 Senate Districts, and 0.46 Congressional Districts.
- * The population of Anaheim is: 336,265
- * This is sufficient population for: 0.72 Assembly Districts, 0.36 Senate Districts, and 0.48 Congressional Districts.

2. Latino population should be kept together: Santa Ana and parts of Anaheim (5 speakers in Santa Ana and by 2 written comments)

Technical notes:

- *Santa Ana and Anaheim are not contiguous. They are separated by the cities of Orange and Garden Grove. Where Anaheim and Santa Ana's borders are the closest, they are separated by a section of the city of Orange that is approximately 1.5 mi. This area includes the Block at Orange (a shopping center) and UC Irvine Medical Center.
- *The Latino population is significant and concentrated in the cities of Santa Ana and central Anaheim (excluding Anaheim Hills).

COI	Population	% Latino VAP	% Black VAP	% API VAP	AD Deviation	CD Deviation	SD Deviation
Santa Ana & Anaheim	660,793	59.78%	2.02%	15.08%	195,119	-42,112	-270,556
Santa Ana & Central Anaheim	614,208	63.50%	2.02%	14.63%	148,534	-88,697	-317,141

3. Little Saigon should be kept together (15 speakers in Santa Ana and by 2 written comments)

- Westminster, Garden Grove, Fountain Valley are key; also include Stanton, Midway City, part of Santa Ana

Technical notes:

COI	Population	% Latino VAP	% Black VAP	% API VAP	AD Deviation	CD Deviation	SD Deviation
Garden Grove, Westminster, Fountain Valley, Midway City	324,382	25.27%	1.06%	41.62%	-141,292	-378,523	-606,967
Garden Grove, Westminster, Fountain Valley, Midway City, Stanton, West Santa Ana	412,443	30.31%	1.09%	39.57%	-53,231	-290,462	-518,906

4. API populations should be kept together (24 speakers in Santa Ana)

- Korean American : Fullerton, Buena Park; also Brea, La Palma, Cypress, Cerritos
- Chinese American: Irvine, Tustin, North Tustin
- South Asian American: mainly Artesia & Cerritos; also La Palma, Buena Park, Northern Cypress, Fullerton
- Vietnamese American: See Little Saigon above

Technical Notes:

*The following are contiguous and contain significant API population.

COI	Population	% Latino VAP	% Black VAP	% API VAP	AD Deviation	CD Deviation	SD Deviation
Buena Park, Cerritos, La Palma, Artesia, Cypress	209,463	22.92%	4.27%	40.31%	-256,211	-493,442	-721,886
Buena Park, Cerritos, La Palma, Artesia, Cypress, Fullerton and Brea	383,912	25.31%	3.29%	32.33%	-81,762	-318,993	-547,437
Irvine, Tustin, N. Tustin	314,065	14.95%	1.86%	34.20%	-151,609	-388,840	-617,284

5. North Orange County area should be kept together: (5 speakers in Santa Ana, 1 speaker in San Marcos, and by 14 written comments)

- Option (a): Northwest Orange Co: Buena Park, Cerritos, La Palma, Artesia, Cypress
- Option (b): North and Northeast Orange Co Buena Park, Fullerton, Placentia, possibly add Yorba Linda or La Habra

Technical notes:

COI	Population	% Latino VAP	% Black VAP	% API VAP	AD Deviation	CD Deviation	SD Deviation
Buena Park, Cerritos, La Palma, Artesia, Cypress	209,463	22.92%	4.27%	40.31%	-256,211	-493,442	-721,886
Buena Park, Fullerton, Placentia	267,925	31.55%	2.58%	24.05%	-197,749	-434,980	-663,424
Buena Park, Fullerton, Placentia, Yorba Linda, La Habra	393,181	31.42%	2.22%	20.84%	-72,493	-309,724	-538,168

6. South Orange County should be kept together (2 speakers in Santa Ana, 2 speakers in San Marcos)

- South Orange County is defined as everything south of Irvine (Laguna Beach, Laguna Woods, Laguna Niguel, Laguna Hills, Lake Forest, Mission Viejo, Rancho Santa Margarita, Coto De Caza, San Juan Capistrano, Dana Point, San Clemente and then stops at Camp Pendelton/county line)

Technical notes:

COI	Population	% Latino VAP	% Black VAP	% API VAP	AD Deviation	CD Deviation	SD Deviation
S. Orange County	577,089	15.82%	1.35%	10.45%	111,415	-125,816	-354,260

7. Keep together Irvine, Tustin, and North Tustin, and not Santa Ana (2 speakers at Santa Ana hearing and 1 written comment)

Technical notes:

COI	Population	% Latino VAP	% Black VAP	% API VAP	AD Deviation	CD Deviation	SD Deviation
Irvine, Tustin, N. Tustin	314,065	14.95%	1.86%	34.20%	-151,609	-388,840	-617,284

8. Create a coastal district (stated by 3 speakers in Santa Ana and by 2 written comments)

Technical notes:

COI	Population	% Latino VAP	% Black VAP	% API VAP	AD Deviation	CD Deviation	SD Deviation
Seal Beach, Sunset Beach, Huntington Beach, Costa Mesa, Newport Beach	411,216	16.70%	1.11%	10.90%	-54,458	-291,689	-520,133

Region I: San Diego and Imperial Counties

1. Keep Oceanside and North San Diego County in San Diego County; do not cross into Orange County (stated by 20 speakers in San Marcos and by 5 written comments)

2. North San Diego County Topics

- Latino and API populations in North San Diego County should be kept together. (stated by 12 speakers in San Marcos and by 1 written comment)
- District Options
 - (a) Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos, Escondido (along the highway 78 corridor) (stated by 7 speakers in San Marcos and by 1 written comment)
 - (b) Coastal district: Camp Pendleton South to Del Mar, or Carlsbad down to Northern San Diego City. (stated by 5 speakers in San Marcos and by 3 written comments)
- Escondido area including Hidden Meadows, Ramona*, Valley Center should be in one district (stated by 2 speakers in San Marcos)

Technical Notes:

*Ramona is not contiguous with Hidden Meadows, Valley Center and Escondido. It is separated by part of the city of San Diego and unincorporated areas of the county of San Diego.

COI	Population	% Latino VAP	% Black VAP	% API VAP	AD Deviation	CD Deviation	SD Deviation
Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos, Escondido	498,492	36.05%	3.32%	8.38%	32,818	-204,413	-432,857
Camp Pendleton, Oceanside, Carlsbad, Encinitas, Del Mar	364,776	20.76%	2.99%	7.86%	-100,898	-338,129	-566,573
Escondido, Hidden Meadows, Ramona, Valley Center	184,737	37.77%	2.03%	6.62%	-280,937	-518,168	-746,612

3. African Americans, Latinos, and APIs form a COI in and around San Diego City.
 (3 speakers in San Marcos and 24 speakers in San Diego)

The following ethnic groups were discussed: Latino, African-American, API (Filipino, Vietnamese, Lao, Burmese (Karen ethnic group) in particular); refugees from central Africa and the Caribbean, Somalians, and Sudanese.

Technical notes:

*Joining neighborhoods within San Diego with areas outside San Diego, such as Chula Vista, National City, or Poway, will require splitting San Diego.

*The city of San Diego has a total population of 1,307,402 that is sufficient for 2.81 Assembly Districts, 1.40 Senate Districts, and 1.86 Congressional Districts.

COI	Population	% Latino VAP	% Black VAP	% API VAP	AD Deviation	CD Deviation	SD Deviation
Poway, Mira Mesa, Rancho Penasquitos, Carmel Valley, Rancho Bernardo, Scripps Ranch*	232,132	9.48%	2.47%	27.35%	-233,542	-470,773	-699,217
Barrio District*, Chula Vista, National City	341,452	56.51%	5.27%	15.59%	-124,222	-361,453	-589,897
Chula Vista, National City, Bonita, Bay Terrace, Paradise Hills*	363,115	51.53%	5.49%	19.95%	-102,559	-339,790	-568,234

*This is an approximation of these neighborhoods of San Diego as we do not have official neighborhood boundaries.

4. “Border district” in southern San Diego and Imperial counties
 (4 speakers in San Marcos, 6 speakers in San Diego, and 1 written comment)

Technical notes:

*This would require crossing the San Diego/Imperial County border.

*This would likely require the splitting of some city boundaries as well.

COI	Population	% Latino VAP	% Black VAP	% API VAP	AD Deviation	CD Deviation	SD Deviation
Border District: Imperial County & South City of San Diego	349,017	64.62%	4.57%	5.88%	-116,657	-353,888	-582,332