Revision to ASR and/or Attachments

Date: **November 8, 2021**

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

CC: County Executive Office

From: **Frank Kim, County Executive Officer**

Digitally signed by Frank Kim
DN: cn=Frank Kim, o=County of Orange, ou=CEO, email=frank.kim@ocgov.com, c=US
Date: 2021.11.08 11:12:34 -08'00'

Re: ASR Control #: 21-000945, Meeting Date 11/9/21, Item No. # 1

Subject: Proposed 2021 Redistricting Maps

Explanation:

On November 2, 2021, the Board directed staff to make the Esri software available to the Board offices to submit any revisions to map proposals 2, 4, and 5 by Thursday, November 4, 2021 at noon. A total of six revised maps were received. The revised map proposals were made available on Friday, November 5, 2021, on the County's redistricting website.

The complete proposal packet for the revised redistricting proposals is being added as a new Attachment C. A new attachment D is being added for those public comments received from Monday, November 1, 2021 at noon through Monday, November 8, 2021 at noon. The website will continue to be updated as public comments are received.

☐ Revised Recommended Action(s)

☐ Make modifications to the:

☐ Subject ☐ Background Information ☐ Summary ☐ Financial Impact

☒ Revised Attachments (attach revised attachment(s) and redlined copy(s))

Attachment C- Revised Redistricting Proposals

Attachment C includes the map proposal packets for the Board office revisions to maps 2, 4, and 5. These map proposal packets are also available on the County's redistricting website – www.ocgov.com/redistricting.

Attachment D- Redistricting Map Proposal Public Comment

Attachment D includes public comments received from noon on Monday, November 1, 2021 through noon on Monday, November 8, 2021.

2021 REDISTRICTING

www.ocgov.com/redistricting

County of Orange
Supervisorial District
Revised Proposals and
Technical Corrections

November 9, 2021

2020 Census Places
Orange County, California



Center for Demographic Research
2021

County of Orange 2021 Redistricting
Supervisorial District Summary of Revised Proposals

Prepared for November 9, 2021 Board Meeting

Proposal	Author	Percent Spread	Number of Split Cities (of 34 total)	Number of Split CDPs (of 11 total)	Technical Adjustment Needed?	Santa Ana/ Tustin Fix Needed?
2- Technical Corrections	Rosio Vigueras (original author) / with 11/2/2021 Board-directed Technical Corrections	1.95%	8	0	Done	Done
4- Technical Corrections	Sam Hoang (original author) / with 11/2/2021 Board-directed Technical Corrections	3.85%	12	0	Done	Not needed
2A	Nick Anas, Office of Supervisor Katrina Foley, Second District	6.46%	9	0	Yes	Needed
4A	James Dinwiddie, Office of Supervisor Lisa A. Bartlett, Fifth District	3.90%	10	0	Yes	Not needed
4B	Nick Anas, Office of Supervisor Katrina Foley, Second District	5.00%	13	1	Yes	Not needed
4C	LaShe Rodriguez, Office of Vice Chairman Doug Chaffee, Fourth District	7.03%	14	0	Yes	Not needed
5A	LaShe Rodriguez, Office of Vice Chairman Doug Chaffee, Fourth District	9.76%	6	1	No	Not needed
5B	Tara Campbell, Office of Supervisor Donald P. Wagner, Third District	9.63%	6	0	Yes	Not needed

CDP- Census Designated Place

Notes:
Technical Adjustments refer to instances where a portion of a city or CDP is split into multiple districts and one of those district assignments contains an area that is unpopulated.
The U.S. Census Bureau misassigned three (3) census blocks to the City of Tustin that are actually in the City of Santa Ana with a total of 260 population.
The Board of Supervisors took action on November 2, 2021 to make technical corrections to reduce unpopulated city/CDP splits and correct the Santa Ana/Tustin error in the initial set of plans submitted by the October 15, 2021 deadline and moved forward on November 2, 2021.

This page is intentionally left blank

County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Proposal 2 Map (Technical Corrections)



This page is intentionally left blank

PROPOSAL 2 with Technical Corrections
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 1. Adjusted 2020 Census Total Population by Race/Ethnicity

District	Total Population	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Some Other Race	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	635,165	431,516	83,847	11,247	1,120	92,084	1,983	2,324	11,044
	100.0%	67.9%	13.2%	1.8%	0.2%	14.5%	0.3%	0.4%	1.7%
2	638,698	124,451	373,482	8,653	1,017	91,998	1,203	3,721	34,173
	100.0%	19.5%	58.5%	1.4%	0.2%	14.4%	0.2%	0.6%	5.4%
3	640,860	232,073	250,543	10,713	1,198	116,551	1,081	3,161	25,540
	100.0%	36.2%	39.1%	1.7%	0.2%	18.2%	0.2%	0.5%	4.0%
4	632,903	189,327	163,660	10,423	985	243,208	2,601	2,532	20,167
	100.0%	29.9%	25.9%	1.6%	0.2%	38.4%	0.4%	0.4%	3.2%
5	645,384	112,914	328,596	8,907	1,005	155,426	869	3,349	34,318
	100.0%	17.5%	50.9%	1.4%	0.2%	24.1%	0.1%	0.5%	5.3%
COUNTY TOTAL	3,193,010	1,090,281	1,200,128	49,943	5,325	699,267	7,737	15,087	125,242
	100.0%	34.1%	37.6%	1.6%	0.2%	21.9%	0.2%	0.5%	3.9%

Table 2. Difference from 2021 Target Supervisorial District Population of 638,602

District	Number	Percent
1	-3,437	-0.54%
2	96	0.02%
3	2,258	0.35%
4	-5,699	-0.89%
5	6,782	1.06%

Percentage Spread (Largest - Smallest)
1.95%

Split Cities/Census Designated Places (CDPs) -

Anaheim (2)
Costa Mesa (2)
Fullerton (2)
Garden Grove (2)
Irvine (2)
La Habra (2)
Orange (2)
Santa Ana (2)

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Number in ( ) indicates number of Supervisorial Districts the city/CDP falls within.

Proposal 2 with Technical Corrections includes the 11/2/2021 Board-directed technical corrections to U.S. Census Bureau's misassignment three (3) census blocks to the City of Tustin that are actually in the City of Santa Ana with a total of 260 population and the correction of city/CDP splits in unpopulated areas.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 2 with Technical Corrections
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 3. Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) by Race/Ethnicity, 2015-2019 5-Year Estimates

District	Total Estimated CVAP	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	342,647	182,646	82,086	8,680	549	61,589	1,684	3,761
	100.0%	53.6%	24.1%	2.5%	0.2%	18.1%	0.5%	1.1%
2	461,397	65,499	317,620	7,136	1,007	56,548	937	11,736
	100.0%	14.2%	69.0%	1.5%	0.2%	12.3%	0.2%	2.5%
3	425,225	115,039	224,926	8,587	594	66,803	681	7,890
	100.0%	27.1%	53.0%	2.0%	0.1%	15.7%	0.2%	1.9%
4	423,111	91,915	155,251	8,794	917	155,464	1,650	8,430
	100.0%	21.8%	36.8%	2.1%	0.2%	36.8%	0.4%	2.0%
5	413,296	55,816	266,678	6,358	866	70,988	615	11,236
	100.0%	13.5%	64.6%	1.5%	0.2%	17.2%	0.1%	2.7%
COUNTY TOTAL	2,065,676	510,915	1,046,561	39,555	3,933	411,392	5,567	43,053
	100.0%	24.8%	50.8%	1.9%	0.2%	20.0%	0.3%	2.1%

Source: Statewide Database 2015-2019 Citizen Voting Age Population, adjusted to reflect reallocated incarcerated persons, on 2020 Census Blocks, Revised 9/27/2021 https://statewidedatabase.org/redistricting2021/counties.html

Notes: Percentages are calculated from sum of individual categories, not Total Estimated CVAP.

Because this is a special tabulation of data and not part of the standard data products shown on the Census Bureau's data.census.gov website, these estimates are rounded. Therefore, individual categories may not exactly add to the total.

For example, the sum of each of the race groups for non-Hispanics may not be the same as the estimate given for non-Hispanics. These estimates will not match counts from the 2020 Census.

The original data source for the Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) is the American Community Survey (ACS). The ACS is an ongoing survey by the U.S. Census Bureau sent to approximately 250,000 households each month.

The ACS estimates used to develop these data were collected from January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2019 utilizing the 2010 Census block groups, which were disaggregated to the 2020 Census blocks by the Statewide Database.

For more information about the CVAP products, visit https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/about/voting-rights/cvap.html and

https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/rdo/technical-documentation/special-tabulation/CVAP_2015-2019_ACS_documentation.pdf

PROPOSAL 2 with Technical Corrections
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 4. Adjusted 2020 Census Population by District and 2020 Census Place

DISTRICT 1

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	278,540	43.9%
Garden Grove*	146	0.0%
Orange*	34,238	5.4%
Santa Ana*	311,366	49.0%
Unincorporated	10,875	1.7%
District 1 Total	**635,165**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 2

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Aliso Viejo	52,222	8.2%
Costa Mesa*	79,591	12.5%
Huntington Beach	199,033	31.2%
Irvine*	83,954	13.1%
Laguna Beach	23,061	3.6%
Laguna Hills	31,399	4.9%
Laguna Niguel	64,417	10.1%
Laguna Woods	17,658	2.8%
Newport Beach	85,338	13.4%
Unincorporated	2,025	0.3%
District 2 Total	**638,698**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 3

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	69,213	10.8%
Brea	47,397	7.4%
Fullerton*	119,847	18.7%
La Habra*	55,069	8.6%
North Tustin CDP	25,749	4.0%
Orange*	105,953	16.5%
Placentia	51,925	8.1%
Santa Ana*	287	0.0%
Tustin	80,152	12.5%
Unincorporated	11,003	1.7%
Villa Park	5,850	0.9%
Yorba Linda	68,415	10.7%
District 3 Total	**640,860**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 4

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Buena Park	84,187	13.3%
Costa Mesa*	32,548	5.1%
Cypress	50,235	7.9%
Fountain Valley	57,120	9.0%
Fullerton*	24,083	3.8%
Garden Grove*	172,200	27.2%
La Habra*	8,165	1.3%
La Palma	15,597	2.5%
Los Alamitos	11,795	1.9%
Midway City CDP	8,845	1.4%
Rossmoor CDP	10,634	1.7%
Seal Beach	25,283	4.0%
Stanton	38,067	6.0%
Unincorporated	3,061	0.5%
Westminster	91,083	14.4%
District 4 Total	**632,903**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 5

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Coto de Caza CDP	14,723	2.3%
Dana Point	33,144	5.1%
Irvine*	224,004	34.7%
Ladera Ranch CDP	26,188	4.1%
Lake Forest	85,965	13.3%
Las Flores CDP	6,004	0.9%
Mission Viejo	93,760	14.5%
Modjeska CDP	632	0.1%
Rancho Mission Viejo CDP	10,385	1.6%
Rancho Santa Margarita	48,000	7.4%
San Clemente	64,384	10.0%
San Juan Capistrano	35,271	5.5%
Silverado CDP	932	0.1%
Trabuco Canyon CDP	1,020	0.2%
Unincorporated	879	0.1%
Williams Canyon CDP	93	0.0%
District 5 Total	**645,384**	**100.0%**

*City split by proposed district.

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Proposal 2 with Technical Corrections includes the 11/2/2021 Board-directed technical corrections to U.S. Census Bureau's misassignment three (3) census blocks to the City of Tustin that are actually in the City of Santa Ana with a total of 260 population and the correction of city/CDP splits in unpopulated areas.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 2 with Technical Corrections
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 5. Adjusted 2020 Census Population 18 Years and Over by Race/Ethnicity

District	Total Population 18 and Over	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Some Other Race	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	484,997	310,234	75,072	9,408	908	78,289	1,602	1,586	7,898
	100.0%	64.0%	15.5%	1.9%	0.2%	16.1%	0.3%	0.3%	1.6%
2	528,793	93,517	321,440	7,613	920	78,241	957	2,855	23,250
	100.0%	17.7%	60.8%	1.4%	0.2%	14.8%	0.2%	0.5%	4.4%
3	504,318	166,840	214,058	8,884	1,033	93,955	866	2,325	16,357
	100.0%	33.1%	42.4%	1.8%	0.2%	18.6%	0.2%	0.5%	3.2%
4	505,416	136,436	142,868	8,442	841	199,637	2,064	1,906	13,222
	100.0%	27.0%	28.3%	1.7%	0.2%	39.5%	0.4%	0.4%	2.6%
5	502,155	80,490	269,965	7,120	800	119,741	715	2,458	20,866
	100.0%	16.0%	53.8%	1.4%	0.2%	23.8%	0.1%	0.5%	4.2%
COUNTY TOTAL	2,525,679	787,517	1,023,403	41,467	4,502	569,863	6,204	11,130	81,593
	100.0%	31.2%	40.5%	1.6%	0.2%	22.6%	0.2%	0.4%	3.2%

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 2 with Technical Corrections

Contact Name:	Rosio Vigueras
Organization:	N/A
Submitted Description:	"A redistricting plan focused on equal representation and keeping communities of interest together. Plan Objectives Keep communities of interest together and maximize equal representation."

Note:	Proposal 2 with Technical Corrections includes the 11/2/2021 Board-directed technical corrections to U.S. Census Bureau's misassignment three (3) census blocks to the City of Tustin that are actually in the City of Santa Ana with a total of 260 population and the correction of city/CDP splits in unpopulated areas.


Hispanic or Latino Percent Share of Adjusted 2020 Census Block Group Population
1
2
3
4
5
Proposal 2- with Technical Corrections
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Hispanic or Latino
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Non-Hispanic Asian Percent Share of Adjusted 2020 Census Block Group Population
1
2
3
4
5
Proposal 2- with Technical Corrections
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Non-Hispanic Asian
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Hispanic or Latino Percent Share of Census Block Group Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population, 2019
1
2
3
4
5
Proposal 2- with Technical Corrections
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Hispanic or Latino
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Non-Hispanic Asian Percent Share of Census Block Group Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population, 2019
1
2
3
4
5
Proposal 2- with Technical Corrections
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Non-Hispanic Asian
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%

This page is intentionally left blank

County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Proposal 4 Map (Technical Corrections)



This page is intentionally left blank

PROPOSAL 4 with Technical Corrections
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 1. Adjusted 2020 Census Total Population by Race/Ethnicity

District	Total Population	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Some Other Race	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	635,005	196,245	175,380	9,193	1,030	226,918	2,594	2,603	21,042
	100.0%	30.9%	27.6%	1.4%	0.2%	35.7%	0.4%	0.4%	3.3%
2	633,244	418,822	117,297	9,271	1,084	68,474	1,619	2,474	14,203
	100.0%	66.1%	18.5%	1.5%	0.2%	10.8%	0.3%	0.4%	2.2%
3	654,625	126,037	359,804	7,718	983	121,316	961	3,208	34,598
	100.0%	19.3%	55.0%	1.2%	0.2%	18.5%	0.1%	0.5%	5.3%
4	630,063	242,771	195,137	14,165	1,260	150,712	1,642	2,966	21,410
	100.0%	38.5%	31.0%	2.2%	0.2%	23.9%	0.3%	0.5%	3.4%
5	640,073	106,406	352,510	9,596	968	131,847	921	3,836	33,989
	100.0%	16.6%	55.1%	1.5%	0.2%	20.6%	0.1%	0.6%	5.3%
COUNTY TOTAL	3,193,010	1,090,281	1,200,128	49,943	5,325	699,267	7,737	15,087	125,242
	100.0%	34.1%	37.6%	1.6%	0.2%	21.9%	0.2%	0.5%	3.9%

Table 2. Difference from 2021 Target Supervisorial District Population of 638,602

District	Number	Percent
1	-3,597	-0.56%
2	-5,358	-0.84%
3	16,023	2.51%
4	-8,539	-1.34%
5	1,471	0.23%

Percentage Spread (Largest - Smallest)
3.85%

Split Cities/Census Designated Places (CDPs) -

Anaheim (4)
Costa Mesa (2)
Fountain Valley (2)
Fullerton (2)
Garden Grove (2)
Huntington Beach (2)
Irvine (2)
Laguna Hills (2)
Orange (4)
Placentia (2)
Santa Ana (2)
Tustin (2)

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Number in ( ) indicates number of Supervisorial Districts the city/CDP falls within.

Proposal 4 with Technical Corrections includes the 11/2/2021 Board-directed technical correction of city splits in unpopulated areas. The U.S. Census Bureau misassigned three (3) census blocks to the City of Tustin that are actually in the City of Santa Ana with a total of 260 population. Since the effected area is fully assigned to District 2, no splits are created and no correction is necessary.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 4 with Technical Corrections
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 3. Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) by Race/Ethnicity, 2015-2019 5-Year Estimates

District	Total Estimated CVAP	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	429,926	98,017	163,452	7,460	1,154	148,465	1,293	8,840
	100.0%	22.9%	38.1%	1.7%	0.3%	34.6%	0.3%	2.1%
2	345,019	175,986	109,667	7,310	619	44,633	1,427	4,474
	100.0%	51.1%	31.9%	2.1%	0.2%	13.0%	0.4%	1.3%
3	441,353	63,641	295,094	6,436	901	63,864	553	10,331
	100.0%	14.4%	66.9%	1.5%	0.2%	14.5%	0.1%	2.3%
4	406,401	118,277	178,546	11,918	738	86,844	1,493	7,716
	100.0%	29.2%	44.0%	2.9%	0.2%	21.4%	0.4%	1.9%
5	442,977	54,994	299,802	6,431	521	67,586	801	11,692
	100.0%	12.4%	67.9%	1.5%	0.1%	15.3%	0.2%	2.6%
COUNTY TOTAL	2,065,676	510,915	1,046,561	39,555	3,933	411,392	5,567	43,053
	100.0%	24.8%	50.8%	1.9%	0.2%	20.0%	0.3%	2.1%

Source: Statewide Database 2015-2019 Citizen Voting Age Population, adjusted to reflect reallocated incarcerated persons, on 2020 Census Blocks, Revised 9/27/2021 https://statewidedatabase.org/redistricting2021/counties.html

Notes: Percentages are calculated from sum of individual categories, not Total Estimated CVAP.

Because this is a special tabulation of data and not part of the standard data products shown on the Census Bureau's data.census.gov website, these estimates are rounded. Therefore, individual categories may not exactly add to the total.

For example, the sum of each of the race groups for non-Hispanics may not be the same as the estimate given for non-Hispanics. These estimates will not match counts from the 2020 Census.

The original data source for the Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) is the American Community Survey (ACS). The ACS is an ongoing survey by the U.S. Census Bureau sent to approximately 250,000 households each month.

The ACS estimates used to develop these data were collected from January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2019 utilizing the 2010 Census block groups, which were disaggregated to the 2020 Census blocks by the Statewide Database.

For more information about the CVAP products, visit https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/about/voting-rights/cvap.html and

https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/rdo/technical-documentation/special-tabulation/CVAP_2015-2019_ACS_documentation.pdf

PROPOSAL 4 with Technical Corrections
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 4. Adjusted 2020 Census Population by District and 2020 Census Place

DISTRICT 1

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	14,358	2.3%
Cypress	50,235	7.9%
Fountain Valley*	56,898	9.0%
Garden Grove*	169,358	26.7%
Huntington Beach*	84,495	13.3%
La Palma	15,597	2.5%
Los Alamitos	11,795	1.9%
Midway City CDP	8,845	1.4%
Orange*	8,000	1.3%
Rossmoor CDP	10,634	1.7%
Santa Ana*	37,277	5.9%
Seal Beach	25,283	4.0%
Stanton	38,067	6.0%
Unincorporated	13,080	2.1%
Westminster	91,083	14.3%
District 1 Total	**635,005**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 2

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	148,154	23.4%
Costa Mesa*	37,161	5.9%
Fountain Valley*	222	0.0%
Fullerton*	2,101	0.3%
Garden Grove*	2,988	0.5%
Orange*	91,158	14.4%
Placentia*	4,811	0.8%
Santa Ana*	274,116	43.3%
Tustin*	68,280	10.8%
Unincorporated	4,253	0.7%
District 2 Total	**633,244**	**100.0%**

*City split by proposed district.

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Proposal 4 with Technical Corrections includes the 11/2/2021 Board-directed technical corrections of city/CDP splits in unpopulated areas.

DISTRICT 3

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Aliso Viejo	52,222	8.0%
Anaheim*	11,710	1.8%
Coto de Caza CDP	14,723	2.2%
Irvine*	68,622	10.5%
Ladera Ranch CDP	26,188	4.0%
Laguna Hills*	28,163	4.3%
Laguna Woods	17,658	2.7%
Lake Forest	85,965	13.1%
Las Flores CDP	6,004	0.9%
Mission Viejo	93,760	14.3%
Modjeska CDP	632	0.1%
North Tustin CDP	25,749	3.9%
Orange*	40,903	6.2%
Rancho Mission Viejo CDP	10,385	1.6%
Rancho Santa Margarita	48,000	7.3%
San Clemente	64,384	9.8%
San Juan Capistrano	35,271	5.4%
Silverado CDP	932	0.1%
Trabuco Canyon CDP	1,020	0.2%
Tustin*	12,132	1.9%
Unincorporated	4,259	0.7%
Villa Park	5,850	0.9%
Williams Canyon CDP	93	0.0%
District 3 Total	**654,625**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 4

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	173,531	27.5%
Brea	47,397	7.5%
Buena Park	84,187	13.4%
Fullerton*	141,829	22.5%
La Habra	63,234	10.0%
Orange*	130	0.0%
Placentia*	47,114	7.5%
Unincorporated	4,226	0.7%
Yorba Linda	68,415	10.9%
District 4 Total	**630,063**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 5

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Costa Mesa*	74,978	11.7%
Dana Point	33,144	5.2%
Huntington Beach*	114,538	17.9%
Irvine*	239,336	37.4%
Laguna Beach	23,061	3.6%
Laguna Hills*	3,236	0.5%
Laguna Niguel	64,417	10.1%
Newport Beach	85,338	13.3%
Unincorporated	2,025	0.3%
District 5 Total	**640,073**	**100.0%**

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 4 with Technical Corrections
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 5. Adjusted 2020 Census Population 18 Years and Over by Race/Ethnicity

District	Total Population 18 and Over	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Some Other Race	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	508,070	142,393	152,402	7,553	864	186,981	2,079	1,972	13,826
	100.0%	28.0%	30.0%	1.5%	0.2%	36.8%	0.4%	0.4%	2.7%
2	483,331	300,144	103,400	7,790	917	58,106	1,275	1,727	9,972
	100.0%	62.1%	21.4%	1.6%	0.2%	12.0%	0.3%	0.4%	2.1%
3	512,963	89,719	296,966	6,420	827	95,063	772	2,330	20,866
	100.0%	17.5%	57.9%	1.3%	0.2%	18.5%	0.2%	0.5%	4.1%
4	495,273	174,472	167,945	11,617	1,073	122,730	1,337	2,159	13,940
	100.0%	35.2%	33.9%	2.3%	0.2%	24.8%	0.3%	0.4%	2.8%
5	526,042	80,789	302,690	8,087	821	106,983	741	2,942	22,989
	100.0%	15.4%	57.5%	1.5%	0.2%	20.3%	0.1%	0.6%	4.4%
COUNTY TOTAL	2,525,679	787,517	1,023,403	41,467	4,502	569,863	6,204	11,130	81,593
	100.0%	31.2%	40.5%	1.6%	0.2%	22.6%	0.2%	0.4%	3.2%

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 4 with Technical Corrections

Contact Name:	Sam Hoang
Organization:	Asian/Pacific Islanders Communities of Interest Orange County
Submitted Description:	"Plan focused on keeping communities of interest together Plan Objectives Keep Communities of Interest together"

Note:	Proposal 4 with Technical Corrections includes the 11/2/2021 Board-directed technical corrections of city/CDP splits in unpopulated areas.


Hispanic or Latino Percent Share of Adjusted 2020 Census Block Group Population
4
1
2
5
3
Proposal 4- with Technical Corrections
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Hispanic or Latino
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Non-Hispanic Asian Percent Share of Adjusted 2020 Census Block Group Population
4
1
2
5
3
Proposal 4- with Technical Corrections
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Non-Hispanic Asian
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Hispanic or Latino Percent Share of Census Block Group Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population, 2019
4
1
2
5
3
Proposal 4- with Technical Corrections
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Hispanic or Latino
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Non-Hispanic Asian Percent Share of Census Block Group Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population, 2019
4
1
2
5
3
Proposal 4- with Technical Corrections
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Non-Hispanic Asian
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%

This page is intentionally left blank

County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Proposal 2A Map



This page is intentionally left blank

PROPOSAL 2A
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 1. Adjusted 2020 Census Total Population by Race/Ethnicity

District	Total Population	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Some Other Race	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	617,041	184,201	155,607	10,250	951	241,623	2,484	2,425	19,500
	100.0%	29.9%	25.2%	1.7%	0.2%	39.2%	0.4%	0.4%	3.2%
2	658,307	124,207	361,480	9,722	1,019	121,112	1,383	4,002	35,382
	100.0%	18.9%	54.9%	1.5%	0.2%	18.4%	0.2%	0.6%	5.4%
3	641,672	231,288	250,556	10,702	1,190	118,085	1,079	3,171	25,601
	100.0%	36.0%	39.0%	1.7%	0.2%	18.4%	0.2%	0.5%	4.0%
4	634,848	431,304	84,021	11,231	1,124	91,846	1,959	2,317	11,046
	100.0%	67.9%	13.2%	1.8%	0.2%	14.5%	0.3%	0.4%	1.7%
5	641,142	119,281	348,464	8,038	1,041	126,601	832	3,172	33,713
	100.0%	18.6%	54.4%	1.3%	0.2%	19.7%	0.1%	0.5%	5.3%
COUNTY TOTAL	3,193,010	1,090,281	1,200,128	49,943	5,325	699,267	7,737	15,087	125,242
	100.0%	34.1%	37.6%	1.6%	0.2%	21.9%	0.2%	0.5%	3.9%

Table 2. Difference from 2021 Target Supervisorial District Population of 638,602

District	Number	Percent
1	-21,561	-3.38%
2	19,705	3.09%
3	3,070	0.48%
4	-3,754	-0.59%
5	2,540	0.40%

Percentage Spread (Largest - Smallest)
6.46%

Split Cities/Census Designated Places (CDPs) -

Anaheim (3)
Fullerton (2)
Huntington Beach (2)
Irvine (4)
La Habra (2)
Laguna Hills (2)
Orange (2)
Santa Ana (2)
Seal Beach (2)

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Number in ( ) indicates number of Supervisorial Districts the city/CDP falls within.

The U.S. Census Bureau misassigned three (3) census blocks to the City of Tustin that are actually in the City of Santa Ana with a total of 260 population.

Submitted plan does not include assignment of three blocks that are in Santa Ana but Census Bureau misassigned to City of Tustin.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 2A
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 3. Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) by Race/Ethnicity, 2015-2019 5-Year Estimates

District	Total Estimated CVAP	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	411,155	89,611	148,602	8,041	853	153,701	1,381	8,332
	100.0%	21.8%	36.2%	2.0%	0.2%	37.4%	0.3%	2.0%
2	462,714	65,590	306,425	7,916	1,145	67,412	1,274	11,973
	100.0%	14.2%	66.4%	1.7%	0.2%	14.6%	0.3%	2.6%
3	425,243	114,667	224,921	8,565	594	67,195	685	7,903
	100.0%	27.0%	53.0%	2.0%	0.1%	15.8%	0.2%	1.9%
4	342,762	182,682	82,246	8,678	549	61,480	1,684	3,770
	100.0%	53.6%	24.1%	2.5%	0.2%	18.0%	0.5%	1.1%
5	423,802	58,365	284,367	6,355	792	61,604	543	11,075
	100.0%	13.8%	67.2%	1.5%	0.2%	14.6%	0.1%	2.6%
COUNTY TOTAL	2,065,676	510,915	1,046,561	39,555	3,933	411,392	5,567	43,053
	100.0%	24.8%	50.8%	1.9%	0.2%	20.0%	0.3%	2.1%

Source: Statewide Database 2015-2019 Citizen Voting Age Population, adjusted to reflect reallocated incarcerated persons, on 2020 Census Blocks, Revised 9/27/2021 https://statewidedatabase.org/redistricting2021/counties.html

Notes: Percentages are calculated from sum of individual categories, not Total Estimated CVAP.

Because this is a special tabulation of data and not part of the standard data products shown on the Census Bureau's data.census.gov website, these estimates are rounded. Therefore, individual categories may not exactly add to the total.

For example, the sum of each of the race groups for non-Hispanics may not be the same as the estimate given for non-Hispanics. These estimates will not match counts from the 2020 Census.

The original data source for the Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) is the American Community Survey (ACS). The ACS is an ongoing survey by the U.S. Census Bureau sent to approximately 250,000 households each month.

The ACS estimates used to develop these data were collected from January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2019 utilizing the 2010 Census block groups, which were disaggregated to the 2020 Census blocks by the Statewide Database.

For more information about the CVAP products, visit https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/about/voting-rights/cvap.html and

https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/rdo/technical-documentation/special-tabulation/CVAP_2015-2019_ACS_documentation.pdf

PROPOSAL 2A
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 4. Adjusted 2020 Census Population by District and 2020 Census Place

DISTRICT 1

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	24	0.0%
Buena Park	84,187	13.6%
Cypress	50,235	8.1%
Fountain Valley	57,120	9.3%
Fullerton*	24,083	3.9%
Garden Grove	172,346	27.9%
Huntington Beach*	15,515	2.5%
La Habra*	8,165	1.3%
La Palma	15,597	2.5%
Los Alamitos	11,795	1.9%
Midway City CDP	8,845	1.4%
Rossmoor CDP	10,634	1.7%
Seal Beach*	24,814	4.0%
Stanton	38,067	6.2%
Unincorporated	4,531	0.7%
Westminster	91,083	14.8%
District 1 Total	**617,041**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 2

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Aliso Viejo*	52,222	7.9%
Costa Mesa	112,139	17.0%
Huntington Beach*	183,518	27.9%
Irvine*	181,877	27.6%
Laguna Beach	23,061	3.5%
Laguna Hills*	0	0.0%
Laguna Woods	17,658	2.7%
Newport Beach	85,338	13.0%
Seal Beach*	469	0.1%
Unincorporated	2,025	0.3%
District 2 Total	**658,307**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 3

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	69,017	10.8%
Brea	47,397	7.4%
Fullerton*	119,847	18.7%
Irvine*	2,126	0.3%
La Habra*	55,069	8.6%
North Tustin CDP	25,749	4.0%
Orange*	104,853	16.3%
Placentia	51,925	8.1%
Santa Ana*	0	0.0%
Tustin	80,412	12.5%
Unincorporated	11,012	1.7%
Villa Park	5,850	0.9%
Yorba Linda	68,415	10.7%
District 3 Total	**641,672**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 4

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	278,712	43.9%
Irvine*	0	0.0%
Orange*	35,338	5.6%
Santa Ana*	311,393	49.1%
Unincorporated	9,405	1.5%
District 4 Total	**634,848**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 5

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Aliso Viejo*	0	0.0%
Coto de Caza CDP	14,723	2.3%
Dana Point	33,144	5.2%
Irvine*	123,955	19.3%
Ladera Ranch CDP	26,188	4.1%
Laguna Hills*	31,399	4.9%
Laguna Niguel	64,417	10.0%
Lake Forest	85,965	13.4%
Las Flores CDP	6,004	0.9%
Mission Viejo	93,760	14.6%
Modjeska CDP	632	0.1%
Rancho Mission Viejo CDP	10,385	1.6%
Rancho Santa Margarita	48,000	7.5%
San Clemente	64,384	10.0%
San Juan Capistrano	35,271	5.5%
Silverado CDP	932	0.1%
Trabuco Canyon CDP	1,020	0.2%
Unincorporated	870	0.1%
Williams Canyon CDP	93	0.0%
District 5 Total	**641,142**	**100.0%**

*City split by proposed district.

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 2A
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 5. Adjusted 2020 Census Population 18 Years and Over by Race/Ethnicity

District	Total Population 18 and Over	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Some Other Race	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	491,999	132,621	135,642	8,280	819	198,128	1,983	1,814	12,712
	100.0%	27.0%	27.6%	1.7%	0.2%	40.3%	0.4%	0.4%	2.6%
2	543,766	93,742	311,244	8,389	877	101,192	1,098	3,099	24,125
	100.0%	17.2%	57.2%	1.5%	0.2%	18.6%	0.2%	0.6%	4.4%
3	504,794	166,262	214,036	8,875	1,025	95,029	864	2,334	16,369
	100.0%	32.9%	42.4%	1.8%	0.2%	18.8%	0.2%	0.5%	3.2%
4	484,770	310,076	75,217	9,389	914	78,100	1,578	1,581	7,915
	100.0%	64.0%	15.5%	1.9%	0.2%	16.1%	0.3%	0.3%	1.6%
5	500,350	84,816	287,264	6,534	867	97,414	681	2,302	20,472
	100.0%	17.0%	57.4%	1.3%	0.2%	19.5%	0.1%	0.5%	4.1%
COUNTY TOTAL	2,525,679	787,517	1,023,403	41,467	4,502	569,863	6,204	11,130	81,593
	100.0%	31.2%	40.5%	1.6%	0.2%	22.6%	0.2%	0.4%	3.2%

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 2A

Contact Name: Nick Anas
Organization: Supervisor Katrina Foley
Submitted Description: "Revisions to Proposal 2 - District 2"

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021


Hispanic or Latino Percent Share of Adjusted 2020 Census Block Group Population
1
2
3
4
5
Proposal 2A
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Hispanic or Latino
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Non-Hispanic Asian Percent Share of Adjusted 2020 Census Block Group Population
1
2
3
4
5
Proposal 2A
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Non-Hispanic Asian
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Hispanic or Latino Percent Share of Census Block Group Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population, 2019
1
2
3
4
5
Proposal 2A
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Hispanic or Latino
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Non-Hispanic Asian Percent Share of Census Block Group Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population, 2019
1
2
3
4
5
Proposal 2A
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Non-Hispanic Asian
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%

This page is intentionally left blank

County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Proposal 4A Map



This page is intentionally left blank

PROPOSAL 4A
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 1. Adjusted 2020 Census Total Population by Race/Ethnicity

District	Total Population	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Some Other Race	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	635,227	196,320	175,417	9,196	1,030	227,014	2,594	2,603	21,053
	100.0%	30.9%	27.6%	1.4%	0.2%	35.7%	0.4%	0.4%	3.3%
2	630,921	417,310	116,833	9,193	1,084	68,270	1,613	2,469	14,149
	100.0%	66.1%	18.5%	1.5%	0.2%	10.8%	0.3%	0.4%	2.2%
3	638,865	106,336	289,490	10,896	769	192,028	887	3,437	35,022
	100.0%	16.6%	45.3%	1.7%	0.1%	30.1%	0.1%	0.5%	5.5%
4	632,164	244,208	195,564	14,240	1,260	150,820	1,648	2,971	21,453
	100.0%	38.6%	30.9%	2.3%	0.2%	23.9%	0.3%	0.5%	3.4%
5	655,833	126,107	422,824	6,418	1,182	61,135	995	3,607	33,565
	100.0%	19.2%	64.5%	1.0%	0.2%	9.3%	0.2%	0.5%	5.1%
COUNTY TOTAL	3,193,010	1,090,281	1,200,128	49,943	5,325	699,267	7,737	15,087	125,242
	100.0%	34.1%	37.6%	1.6%	0.2%	21.9%	0.2%	0.5%	3.9%

Table 2. Difference from 2021 Target Supervisorial District Population of 638,602

District	Number	Percent
1	-3,375	-0.53%
2	-7,681	-1.20%
3	263	0.04%
4	-6,438	-1.01%
5	17,231	2.70%

Percentage Spread (Largest - Smallest)
3.90%

Split Cities/Census Designated Places (CDPs) -

Anaheim (4)
Costa Mesa (2)
Fullerton (2)
Garden Grove (2)
Huntington Beach (2)
Mission Viejo (2)
Orange (4)
Placentia (2)
Santa Ana (3)
Tustin (2)

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Number in ( ) indicates number of Supervisorial Districts the city/CDP falls within.

The U.S. Census Bureau misassigned three (3) census blocks to the City of Tustin that are actually in the City of Santa Ana with a total of 260 population. Since the affected area is fully assigned to District 2, no splits are created and no correction is necessary.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 4A
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 3. Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) by Race/Ethnicity, 2015-2019 5-Year Estimates

District	Total Estimated CVAP	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	430,045	98,045	163,488	7,460	1,154	148,529	1,293	8,841
	100.0%	22.9%	38.1%	1.7%	0.3%	34.6%	0.3%	2.1%
2	343,786	175,142	109,350	7,269	619	44,546	1,427	4,457
	100.0%	51.1%	31.9%	2.1%	0.2%	13.0%	0.4%	1.3%
3	405,725	55,485	240,037	6,883	705	90,081	518	10,898
	100.0%	13.7%	59.3%	1.7%	0.2%	22.3%	0.1%	2.7%
4	407,515	119,093	178,827	11,959	738	86,867	1,493	7,732
	100.0%	29.3%	44.0%	2.9%	0.2%	21.4%	0.4%	1.9%
5	478,605	63,150	354,859	5,984	717	41,369	836	11,125
	100.0%	13.2%	74.2%	1.3%	0.1%	8.7%	0.2%	2.3%
COUNTY TOTAL	2,065,676	510,915	1,046,561	39,555	3,933	411,392	5,567	43,053
	100.0%	24.8%	50.8%	1.9%	0.2%	20.0%	0.3%	2.1%

Source: Statewide Database 2015-2019 Citizen Voting Age Population, adjusted to reflect reallocated incarcerated persons, on 2020 Census Blocks, Revised 9/27/2021 https://statewidedatabase.org/redistricting2021/counties.html

Notes: Percentages are calculated from sum of individual categories, not Total Estimated CVAP.

Because this is a special tabulation of data and not part of the standard data products shown on the Census Bureau's data.census.gov website, these estimates are rounded. Therefore, individual categories may not exactly add to the total.

For example, the sum of each of the race groups for non-Hispanics may not be the same as the estimate given for non-Hispanics. These estimates will not match counts from the 2020 Census.

The original data source for the Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) is the American Community Survey (ACS). The ACS is an ongoing survey by the U.S. Census Bureau sent to approximately 250,000 households each month.

The ACS estimates used to develop these data were collected from January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2019 utilizing the 2010 Census block groups, which were disaggregated to the 2020 Census blocks by the Statewide Database.

For more information about the CVAP products, visit https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/about/voting-rights/cvap.html and

https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/rdo/technical-documentation/special-tabulation/CVAP_2015-2019_ACS_documentation.pdf

PROPOSAL 4A
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 4. Adjusted 2020 Census Population by District and 2020 Census Place

DISTRICT 1

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	14,358	2.3%
Cypress	50,235	7.9%
Fountain Valley	57,120	9.0%
Garden Grove*	169,358	26.7%
Huntington Beach*	84,495	13.3%
La Palma	15,597	2.5%
Los Alamitos	11,795	1.9%
Midway City CDP	8,845	1.4%
Orange*	8,000	1.3%
Rossmoor CDP	10,634	1.7%
Santa Ana*	37,277	5.9%
Seal Beach	25,283	4.0%
Stanton	38,067	6.0%
Unincorporated	13,080	2.1%
Westminster	91,083	14.3%
District 1 Total	**635,227**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 2

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	148,154	23.5%
Costa Mesa*	37,161	5.9%
Fullerton*	0	0.0%
Garden Grove*	2,988	0.5%
Orange*	91,158	14.4%
Placentia*	4,811	0.8%
Santa Ana*	274,116	43.4%
Tustin*	68,280	10.8%
Unincorporated	4,253	0.7%
District 2 Total	**630,921**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 3

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	11,710	1.8%
Irvine	307,958	48.2%
Lake Forest	85,965	13.5%
Mission Viejo*	93,760	14.7%
Modjeska CDP	632	0.1%
North Tustin CDP	25,749	4.0%
Orange*	40,903	6.4%
Rancho Santa Margarita	48,000	7.5%
Santa Ana*	0	0.0%
Silverado CDP	932	0.1%
Trabuco Canyon CDP	1,020	0.2%
Tustin*	12,132	1.9%
Unincorporated	4,161	0.7%
Villa Park	5,850	0.9%
Williams Canyon CDP	93	0.0%
District 3 Total	**638,865**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 4

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	173,531	27.5%
Brea	47,397	7.5%
Buena Park	84,187	13.3%
Fullerton*	143,930	22.8%
La Habra	63,234	10.0%
Orange*	130	0.0%
Placentia*	47,114	7.5%
Unincorporated	4,226	0.7%
Yorba Linda	68,415	10.8%
District 4 Total	**632,164**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 5

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Aliso Viejo	52,222	8.0%
Costa Mesa*	74,978	11.4%
Coto de Caza CDP	14,723	2.2%
Dana Point	33,144	5.1%
Huntington Beach*	114,538	17.5%
Ladera Ranch CDP	26,188	4.0%
Laguna Beach	23,061	3.5%
Laguna Hills	31,399	4.8%
Laguna Niguel	64,417	9.8%
Laguna Woods	17,658	2.7%
Las Flores CDP	6,004	0.9%
Mission Viejo*	0	0.0%
Newport Beach	85,338	13.0%
Rancho Mission Viejo CDP	10,385	1.6%
San Clemente	64,384	9.8%
San Juan Capistrano	35,271	5.4%
Unincorporated	2,123	0.3%
District 5 Total	**655,833**	**100.0%**

*City split by proposed district.

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 4A
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 5. Adjusted 2020 Census Population 18 Years and Over by Race/Ethnicity

District	Total Population 18 and Over	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Some Other Race	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	508,240	142,436	152,436	7,554	864	187,066	2,079	1,972	13,833
	100.0%	28.0%	30.0%	1.5%	0.2%	36.8%	0.4%	0.4%	2.7%
2	481,443	298,992	102,961	7,723	917	57,927	1,269	1,723	9,931
	100.0%	62.1%	21.4%	1.6%	0.2%	12.0%	0.3%	0.4%	2.1%
3	506,777	78,988	242,689	8,978	572	150,457	717	2,528	21,848
	100.0%	15.6%	47.9%	1.8%	0.1%	29.7%	0.1%	0.5%	4.3%
4	496,991	175,581	168,350	11,683	1,073	122,824	1,343	2,163	13,974
	100.0%	35.3%	33.9%	2.4%	0.2%	24.7%	0.3%	0.4%	2.8%
5	532,228	91,520	356,967	5,529	1,076	51,589	796	2,744	22,007
	100.0%	17.2%	67.1%	1.0%	0.2%	9.7%	0.1%	0.5%	4.1%
COUNTY TOTAL	2,525,679	787,517	1,023,403	41,467	4,502	569,863	6,204	11,130	81,593
	100.0%	31.2%	40.5%	1.6%	0.2%	22.6%	0.2%	0.4%	3.2%

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 4A

Contact Name:	James Dinwiddie
Organization:	Fifth District
Submitted Description:	"Modified Map 4 seeks to provide greater connectivity of South County Communities."


Hispanic or Latino Percent Share of Adjusted 2020 Census Block Group Population
4
1
2
3
5
Proposal 4A
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Hispanic or Latino
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Non-Hispanic Asian Percent Share of Adjusted 2020 Census Block Group Population
4
1
2
3
5
Proposal 4A
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Non-Hispanic Asian
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Hispanic or Latino Percent Share of Census Block Group Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population, 2019
4
1
2
3
5
Proposal 4A
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Hispanic or Latino
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Non-Hispanic Asian Percent Share of Census Block Group Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population, 2019
4
1
2
3
5
Proposal 4A
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Non-Hispanic Asian
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%

This page is intentionally left blank

County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Proposal 4B Map



This page is intentionally left blank

PROPOSAL 4B
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 1. Adjusted 2020 Census Total Population by Race/Ethnicity

District	Total Population	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Some Other Race	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	633,358	193,657	177,260	8,967	1,023	225,868	2,596	2,630	21,357
	100.0%	30.6%	28.0%	1.4%	0.2%	35.7%	0.4%	0.4%	3.4%
2	655,832	104,348	328,342	9,909	915	173,448	1,094	3,766	34,010
	100.0%	15.9%	50.1%	1.5%	0.1%	26.4%	0.2%	0.6%	5.2%
3	652,918	134,077	390,040	7,620	1,096	80,515	986	3,385	35,199
	100.0%	20.5%	59.7%	1.2%	0.2%	12.3%	0.2%	0.5%	5.4%
4	627,007	235,975	199,022	13,915	1,253	150,600	1,619	2,951	21,672
	100.0%	37.6%	31.7%	2.2%	0.2%	24.0%	0.3%	0.5%	3.5%
5	623,895	422,224	105,464	9,532	1,038	68,836	1,442	2,355	13,004
	100.0%	67.7%	16.9%	1.5%	0.2%	11.0%	0.2%	0.4%	2.1%
COUNTY TOTAL	3,193,010	1,090,281	1,200,128	49,943	5,325	699,267	7,737	15,087	125,242
	100.0%	34.1%	37.6%	1.6%	0.2%	21.9%	0.2%	0.5%	3.9%

Table 2. Difference from 2021 Target Supervisorial District Population of 638,602

District	Number	Percent
1	-5,244	-0.82%
2	17,230	2.70%
3	14,316	2.24%
4	-11,595	-1.82%
5	-14,707	-2.30%

Percentage Spread (Largest - Smallest)
5.00%

Split Cities/Census Designated Places (CDPs) -

Anaheim (4)
Fountain Valley (2)
Fullerton (2)
Garden Grove (2)
Huntington Beach (2)
Irvine (2)
Laguna Woods (2)
North Tustin CDP (2)
Orange (4)
Placentia (2)
Santa Ana (3)
Seal Beach (2)
Tustin (3)
Villa Park (2)

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Number in ( ) indicates number of Supervisorial Districts the city/CDP falls within.

The U.S. Census Bureau misassigned three (3) census blocks to the City of Tustin that are actually in the City of Santa Ana with a total of 260 population. Since the affected area is fully assigned to District 5, no splits are created and no correction is necessary.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 4B
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 3. Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) by Race/Ethnicity, 2015-2019 5-Year Estimates

District	Total Estimated CVAP	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	428,267	95,885	165,139	7,296	1,109	147,414	1,324	8,875
	100.0%	22.5%	38.7%	1.7%	0.3%	34.5%	0.3%	2.1%
2	429,107	53,165	274,830	6,720	693	80,686	1,089	10,759
	100.0%	12.4%	64.2%	1.6%	0.2%	18.9%	0.3%	2.5%
3	465,385	67,949	325,375	6,946	817	51,702	612	11,492
	100.0%	14.6%	70.0%	1.5%	0.2%	11.1%	0.1%	2.5%
4	408,036	116,896	181,520	11,408	713	87,519	1,442	7,665
	100.0%	28.7%	44.6%	2.8%	0.2%	21.5%	0.4%	1.9%
5	334,881	177,020	99,697	7,185	601	44,071	1,100	4,262
	100.0%	53.0%	29.9%	2.2%	0.2%	13.2%	0.3%	1.3%
COUNTY TOTAL	2,065,676	510,915	1,046,561	39,555	3,933	411,392	5,567	43,053
	100.0%	24.8%	50.8%	1.9%	0.2%	20.0%	0.3%	2.1%

Source: Statewide Database 2015-2019 Citizen Voting Age Population, adjusted to reflect reallocated incarcerated persons, on 2020 Census Blocks, Revised 9/27/2021 https://statewidedatabase.org/redistricting2021/counties.html

Notes: Percentages are calculated from sum of individual categories, not Total Estimated CVAP.

Because this is a special tabulation of data and not part of the standard data products shown on the Census Bureau's data.census.gov website, these estimates are rounded. Therefore, individual categories may not exactly add to the total.

For example, the sum of each of the race groups for non-Hispanics may not be the same as the estimate given for non-Hispanics. These estimates will not match counts from the 2020 Census.

The original data source for the Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) is the American Community Survey (ACS). The ACS is an ongoing survey by the U.S. Census Bureau sent to approximately 250,000 households each month.

The ACS estimates used to develop these data were collected from January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2019 utilizing the 2010 Census block groups, which were disaggregated to the 2020 Census blocks by the Statewide Database.

For more information about the CVAP products, visit https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/about/voting-rights/cvap.html and

https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/rdo/technical-documentation/special-tabulation/CVAP_2015-2019_ACS_documentation.pdf

PROPOSAL 4B
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 4. Adjusted 2020 Census Population by District and 2020 Census Place

DISTRICT 1

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	16,319	2.6%
Cypress	50,235	7.9%
Fountain Valley*	56,898	9.0%
Garden Grove*	168,249	26.6%
Huntington Beach*	92,007	14.5%
La Palma	15,597	2.5%
Los Alamitos	11,795	1.9%
Midway City CDP	8,845	1.4%
Orange*	1,258	0.2%
Rossmoor CDP	10,634	1.7%
Santa Ana*	34,477	5.4%
Seal Beach*	24,814	3.9%
Stanton	38,067	6.0%
Unincorporated	13,080	2.1%
Westminster	91,083	14.4%
District 1 Total	**633,358**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 2

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Costa Mesa	112,139	17.1%
Huntington Beach*	107,026	16.3%
Irvine*	307,958	47.0%
Laguna Beach	23,061	3.5%
Laguna Woods*	17,658	2.7%
Newport Beach	85,338	13.0%
Santa Ana*	158	0.0%
Seal Beach*	469	0.1%
Tustin*	0	0.0%
Unincorporated	2,025	0.3%
District 2 Total	**655,832**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 3

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Aliso Viejo	52,222	8.0%
Anaheim*	397	0.1%
Coto de Caza CDP	14,723	2.3%
Dana Point	33,144	5.1%
Ladera Ranch CDP	26,188	4.0%
Laguna Hills	31,399	4.8%
Laguna Niguel	64,417	9.9%
Laguna Woods*	0	0.0%
Lake Forest	85,965	13.2%
Las Flores CDP	6,004	0.9%
Mission Viejo	93,760	14.4%
Modjeska CDP	632	0.1%
North Tustin CDP*	24,845	3.8%
Orange*	36,129	5.5%
Rancho Mission Viejo CDP	10,385	1.6%
Rancho Santa Margarita	48,000	7.4%
San Clemente	64,384	9.9%
San Juan Capistrano	35,271	5.4%
Silverado CDP	932	0.1%
Trabuco Canyon CDP	1,020	0.2%
Tustin*	14,778	2.3%
Unincorporated	2,380	0.4%
Villa Park*	5,850	0.9%
Williams Canyon CDP	93	0.0%
District 3 Total	**652,918**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 4

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	179,912	28.7%
Brea	47,397	7.6%
Buena Park	84,187	13.4%
Fullerton*	132,130	21.1%
La Habra	63,234	10.1%
Orange*	392	0.1%
Placentia*	47,114	7.5%
Unincorporated	4,226	0.7%
Yorba Linda	68,415	10.9%
District 4 Total	**627,007**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 5

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	151,125	24.2%
Fountain Valley*	222	0.0%
Fullerton*	11,800	1.9%
Garden Grove*	4,097	0.7%
Irvine*	0	0.0%
North Tustin CDP*	904	0.1%
Orange*	102,412	16.4%
Placentia*	4,811	0.8%
Santa Ana*	276,758	44.4%
Tustin*	65,634	10.5%
Unincorporated	6,132	1.0%
Villa Park*	0	0.0%
District 5 Total	**623,895**	**100.0%**

*City/CDP split by proposed district.

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 4B
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 5. Adjusted 2020 Census Population 18 Years and Over by Race/Ethnicity

District	Total Population 18 and Over	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Some Other Race	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	506,039	139,957	153,829	7,343	859	185,981	2,082	1,996	13,992
	100.0%	27.7%	30.4%	1.5%	0.2%	36.8%	0.4%	0.4%	2.8%
2	534,428	79,277	282,548	8,279	761	137,277	874	2,884	22,528
	100.0%	14.8%	52.9%	1.5%	0.1%	25.7%	0.2%	0.5%	4.2%
3	516,555	95,645	322,627	6,437	936	65,770	793	2,488	21,859
	100.0%	18.5%	62.5%	1.2%	0.2%	12.7%	0.2%	0.5%	4.2%
4	493,293	169,724	171,088	11,389	1,066	122,521	1,311	2,146	14,048
	100.0%	34.4%	34.7%	2.3%	0.2%	24.8%	0.3%	0.4%	2.8%
5	475,364	302,914	93,311	8,019	880	58,314	1,144	1,616	9,166
	100.0%	63.7%	19.6%	1.7%	0.2%	12.3%	0.2%	0.3%	1.9%
COUNTY TOTAL	2,525,679	787,517	1,023,403	41,467	4,502	569,863	6,204	11,130	81,593
	100.0%	31.2%	40.5%	1.6%	0.2%	22.6%	0.2%	0.4%	3.2%

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 4B

Contact Name:	Nick Anas
Organization:	Supervisor Katrina Foley
Submitted Description:	"District 2 - Revisions to Proposal 4 - Final"


Hispanic or Latino Percent Share of Adjusted 2020 Census Block Group Population
4
5
1
2
3
Proposal 4B
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Hispanic or Latino
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Non-Hispanic Asian Percent Share of Adjusted 2020 Census Block Group Population
4
5
1
2
3
Proposal 4B
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Non-Hispanic Asian
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Hispanic or Latino Percent Share of Census Block Group Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population, 2019
4
1
5
2
3
Proposal 4B
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Hispanic or Latino
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Non-Hispanic Asian Percent Share of Census Block Group Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population, 2019
4
1
5
2
3
Proposal 4B
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Non-Hispanic Asian
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%

This page is intentionally left blank

County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Proposal 4C Map



This page is intentionally left blank

PROPOSAL 4C
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 1. Adjusted 2020 Census Total Population by Race/Ethnicity

District	Total Population	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Some Other Race	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	624,166	147,259	233,089	8,113	1,092	204,060	2,232	2,842	25,479
	100.0%	23.6%	37.3%	1.3%	0.2%	32.7%	0.4%	0.5%	4.1%
2	658,490	425,150	119,447	9,275	1,117	84,779	1,782	2,533	14,407
	100.0%	64.6%	18.1%	1.4%	0.2%	12.9%	0.3%	0.4%	2.2%
3	665,026	122,461	353,362	8,788	888	139,952	968	3,338	35,269
	100.0%	18.4%	53.1%	1.3%	0.1%	21.0%	0.1%	0.5%	5.3%
4	620,138	280,790	152,305	14,622	1,237	148,145	1,962	2,813	18,264
	100.0%	45.3%	24.6%	2.4%	0.2%	23.9%	0.3%	0.5%	2.9%
5	625,190	114,621	341,925	9,145	991	122,331	793	3,561	31,823
	100.0%	18.3%	54.7%	1.5%	0.2%	19.6%	0.1%	0.6%	5.1%
COUNTY TOTAL	3,193,010	1,090,281	1,200,128	49,943	5,325	699,267	7,737	15,087	125,242
	100.0%	34.1%	37.6%	1.6%	0.2%	21.9%	0.2%	0.5%	3.9%

Table 2. Difference from 2021 Target Supervisorial District Population of 638,602

District	Number	Percent
1	-14,436	-2.26%
2	19,888	3.11%
3	26,424	4.14%
4	-18,464	-2.89%
5	-13,412	-2.10%

Percentage Spread (Largest - Smallest)
7.03%

Split Cities/Census Designated Places (CDPs) -

Anaheim (4)
Costa Mesa (3)
Fountain Valley (2)
Fullerton (2)
Garden Grove (3)
Irvine (2)
Laguna Hills (2)
Orange (2)
Placentia (2)
San Juan Capistrano (2)
Santa Ana (2)
Stanton (2)
Tustin (2)
Yorba Linda (2)

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Number in ( ) indicates number of Supervisorial Districts the city/CDP falls within.

The U.S. Census Bureau misassigned three (3) census blocks to the City of Tustin that are actually in the City of Santa Ana with a total of 260 population. Since the affected area is fully assigned to District 2, no splits are created and no correction is necessary.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 4C
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 3. Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) by Race/Ethnicity, 2015-2019 5-Year Estimates

District	Total Estimated CVAP	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	442,404	77,450	210,912	7,039	1,162	133,047	1,364	10,272
	100.0%	17.6%	47.8%	1.6%	0.3%	30.2%	0.3%	2.3%
2	367,550	182,596	113,693	7,381	662	56,355	1,231	4,572
	100.0%	49.8%	31.0%	2.0%	0.2%	15.4%	0.3%	1.2%
3	450,500	64,873	292,046	7,045	744	74,210	503	10,441
	100.0%	14.4%	64.9%	1.6%	0.2%	16.5%	0.1%	2.3%
4	380,644	129,533	141,484	11,974	764	87,287	1,807	6,879
	100.0%	34.1%	37.3%	3.2%	0.2%	23.0%	0.5%	1.8%
5	424,578	56,463	288,426	6,116	601	60,493	662	10,889
	100.0%	13.3%	68.1%	1.4%	0.1%	14.3%	0.2%	2.6%
COUNTY TOTAL	2,065,676	510,915	1,046,561	39,555	3,933	411,392	5,567	43,053
	100.0%	24.8%	50.8%	1.9%	0.2%	20.0%	0.3%	2.1%

Source: Statewide Database 2015-2019 Citizen Voting Age Population, adjusted to reflect reallocated incarcerated persons, on 2020 Census Blocks, Revised 9/27/2021 https://statewidedatabase.org/redistricting2021/counties.html

Notes: Percentages are calculated from sum of individual categories, not Total Estimated CVAP.

Because this is a special tabulation of data and not part of the standard data products shown on the Census Bureau's data.census.gov website, these estimates are rounded. Therefore, individual categories may not exactly add to the total.

For example, the sum of each of the race groups for non-Hispanics may not be the same as the estimate given for non-Hispanics. These estimates will not match counts from the 2020 Census.

The original data source for the Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) is the American Community Survey (ACS). The ACS is an ongoing survey by the U.S. Census Bureau sent to approximately 250,000 households each month.

The ACS estimates used to develop these data were collected from January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2019 utilizing the 2010 Census block groups, which were disaggregated to the 2020 Census blocks by the Statewide Database.

For more information about the CVAP products, visit https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/about/voting-rights/cvap.html and

https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/rdo/technical-documentation/special-tabulation/CVAP_2015-2019_ACS_documentation.pdf

PROPOSAL 4C
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 4. Adjusted 2020 Census Population by District and 2020 Census Place

DISTRICT 1

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	2,954	0.5%
Costa Mesa*	0	0.0%
Cypress	50,235	8.0%
Fountain Valley*	56,898	9.1%
Garden Grove*	117,557	18.8%
Huntington Beach	199,033	31.9%
La Palma	15,597	2.5%
Los Alamitos	11,795	1.9%
Midway City CDP	8,845	1.4%
Rossmoor CDP	10,634	1.7%
Santa Ana*	32,514	5.2%
Seal Beach	25,283	4.1%
Stanton*	352	0.1%
Unincorporated	1,386	0.2%
Westminster	91,083	14.6%
District 1 Total	**624,166**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 2

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	116,627	17.7%
Costa Mesa*	37,161	5.6%
Fountain Valley*	222	0.0%
Fullerton*	0	0.0%
Garden Grove*	53,910	8.2%
Orange*	99,158	15.1%
Santa Ana*	278,879	42.4%
Tustin*	68,280	10.4%
Unincorporated	4,253	0.6%
District 2 Total	**658,490**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 3

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Aliso Viejo	52,222	7.9%
Anaheim*	53,033	8.0%
Coto de Caza CDP	14,723	2.2%
Irvine*	68,622	10.3%
Ladera Ranch CDP	26,188	3.9%
Laguna Hills*	28,163	4.2%
Laguna Woods	17,658	2.7%
Lake Forest	85,965	12.9%
Las Flores CDP	6,004	0.9%
Mission Viejo	93,760	14.1%
Modjeska CDP	632	0.1%
North Tustin CDP	25,749	3.9%
Orange*	41,033	6.2%
Placentia*	1,960	0.3%
Rancho Mission Viejo CDP	10,385	1.6%
Rancho Santa Margarita	48,000	7.2%
San Juan Capistrano*	0	0.0%
Silverado CDP	932	0.1%
Trabuco Canyon CDP	1,020	0.2%
Tustin*	12,132	1.8%
Unincorporated	6,692	1.0%
Villa Park	5,850	0.9%
Williams Canyon CDP	93	0.0%
Yorba Linda*	64,210	9.7%
District 3 Total	**665,026**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 4

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	175,139	28.2%
Brea	47,397	7.6%
Buena Park	84,187	13.6%
Fullerton*	143,930	23.2%
Garden Grove*	879	0.1%
La Habra	63,234	10.2%
Placentia*	49,965	8.1%
Stanton*	37,715	6.1%
Unincorporated	13,487	2.2%
Yorba Linda*	4,205	0.7%
District 4 Total	**620,138**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 5

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Costa Mesa*	74,978	12.0%
Dana Point	33,144	5.3%
Irvine*	239,336	38.3%
Laguna Beach	23,061	3.7%
Laguna Hills*	3,236	0.5%
Laguna Niguel	64,417	10.3%
Newport Beach	85,338	13.6%
San Clemente	64,384	10.3%
San Juan Capistrano*	35,271	5.6%
Unincorporated	2,025	0.3%
District 5 Total	**625,190**	**100.0%**

*City split by proposed district.

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 4C
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 5. Adjusted 2020 Census Population 18 Years and Over by Race/Ethnicity

District	Total Population 18 and Over	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Some Other Race	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	505,335	107,127	201,650	6,677	940	168,144	1,808	2,224	16,765
	100.0%	21.2%	39.9%	1.3%	0.2%	33.3%	0.4%	0.4%	3.3%
2	505,236	305,856	105,587	7,875	953	71,655	1,410	1,777	10,123
	100.0%	60.5%	20.9%	1.6%	0.2%	14.2%	0.3%	0.4%	2.0%
3	521,374	87,341	292,281	7,328	725	109,415	769	2,400	21,115
	100.0%	16.8%	56.1%	1.4%	0.1%	21.0%	0.1%	0.5%	4.0%
4	484,655	201,371	132,881	11,911	1,044	121,628	1,574	2,036	12,210
	100.0%	41.5%	27.4%	2.5%	0.2%	25.1%	0.3%	0.4%	2.5%
5	509,079	85,822	291,004	7,676	840	99,021	643	2,693	21,380
	100.0%	16.9%	57.2%	1.5%	0.2%	19.5%	0.1%	0.5%	4.2%
COUNTY TOTAL	2,525,679	787,517	1,023,403	41,467	4,502	569,863	6,204	11,130	81,593
	100.0%	31.2%	40.5%	1.6%	0.2%	22.6%	0.2%	0.4%	3.2%

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 4C

Contact Name:	LaShe Rodriguez
Organization:	BOS-District 4
Submitted Description:	"Deviation D. 1,4,3

Plan Objectives
To keep communities of interest intact"


Hispanic or Latino Percent Share of Adjusted 2020 Census Block Group Population
4
2
1
3
5
Proposal 4C
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Hispanic or Latino
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Non-Hispanic Asian Percent Share of Adjusted 2020 Census Block Group Population
4
2
1
3
5
Proposal 4C
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Non-Hispanic Asian
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Hispanic or Latino Percent Share of Census Block Group Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population, 2019
4
2
1
3
5
Proposal 4C
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Hispanic or Latino
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Non-Hispanic Asian Percent Share of Census Block Group Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population, 2019
4
2
1
3
5
Proposal 4C
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Non-Hispanic Asian
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%

This page is intentionally left blank

County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Proposal 5A Map



This page is intentionally left blank

PROPOSAL 5A
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 1. Adjusted 2020 Census Total Population by Race/Ethnicity

District	Total Population	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Some Other Race	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	608,672	139,812	233,285	8,077	1,068	195,989	2,188	2,811	25,442
	100.0%	23.0%	38.3%	1.3%	0.2%	32.2%	0.4%	0.5%	4.2%
2	664,667	115,776	311,408	10,916	757	186,813	1,105	3,698	34,194
	100.0%	17.4%	46.9%	1.6%	0.1%	28.1%	0.2%	0.6%	5.1%
3	671,019	130,892	402,497	7,775	1,191	89,062	880	3,418	35,304
	100.0%	19.5%	60.0%	1.2%	0.2%	13.3%	0.1%	0.5%	5.3%
4	629,713	290,184	152,733	14,800	1,287	147,575	1,988	2,836	18,310
	100.0%	46.1%	24.3%	2.4%	0.2%	23.4%	0.3%	0.5%	2.9%
5	618,939	413,617	100,205	8,375	1,022	79,828	1,576	2,324	11,992
	100.0%	66.8%	16.2%	1.4%	0.2%	12.9%	0.3%	0.4%	1.9%
COUNTY TOTAL	3,193,010	1,090,281	1,200,128	49,943	5,325	699,267	7,737	15,087	125,242
	100.0%	34.1%	37.6%	1.6%	0.2%	21.9%	0.2%	0.5%	3.9%

Table 2. Difference from 2021 Target Supervisorial District Population of 638,602

District	Number	Percent
1	-29,930	-4.69%
2	26,065	4.08%
3	32,417	5.08%
4	-8,889	-1.39%
5	-19,663	-3.08%

Percentage Spread (Largest - Smallest)
9.76%

Split Cities/Census Designated Places (CDPs) -

Anaheim (3)
Garden Grove (2)
Laguna Hills (2)
Lake Forest (2)
North Tustin CDP (2)
Orange (2)
Tustin (3)

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Number in ( ) indicates number of Supervisorial Districts the city/CDP falls within.

The U.S. Census Bureau misassigned three (3) census blocks to the City of Tustin that are actually in the City of Santa Ana with a total of 260 population. Since the affected area is fully assigned to District 5, no splits are created and no correction is necessary.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 5A
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 3. Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) by Race/Ethnicity, 2015-2019 5-Year Estimates

District	Total Estimated CVAP	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	433,147	73,545	211,298	7,074	1,161	127,291	1,284	10,297
	100.0%	17.0%	48.9%	1.6%	0.3%	29.5%	0.3%	2.4%
2	422,853	56,967	257,535	7,665	656	87,069	901	10,880
	100.0%	13.5%	61.1%	1.8%	0.2%	20.6%	0.2%	2.6%
3	483,754	69,835	337,988	6,886	753	56,206	592	11,250
	100.0%	14.4%	69.9%	1.4%	0.2%	11.6%	0.1%	2.3%
4	385,143	133,487	142,193	11,844	789	87,149	1,815	6,918
	100.0%	34.7%	37.0%	3.1%	0.2%	22.7%	0.5%	1.8%
5	340,779	177,081	97,547	6,086	574	53,677	975	3,708
	100.0%	52.1%	28.7%	1.8%	0.2%	15.8%	0.3%	1.1%
COUNTY TOTAL	2,065,676	510,915	1,046,561	39,555	3,933	411,392	5,567	43,053
	100.0%	24.8%	50.8%	1.9%	0.2%	20.0%	0.3%	2.1%

Source: Statewide Database 2015-2019 Citizen Voting Age Population, adjusted to reflect reallocated incarcerated persons, on 2020 Census Blocks, Revised 9/27/2021 https://statewidedatabase.org/redistricting2021/counties.html

Notes: Percentages are calculated from sum of individual categories, not Total Estimated CVAP.

Because this is a special tabulation of data and not part of the standard data products shown on the Census Bureau's data.census.gov website, these estimates are rounded. Therefore, individual categories may not exactly add to the total.

For example, the sum of each of the race groups for non-Hispanics may not be the same as the estimate given for non-Hispanics. These estimates will not match counts from the 2020 Census.

The original data source for the Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) is the American Community Survey (ACS). The ACS is an ongoing survey by the U.S. Census Bureau sent to approximately 250,000 households each month.

The ACS estimates used to develop these data were collected from January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2019 utilizing the 2010 Census block groups, which were disaggregated to the 2020 Census blocks by the Statewide Database.

For more information about the CVAP products, visit https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/about/voting-rights/cvap.html and

https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/rdo/technical-documentation/special-tabulation/CVAP_2015-2019_ACS_documentation.pdf

PROPOSAL 5A
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 4. Adjusted 2020 Census Population by District and 2020 Census Place

DISTRICT 1

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Cypress	50,235	8.3%
Fountain Valley	57,120	9.4%
Garden Grove*	135,704	22.3%
Huntington Beach	199,033	32.7%
La Palma	15,597	2.6%
Los Alamitos	11,795	1.9%
Midway City CDP	8,845	1.5%
Rossmoor CDP	10,634	1.7%
Seal Beach	25,283	4.2%
Unincorporated	3,343	0.5%
Westminster	91,083	15.0%
District 1 Total	**608,672**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 2

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Aliso Viejo	52,222	7.9%
Costa Mesa	112,139	16.9%
Irvine	307,958	46.3%
Laguna Beach	23,061	3.5%
Laguna Hills*	16,901	2.5%
Laguna Woods	17,658	2.7%
Lake Forest*	16,406	2.5%
Newport Beach	85,338	12.8%
Tustin*	30,955	4.7%
Unincorporated	2,029	0.3%
District 2 Total	**664,667**	**100.0%**

*City/CDP split by proposed district.

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

DISTRICT 3

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	56,099	8.4%
Coto de Caza CDP	14,723	2.2%
Dana Point	33,144	4.9%
Ladera Ranch CDP	26,188	3.9%
Laguna Hills*	14,498	2.2%
Laguna Niguel	64,417	9.6%
Lake Forest*	69,559	10.4%
Las Flores CDP	6,004	0.9%
Mission Viejo	93,760	14.0%
Modjeska CDP	632	0.1%
North Tustin CDP*	18,131	2.7%
Orange*	33,354	5.0%
Rancho Mission Viejo CDP	10,385	1.5%
Rancho Santa Margarita	48,000	7.2%
San Clemente	64,384	9.6%
San Juan Capistrano	35,271	5.3%
Silverado CDP	932	0.1%
Trabuco Canyon CDP	1,020	0.2%
Tustin*	0	0.0%
Unincorporated	6,160	0.9%
Villa Park	5,850	0.9%
Williams Canyon CDP	93	0.0%
Yorba Linda	68,415	10.2%
District 3 Total	**671,019**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 4

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	189,443	30.1%
Brea	47,397	7.5%
Buena Park	84,187	13.4%
Fullerton	143,930	22.9%
La Habra	63,234	10.0%
Placentia	51,925	8.2%
Stanton	38,067	6.0%
Unincorporated	11,530	1.8%
District 4 Total	**629,713**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 5

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	102,211	16.5%
Garden Grove*	36,642	5.9%
North Tustin CDP*	7,618	1.2%
Orange*	106,837	17.3%
Santa Ana	311,393	50.3%
Tustin*	49,457	8.0%
Unincorporated	4,781	0.8%
District 5 Total	**618,939**	**100.0%**

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 5A
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 5. Adjusted 2020 Census Population 18 Years and Over by Race/Ethnicity

District	Total Population 18 and Over	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Some Other Race	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	492,851	101,722	201,837	6,649	934	160,998	1,775	2,208	16,728
	100.0%	20.6%	41.0%	1.3%	0.2%	32.7%	0.4%	0.4%	3.4%
2	536,073	87,002	265,986	9,094	606	147,476	865	2,743	22,301
	100.0%	16.2%	49.6%	1.7%	0.1%	27.5%	0.2%	0.5%	4.2%
3	531,019	93,263	333,319	6,530	1,015	71,893	725	2,525	21,749
	100.0%	17.6%	62.8%	1.2%	0.2%	13.5%	0.1%	0.5%	4.1%
4	491,691	208,051	133,272	12,057	1,082	121,344	1,598	2,052	12,235
	100.0%	42.3%	27.1%	2.5%	0.2%	24.7%	0.3%	0.4%	2.5%
5	474,045	297,479	88,989	7,137	865	68,152	1,241	1,602	8,580
	100.0%	62.8%	18.8%	1.5%	0.2%	14.4%	0.3%	0.3%	1.8%
COUNTY TOTAL	2,525,679	787,517	1,023,403	41,467	4,502	569,863	6,204	11,130	81,593
	100.0%	31.2%	40.5%	1.6%	0.2%	22.6%	0.2%	0.4%	3.2%

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 5A

Contact Name: LaShe Rodriguez
Organization: BOS-District 4
Submitted Description: "Deviation off in D.1,3,5

Plan Objectives
To keep communities of interest intact."


Hispanic or Latino Percent Share of Adjusted 2020 Census Block Group Population
4
5
1
2
3
Proposal 5A
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Hispanic or Latino
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Non-Hispanic Asian Percent Share of Adjusted 2020 Census Block Group Population
4
5
1
2
3
Proposal 5A
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Non-Hispanic Asian
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Hispanic or Latino Percent Share of Census Block Group Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population, 2019
4
5
1
2
3
Proposal 5A
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Hispanic or Latino
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Non-Hispanic Asian Percent Share of Census Block Group Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population, 2019
4
5
1
2
3
Proposal 5A
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Non-Hispanic Asian
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%

This page is intentionally left blank

County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Proposal 5B Map



This page is intentionally left blank

PROPOSAL 5B
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 1. Adjusted 2020 Census Total Population by Race/Ethnicity

District	Total Population	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Some Other Race	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	609,950	140,330	233,495	8,100	1,071	196,491	2,192	2,811	25,460
	100.0%	23.0%	38.3%	1.3%	0.2%	32.2%	0.4%	0.5%	4.2%
2	663,910	118,547	352,230	10,597	871	142,154	1,103	3,776	34,632
	100.0%	17.9%	53.1%	1.6%	0.1%	21.4%	0.2%	0.6%	5.2%
3	670,176	126,681	362,579	7,975	1,043	132,839	878	3,314	34,867
	100.0%	18.9%	54.1%	1.2%	0.2%	19.8%	0.1%	0.5%	5.2%
4	640,323	291,323	159,011	14,987	1,347	149,780	1,999	2,878	18,998
	100.0%	45.5%	24.8%	2.3%	0.2%	23.4%	0.3%	0.4%	3.0%
5	608,651	413,400	92,813	8,284	993	78,003	1,565	2,308	11,285
	100.0%	67.9%	15.2%	1.4%	0.2%	12.8%	0.3%	0.4%	1.9%
COUNTY TOTAL	3,193,010	1,090,281	1,200,128	49,943	5,325	699,267	7,737	15,087	125,242
	100.0%	34.1%	37.6%	1.6%	0.2%	21.9%	0.2%	0.5%	3.9%

Table 2. Difference from 2021 Target Supervisorial District Population of 638,602

District	Number	Percent
1	-28,652	-4.49%
2	25,308	3.96%
3	31,574	4.94%
4	1,721	0.27%
5	-29,951	-4.69%

Percentage Spread (Largest - Smallest)
9.63%

Split Cities/Census Designated Places (CDPs) -

Anaheim (3)
Garden Grove (2)
Irvine (2)
Mission Viejo (2)
Orange (3)
Tustin (3)

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Number in ( ) indicates number of Supervisorial Districts the city/CDP falls within.

The U.S. Census Bureau misassigned three (3) census blocks to the City of Tustin that are actually in the City of Santa Ana with a total of 260 population. Since the affected area is fully assigned to District 5, no splits are created and no correction is necessary.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 5B
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 3. Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) by Race/Ethnicity, 2015-2019 5-Year Estimates

District	Total Estimated CVAP	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	434,168	73,835	211,585	7,090	1,161	127,765	1,284	10,312
	100.0%	17.1%	48.9%	1.6%	0.3%	29.5%	0.3%	2.4%
2	449,199	59,702	295,330	8,095	559	71,882	904	11,696
	100.0%	13.3%	65.9%	1.8%	0.1%	16.0%	0.2%	2.6%
3	457,316	66,402	301,175	6,427	856	71,156	599	10,312
	100.0%	14.5%	65.9%	1.4%	0.2%	15.6%	0.1%	2.3%
4	392,835	133,933	148,026	11,995	814	88,338	1,731	7,147
	100.0%	34.2%	37.8%	3.1%	0.2%	22.5%	0.4%	1.8%
5	332,158	177,043	90,445	5,948	543	52,251	1,049	3,586
	100.0%	53.5%	27.3%	1.8%	0.2%	15.8%	0.3%	1.1%
COUNTY TOTAL	2,065,676	510,915	1,046,561	39,555	3,933	411,392	5,567	43,053
	100.0%	24.8%	50.8%	1.9%	0.2%	20.0%	0.3%	2.1%

Source: Statewide Database 2015-2019 Citizen Voting Age Population, adjusted to reflect reallocated incarcerated persons, on 2020 Census Blocks, Revised 9/27/2021 https://statewidedatabase.org/redistricting2021/counties.html

Notes: Percentages are calculated from sum of individual categories, not Total Estimated CVAP.

Because this is a special tabulation of data and not part of the standard data products shown on the Census Bureau's data.census.gov website, these estimates are rounded. Therefore, individual categories may not exactly add to the total.

For example, the sum of each of the race groups for non-Hispanics may not be the same as the estimate given for non-Hispanics. These estimates will not match counts from the 2020 Census.

The original data source for the Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) is the American Community Survey (ACS). The ACS is an ongoing survey by the U.S. Census Bureau sent to approximately 250,000 households each month.

The ACS estimates used to develop these data were collected from January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2019 utilizing the 2010 Census block groups, which were disaggregated to the 2020 Census blocks by the Statewide Database.

For more information about the CVAP products, visit https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/about/voting-rights/cvap.html and

https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/rdo/technical-documentation/special-tabulation/CVAP_2015-2019_ACS_documentation.pdf

PROPOSAL 5B
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 4. Adjusted 2020 Census Population by District and 2020 Census Place

DISTRICT 1

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Cypress	50,235	8.2%
Fountain Valley	57,120	9.4%
Garden Grove*	136,982	22.5%
Huntington Beach	199,033	32.6%
La Palma	15,597	2.6%
Los Alamitos	11,795	1.9%
Midway City CDP	8,845	1.5%
Rossmoor CDP	10,634	1.7%
Seal Beach	25,283	4.1%
Unincorporated	3,343	0.5%
Westminster	91,083	14.9%
District 1 Total	**609,950**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 2

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Aliso Viejo	52,222	7.9%
Costa Mesa	112,139	16.9%
Dana Point	33,144	5.0%
Irvine*	229,401	34.6%
Laguna Beach	23,061	3.5%
Laguna Hills	31,399	4.7%
Laguna Niguel	64,417	9.7%
Laguna Woods	17,658	2.7%
Mission Viejo*	0	0.0%
Newport Beach	85,338	12.9%
Tustin*	13,106	2.0%
Unincorporated	2,025	0.3%
District 2 Total	**663,910**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 3

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	46,881	7.0%
Coto de Caza CDP	14,723	2.2%
Irvine*	78,557	11.7%
Ladera Ranch CDP	26,188	3.9%
Lake Forest	85,965	12.8%
Las Flores CDP	6,004	0.9%
Mission Viejo*	93,760	14.0%
Modjeska CDP	632	0.1%
North Tustin CDP	25,749	3.8%
Orange*	33,354	5.0%
Rancho Mission Viejo CDP	10,385	1.5%
Rancho Santa Margarita	48,000	7.2%
San Clemente	64,384	9.6%
San Juan Capistrano	35,271	5.3%
Silverado CDP	932	0.1%
Trabuco Canyon CDP	1,020	0.2%
Tustin*	17,849	2.7%
Unincorporated	6,164	0.9%
Villa Park	5,850	0.9%
Williams Canyon CDP	93	0.0%
Yorba Linda	68,415	10.2%
District 3 Total	**670,176**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 4

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	188,501	29.4%
Brea	47,397	7.4%
Buena Park	84,187	13.1%
Fullerton	143,930	22.5%
La Habra	63,234	9.9%
Orange*	11,063	1.7%
Placentia	51,925	8.1%
Stanton	38,067	5.9%
Unincorporated	12,019	1.9%
District 4 Total	**640,323**	**100.0%**

DISTRICT 5

Place	Total Population	Percent of District
Anaheim*	112,371	18.5%
Garden Grove*	35,364	5.8%
Orange*	95,774	15.7%
Santa Ana	311,393	51.2%
Tustin*	49,457	8.1%
Unincorporated	4,292	0.7%
District 5 Total	**608,651**	**100.0%**

*City split by proposed district.

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 5B
County of Orange 2021 Redistricting

Table 5. Adjusted 2020 Census Population 18 Years and Over by Race/Ethnicity

District	Total Population 18 and Over	Hispanic or Latino of any Race	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black or African-American	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native	Non-Hispanic Asian	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Non-Hispanic Some Other Race	Non-Hispanic Two or More Races
1	493,894	102,097	202,026	6,671	937	161,436	1,779	2,208	16,740
	100.0%	20.7%	40.9%	1.4%	0.2%	32.7%	0.4%	0.4%	3.4%
2	543,749	89,258	301,919	8,939	709	115,903	849	2,838	23,334
	100.0%	16.4%	55.5%	1.6%	0.1%	21.3%	0.2%	0.5%	4.3%
3	522,153	89,982	298,146	6,590	875	102,727	734	2,414	20,685
	100.0%	17.2%	57.1%	1.3%	0.2%	19.7%	0.1%	0.5%	4.0%
4	500,127	208,850	138,425	12,215	1,138	123,134	1,603	2,085	12,677
	100.0%	41.8%	27.7%	2.4%	0.2%	24.6%	0.3%	0.4%	2.5%
5	465,756	297,330	82,887	7,052	843	66,663	1,239	1,585	8,157
	100.0%	63.8%	17.8%	1.5%	0.2%	14.3%	0.3%	0.3%	1.8%
COUNTY TOTAL	2,525,679	787,517	1,023,403	41,467	4,502	569,863	6,204	11,130	81,593
	100.0%	31.2%	40.5%	1.6%	0.2%	22.6%	0.2%	0.4%	3.2%

Percent shares calculated using unrounded numbers, but table displays only to tenths; therefore, percents displayed may not sum to 100%.

Source: Statewide Database; Adjusted, incarcerated persons reallocated P.L. 94-171 2020 Redistricting Data, Revised 9/27/2021

PROPOSAL 5B

Contact Name:	Tara Campbell
Organization:	Board of Supervisors, Third District
Submitted Description:	"To keep communities of interest together."


Hispanic or Latino Percent Share of Adjusted 2020 Census Block Group Population
4
5
1
2
3
Proposal 5B
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Hispanic or Latino
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Non-Hispanic Asian Percent Share of Adjusted 2020 Census Block Group Population
4
5
1
2
3
Proposal 5B
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Non-Hispanic Asian
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Hispanic or Latino Percent Share of Census Block Group Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population, 2019
4
5
1
2
3
Proposal 5B
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Hispanic or Latino
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%


Non-Hispanic Asian Percent Share of Census Block Group Adjusted Citizen Voting Age Population, 2019
4
5
1
2
3
Proposal 5B
Freeways and Toll Roads
Percent Non-Hispanic Asian
0.0 - 19.9%
20.0 - 39.9%
40.0 - 50.0%
50.1 - 59.9%
60.0 - 79.9%
80.0 - 100.0%

Attachment D: Redistricting Map Proposal Public Comment

Received November 1, 2021 – November 8, 2021 Noon

For a complete list of all public comments received please visit – www.ocgov.com/redistricting

Osborn, Rachael

From: Prinsky, Lorraine <lprinsky@fullerton.edu>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 11:54 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: I support Maps 5 and 2A

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Please keep Costa Mesa together. I support Maps 5 and 2A.

Lorraine
****
Lorraine Prinsky, Ph.D, Trustee
Coast Community College District
Professor Emeritus, CSUF
www.lorraineprinsky.com
****

Osborn, Rachael

From: Daryl Williams <williamshadden@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 11:43 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting Maps

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Keep Costa Mesa united. I support maps 2A and 5.

Daryl Williams
williamshadden@hotmail.com
516 B Poinsettia Ave
Newport Beach, CA 92625
Sent from my iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: Deborah Newquist <debnewquist@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 11:39 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting Comment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I am a resident of Orange County. My comment about the redistricting proposals are:

Keep Costa Mesa United" I support Maps 5 and 2A

Thank you,
Deborah Newquist
20 Urey Court
Irvine, CA 92617

Sent from my iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: Jaime Kauffman Palumbo <Jaime@pmdl.me>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 11:37 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Attention: This email originated from outside the County of Orange. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Hello,
I am a resident of Huntington Beach and would like to voice my opinion on the possible maps that were released. Please keep Costa Mesa united. I am in favor of maps 5 and 2A.

Thank you,
Jaime Palumbo

Osborn, Rachael

From: Cindy Hadden <cehadden@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 11:34 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting Maps

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Keep Costa Mesa United. I support maps 5 and 2A.

Cindy Hadden
516 Poinsettia Ave
Corona Del Mar, CA 92625
cehadden@hotmail.com

Sent from my iPad

Osborn, Rachael

From: Michele Mullen <mullen.michele@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 11:29 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Attention: This email originated from outside the County of Orange. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Good Afternoon,
Please Keep Newport Beach and Costa Mesa United!
I support Maps 5 & 2A.
Thank you,
Michele Mullen
Costa Mesa Resident

Sent from my iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: Margie Sampson <cindertoad@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 11:27 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Maps

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Keep Costa MesaUnited! I support Maps 5 and 2A!

Osborn, Rachael

From: lindaklaw (null) <lindaklaw@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 11:06 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Keep Costa Mesa United

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Please keep Costa Mesa United. I support maps 5 an 2A

Sent from my iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: Cathey Ryder <the4ryders@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 11:05 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Costa Mesa Together

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Keep Costa Mesa United:
I support Maps 5 and 2A

Costa Mesa Homeowner

Sent from my iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: Susan Lew <bucketsue@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 10:52 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Support for Maps 5 and 2A

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear County Redistricting Decisionmakers,
Please Keep Costa Mesa United. Please support Maps 5 and 2A.

Thank you!
Susan Lew

Osborn, Rachael

From: Betty Chu <bchu4mp09@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 10:52 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting Proposals 2, 4 and 5
Attachments: Attachment 1 Equal Population Districts .pdf; EXHIBIT 1 POPULATION DEVIATION COMPARISONS.xlsx. copy.pdf; ATTACHMENT 2 HISPANIC AND ASIAN POPULATION DISTRICTS.pdf; EXHIBIT 2 HISPANIC AND ASIAN COMPARISONS copy.pdf; EXHIBIT 3 Other Comparisons copy.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Chairman Do, Vice Chairman Chaffee and Supervisors,

I respectfully each of you to adopt Proposal 2 as discussed on November 2 for each and all, of the following reasons:

a. Proposal 5 violates the requirements, priorities and intent of the U.S. Constitution, Federal Voting Rights Act, California Constitution and Elections Code section 21,500 by unfairly diluting the vote of Asians to preclude their election of a representative of their choice.

b. Proposal 2 is the best in compliance with the requirements, priorities and intent of the U.S. Constitution, Federal Voting Rights Act, California Constitution, and Elections Code section 21,500.

c. Proposal 2 is the only map submitted with population numbers and percentages that deviate the least from the target population and is the only map that creates the best Majority Hispanic Minority Voting District and the best Influence Asian Voting District.

d. Proposal 2 is the fairest geographic representation of the three major diverse racial/ethnic populations and the current trending demographics in Orange County.

e. Proposal 2 creates the best and strongest Majority Minority Voting District. Proposal 2, District 1 has the highest population count Hispanics, more than the corresponding District 2 in Proposal 4 and District 5 in Proposal 5. Proposal 2 ties with Proposal 5 with the largest Hispanic percentage.

f. Proposal 2, District 4 has the best Influence Asian Voting District. Both the largest percentage and highest population count of contiguous Asians, significantly more than Proposals 4 and 5.

g. Proposal 5 has the weakest Influence Asian District (32.2%) which is sacrificed to create a 67.9% Majority Hispanic Minority district, the highest percentage tied with Proposal 4, and sacrificed to create the strongest Influence Hispanic Voting District at 45.5%. The Influence Asian District is adjacent to both of these Hispanic districts.

h. Failure to adopt Proposal 2 will have a substantial negative impact on the rights of Asians to fair representation as protected by the U. S. and California Constitutions, the Federal Voting Rights Act and the California Elections Code.

i. Adoption of Proposals 4 and 5 will adversely affect the Constitutional equal opportunity rights of an increasing Asian population to participate in the political process for the next ten years.

j. Adoption of Proposals 4 and 5 will deny a significant racial minority "from voting a representative of their choice" contrary to the protections afforded under the Constitutions and Laws of the United States and California.

k. Proposal 2 includes all of Santa Ana and Little Arabia and parts of Garden Grove in the Majority Minority Voting District as desired by the speakers on November 4 supporting Proposals 4 and 5.

Please vote for Proposal 2, as presented on November 2, 2021, the map that is the redistricting plan most and best "focused on equal representation and keeping communities of interest together". Voting for Proposal 2 avoids the perception of self-interest since it strengthens the Hispanic Majority Minority Voting District, gives the right for fair representation to the Asians and similarly includes the cities in adjacent districts desired by proponents of the other maps.

Adoption of any map other than Proposal 2 denies the right of Asians to participate in the political process, gives the appearance of a conflict of interest, self-interest and political preferences and is Anti-Asian discrimination in violation of the federal and state Constitutions, Voting Rights Act and Elections code 21,500 et seq.

I also support any technical or other changes to Proposal 2 that do not decrease the percentages nor population numbers as reflected by Proposal 2 presented on November 2, 2021.

Additional data and analysis supporting Proposal 2 are included in attachments and exhibits. Attachment 1 is additional comments on Equal Population Districts. Exhibit 1 is Population Deviation Comparison Chart. Attachment 2 is additional comments on Hispanic and Asian Districts. Exhibit 2 is Hispanic and Asian District Comparison Chart. Exhibit 3 is Racial Comparison Chart.

Thank you for your consideration in this manner.

Respectfully,

Betty Chu
Resident OC District 3
Chinese American Citizens Alliance

of Orange County
Email: bchu4mp09@yahoo.com

2021 1108 CHU REDISTRICTING PROPOSAL

ATTACHMENT 1: EQUAL POPULATION DISTRICTS

PROPOSAL 2 IS THE MOST COMPLIANT WITH THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION, VOTING RIGHTS ACT AND ELECTIONS CODE SECTION 21,500. PROPOSAL 5 IS THE LEAST COMPLIANT.

Proposal 2 is the fairest and the most compliant map. The most important requirement, Elections Code Section 21,500 (a) (1), requires districts to be "substantially equal in population as required by the United States Constitution". This requirement protects the right of minorities for "equal opportunity to be part of the political process". Proposal 2 is the most "substantially equal in population as required by the United States Constitution.

Exhibit 1 is a chart of the population deviation percentage comparisons for each district in the three maps ranked from the smallest to the largest.

Proposal 2 is the most compliant with a low deviation percentage of 1.95%, the least deviation percentage spread of all three Proposals. Proposal 5 is the least compliant with a high of 9.52%, only 0.48% less than the maximum 10% allowed and 7½ times more than Proposal 2. The 3.85% percentage spread deviation of Proposal 4 is still almost twice that of Proposal 2. (Exhibit 1)

The population deviation numerical spread from the lowest number of persons to the highest in Proposal 2 districts is 12,481 persons, the lowest numerical deviation of the three Proposals. Proposal 5 is much less compliant with a spread of 60,768 persons, the largest numerical deviation of the three Proposals.

The Majority Hispanic Minority Voting District is District 1 in Proposal 2, District 2 in Proposal 4, and District 5 in Proposal 5. The Majority Hispanic Minority Voting District in Proposal 4 has the lowest deviation percentage at -0.56% and the lowest numerical deviation, 3,597 persons less than the target population per district. The corresponding district in Proposal 2 is very similar to Proposal 4, the deviation percentage at -0.58% and 3,697 persons less than the target population per district. The greatest deviation is in Proposal 5 with a population of 29,951 less than the target population or -4.69% percentage deviation.

The Influence Asian Voting District is District 4 in Proposal 2, District 1 in Proposal 4, and District 1 in Proposal 5. Again, Proposal 5 has the largest

deviation percentage (-4.49%) and number (29,951), significantly more than Proposals 2 and 4. Again, Proposals 2 and 4 are at -0.89%, 5,699 and -0.56%, 3,597, respectively.

The districts in Proposal 2 overall have the least percentage and numerical deviation at 1.95% and 12,481. The deviations in Proposal 4 are almost double at 3.85% and 24,562. Proposal 5 has the greatest deviations, 9.52% and 60,768, almost 5 times the deviations in Proposal 2. Proposal 2 is the most compliant with Elections Code and the Constitutions as the districts are the most equal in representation.

2021 1108 Chu Redistricting Proposals

ATTACHMENT 2: HISPANIC AND ASIAN POPULATION DISTRICTS

1. PROPOSAL 5 VIOLATES THE PROVISIONS, PRIORITIES AND INTENT OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION, VOTING RIGHTS ACT AND ELECTIONS CODE SECTION 12, 500 ET SEQ.

Proposal 5 has the lowest Asian population numbers and percentages in the Influence Asian Voting District. The Asian population is divided in smaller percentages over different districts in Proposal 5. The district divisions in Proposal 5 resulted in the weakest Influence Asian Voting District.

The creation of Major Minority Voting District 5 with 67.9% Hispanics and Influence Hispanic Voting District 4 with 45.5% weakened the abutting Influence Asian Voting District in Proposal 5 to only 32.2%. The sacrifice of the Asian population to add to the Majority Hispanic Minority Voting District and/or to the Influence Hispanic Voting District adversely impacts the ability of Asians to participate fairly and equally in the election process.

This is particularly true when coupled with the largest population percentage and numerical deviations of Proposal 5. This clearly results in Anti-Asian discrimination prohibited under the U.S. Constitution, the California Constitution, Voting Rights Act and Election Code 21,500 et seq.

Alternatively, the strongest Majority Hispanic Minority Voting District 1 is created in Proposal 2 District 4 adjacent to the strongest Influence Asian Voting District. Although the percentages of Hispanics in the Majority Hispanic Minority Voting District in Proposals 2 and 5 are the same, the one in Proposal 2 has the largest population number, 431,360 Hispanics, 4.3% or 17,960 more than the 431,400 Hispanics in Proposal 5 and 3% or 16,290 more than the 418,822 Hispanics in Proposal 5. Proposal 2 is the only map with the strongest Majority Hispanic Minority District adjacent to the strongest Influence Asian Voting District.

Proposal 5 will have a substantial negative impact on the rights of Asians to fair political representation for the next ten years. To the contrary, Proposal 2 strengthens the Influence Asian Voting District without adversely affecting the Majority Hispanic Minority Voting District.

2. PROPOSAL 2 IS THE FAIREST AND MOST COMPLIANT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS, PRIORITIES AND INTENT OF THE U.S. AND CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTIONS, VOTING RIGHTS ACT AND ELECTIONS CODE 21,500

Proposal 2 is the fairest and the most compliant map with the provisions, priorities and intent of the Federal and California Constitutions, Voting Rights Act and Election Code section 21,500.

The most important requirement, Elections Code Section 21,500 (a) (1), requires districts to be "substantially equal in population as required by the United States Constitution". This requirement protects the right of minorities for "equal opportunity to be part of the

political process". Proposal 2 is the most "substantially equal in population as required by the United States Constitution. Exhibit 1 includes a chart of the deviation spreads for each district in the three maps from low to high.

All of the districts in Proposal 2 have numbers and percentages that deviate the least from the target population and at the same time, creates the best Majority Hispanic Minority Voting District and the best Influence Asian Voting District.

The population deviation spread of Proposal 2 is the most compliant with a low deviation percentage of 1.95%. Proposal 5 is the least compliant with a high of 9.52%. The population deviation spreads as shown in numbers under the target population in Proposal 2 is minus 5,699. Proposal 5 is much less compliant with a minus spread of 29,951. The spread over the target population in Proposal 2 is plus 6,782. Again Proposal 5 is substantially less compliant with a sizeable population plus of 30,817.

Both Proposals 2 and 5 have the least split cities after the technical boundary adjustments. Proposal 4 will have almost twice as many split cities. The splits of Fountain Valley, Fullerton, Garden Grove and Irvine has a negative impact on the Asian communities of interest.

3. PROPOSAL 2 HAS THE STRONGEST AND LARGEST MAJORITY HISPANIC MINORITY VOTING DISTRICT

The best and strongest Majority Minority Voting District is in Proposal 2. Proposal 2, District 1 has the highest population count of Hispanics, more than the corresponding District 2 in Proposal 4 and District 5 in Proposal 5. Proposal 2 ties with Proposal 5 on the largest Hispanic percentage.

These higher population percentage and numbers in Proposal 2 strengthen the Majority Hispanic Minority Voting District over those in Proposals 4 and 5.

Proposal 2, District 1 includes 431,360 Hispanics, the highest number of Hispanic populations, 12,538 more than Proposal 4. Although the population percentages in Proposals 2 and Proposal 5 are the same and are the largest percentages as compared to Proposal 4, Proposal 2 has 17,960 more Hispanics than Proposal 5.

Proposal 2 creates the strongest Majority Hispanic Minority Voting District 1 with the largest population of Hispanics and has an additional two Hispanic districts of influence. Proposal 4 also has a Majority Hispanic Minority District but only one Influence Hispanic District.

The Majority Hispanic Minority Voting District in Proposal 2 includes all of Santa Ana and Little Arabia and parts of Garden Grove as desired by the speakers on November 4 supporting Proposals 4
and 5.

4. PROPOSAL 2 DISTRICT 4 IS THE STRONGEST AND LARGEST INFLUENCE ASIAN VOTING DISTRICT

Proposal 2 is the only one that strengthens both the Majority Minority District and the Influence Voting District. Proposal 2 is the most compliant with the provisions and intent

of the Federal and California Constitutions, the Voting rights Act and Election Code section 21,500. All of the districts in Proposal 2 have numbers and percentages that deviate the least from the target population and at the same time, creates the best Majority Hispanic Minority Voting District and the best Influence Asian Voting District.

Proposal 2, District 1 includes Santa Ana, Little Arabia, and parts of Garden Grove in a single district as desired by the speakers last week in support of Proposals 4 and 5.

Proposal 2 is the only Proposal that strengthens both the Majority Minority Voting District and the Influence Voting District in population numbers and percentages.

Proposal 2 is the most compliant with the provisions, priorities and intent of the Federal and California Constitutions, the Voting rights Act and Election Code section 21,500. All of the districts in Proposal 2 have numbers and percentages that deviate the least from the target population and at the same time, creates the largest Majority Hispanic Minority Voting District and the best Influence Asian Voting District.

Proposal 2 has the highest percentages and the largest number of Asians in District 4 to form the strongest Asian Influence Voting District. The Asian Influence Voting Districts in Proposals 4 and 5 are significantly lower in percentages and numbers than Proposal 2.

Proposal 2, District 4 includes 243,208 (38.4%) Asians, the largest of the Influence Asian Voting Districts submitted. The Influence Asian Voting District in Proposal 4 is populated by 226,918 Asians, 16,290 and 7% less than Proposal 2. The Influence Asian Voting District in Proposal 5 has the least Asian Population, 196,491 or 23.7% less than that of Proposal 2.

5. Proposal 2 is the most compliant with the provisions and intent of the Federal and California Constitutions, the Voting rights Act and Election Code section 21,500. All of the districts in Proposal 2 have numbers and percentages that deviate the least from the target population and at the same time, creates the best Majority Hispanic Minority Voting District and the best Influence Asian Voting District.

5. THE ELIMINATION OF PROPOSAL 2 WILL HAVE SEVERE ADVERSE IMPACTS ON THE RIGHTS OF ASIANS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE POLITICAL PROCESSES FOR THE NEXT TEN YEARS.

Proposal 5 will have drastic adverse impacts on the rights of Asians to elect a representative of their choice as guaranteed by the federal and state Constitutions and laws. Although not as drastic, Proposal 4 will still lessen the opportunities for Asians to be fairly represented.

The Influence Voting Districts in Proposals 4 and 5 are significantly lower in percentages and numbers than Proposal 2. This violates the provisions, priorities and intent of the U.S. and California Constitutions, the Voting Rights Act and Elections Code.

Proposal 2 creates the strongest Majority Minority District 1 with the largest population of Hispanics and has two Hispanic districts of influence. Proposal 4 also has a Majority Hispanic Minority District and only one Influence Hispanic District.

On the other hand, the Asians in Proposal 5, the lowest in numbers and percentages, are spread over different districts in Proposal 5. The creation of Major Minority District 5 with 67.9% Hispanics and Influence Hispanic District 4 with 45.5% weakened the abutting Influence Asian District to 32.2%. This clearly presents a perception of Anti-Asian discrimination prohibited under the U.S. Constitution, the California Constitution, Voting Rights Act and Election Code 21,500 et seq.

The weakened Influence Asian District was sacrificed to create a Majority Minority District (District 5) of 67.9% and the strongest Influence Hispanic District (District of 45.5%) both abutting the Influence Asian District

The increased Hispanic population included in Proposal 2 is not detrimental to the Hispanics' rights for fair representation and in fact, strengthens the Majority Minority Voting Rights District.

Proposal 2 is the only one that strengthens both the Majority Minority District as well as that of the Influence Voting District.

The elimination of Proposal 2 will discriminate against the Asians contrary to the provisions and intent of the U.S. and California Constitutions and Elections Code 21,500. Dilution of the Asian voices for the next ten years is not in the best interest of Orange County and is tantamount to deletion of the Asian voices.

The elimination of Proposal 2 containing increased percentages and numbers of the Hispanic population will deprive Orange County Hispanics of a stronger Majority Minority District.

The percentage and numerical differences in Proposals 4 (District 2) and 5 (District 5) both adversely affect the Asian community. Both District 2, Proposal 4, and District 5, Proposal 5 abut to District 4, Proposal 2.

On the other hand, the percentage and numerical difference strengthens the Hispanic Majority Minority Voting District and therefore, does not have a negative affect on the Hispanic community.

2021 1109 CHU REDISTRICTING PROPOSALS

EXHIBIT 1 POPULATION DEVIATION CHART
ELECTIONS CODE 21500: SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICTS MUST BE SUBSTANTIALLY EQUAL IN POPULATION

POPULATION DEVIATION COMPARISONS FROM LOW TO HIGH					
PROPOSAL 2			PROPOSAL 4		
DISTRICTS	NUMBER	PERCENT	DISTRICT	NUMBER	PERCENT
DISTRICT 2	96	0.02%	DISTRICT 5	1,471	0.23%
DISTRICT 3	2,518	0.39%	DISTRICT 1**	-3,597	-0.56%
DISTRICT 1*	-3,697	-0.58%	DISTRICT 2*	-5,358	-0.84%
DISTRICT 4**	-5,699	-0.89%	DISTRICT 4	-8,539	-1.34%
DISTRICT 5	6,782	1.06%	DISTRICT 3	16,023	2.51%
LOWEST	-5,699	-0.89%		-8,539	-1.34%
HIGHEST	6,782	1.06%		16,023	2.51%
# SPREAD	12,481			24,562	
% SPREAD		1.95%			3.85%
* Majority Hispanic Minority Voting District ** Influence Asian Voting District					

PROPOSAL 2			PROPOSAL 5		
DISTRICTS	NUMBER	PERCENT	DISTRICT	NUMBER	PERCENT
DISTRICT 2	96	0.02%	DISTRICT 4	1,721	0.27%
DISTRICT 3	2,518	0.39%	DISTRICT 2	26,065	4.08%
DISTRICT 1*	-3,697	-0.58%	DISTRICT 1**	-28,652	-4.49%
DISTRICT 4**	-5,699	-0.89%	DISTRICT 5*	-29,951	-4.69%
DISTRICT 5	6,782	1.06%	DISTRICT 3	30.817	4.83%
LOWEST	-5,699	-0.89%		-29,951	-4.69%
HIGHEST	6,782	1.06%		30,817	4.83%
# SPREAD	12,481			60,768	
% SPREAD		1.95%			9.52%
* Majority Hispanic Minority Voting District ** Influence Asian Voting District					

2021 1108 CHU REDISTRICTING PROPOSALS

EXHIBIT 2			HISPANIC AND ASIAN POPULATION COMPARISONS					
PROPOSAL 2			PROPOSAL 4			PROPOSAL 5		
HISPANIC			HISPANIC			HISPANIC		
DISTRICT	NUMBER	PERCENT	DISTRICT	NUMBER	PERCENT	DISTRICT	NUMBER	PERCENT
District 1	431,360	67.9%	District 2	418,822	66.1%	District 5	413400	67.9%
PROPOSAL 2			PROPOSAL 4			PROPOSAL 5		
ASIAN			ASIAN			ASIAN		
DISTRICT	NUMBER	PERCENT	DISTRICT	NUMBER	PERCENT	DISTRICT	NUMBER	PERCENT
District 4	243,208	38.4%	District 1	226,918	35.7%	District 1	196,491	32.2%%

ASIAN DISTRICT DIFFERENCES PROPOSAL 2 AND 5		
NUMBER		
District 4	243,208	Proposal 2
District 1	196,491	Proposal 5
	46,717	Difference

PERCENTAGE
196,491 divided by 46,717 = 23.77%

EXHIBIT 3 NON-HISPANIC WHITE DISTRICT COMPARISONS								
NON-HISPANIC WHITE DISTRICT COMPARISONS								
PROPOSAL 2			**PROPOSAL 4**			**PROPOSAL 5**		
DISTRICT	**NUMBER**	**PERCENT**	**DISTRICT**	**NUMBER**	**PERCENT**	**DISTRICT**	**NUMBER**	**PERCENT**
District 1*	83,791	13.2%	District 2*	117,297	18.5%	District 5*	92,813	15.2%
District 2	373,482	58.5%	District 5	352,510	55.1%	District 2	311,408	46.9%
District 3	250,599	39.1%	District 4	195,137	31.0%	District 4	159,011	24.8%
District 4**	163,660	25.9%	District 1*	175,380	27.6%	District 1*	233,495	38.3%
District 5	328,596	50.9%	District 3	359,804	55.0%	District 3	403,401	60.3%
* Majority Minority District								
** Influence Asian District								

ASIAN COMPARISONS								
PROPOSAL 2			**PROPOSAL 4**			**PROPOSAL 5**		
ASIAN			**ASIAN**			**ASIAN**		
DISTRICT	**NUMBER**	**PERCENT**	**DISTRICT**	**NUMBER**	**PERCENT**	**DISTRICT**	**NUMBER**	**PERCENT**
District 1*	92,057	14.5%	District 2*	68,474	10.8%	District 5*	78,003	12.8%
District 2	91,998	14.4%	District 5	131,847	20.6%	District 2	186,613	28.1%
District 3	116,578	18.2%	District 4	150,712	23.9%	District 4	149,780	23.4%
District 4**	243,208	38.4%	District 1**	226,918	35.7%	District 1**	196,491	32.2%
District 5	155,426	24.1%	District 3	121,316	18.5%	District 3	88,180	13.2%
* Majority Minority District								
** Influence Asian District								

HISPANIC COMPARISONS								
PROPOSAL 2			PROPOSAL 4			PROPOSAL 5		
HISPANIC			HISPANIC			HISPANIC		
DISTRICT	NUMBER	PERCENT	DISTRICT	NUMBER	PERCENT	DISTRICT	NUMBER	PERCENT
District 1*	431,360	67.9%	District 2*	418,822	66.10%	District 5*	413,400	67.9%
District 2	124,451	19.5%	District 5	106,406	16.6	District 2	115,770	17.4%
District 3	232,229	36.2%	District 4	242,771	38.5	District 4	281,323	45.5%
District 4**	189,327	29.9%	District 1*	196,245	30.9%	District 1*	140,330	23.0%
District 5	112,914	17.5%	District 3	126,037	19.3%	District 3	129,452	19.3%
* Majority Minority Hispanic District								
** Influence Asian District								

Osborn, Rachael

From: Dennis Bress <dennis@ieei.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 10:49 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: "Keep Costa Mesa United" I support Maps 5 and 2A : Dennis Bress

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello and hope you are well.

I am a resident of Newport Beach, Orange County.

“Keep Costa Mesa United” I support Maps 5 and 2A

Again, I support Maps 5 and 2A

Best regards,
Dennis Bress
Newport Beach, Ca (Orange County)
Tele: 714-878-1276

Osborn, Rachael

From: Susan Tate <state71@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 10:44 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: New maps

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Attention: This email originated from outside the County of Orange. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

My name is Susan Tate and I live in Newport Coast. I feel strongly that Newport and Costa Mesa should not have their districts split.

I support Maps 5 and 2A.

Susan Tate
5 Pavona
Newport Coast, CA 92657

Osborn, Rachael

From: Sue Quam <suequam@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 10:42 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Keep Costa Mesa United. I support Maps 5 and 2A

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Please Keep Costa Mesa United. I support Maps 5 and 2A . Please vote for us in fair representation. Thank you
Sue Ellen Quam
209 B Avenida Majorca
Laguna Woods, CA 92637

Sent from my iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: Cynthia Blackwell <cindymarye@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 11:22 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Keep Costa Mesa United

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Please use map 2a or 5 for redistributing.
Michael and Cynthia Blackwell
--
Cynthia

Osborn, Rachael

From: Audrey Prosser <prosserga@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 10:19 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Support Maps 2-A and 5

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Maps 5 and 2-A keeps Costa Mesa United. I endorse Map 2-A and 5.

My name is Audrey Prosser. I am a resident in what is currently District 2.

Osborn, Rachael

From: lagunabob <lagunabob@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 10:17 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: New Supervisor maps

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I support keeping Costa Mesa UNITED. Maps 2A and 5 do just that. There is no logical reason to divide Costa Mesa. Maps are not supposed to be partisan or Gerrymandered!!

Laguna Bob

Sent from my Sprint Tablet.

Osborn, Rachael

From: Maggie G <irishmag@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 10:13 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: BOS redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Do not split Costa Mesa into separate districts. I support Maps 5 and 2A. Thank you.

Maggie Gallagher
1300 Adams Ave
Costa Mesa

Osborn, Rachael

From: bobhartman <bobhartman@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 10:12 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting Maps

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Sirs:

I support keeping Costa Mesa UNITED. Why would that be done? Cities should remain together.

I think maps 5 and map 2A are best for Orange County and for Costa Mesa. Please do not arbitrarily divide Costa Mesa.

Thank you,

Bob Hartman



Bob Hartman
Laguna Beach, CA 92651

Osborn, Rachael

From: Buffie Channel <hbbuffie@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 9:56 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: New Maps-Keep Costa Mesa United

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Re: Redistricting

KEEP COSTA MESA UNITED

SUPPORT MAPS 5 and 2A.

Keep this fair snd balanced. Do not break up Costa Mesa.
--
Buffie Channel
Relocation Consultant
Quest Relocation Group
Call/Text: 714-317-3035

Osborn, Rachael

From: Bonnie Eastman <bonnie@wave4all.org>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 9:50 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: redistricting plans

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I support maps 2A and 5 for the redistricting plan for Orange County. Keep Costa Mesa and other cities united and undivided wherever possible. Residents of each of our cities have common interests which should be recognized and respected in the election process.
Sincerely,

Bonnie Eastman
bonnie@wave4all.org
714-322-9716

Osborn, Rachael

From: Pat Goodman <patgoodman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 9:28 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting 2021 Support Maps 2A and 5

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Orange County Board of Supervisors,

I live in District 2 and I hope that you will commit to keep cities in tact when developing the new supervisorial districts. With this in mind I support maps 2A and 5, keep Costa Mesa intact.

Thank you!

Patricia Goodman
Huntington Beach, CA 92648

Osborn, Rachael

From: ladydi8562@aol.com
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 9:21 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: KEEP COSTA MESA UNITED

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I SUPPORT MAPS 5 AND 2A!!!!

Osborn, Rachael

From: Hank Castignetti <hanksterc@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 9:01 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: KEEP COSTA MESA UNITED!!!

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I SUPPORT MAPS 5 AND 2A!!!!

Osborn, Rachael

From: Flomama Martin <floseppi@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 8:47 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: I support

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

AS A 54-YEAR RESIDENT AND VOTER IN COSTA MESA, I SUPPORT REDISTRICTING MAP 2A.

FLORENCE MARTIN
2442 Andover Pl, Costa Mesa, CA 92626
949-933-3699

Osborn, Rachael

From: Birdie Reed <birdieuu@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 8:42 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Keep Costa Mesa United. I support maps 5 and 2a

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Sent from my iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: James Meyer <jim.meyer09@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 8:37 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Fwd:

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Jim Meyer

Please

“Keep Costa Mesa United” I support Maps 5 and 2A

Osborn, Rachael

From: Jayme Mekis <jayme.mekis@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 8:36 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting; James Meyer

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Please

“Keep Costa Mesa United” I support Maps 5 and 2A

Osborn, Rachael

From: LISE MILLER <genereaux@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 8:26 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Attention: This email originated from outside the County of Orange. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a fourth generation Costa Mesa resident that goes back to the days of it being called “Goat Hill. I am appalled and dismayed there is a movement to split up Costa Mesa in the redistricting process.

It is ESSENTIAL that we keep Costa Mesa united and not divided.

I implore you to only consider Maps 5 and 2A!

“Keep Costa Mesa United” I support Maps 5 and 2A

Thank you for keeping redistricting fair and balanced respecting our civic representation in Costa Mesa.

Best,
Joan Miller

Osborn, Rachael

From: Response@ocgov.com on behalf of OC Clerk of the Board <Response@ocgov.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 7:54 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: 2021 Redistricting Idea Form - ONLINE FORM SUBMISSION

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Submitted on Mon, 11/08/2021 - 07:53

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name
Dr. Gerardo de Jesus

Organization
Fusion Pastoral Counseling, LLC

Phone Number
4073350483

Email
drjerrydejesus@gmail.com

City/County
Orlando

My ideas/comments are as follows
KEEP MEADOWOODS NEIGHBORHOOD IN ORANGE COUNTY DISTRICT 4
MY PARENTS AND I HAVE LIVED IN THIS DISTRICT FOR OVER 30 YEARS. WE ARE ACTIVE IN CIVIC ACTIVITIES AND HAVE DO HOPE THAT THIS DISTRICT REMAINS AS IS. MAINTAINING A BALANCE IN ETHNIC AND SOCIAL COMPOSITION IS ESSENTIAL FOR CITIZENS TO FEEL REPRESENTED.

Osborn, Rachael

From: Lara Horgan <larahorgan@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 7:53 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Support for Redistricting maps 5 and 2a

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Attention: This email originated from outside the County of Orange. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear OC Supervisors,

I strongly support maps 5 and 2a. Having worked, shopped and dined in Costa Mesa for the last 30 years, I know that Costa Mesa culturally and socioeconomically distinct from surrounding communities.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Lara Horgan
17 S Peak
Laguna Niguel CA 92677
949-933-5272

Osborn, Rachael

From: Roseanne Brown <roseanne@rbimages.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 7:51 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Keep Costa Mesa United

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

"Keep Costa Mesa United" I support Maps 5 and 2A

Roseanne Brown
roseanne@rbimages.com
CELL: 323-253-5338

Osborn, Rachael

From: Teray Stephens <teray@stephensconsultinggroup.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 7:33 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Keep Costa Mesa United

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I support maps 5 and 2a.
Theresa Stephens

Osborn, Rachael

From: Cheryl Galloway <galcheryl@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 7:24 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Vote on redistributing

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Keep Costa Mesa united. I support Maps 5 and 2A.
I am an active voter .
Chery l Galloway

Sent from my iPhone
Cheryl L Galloway

Osborn, Rachael

From: Elizabeth Riley <pjr355@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 7:10 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Re districting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Keep Costa Mesa United.
I support maps 5 and 2A.
Peter Riley

Osborn, Rachael

From: Peter Riley <racerriley@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 7:07 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Don't divide Costa Mesa

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Keep Costa Mesa United.
I support maps 5 and 2A.
Elizabeth Brennan

Osborn, Rachael

From: natalie rokos <nrokos28@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 7:01 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Do not split Costa Mesa

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I respectfully ask that you keep Costa Mesa united and not split it for redistricting.
I support Maps 5 and 2A.
Thank you for your serious consideration to my request. Sincerely,

Natalie Rokos, Huntington Beach

Osborn, Rachael

From: Penny Elia <greenp1@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 6:57 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: "Keep Costa Mesa United" I support Maps 5 and 2A

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

The public has been purposely kept in the dark about your plans to redistrict. Keep Costa Mesa united!

Daniel Elia
Laguna Beach

Osborn, Rachael

From: Penny Elia <greenp1@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 6:57 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: "Keep Costa Mesa United" I support Maps 5 and 2A

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Attention: This email originated from outside the County of Orange. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

The public has been purposely kept in the dark about your plans to redistrict. Keep Costa Mesa united!

Penny Elia
Laguna Beach

Osborn, Rachael

From: Jason Feddy <jasonfeddy@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 6:49 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

"Keep Costa Mesa United" I support Maps 5 and 2A

Jason Feddy, resident, Aliso Viejo.

Osborn, Rachael

From: Janet Bescoby <jbescoby@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 6:31 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: BOS Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Keep Costa Mesa United!
I support map 5 and 2A.

Janet Bescoby
Laguna Beach

Osborn, Rachael

From: Debbi Parrott <debparrott@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 6:17 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Attention: This email originated from outside the County of Orange. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

To whom it may concern,
"Keep Costa Mesa United" I support Maps 5 and 2A Debbi Parrott, Huntington Beach 92649

Sent from my iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: carol lovely <clovely4@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 5:38 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

"Keep Costa Mesa United" I support Maps 5 and 2A

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad

Osborn, Rachael

From: Debbie Silverstein <milwaukee_debbie@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 11:18 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Keep Costa Mesa United! I support maps 5 and 2a.
Thank you,
Debbie Silverstein

Osborn, Rachael

From: Andrea Alexander <andreaalexander12@ymail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 11:16 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Maps

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I would appreciate that you, our Board of Supervisors, keep Costa Mesa together. Do not split our city. I suggest that the Board consider strongly maps numbered 5 and 2A.

It is important that you, as a Board, remain unpolitical in this process and that Costa Mesa continue to be United as a singular District. Anything else would suggest gerrymandering. We are watching this process carefully and your decisions will speak volumes.

Andrea Alexander

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: John Aguilera <ja-12@pacbell.net>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 10:04 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Re districting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Attention: This email originated from outside the County of Orange. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I would like to keep Costa Mesa united. I support maps 5 and 2A.

Joseph Aguilera

Sent from my iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: vtriem@cox.net
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 9:43 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Keep Costa Mesa United! I support Maps 5 & 2A.
Vivian Candy

Sent from my iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: Joni Nichols <jonibnichols@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 9:30 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

"Keep Costa Mesa United" I support Maps 5 and 2A

Joan Nichols

213 Diamond Ave

92662

Osborn, Rachael

From: Aline Arbid <alinearbid@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 9:16 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Keep Costa Mesa United

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

"Keep Costa Mesa United".
I support Maps 5 and 2A.

Aline A. Blumetti

Osborn, Rachael

From: Barbara J Anderson <barba1844@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 9:08 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I support Maps 5 and 2 A
Keep Costa Mesa United

Thank You
Barb

Barbara J Anderson
Certified Advanced Rolfer since 1986
714-393-4398
therolfingroom.com
barb@therolfingroom.com

Osborn, Rachael

From: info <lagunaresidentsfirst@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 8:48 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello Orange County Supervisors:

Keep Costa Mesa United" I support Maps 5 and 2A

George Weiss
Laguna Beach

Osborn, Rachael

From: Judy Stamm <judystamm@att.net>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 8:31 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting Costa Mesa

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

"Keep Costa Mesa United" I support Maps 5 and 2A

Sent from my iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: Nicole Nelson <olenicole@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 8:27 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Regarding Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To Whom it May Concern:

Keep Costa Mesa United. I support Maps 5 and 2A.

Sincerely,
Nicole Nelson
Newport Beach, CA

Osborn, Rachael

From: Debra Quam <dkquam@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 8:01 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting maps

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Attention: This email originated from outside the County of Orange. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

It would not serve any good purpose to split Costa Mesa and would have many negative impacts. Keep Costa Mesa united. I support map 2A and map 5 and I currently live in District 2.

Debra Quam

Sent from my iPad

Osborn, Rachael

From: Audrey Prosser <prosserga@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 7:50 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting Maps - BOS meeting Tuesday

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Please keep Costa Mesa United. I support Maps 5 and 2-A

Osborn, Rachael

From: Anna-Marie Claassen <claassenam@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 7:47 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Do Not Split Costa Mesa

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Please keep Costa Mesa United. I support maps 5 and 2A.

Thank you,
Anna-Marie Claassen, Newport Beach

Osborn, Rachael

From: Mary <oloughlm@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 7:35 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Keep Costa Mesa United

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I support maps 5 and 2A.

Mary O'Loughlin
92660

Sent from my iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: Ann Owens <annowens@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 7:30 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting maps

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Attention: This email originated from outside the County of Orange. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Board of Supervisors,
Please be fair in drawing the new redistricting maps. Costa Mesa or any other city should not be divided. One week is insufficient time to peruse all the maps presented, however I do prefer maps 2A and 5. These political tricks only show your lack of honesty and fair play.

Sincerely,
Ann Owens
Lake Forest, Ca

Sent from my iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: Ann Owens <annowens@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 7:22 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting maps

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please consider fairness and transparency when picking your new redistricting maps. Please keep Costa Mesa united. Cities should not be split. I support maps 2 and 5 A as they have the fairest boundaries. Do not lower yourself to political manipulations.
Sincerely,
Ann Owens
Lake Forest, Cac
Sent from my iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: gialisa at gmail <gialisa@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 7:20 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

It is transparently political that you want to split the city of costa mesa. Keep Costa Mesa united! Keep gerrymandering out of politics.
If you want costa mesa voters, come up with better policies that appeal to them. Do not divide a city. I support maps 5 and 2A.

I am a resident and homeowner in Newport Beach, CA.

Warm regards,

Gialisa Gaffaney

Osborn, Rachael

From: Nina Smith <nm_smith@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 7:09 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello...

I'm a Costa Mesa business owner and a Newport Beach resident.

Keep Costa Mesa United. I support Maps 5 and 2A.

Thank you,
Nina

Nina Smith
2224 Heather Ln
Newport Beach, CA 92660

Owner of the Eastside Mini-Mart, Costa Mesa, CA

Osborn, Rachael

From: Liz Dorn Parker <lizdornparker@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 7:06 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: DO NOT SPLIT UP COSTA MESA!!!

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I live in Costa Mesa, and the following maps are the BEST for Costa Mesa residents:

2A and 5

Splitting up Costa Mesa violates the 'keep communities together' which is mandated in law!

Elizabeth Parker
Costa Mesa Resident

Osborn, Rachael

From: Julie Frost <julie.frost@geminos.ai>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 6:56 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Comment on Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Keep Costa Mesa United" I support Maps 5 and 2A

Julie Frost
6 Heavenly Isle
Ladera Ranch, CA 92694

Osborn, Rachael

From: Carol Nilsen <cznilsen@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 6:56 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Support Maps 5 and 2A

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Board of supervisors,
I support a unified Costa Mesa. Please vote in support of maps 5 and 2A.
Carol Nilsen
Laguna Beach

Osborn, Rachael

From: Louise Adler <dr.louise.adler@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 6:40 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Costa Mesa

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Keep Costa Mesa united. I support Maps 5 an 2A

--
Louise Adler, She/Her

Osborn, Rachael

From: Dan Haspert <danhaspert@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 6:35 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: No no politically motivated redistricting.

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This idea is shameful. Isupport maps 5 and 2a. Daniel E. Haspert, MD

Osborn, Rachael

From: Helaine Feingold <sunshine38@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 6:35 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Attention: This email originated from outside the County of Orange. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

I made an error in the last email I sent. I want to keep Costa Mesa United and keep maps five and2A Helaine Feingold

Sent from my iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: Anne Caenn <anne@lagunaemail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 6:32 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Keep Costa Mesa United. I support Maps 5 and 2A.

Anne Caenn
965 Katella Street
Laguna Beach, CA 92651

Osborn, Rachael

From: Gregory McDonel <lrgmcdonel@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 6:31 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting!

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

"Keep Costa Mesa United" I support Maps 5 and 2A

Osborn, Rachael

From: Chris <cchris675@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 6:21 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

No

Osborn, Rachael

From: Response@ocgov.com on behalf of OC Clerk of the Board <Response@ocgov.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 6:15 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: 2021 Redistricting Idea Form - ONLINE FORM SUBMISSION

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Submitted on Sun, 11/07/2021 - 18:15

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name
Jo Shade

Organization
Rossmoor Homeowners Assoc.

Phone Number
15628181747

Email
coolshade@verizon.net

City/County
Los Alamitos

My ideas/comments are as follows
Adamantly, oppose this redistricting...
Didn't purchase our home in the LA county for many reasons.
Not about to accept this on any level.

Osborn, Rachael

From: kacollell <kacollell@att.net>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 6:14 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the OC Board of Supervisors,
I strongly oppose the proposed redistricting changes. No one wants Costa Mesa divided. I support Maps 5 and 2A. Keep Costa Mesa united! We expect you to represent our voices, not manipulating our district for political gains. No gerrymandering in OC. We are watching...
Sincerely,
Kim Collell
Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

Osborn, Rachael

From: Jahn Levitt <jahnml@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 6:10 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: No redistribution!!!

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Keep Costa Mesa united!
I support maps 5 and 2A.

Jahn Levitt

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: Eric & Danielle Braham <lagunabraham1@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 6:05 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

"Keep Costa Mesa United" I support Maps 5 and 2A

--
Best,

Danielle Braham
949-566-1896

Osborn, Rachael

From: Barbara Schilling - GMAIL <harper0117@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 6:03 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: "Keep Costa Mesa United" I support Maps 5 and 2A

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

"Keep Costa Mesa United" I support Maps 5 and 2A

Barbara Ellen

"Music gives a soul to the universe,
wings to the mind,
flight to the imagination,
and life to everything."
~ Plato ~

Osborn, Rachael

From: Suad Elias <suadelias@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 5:50 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Keep Costa Mesa united

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I want to express my support for Maps 5 and 2A. Costa Mesa should stay united.
Respectfully,

Suad Elias

Osborn, Rachael

From: Kathy de Marquette <katdmrkt@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 3:20 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Redesticting concerns

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Attention: This email originated from outside the County of Orange. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

To the members of the commission which is considering redistricting Orange County and surrounding counties,

As residents of San Clemente for 33 years we emplore the Commission to keep Orange County beaches as they are with representation by Orange County, and not by San Diego nor Los Angeles. All Orange County beaches shall be united in one congressional district.
We need representatives that truly represent our beach area and will address our unique concerns, not those of Los Angeles, San Diego or Riverside counties.

We appreciate your consideration to keep our district intact, Brad & Kathy de Marquette

Osborn, Rachael

From: Response@ocgov.com on behalf of OC Clerk of the Board <Response@ocgov.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 11:18 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: 2021 Redistricting Idea Form - ONLINE FORM SUBMISSION

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Submitted on Sun, 11/07/2021 - 11:17

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name
Clark Riley

Email
clarkriley@cox.net

City/County
San Clemente , Orange

My ideas/comments are as follows
Do not redistrict

Osborn, Rachael

From: Response@ocgov.com on behalf of OC Clerk of the Board <Response@ocgov.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 07, 2021 9:55 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: 2021 Redistricting Idea Form - ONLINE FORM SUBMISSION

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Submitted on Sun, 11/07/2021 - 09:54

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name
Ginger Leibfreid

Organization
none

Phone Number
7145013700

Email
glpoli@protonmail.com

City/County
Huntington Beach/Orange County

My ideas/comments are as follows
I do not want Huntington Beach to be redistricted from Orange County to LA County. When I look at the shore of Long Beach it is nothing like the shores of Orange County! Befoer we purchased our home in 1989 in Huntington Beach, we looked in LA County, Long Beach to be specific we decided we wanted to forever be in Orange County for its lovely coastline and many reasons. Please know I oppose the redistricting of my home city of Huntington Beach to LA County and am asking you to oppose as well!

Osborn, Rachael

From: Response@ocgov.com on behalf of OC Clerk of the Board <Response@ocgov.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 06, 2021 6:29 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: 2021 Redistricting Idea Form - ONLINE FORM SUBMISSION

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Submitted on Sat, 11/06/2021 - 18:29

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name
Samuel Helm

Organization
concerned citizen

Email
samuelahelm@gmail.com

City/County
Costa Mesa

My ideas/comments are as follows
Please do not divide the City of Costa Mesa in any redistricting plan. Keep Costa Mesa whole. I understand "map 2A" is the redistricting option that will keep Costa Mesa whole.

Samuel A. Helm

Osborn, Rachael

From: Response@ocgov.com on behalf of OC Clerk of the Board <Response@ocgov.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 06, 2021 2:05 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: 2021 Redistricting Idea Form - ONLINE FORM SUBMISSION

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Submitted on Sat, 11/06/2021 - 14:05

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name
Fabia Barsic

Phone Number
6262308496

Email
fbarsic@protonmail.com

City/County
San Clemente / Orange County

My ideas/comments are as follows
Please do NOT redistrict Orange County. We need to keep all voting districts as it is and all beaches of Orange County part of the same county going forward. Orange County has a history with all of its beaches, keeping the caliber of those beaches above all other counties, in many ways.

All Orange County Beach cities shall stay in Orange County and not be redistricted to other counties.

Sincerely,
Fabia Barsic
Resident of San Clemente, Orange County
2708 Calle Estrella De Mar, San Clemente, CA 92673

Osborn, Rachael

From: Response@ocgov.com on behalf of OC Clerk of the Board <Response@ocgov.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 06, 2021 2:04 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: 2021 Redistricting Idea Form - ONLINE FORM SUBMISSION

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Submitted on Sat, 11/06/2021 - 14:03

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name
Carolyn Byrne

Phone Number
3233942223

Email
carolynb77@aol.com

City/County
LA PALMA

My ideas/comments are as follows
To the Members of the Commission which is considering redistricting Orange County and surroundings counties.

As a resident of La Palma I emplore the Commission to keep Orange County beaches as they are with representation by Orange County, and not by San Diego nor Los Angeles. All Orange County beaches shall be united in one congressional district.

Sincerely,
Carolyn Byrne

Osborn, Rachael

From: Catherine Harbin <cathyemily3@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 05, 2021 6:49 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Emailing IDEA_C_2.PDF
Attachments: IDEA_C_2.PDF

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

County of Orange 2021 Redistricting
Supervisorial District Idea and Comment Form

Name: (required) Catherine Harbin

Optional Information[1]

City/County: Stanton,Orange

Phone Number: 714 931 4745

Email: cathyemily3@gmail.com

Organization (if any): resident

Please write any ideas or comments you would like to share with the County of Orange on redistricting. If you are sharing ideas about proposed district boundaries or communities of interest (including, but not limited to information on boundaries of your community whether defined by city, school area or other criteria, and what bonds your community, please include descriptive information about the area in mind, such as streets or landmarks. The comments you provide will be posted online as part of the public comment and public input process.

A "community of interest" is a population that shares common social or economic interests that should be included within a single supervisorial district for purposes of its effective and fair representation. Communities of interest do not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates.

Please use additional pages if you require more room to write.

My ideas/comments are as follows:

Greetings All,
Short n sweet...
As a lifelong resident of LA and Orange Countys
I do believe your "proposed plan "choices 1-8
Seem to try to offer something for everyone. However
I do not believe that should be the objective.
So IF WE THE PEOPLE WERE GIVEN A CHOICE ,
I WOULD
choose THE # 1 PLAN , BECAUSE IT APPEARS TO BE
THE ONLY
ONE OF THE EIGHT DRAWN
WITHOUT BIAS. THANK YOU ,
BEST WISHES,
Cathy Harbin Emily Harbin

CATHERINE HARBIN AND DAUGHTER EMILY HARBI

[1] If this information is provided, the County may use it to contact you with questions. The information may be subject to disclosure under the Public Records Act

Please continue on additional pages if you need more space.

Submit to:

- Email: redistricting@ocgov.com *OR*
- Mail paper copy to:
  Attn: 2021 Redistricting Team
  333 West Santa Ana Blvd., 3rd Floor
  Santa Ana, CA 92701

Comments may also be submitted via the online web form at https://www.ocgov.com/redistricting/feedback

Osborn, Rachael

From: Luis Tapia <ltapia@oclafco.org>
Sent: Friday, November 05, 2021 3:52 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: 2021 County of Orange Redistricting Proposals
Attachments: County BOS Redistricting - OC LAFCO Comment Letter_11_5_2021.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Good afternoon,

Please find the attached agency comments from Orange County Local Agency Formation Commission relative to the 2021 County of Orange Redistricting Proposals. If you have any questions, please contact Carolyn Emery, Executive Officer, at (714) 640-5100 or email cemery@oclafco.org.

Luis Tapia
Policy Analyst
Orange LAFCO
ltapia@oclafco.org
714-640-5100

ORANGE COUNTY LAFCO

2677 North Main Street | Suite 1050
Santa Ana, CA 92705
Phone: 714.640.5100 | **Fax:** 714.640.5139

November 5, 2021

TO: Board of Supervisors
County of Orange

FROM: Carolyn Emery
OC LAFCO Executive Officer

SUBJECT: OC LAFCO Comments – 2021 County of Orange Redistricting Proposals

The Local Agency Formation Commission of Orange County (OC LAFCO) respectfully provides the following comments to the County's redistricting proposals as specified below:

Proposal 4A and 4B Maps

- Referenced in the Proposal 4A and 4B maps is an unincorporated area located south of Broadway Avenue, bordering Orange Avenue to the north, Brookhurst to the west and Gilbert Street to the east and proposed for placement within District 4. As a note, the area is a part of a larger unincorporated area identified by OC LAFCO as the "Southwest Anaheim" island that is located within the City of Anaheim's sphere of influence. As this area has established a shared community identity and to assist in the facilitation of future annexation of the entire unincorporated area to the City of Anaheim, OC LAFCO recommends the Board consider placing the entire Southwest Anaheim island within District 4. A map of the entire Southwest Anaheim island is attached for your reference as ***Exhibit A***.

Proposal 4A and 4C Maps

- Referenced in the Proposal 4A and 4C maps is an unincorporated area located to the east of Rancho Santiago Boulevard, west of Hewest Street, and north of Pearl Avenue and proposed for placement within District 3. As a note, the area is part of a larger unincorporated area identified by OC LAFCO as the "El Modena" island that is located within the City of Orange's sphere of influence. As the larger portion of the El Modena island is proposed for placement within District 2 and to assist in the facilitation of future annexation of the entire island to the City of Orange, OC LAFCO recommends the Board consider placing the entire

El Modena island within District 2. A map of the entire El Modena island is attached for your reference as ***Exhibit B***.

Thank you for considering these comments, and if you have any questions, the Board or County staff may contact me at (714) 640-5100 or by email at cemery@oclafco.org.

cc: Jessica Witt, County Executive Office
Tom Hatch, Interim City Manager, Orange
James Vanderpool, City Manager, Anaheim

Exhibits:
A: Southwest Anaheim Island
B: El Modena Island



City of Anaheim
Southwest Anaheim Island

ORANGE COUNTY LAFCO

Legend

Southwest Anaheim Island

0 0.5 Miles



ORANGE COUNTY LAFCO

City of Orange
El Modena Island

0 0.2 Miles

Legend

El Modena Island

Osborn, Rachael

From: Response@ocgov.com on behalf of OC Clerk of the Board <Response@ocgov.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 04, 2021 4:12 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: 2021 Redistricting Idea Form - ONLINE FORM SUBMISSION

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Submitted on Thu, 11/04/2021 - 16:12

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name
Zachary Griggy

Organization
Associated Students of UC Irvine

Email
zgriggy@uci.edu

City/County
Irvine, CA

My ideas/comments are as follows
My name is Zachary Griggy and I represent over 6,000 UC Irvine undergraduates in the UCI undergraduate student Senate. I'm writing on behalf of the Associated Students of UC Irvine to express our concerns about Proposals 2 and 4 and how they treat Irvine's college student population and UC Irvine's off-campus student population.

UC Irvine is a community of over 30,000 undergraduate students, 6,000 graduate students and thousands of university professors, administrators and staff. The University is a powerful engine for the local economy and student upward mobility, as many of UCI's undergraduate students are first generation students or from low-income families. While most UCI students live within two miles of campus, a large contingent of students live farther away from campus in other Irvine neighborhoods and commute to and from their classes due to unaffordable rents near the main campus.

ASUCI is concerned about Proposals 2 and 4, as we believe these maps could divide UCI's off-campus student population. The ASUCI Senate voted unanimously on Tuesday to officially oppose Proposals 2 and 4 unless the maps are amended to better keep Irvine's college student population together. We believe these maps will jeopardize Irvine college students opportunity for political representation by dividing UCI's off-campus student population and, in the case, of Proposal 2, separating UC Irvine from Irvine Valley College, a campus where many UCI students attend classes and whose students have similar issues in need of representation.

We hope that the board will make the following changes to Proposals 2 and 4 to make them more representative of

Irvine college students as well as the city in general:

- Avoiding dividing the city of Irvine between districts, if possible. This would help ensure that UCI's off-campus population is better represented and minimize potential for voter confusion.
- If Irvine must be divided, do not divide the city into more than two districts and avoid using Interstate 405 as the dividing line, which is a boundary that would separate UCI from IVC and many off-campus students from the main campus
- Minimize the amount of coastal Orange County South Irvine gets paired with. UC Irvine serves a number of low-income and first generation college students and we are concerned that pairing UC Irvine and the middle class neighborhoods of south Irvine could result in a district that does not represent those communities

We hope that the Board will listen to our concerns and we thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Zachary R. Griggy
Social Sciences Senator
Associated Students of UC Irvine

Osborn, Rachael

From: Response@ocgov.com on behalf of OC Clerk of the Board <Response@ocgov.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 03, 2021 3:03 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: 2021 Redistricting Idea Form - ONLINE FORM SUBMISSION

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Submitted on Wed, 11/03/2021 - 15:02

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name
Cassius Rutherford

Email
cashrutherford@gmail.com

City/County
Costa Mesa

My ideas/comments are as follows
As an active voter, I write to ask that you make sure that the City of Costa Mesa is wholly included in one supervisorial district. The plans to divide the city into multiple supervisors' districts are unwarranted and will negatively impact our residents in the political process. Given that Costa Mesa was recently the target of a lawsuit under the voting rights act due to parts of the city not receiving fair representation over several decades, it would also be unwise for the county to break up the city into multiple political districts. Please keep Costa Mesa in one district.

Osborn, Rachael

From: outlook_2A2E30A39CA19C2D@outlook.com <wendyleece@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 03, 2021 11:08 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting; Wendy Leece
Subject: Keep Costa Mesa Together

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Please do not select a map that would divide Costa Mesa.
Thank you very much.
Wendy Leece
Costa Mesa resident

Sent from Mail for Windows

Osborn, Rachael

From: Uyen Phuong <isitonthetoiletnwrite@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 02, 2021 2:40 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: I Support the OC PRA Map

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

My name is Uyen Vo and I am a resident of Westminster, CA. I support the OC People's Redistricting Alliance Supervisorial map. This map prioritizes communities that have been historically marginalized, corrects the problems with the current configuration, and complies with the legal requirements of the Voting Rights Act and Fair Maps Act. The current map configuration has disenfranchised communities of color by prioritizing the interests of one political party.

The OC PRA map has made communities of interest its top priority when drawing lines, considering the important testimonies of residents from communities that have been harmed by the current configuration.

The board needs to correct the significant legal problems with the current map configuration. I urge you to adopt the OC People's Redistricting Alliance map.

Osborn, Rachael

From: Cuong Vo <cuongvo6@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 02, 2021 2:39 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: I Support the OC PRA Map

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

My name is Cuong Vo and I am a resident of Westminster, CA. I support the OC People's Redistricting Alliance Supervisorial map. This map prioritizes communities that have been historically marginalized, corrects the problems with the current configuration, and complies with the legal requirements of the Voting Rights Act and Fair Maps Act. The current map configuration has disenfranchised communities of color by prioritizing the interests of one political party.

The OC PRA map has made communities of interest its top priority when drawing lines, considering the important testimonies of residents from communities that have been harmed by the current configuration.

The board needs to correct the significant legal problems with the current map configuration. I urge you to adopt the OC People's Redistricting Alliance map.

Osborn, Rachael

From: Phuong Vo <vophuong4@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 02, 2021 2:37 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: I Support the OC PRA Map

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Attention: This email originated from outside the County of Orange. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Hello,

My name is Phuong Vo and I am a resident of Long Beach, CA. I'm writing to support the OC People's Redistricting Alliance map. As the current map configuration stands, communities of color are disenfranchised because of the prioritization of the interests of one political party. Whereas the OC PRA map prioritizes communities that have been historically marginalized, corrects the problems with the current map configuration, and complies with the legal requirements of the Voting Rights Act and Fair Maps Act. The OC PRA map has made communities of interest its top priority when drawing lines. Including consideration of the important testimonies of residents from communities that have been harmed by the current map. The Board needs to correct the significant legal problems with the current map configuration, so I urge you to adopt the OC People's Redistricting Alliance map.

Best,

Phuong Vo

Osborn, Rachael

From: John Holmquist <jwholmquist@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 02, 2021 10:00 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: California Citizens Redistricting Commision

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To whom it may concern:

I am a citizen and 35 year resident of Rossmoor. It is my strong belief that the unincorporated community of Rossmoor should in all matters and respects be governed by Orange County. Any consideration or proposal to place Rossmoor in a legislative district other than Orange County should be rejected immediately. Our neighboring cities of Los Alamitos and Seal Beach together comprise a tight knit, well-balanced community. All three are located in the County of Orange and share the Los Alamitos school district. Any redistricting with Long Beach or other communities in Los Angeles county makes no sense for any residents. Thank you!

John Holmquist
2842 Walker Lee Drive
Rossmoor, CA 90720
562-773-9706

Osborn, Rachael

From: Response@ocgov.com on behalf of OC Clerk of the Board <Response@ocgov.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 02, 2021 9:55 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: 2021 Redistricting Idea Form - ONLINE FORM SUBMISSION

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Submitted on Tue, 11/02/2021 - 09:55

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name
John Holmquist

Organization
Citizen

Phone Number
5627739706

Email
jwholmquist@gmail.com

City/County
Rossmoor / Orange County

My ideas/comments are as follows
It is my strong belief that the unincorporated community of Rossmoor should in all matters and respects be governed by Orange County. Any consideration or proposal to place Rossmoor in a legislative district other than Orange County should be rejected immediately. Our neighboring cities of Los Alamitos and Seal Beach together comprise a tight knit, well-balanced community. All three are located in the County of Orange and share the Los Alamitos school district. Any redistricting with Long Beach or other communities in Los Angeles county makes no sense for any residents.
John Holmquist

Osborn, Rachael

From: Ryan Daliwal <ryandaliwal@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 02, 2021 9:19 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: I Support the OC PRA Map

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

My name is Ryan and I am a resident of Santa Ana. I'm writing to support the OC People's Redistricting Alliance map. As the current map configuration stands, communities of color are disenfranchised because of the prioritization of the interests of one political party. Whereas the OC PRA map prioritizes communities that have been historically marginalized, corrects the problems with the current map configuration, and complies with the legal requirements of the Voting Rights Act and Fair Maps Act. The OC PRA map has made communities of interest its top priority when drawing lines. Including consideration of the important testimonies of residents from communities that have been harmed by the current map. The Board needs to correct the significant legal problems with the current map configuration, so I urge you to adopt the OC People's Redistricting Alliance map.

Ryan Daliwal

Osborn, Rachael

From: Charles Victorio <charles1victorio@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 02, 2021 7:23 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting; COB_Response
Subject: 11/2 BOS Meeting - Agenda Item: # 23

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello,

I have been advised by my healthcare professionals to continue to shelter at home during the COVID pandemic. I am also concerned that mask-wearing is not being enforced indoors during the meetings. This renders me unable to attend the Board meeting in person. Therefore, I am submitting my comments here and I ask that you accommodate my needs by reading these remarks into the record at the appropriate time.

Thank you for reading my comments, included below:

My name is Charles Victorio and I am a resident of Irvine. The way the current districts are set up, it is a partisan effort to disenfranchise communities of color. The map from the OC PRA is influenced by input from the community on how to improve the situation. I urge you to adopt the OC People's Redistricting Alliance map.

Osborn, Rachael

From: Marc Ang <marc@aib2b.org>
Sent: Tuesday, November 02, 2021 3:24 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Support of Proposal 2 (45 parties included in this)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

45 signatories, some of who will show up today to speak but not all.

I support the Proposal 2 Map:

Timestamp	Name	Organization	Email	Phone	A C
10/27/2021 17:15:27	Dustin Lam	Former VAMHA	DI. CreativeConsultant@gmail.com	9495625542	9 W Av W 92
10/28/2021 14:24:10	Jim Chen	AIB2B	Chengkai6@hotmail.com	9495728178	25 sh La hi 92
10/28/2021 14:26:15	Joy chen	Chinese American Cultural Association-OC	Joylizhenchen@gmail.com	9493203134	25 sh La H 92
10/28/2021 15:02:14	Sandra Dentice	OC resident	Sandradentice@gmail.com	9498856844	
10/28/2021 15:02:14	Michael Pestano	AIB2B	Ironeaglemike@gmail.com	4243356157	13 C
10/28/2021 15:15:43	James Mai	AAPI United	James@aapiunited.com	9492160007	48 Ba Av C

10/28/2021 15:25:01	Andrew Lee	None	andy.s.lee@gmail.com	5627567608	36 Irv 92
10/28/2021 16:03:32	Connie Shu	Na	connieandtaz@yahoo.com	7147572595	22 C D
10/28/2021 18:53:39	Andrew Cho	Law Office of Andrew S. Cho	andrew@ascholaw.com	2138042212	12 Sl D Fu 92
10/28/2021 19:01:28	Bomi park	I support this and will tell other API voices/groups to support Proposal 2.	pianobomi@hotmail.com	7143363640	
10/29/2021 12:47:40	Irving Kau	KWCP	irving@elementzventures.com	9493715287	34 St Irv 92
10/29/2021 13:17:46	Crystal Jade	none	crystaljades@ymail.com	9493746682	
10/29/2021 14:47:52	Gay De Perio	Asian Industries Business 2 Business	Points2Health@gmail.com	7143511591	89 Fu D
10/29/2021 15:09:23	Thomas Endo	Asians	thomasaendo@gmail.com	7143459986	35 Av St C C

10/29/2021 15:21:38	Michael Pestano	AIB2B	Ironeaglemike@gmail.com	4243356257	13 C G G 92
10/30/2021 19:28:12	Lael Sunny Meagher	EV Free Church Fullerton	sunny.lael@gmail.com	714-787-8238	50 Vi
10/30/2021 22:45:40	Yul Gevargis	Park Place	yul@roadrunner.com	16618603488	36 St P 90
10/31/2021 8:44:11	Dinah Lin	AIB2B	dinah.lin@gmail.com	9493785805	77 G Bl C
11/1/2021 12:40:03	Charlyn Park Hiebert	Hanmin Church	charcurt3@gmail.com	3238208520	71 Li St Bu C 43 Bl C
11/1/2021 12:54:30	Eric Ching	ericchingforcongress.com	ericcihng4congress@gmail.com	16269261988	22 E Sl C D W C
11/1/2021 13:24:03	Antao Chien	Antao Chien	antao2000@yahoo.com	6262745488	D Ba
11/1/2021 19:16:04	Joseph Hwa	All Nations Jesus Church	Joseph.hwa8@gmail.com	714 204 9944	12 R Av Fu 92
11/1/2021 21:46:49	Harumi Lucak	N/A	chlucak@dslextreme.com	7146866058	59 Le C 90

11/2/2021 0:21:03	Betty Chang	Corcoran Global Living	bchangrealty@gmail.com	5623310047	3 E R C
10/28/2021 16:27:50	SwoopsLopez@gmail.com	Daniel Lopez	D.E.S. Portuguese Hall of Artesia	SwoopsLopez@gmail.com	11 As Ar 90
10/28/2021 17:28:17	chriscaowsb@gmail.com	Chris Cao	Five Rooster LLC	Chriscaowsb@gmail.com	12 Pe ga Gr 92
10/28/2021 17:32:10	Lkkn714@gmail.com	Kinh Nguyen		Lkkn714@gmail.com	11 Ke W Gr
10/30/2021 11:02:12	tjwinger@hotmail.com	Tim Winger		tjwinger@hotmail.com	71 Jo Sa CA

10/30/2021 18:00:03	anncoil@att.net	Ann Coil	None	I support this new district	20 Dr Ar 92
10/30/2021 20:16:22	lasims17@gmail.com	Larry Sims	Build a better you	Lasims17@gmail.com	34 W Irv 92
11/1/2021 0:09:48	uskoreaone@gmail.com	Jacob Woo H. Lee	Coral Ridge Korean Presbyterian Church	uskoreaone@gmail.com	66 Bu Av
11/1/2021 9:28:30	zetnomlegna@gmail.com	Angelo Montez	Retired	zetnomlegna@gmail.com	74 Se Tw Pa 92
11/1/2021 10:22:14	chlucak@dslextreme.com	Harumi Lucak	N/A		
11/1/2021 11:58:21	dave@rodecker.com	David Rodecker	Relevant Ads	dave@rodecker.com	18 Sa Sc
11/1/2021 13:19:27	hiebert.curtis@gmail.com	Curtis Hiebert	Charagape Ministry	Hiebert.curtis@gmail.com	71 Lin Bu CA
11/1/2021 14:54:27	hiebert.curtis@gmail.com	Charlyn Hiebert	Charagape Ministries	hiebert.curtis@gmail.com	71 Lin Bu CA
11/1/2021 15:06:52	chlucak@dslextreme.com	Harumi Lucak			59 Av Cy 90
11/1/2021 16:13:31	lwissink@sbcglobal.net	Leah Wissink		Lwissink@sbcglobal.net	12 Lin Fu 92
11/1/2021 21:52:32	chlucak@dslextreme.com	Harumi Lucak			59 Av Cy CA
11/1/2021 22:05:31	jdssoup@reagan.com	Jan Campbell		jdssoup@reagan.com	Lo Al 90
11/1/2021 22:33:49	jenice8@icloud.com	Jenice Anderson	Asian	jenice8@icloud.com	44 Ha Av Be
11/1/2021 23:01:57	jbc3rd@gmail.com	Beth Culver	Retired	jbc3rd@gmail.com	44 M
11/1/2021 23:58:59	tanggexin@yahoo.com	Gexin Tang	We Save America	tanggexin@yahoo.com	48 Co Irv 92

11/2/2021 0:02:38	Mge991@yahoo.com	Ming Ge	Gexin & Associate, Inc	Mge991@yahoo.com	38 Irv 92

45 signatories, some of who will show up today to speak but not all.

I support the Proposal 2 Map:

Timestamp	Name	Organization	Email	Phone	Address, City and Zip	Personal Comments
10/27/2021 17:15	Dustin Lam	Former VAMHA	Dl. CreativeConsultant@gmail.com	9495625542	9126 Washington Ave Westminster 92683	Nothing
10/28/2021 14:24	Jim Chen	AIB2B	Chengkai6@hotmail.com	9495728178	25951 sheriff road, Laguna hills, Ca 92653	And I am a property owner in the city of Garden Grove. It would be very important for our community to have a strong voice in this district.
10/28/2021 14:26	Joy chen	Chinese American Cultural Association-OC	Joylizhenchen@gmail.com	9493203134	25951 sheriff road, Laguna Hills, Ca 92653	It is extremely crucial that the Asian Community finally has a strong voice in Orange County to protect our historical interests.
10/28/2021 15:02	Sandra Dentice	OC resident	Sandradentice@gmail.com	9498856844	92656	I fully support this
10/28/2021 15:02	Michael Pestano	AIB2B	Ironeaglemike@gmail.com	4243356157	13191 Coleman Pl	Let's do this
10/28/2021 15:15	James Mai	AAPI United	James@aapiunited.com	9492160007	4852 Barkwood Ave Irvine CA 92604	Please please please recognize this district and it's needs for the community which are unique
10/28/2021 15:25	Andrew Lee	None	andy.s.lee@gmail.com	5627567608	36 Twiggs, Irvine, 92620	Asian representation is overdue.
10/28/2021 16:03	Connie Shu	Na	connieandtaz@yahoo.com	7147572595	22492 Costa Bella Dr	
10/28/2021 18:53	Andrew Cho	Law Office of Andrew S. Cho	andrew@ascholaw.com	2138042212	1296 Sheller Drive, Fullerton 92833	Keep District 4 Asian!
10/28/2021 19:01	Bomi park	I support this and will tell other API voices/groups to support Proposal 2.	pianobomi@hotmail.com	7143363640	90621	I support this and will tell other API voices/groups to support Proposal 2.
10/29/2021 12:47	Irving Kau	KWCP	irving@elementzventures.com	9493715287	3461 Eboe Street, Irvine, CA 92606	
10/29/2021 13:17	Crystal Jade	none	crystaljades@ymail.com	9493746682	92629	better representation
10/29/2021 14:47	Gay De Perio	Asian Industries Business 2 Business	Points2Health@gmail.com	7143511591	8922 Ernest Fulsom Drive	I have lived in Orange County for 51 years. It is important to have my voice heard in this district. My concern is that the undocumented migrants will be heard over my voice as a concerned American Naturalized citizen. Give us a voice, and let us be heard. Thank you.

10/29/2021 15:09	Thomas Endo	Asians	thomasaendo@gmail.com	7143459986	350 Avocado Street H2 Costa Mesa CA 92627	As an Asian-American we use the right to have our voices heard via the 1st Amendment to make aware our particular needs as a set of cultures based in the Far East, India, and the Pacific Islands.
10/29/2021 15:21	Michael Pestano	AIB2B	Ironeaglemike@gmail.com	4243356257	13191 Coleman Pl, Garden Grove, CA 92843	
10/30/2021 19:28	Lael Sunny Meagher	EV Free Church Fullerton	sunny.lael@gmail.com	714-787-8238	5061 Manor View Dr	n/a
10/30/2021 22:45	Yul Gevargis	Park Place	yul@roadrunner.com	16618603488	36020 32nd Street East P.O Box 900695	I support this and will tell other API voices to support proposal 2.
10/31/2021 8:44	Dinah Lin	AIB2B	dinah.lin@gmail.com	9493785805	7725 Gateway Blvd. Irvine, CA 92618	I support this important initiative for the Asian community
11/1/2021 12:40	Charlyn Park Hiebert	Hanmin Church	charcurt3@gmail.com	3238208520	7151 W. Lincoln Street Buena Park. CA 90620, 4334 York Blvd. LA, CA 90041	I support OC's growing north-western API communities, especially in cities like Garden Grove, Fullerton, Westminster and Fountain Valley.
11/1/2021 12:54	Eric Ching	ericchingforcongress.com	ericcihng4congress@gmail.com	16269261988	22077 EAST SNOW CREEK DRIVE, WALNUT, CA 91789	I believe in serving the public by putting God first and people's interests first.
11/1/2021 13:24	Antao Chien	Antao Chien	antao2000@yahoo.com	6262745488	Diamond Bar 91765	Support
11/1/2021 19:16	Joseph Hwa	All Nations Jesus Church	Joseph.hwa8@gmail.com	714 204 9944	1213 n Raymond Ave, Fullerton 92831	I support!
11/1/2021 21:46	Harumi Lucak	N/A	chlucak@dslextreme.com	7146866058	5912 Lemon Ave, Cypress, Ca 90630	Please vote for Orange County BOS Redistricting proposal #2. 1. This map proposal creates the strongest API district of any proposal 2. Connects OC's growing north-western API communities 3. Strongest possible configuration to empower API voices 4. It is legally sound and creates a Latino VRA district as required by law 5. This will help the Asian community in the next 10 years as these lines will be set. Thank you in advance for your time and dedication to the redistricting process

11/2/2021 0:21	Betty Chang	Corcoran Global Living	bchangrealty@gmail.com	5623310047	3172 Ruth Elaine, Rossmoor, CA90720	I strongly support Proposal 2 Map for Orange Supervisor District 4.
10/28/2021 16:27	SwoopsLopez@gmail.com	Daniel Lopez	D.E.S. Portuguese Hall of Artesia	SwoopsLopez@gmail.com	11903 Ashworth St, Artesia, CA 90701	
10/28/2021 17:28	chriscaowsb@gmail.com	Chris Cao	Five Rooster LLC	Chriscaowsb@gmail.com	12172 Pearce ave garden Grove, CA 92843	
10/28/2021 17:32	Lkkn714@gmail.com	Kinh Nguyen		Lkkn714@gmail.com	11421 Kearney Way, Garden Grove 92840	
10/30/2021 11:02	tjwinger@hotmail.com	Tim Winger		tjwinger@hotmail.com	719 W Jonquil Rd, Santa Ana, CA 92706	
10/30/2021 18:00	anncoil@att.net	Ann Coil	None	I support this new district	2024 Victoria Dr Santa Ana CA 92706	
10/30/2021 20:16	lasims17@gmail.com	Larry Sims	Build a better you	Lasims17@gmail.com	34 Queens Wreath Way, Irvine CA 92612	
11/1/2021 0:09	uskoreaone@gmail.com	Jacob Woo H. Lee	Coral Ridge Korean Presbyterian Church	uskoreaone@gmail.com	6642 Burnham Ave	
11/1/2021 9:28	zetnomlegna@gmail.com	Angelo Montez	Retired	zetnomlegna@gmail.com	74850 Serrano Dr, Twentynine Palms, CA, 92277	
11/1/2021 10:22	chlucak@dslextreme.com	Harumi Lucak	N/A			
11/1/2021 11:58	dave@rodecker.com	David Rodecker	Relevant Ads	dave@rodecker.com	18241 Santa Sophia Cir	
11/1/2021 13:19	hiebert.curtis@gmail.com	Curtis Hiebert	Charagape Ministry	Hiebert.curtis@gmail.com	7151 W. Lincoln Ave. Buena Park, CA 90620	
11/1/2021 14:54	hiebert.curtis@gmail.com	Charlyn Hiebert	Charagape Ministries	hiebert.curtis@gmail.com	7151 W. Lincoln Ave. Buena Park, CA 90620	
11/1/2021 15:06	chlucak@dslextreme.com	Harumi Lucak			5912 Lemon Ave, Cypress, CA 90630	
11/1/2021 16:13	lwissink@sbcglobal.net	Leah Wissink		Lwissink@sbcglobal.net	1231 N Lincoln Ave. Fullerton 92831	
11/1/2021 21:52	chlucak@dslextreme.com	Harumi Lucak			5912 Lemon Ave, Cypress, CA-90630	
11/1/2021 22:05	jdssoup@reagan.com	Jan Campbell		jdssoup@reagan.com	Los Alamitos, 90720	
11/1/2021 22:33	jenice8@icloud.com	Jenice Anderson	Asian	jenice8@icloud.com	4424 Hazelnut Ave Seal Beach 90740	
11/1/2021 23:01	jbc3rd@gmail.com	Beth Culver	Retired	jbc3rd@gmail.com	4412 Via Majorca	
11/1/2021 23:58	tanggexin@yahoo.com	Gexin Tang	We Save America	tanggexin@yahoo.com	4892 Corkwood, Irvine, Ca 92612	
11/2/2021 0:02	Mge991@yahoo.com	Ming Ge	Gexin & Associate, Inc	Mge991@yahoo.com	38 Butler , Irvine, Ca 92612	

Osborn, Rachael

From: Nathan Hayden <allmodcons@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 02, 2021 12:33 AM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: People's Redistricting Alliance of Orange County

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

My name is Nathan Hayden and I am a resident of Irvine. I support the OC People's Redistricting Alliance Supervisorial map. This map prioritizes communities that have been historically marginalized, corrects the problems with the current configuration, and complies with the legal requirements of the Voting Rights Act and Fair Maps Act. The current map configuration has disenfranchised communities of color by prioritizing the interests of one political party.

The OC PRA map has made communities of interest its top priority when drawing lines, considering the important testimonies of residents from communities that have been harmed by the current configuration.

The board needs to correct the significant legal problems with the current map configuration. I urge you to adopt the OC People's Redistricting Alliance map.

Thank you

Osborn, Rachael

From: Response@ocgov.com on behalf of OC Clerk of the Board <Response@ocgov.com>
Sent: Monday, November 01, 2021 11:47 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: 2021 Redistricting Idea Form - ONLINE FORM SUBMISSION

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Submitted on Mon, 11/01/2021 - 23:46

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name
Cierra Nevada

My ideas/comments are as follows
Dear members of OC BOS:
I am writing this to request your support in voting for redistricting proposal map #2
1. This map proposal creates the strongest Asian Pacific Islander district of any proposal, unifying and focused on our common Asian needs.
2. Connects Orange County's growing north-western Asian Pacific Islander communities, especially in cities like Garden Grove, Fullerton, Westminster and Fountain Valley.
3. It is the strongest possible configuration to empower API voices as a whole.
4. It is legally sound and creates a Latino Voting Rights Act district as required by law
Communities of interest deserve local representation that advocates for their needs and values and promotes opportunities for them. I hope the immigrant communities of Orange County can look forward to a local government that serves and represents them well by adopting the proposal #2 map.
The map #2 also keeps Los Alamitos Unified School District intact,, as it covers three cities- Seal Beach, Los Alamitos and Rossmoor.
Please vote in favor of proposal map #2. Thank you very much,

Osborn, Rachael

From: Chelsea Boyle <cdrake1221@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 01, 2021 6:40 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: I Support the OC PRA Map

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Attention: This email originated from outside the County of Orange. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

My name is Chelsea Boyle and I am a resident of Irvine. I'm writing to support the OC People's Redistricting Alliance map. As the current map configuration stands, communities of color are disenfranchised because of the prioritization of the interests of one political party. Whereas the OC PRA map prioritizes communities that have been historically marginalized, corrects the problems with the current map configuration, and complies with the legal requirements of the Voting Rights Act and Fair Maps Act. The OC PRA map has made communities of interest its top priority when drawing lines. Including consideration of the important testimonies of residents from communities that have been harmed by the current map. The Board needs to correct the significant legal problems with the current map configuration, so I urge you to adopt the OC People's Redistricting Alliance map. Thank you.

Osborn, Rachael

From: Chris Jeong <seyunjeong0130@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, November 01, 2021 5:15 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: I Support the OC PRA Map

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Attention: This email originated from outside the County of Orange. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

My name is Chris Jeong and I am a resident of Irvine, CA. I'm writing to support the OC People's Redistricting Alliance map. As the current map configuration stands, communities of color are disenfranchised because of the prioritization of the interests of one political party. Whereas the OC PRA map prioritizes communities that have been historically marginalized, corrects the problems with the current map configuration, and complies with the legal requirements of the Voting Rights Act and Fair Maps Act. The OC PRA map has made communities of interest its top priority when drawing lines. Including consideration of the important testimonies of residents from communities that have been harmed by the current map. The Board needs to correct the significant legal problems with the current map configuration, so I urge you to adopt the OC People's Redistricting Alliance map.

Sent from my iPhone

Osborn, Rachael

From: Chris Lucak <chlucak@dslextreme.com>
Sent: Monday, November 01, 2021 3:24 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: Please support Proposal #2 for BOS redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear members of Orange County Board of supervisors:

I am writing this to give full support to the proposal #2 redistricting.
Being an american of Asian descent I believe the proposal #2 redistricting map:

1. Creates the strongest API district of any proposal
2. Connects OC's growing north-western API communities
3. Strongest possible configuration to empower API voices
4. It is legally sound and creates a Latino VRA district as required by law
5. This will help the Asian community in the next 10 years as these lines will be set.

Thank you very much in advance for considering my support for the proposal #2 map.
Sincerely,
Harumi Lucak

Osborn, Rachael

From: Response@ocgov.com on behalf of OC Clerk of the Board <Response@ocgov.com>
Sent: Monday, November 01, 2021 2:54 PM
To: 2021 Orange County Redistricting
Subject: 2021 Redistricting Idea Form - ONLINE FORM SUBMISSION

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Submitted on Mon, 11/01/2021 - 14:53

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name
Ron Kirkpatrick

Phone Number
(562) 370-0064

Email
kpatricks@verizon.net

City/County
Rossmoor

My ideas/comments are as follows
My name is Ron Kirkpatrick and I live in Rossmoor and I'm a member of the Rossmoor Homeowners Association (RHA). I am against proposals that would separate Rossmoor from our neighbors in Los Alamitos and Seal Beach. We all share a school district, infrastructure and commerce and, in many ways, share common goals. As a result I am against maps 1, 6 and 8. I agree with Los Alamitos Unified School Superintendent Dr. Andrew Pulver that Map 7 is the best for our shared area. It splits our cities and communities the least of all 8 maps. Thank you for your consideration