

---

---

# 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  
John Kopp  
Morris Mendoza  
Larry Smith

County Executive Office  
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 shape 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.