

**ORANGE COUNTY
COMMITTEE
ON
SCHOOL DISTRICT
ORGANIZATION**

c/o ORANGE COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
200 KALMUS DRIVE
P.O. BOX 9050
COSTA MESA, CA
92628-9050
(714)966-4000
www.ocde.us/CCSDO

January 21, 2022
HAND DELIVERY

Re: Additional Documents for County Committee Binder Related to the Adjustment of Orange County Board of Education Trustee Area Boundaries

Dear County Committee Members:

Enclosed with this letter are additional documents that are related to the adjustment of the Orange County Board of Education's trustee area boundaries to be added to the Orange County Committee on School District Organization: Adjustment to Orange County Board of Education Trustee Area Boundaries following 2020 Census Binder (Binder).

The additional documents enclosed and instructions for inserting them in the Binder are as follows:

1. Main Index (Please replace the Main Index with the enclosed updated version.)
2. Section A
 - a. Index (Please replace the Section A Index after Tab A with the enclosed updated version)
 - b. Under Tab 4, after the agenda, please insert Minutes from County Committee's Meeting on December 10, 2021
 - c. Insert New Tab 13 with accompanying documents:
 - i. January 14, 2022 Agenda for County Committee Special Meeting
 - ii. Attachment A2 OCBOE Adopted Map 5 (Converted into Maptitude by Redistricting Partners)
 - iii. Attachment B AB 361 Resolution
 - d. Insert New Tab 14 with accompanying documents:
 - i. OCBOE Map Option 5 (Converted into Maptitude by Redistricting Partners) – School District and City Split Reports Only. *See above* Tab 13 for the OCBOE Adopted Map 5 (Converted into Maptitude by Redistricting Partners)
 - e. Insert New Tab 15 with accompanying documents:
 - i. OCBOE Map Option 5 Modified by RP #1 (Created by Redistricting Partners)
 - ii. School District and City Split Reports

January 21, 2022

Page 2 of 2

- a. Insert New Tab 16 with accompanying documents:
 - i. OCBOE Map Option 5 Modified by RP #2 (Created by Redistricting Partners)
 - ii. School District and City Split Reports
- b. Insert New Tab 17 with accompanying documents:
 - i. Map 9B (Submitted by Wright and converted into Maptitude by Redistricting Partners)
 - ii. Map 9B (Submitted by Billie Joe Wright)
 - iii. School District and City Split Reports
- c. Insert New Tab 18 with accompanying documents:
 - i. Map C (Created by Redistricting Partners)
 - ii. School District and City Split Reports
- d. Insert New Tab 19 with accompanying documents:
 - i. Public input received by County Committee between January 13, 2022 and January 21, 2022

If you have any questions or need assistance updating the Binder we will be available at the January 21, 2022 County Committee meeting to assist you. You are also welcome to call Laurie Weiss at (714) 966-4234 for additional assistance.

Sincerely,



Howard Marinier

Secretary to County Committee

Enclosures

cc: Laurie Weiss, Manager Business Services OCDE
Dean West, Assistant Superintendent Business Services, OCDE
Jeff Riel, General Counsel, OCDE
Ruth Brewda, Counsel, OCDE
Lysa Saltzman, Counsel, OCDE

MAIN INDEX

A. COUNTY COMMITTEE INFORMATION

NO	DATE	DOCUMENT	DESCRIPTION
1.	11/8/21	Agenda	Agenda, minutes and PowerPoint presentation
2.	11/24/21	Correspondence	From Secretary of County Committee to Orange County Board of Education
3.	11/28/21	Correspondence	From Board President OCBE to Secretary of County Committee
4.	12/10/21	Agenda	Agenda, minutes, and the following: • Legal Services Presentation • OCBE Redistricting Map – Option 5 • National Demographic Corporation Power Point Presentation During Public Hearing
5.	12/10/21	OCBE	Material provided to County Committee by OCBE including: • Resolution on County Board of Education Redistricting Plan – Orange County Board of Education – December 8, 2021; • National Demographics Corporation (41 pages); • Document entitled Nielsen Merksamer's Redistricting and Voting Rights Practice
6.	Various	Emails	Public Comments sent by email to County Committee regarding OCBE Redistricting Plan received <u>prior to</u> 12pm on December 10, 2021
7.	Various	Emails	Public Comments sent by email to County Committee regarding OCBE Redistricting Plan received <u>after</u> 12pm on December 10, 2021
8.	12/14/21	Correspondence	Letter to Orange County Registrar of Voters regarding the status of the County Committee's process
9.	12/16/21	Correspondence	Email from Secretary to County Committee with update following County Committee meeting
10.		County Committee	Bylaws
11.	12/29/21	Correspondence	Letter from Orange County Registrar of Voters regarding timeline for submission of OCBE map for June 7, 2022 Primary Elections and

			enclosures: (1) Letter from OCBE to OC ROV dated 12/15/21 and (2) Letter from County Committee to OC ROV dated 12/14/21.
12.	Various	Emails and Correspondence	Public input received by County Committee between December 11, 2021 through January 13, 2022
13.	1/14/22	Agenda	County Committee Meeting Agenda including: • Attachment A2 – OCBOE Map Option 5 (Converted into Maptitude by Redistricting Partners) • Attachment B – AB 361 Resolution
14.	1/20/22	Map Option	OCBOE Map Option 5 (Created by Redistricting Partners) – School District and City Split Reports Only
15.	1/20/22	Map Option	OCBOE Map Option 5 Modified by RP #1 (Created by Redistricting Partners) School District and City Split Reports
16.	1/20/22	Map Option	OCBOE Map Option 5 Modified by RP #2 (Created by Redistricting Partners) School District and City Split Reports
17.	1/20/22	Map Option	Map 9B (Submitted by Wright and converted into Maptitude by Redistricting Partners) Map 9B (Submitted by Billie Joe Wright) School District and City Split Reports
18.	1/20/22	Map Option	Map C (Created by Redistricting Partners) School District and City Split Reports
19.	1/21/22	Emails	Public input received by County Committee between January 13, 2022 through January 21, 2022

B. ORANGE COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETINGS/INFORMATION

NO	DATE	DOCUMENT	DESCRIPTION
1.	5/5/21	Agenda/Minutes/Transcript	2021 Board Census Presentation by Greg Rolen

2.	6/2/21	Agenda/Minutes/Transcript	Board Action on Redistricting Contract with National Demographics Corporation (NDC)
3.	6/16/21	Agenda/Minutes/Transcript	Redistricting Committee Appointment
4.	8/4/21	Agenda/Minutes/Transcript	Redistricting Presentation by OCBE Redistricting by Doug Johnson, NDC
5.	10/6/21	Agenda/Minutes/Transcript	Update on Redistricting
6.	11/3/21	Agenda/Minutes/Transcript	Redistricting Presentation and Proposed Map Option 1, Option 2, Option 3 by Greg Rolén and Douglas Johnson Public Hearing on OCBE Redistricting
7.	12/1/21	Agenda/Minutes/Transcript	Redistricting Update by Douglas Johnson & Greg Rolén Public Hearing on Redistricting Map Options 1-10
8.	12/8/21	Agenda/Minutes/Transcript	Public Report of Action Taken in Closed Session Redistricting Update by Douglas Johnson and Greg Rolén Redistricting Public Hearing on Redistricting Map Option 4 and Map Option 5 Final Board Approval 2021 Trustee Districts
9.		Emails	Public Comment sent by email to Orange County Board of Education regarding Cypress.
10.	1/5/22	Agenda	Conference with Legal Counsel-Anticipated Litigation Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 54956.9.

C. REDISTRICTING MAPS

NO	DATE	DOCUMENT	DESCRIPTION
----	------	----------	-------------

1.	2011	Current OCBE Boundaries	Trustee area boundaries created in 2011 with demographic information from the 2020 Census
2.	11/3/21	Option 1	Created by NDC and submitted by OCBE Redistricting Committee. Considered by OCBE on November 3, 2021 and December 1, 2021.
3.	11/3/21	Option 2	Created by NDC and submitted by OCBE Redistricting Committee. Considered by OCBE on November 3, 2021 and December 1, 2021.
4.	11/3/21	Option 3	Created by NDC and submitted by OCBE Redistricting Committee. Considered by OCBE on November 3, 2021 and December 1, 2021.
5.	12/1/21	Option 4	Created by NDC (after public hearing on November 3, 2021) and submitted by OCBE Redistricting Committee. Considered by OCBE on November 3, 2021, December 1, 2021, and December 8, 2021.
6.	12/1/21	Option 5	Created by NDC (after public hearing on November 3, 2021) and submitted by OCBE Redistricting Committee. Considered by OCBE on November 3, 2021, December 1, 2021, and December 8, 2021.
7.	12/1/21	Option 6	Submitted by Tom Berry, Mappings and GIS. Considered by OCBE on December 1, 2021.
8.	12/1/21	Option 7	Submitted by Tom Berry, Mappings and GIS. Considered by OCBE on December 1, 2021.
9.	12/1/21	Option 8	Submitted by Tom Berry, Mappings and GIS. Considered by OCBE on December 1, 2021.
10.	12/1/21	Option 9	Submitted by Billie Joe Wright. Considered by OCBE on December 1, 2021.
11.	12/1/21	Option 10	Submitted by MALDEF. Considered by OCBE on December 1, 2021.
12.	12/3/21	Option 9A	Submitted by Billie Joe Wright.
13.	12/8/21	OCBOS	Redistricting Map adopted by the Orange County Board of Supervisors. Provided as a reference.

D. ORANGE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETINGS/INFORMATION

NO	DATE	DOCUMENT	DESCRIPTION
1.	12/2/21	Staff Report	Staff Report from Orange County Executive Office providing background on Board of Supervisor process.
2.	12/3/21	Revised Staff Report	Memo from Orange County Executive Office regarding Adoption of 2021 Redistricting Map Ordinance
3.	12/7/21	Ordinance	County of Orange 2021 Redistricting Ordinance with Adopted Map
4.	12/7/21	Map	2021 Map adopted by Board of Supervisors with demographic information

SECTION A: COUNTY COMMITTEE INFORMATION

NO	DATE	DOCUMENT	DESCRIPTION
1.	11/8/21	Agenda	Agenda, minutes and PowerPoint presentation
2.	11/24/21	Correspondence	From Secretary of County Committee to Orange County Board of Education
3.	11/28/21	Correspondence	From Board President OCBE to Secretary of County Committee
4.	12/10/21	Agenda	Agenda, minutes, and the following: • Legal Services Presentation • OCBE Redistricting Map – Option 5 • National Demographic Corporation Power Point Presentation During Public Hearing
5.	12/10/21	OCBE	Material provided to County Committee by OCBE including: • Resolution on County Board of Education Redistricting Plan – Orange County Board of Education – December 8, 2021; • National Demographics Corporation (41 pages); • Document entitled Nielsen Merksamer's Redistricting and Voting Rights Practice
6.	Various	Emails	Public Comments sent by email to County Committee regarding OCBE Redistricting Plan received <u>prior to</u> 12pm on December 10, 2021
7.	Various	Emails	Public Comments sent by email to County Committee regarding OCBE Redistricting Plan received <u>after</u> 12pm on December 10, 2021
8.	12/14/21	Correspondence	Letter to Orange County Registrar of Voters regarding the status of the County Committee's process
9.	12/16/21	Correspondence	Email from Secretary to County Committee with update following County Committee meeting
10.		County Committee	Bylaws
11.	12/29/21	Correspondence	Letter from Orange County Registrar of Voters regarding timeline for submission of OCBE map

			for June 7, 2022 Primary Elections and enclosures: (1) Letter from OCBE to OC ROV dated 12/15/21 and (2) Letter from County Committee to OC ROV dated 12/14/21.
12.	Various	Emails and Correspondence	Public input received by County Committee between December 11, 2021 through January 13, 2022
13.	1/14/22	Agenda	County Committee Meeting Agenda including: • Attachment A2 – OCBOE Map Option 5 (Converted into Maptitude by Redistricting Partners) • Attachment B – AB 361 Resolution
14.	1/20/22	Map Option	OCBOE Map Option 5 (Created by Redistricting Partners) – School District and City Split Reports Only
15.	1/20/22	Map Option	OCBOE Map Option 5 Modified by RP #1 (Created by Redistricting Partners) School District and City Split Reports
16.	1/20/22	Map Option	OCBOE Map Option 5 Modified by RP #2 (Created by Redistricting Partners) School District and City Split Reports
17.	1/20/22	Map Option	Map 9B (Submitted by Wright and converted into Maptitude by Redistricting Partners) Map 9B (Submitted by Billie Joe Wright) School District and City Split Reports
18.	1/20/22	Map Option	Map C (Created by Redistricting Partners) School District and City Split Reports
19.	1/21/22	Emails	Public input received by County Committee between January 13, 2022 through January 21, 2022

ORANGE COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
MINUTES
Special Meeting and Public Hearing
December 10, 2021

1. CALL TO ORDER

ORANGE COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION

The Special Meeting of the Orange County Committee on School District Organization was called to order by Chairperson Sheila Benecke at 3:15 p.m., December 10, 2021 in Building D, Room 1004-1006 at the Orange County Department of Education, 200 Kalmus Drive, Costa Mesa, California, 92626.

2. FLAG SALUTE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Howard Marinier.

3. ROLL CALL

Chairperson Benecke asked Laurie Weiss to take roll.

Present:

Sheila Benecke, Chairperson

Marilyn Buchi

Jackie Filbeck

Karin Freeman, Vice Chairperson

Kathleen Heard

Francine Scinto

Suzie Swartz

Virginia Wilson

Kathy Moffat (arrived late)

Absent:

Meg Cutuli

Jo-Ann Purcell

4. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion by Karin Freeman, seconded by Virginia Wilson, and carried by unanimous vote of all members present to adopt the agenda as presented.

5. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

Motion by Virginia Wilson and seconded by Suzie Swartz to approve the minutes. During discussion, Francine Scinto requested to change the description in agenda item Number 10 regarding Next Meeting from "required to adjust" to "required to review" the trustee area boundaries of the County Board of Education. The County Committee members voted on the proposed amendment to the minutes and unanimously passed a motion to accept the minutes as amended.

Another motion was made to approve the minutes by Karin Freeman, seconded by Virginia Wilson, and carried by unanimous vote of all members present, approving the County Committee minutes of the November 8, 2021 meeting, as amended.

County Committee member Kathy Moffat arrived after the acceptance of the minutes at 3:23 p.m.

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairperson Benecke explained the opportunities available for members of the public who wish to address the County Committee. There was no public comment at this time.

7. CLOSED SESSION

At 3:25pm, Chairperson Benecke explained the County Committee would now meet in closed session with legal counsel under the authority of subdivision (d) of Government Code section 54956.9,

At 4:43pm, Chairperson Benecke reconvened the County Committee meeting and reported that no action had been taken in closed session.

8. NEW BUSINESS

A. Staff Report – Adjustment to Orange County Board of Education Trustee Area Boundaries following 2020 Federal Census

Chairperson Benecke asked Mr. Howard Marinier, Secretary to the County Committee, to give a staff report.

Mr. Marinier provided a brief introduction of the County Committee duties following the decennial federal census and then introduced Mr. Jeff Riel, General Counsel for the Orange County Department of Education.

Mr. Riel began with a PowerPoint presentation that provided an overview of the County Committee on School District Organization, the 2020 Census, Education Code section 1002, prior boundary adjustments, the timeline for the County Committee to make adjustments for the June 2022 Primary elections, and the criteria and considerations for boundary adjustments.

B. Public Hearing – Request by the Orange County Board of Education to Adopt Trustee Area Redistricting Plan:

Chairperson Benecke explained the format of the hearing as set forth in the County Committee Bylaws and as reflected on the agenda.

1. Open Public Hearing

Chairperson Benecke opened the public hearing at 4:57 p.m. She explained that the public hearing has been called to receive public testimony/input on the Orange County Board of Education's proposed redistricting plan.

2. Demographics and Plan Presentation-Orange County Board of Education

Chairperson Benecke invited the representatives of the Orange County Board of Education (OCBOE) to introduce themselves and give their presentation.

Mr. Gregory Rolen, Counsel for the OCBOE introduced himself, Mr. Justin Levitt, Vice President of National Demographics Corporation (NDC), and via Zoom, Ms. Marguerite Leoni, a Partner in Nielsen Merksamer, Parrinello, Gross, & Leoni LLP.

Mr. Levitt explained the process for the creation of the maps, the criteria utilized, and how the OCBOE Map 5 keeps different areas together. He also explained the zero percent population deviation and how OCBOE Map 5 created a 51% majority Latino Citizen Voting Age Population in Trustee Area 1 as well as a 34% Asian American seat by eligible voters in Trustee Area 2.

Mr. Rolen explained the timeline of the process used by the OCBOE, the public hearings held, and the resolution adopted by the OCBOE.

3. Public Comment

Chairperson Benecke asked for the public comment cards and stated she received thirty speaker cards. Based on the number of speaker cards, each speaker was given one minute. One person withdrew her card and one was a duplicate comment card so she only spoke once. A majority of the speakers supported Map 5 and one speaker supported Map 9.

4. Rebuttal

Ms. Leoni gave the rebuttal for the OCBOE stating the map presented satisfies the California Voting Rights Act and other legal criteria. Mr. Rolen then introduced the OCBOE trustees present in the audience: Ms. Barke, Dr. Williams, Ms. Sparks, and Ms. Gomez.

No public rebuttal was given.

5. Questions from County Committee Members

Committee members asked questions regarding OCBOE Map 5, community engagement, the criteria used for developing the various maps considered by the OCBOE and the OCBOE Resolution. Mr. Levitt responded to questions regarding the maps.

There was a discussion between the County Committee, Mr. Riel, Mr. Rolen, and Ms. Leoni regarding the deadline for submitting a map to the Orange County Registrar of Voters in time for the June 2022 election.

6. Close Public Hearing

The public hearing was closed at 6:40pm.

C. Discussion from County Committee Members

Mr. Riel answered questions from County Committee members regarding the timeline for adopting a map and the legal criteria. Several County Committee members expressed a desire for more time to consider the information presented and the various proposed maps.

There was a proposed motion by Kathleen Heard to provide additional information and schedule additional meetings to consider the OCBOE's proposed map. The motion was not seconded. Another motion was made by Kathy Moffat to table this issue to a time certain for the purpose of gathering further information and clarifying the information and data presented with information requests to be submitted by January 5, 2022 and another County Committee meeting to be held as early in January as possible. The motion was seconded by Suzie Swartz. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed by a 7 to 2 vote with County Committee members Marilyn Buchi and Francine Scinto opposing.

- D. Vote on the Redistricting Plan submitted by Orange County Board of Education
No action taken.

9. PRESENTATIONS FROM
THE PUBLIC

No presentations from the public.

10. NEXT MEETING

Chairperson Benecke reported that there are no meetings scheduled at this time. She also stated that the County Committee will be required to have a meeting/public hearing in the Santa Ana Unified School District to review and either approve or disapprove their established trustee areas and change to a by-trustee area method of election.

Additionally, a meeting will need to be scheduled in January to consider the Orange County Board of Education's proposed redistricting plan.

11. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business Chairperson Benecke requested a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was moved by Karin Freeman, seconded by Suzie Swartz, and unanimously approved by all members present. The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

13



ORANGE COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION

200 Kalmus Drive
P.O. Box 9050
Costa Mesa, CA 92628

SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA

Friday, January 14, 2022
3:00 p.m.

Meeting Location

Orange County Department of Education
Board Room
200 Kalmus Drive
Costa Mesa, CA 92628

The Orange County Committee on School District Organization is an eleven member committee comprised of two representatives from each supervisorial district and one member at large elected by representatives from local boards of education. The County Committee studies and makes recommendations in the areas of (a) the organization and reorganization of school districts; (b) changes in school district boundaries; and (c) the number of trustees and the manner by which they are elected. For more information on the County Committee, please visit its website at <http://www.ocde.us/CCSDO/Pages/default.aspx>.

ITEMS ON THE AGENDA. Any person may address the County Committee as a part of tonight's public meeting and/or at the end of the meeting under Presentations from the Public (for items not on the agenda).¹ Prior to the opening of the meeting, a Request to Address the County Committee card (located at the back of the room) should be completed and submitted to Laurie Weiss, Orange County Department of Education staff. Once the agenda item has been opened for public comment, no additional Request to Address the County Committee cards shall be accepted for that topic.

1. Call to Order.
2. Flag Salute.
3. Roll Call.
4. Adoption of Agenda (ACTION).
5. Acceptance of Minutes – December 10, 2021 (ACTION)
6. Public Comments of Persons Desiring to Address the County Committee Related to Closed Session: Not to Exceed 3 minutes per person/30 minutes total

¹ Public testimony shall be limited to a maximum of 30 minutes per item with a maximum of 3 minutes per speaker, except as otherwise noted.

7. Closed Session: Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation
Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (d) of Government Code section 54956.9 (one potential case)
8. Public Comments of Persons Desiring to Address the County Committee: Not to Exceed 3 minutes per person/30 minutes total
9. New Business: (Time Certain 5:00 pm)
 - A. Adjustment to Orange County Board of Education Trustee Area Boundaries following 2020 Federal Census (Attachment A)
 1. Staff Report
 2. Discussion
 3. Vote on the Redistricting Plan submitted by Orange County Board of Education (ACTION)
 - B. State of Emergency and Resolution Authorizing Teleconferenced Meetings Pursuant to the Provisions of AB 361 (Attachment B)
 1. Staff Report
 2. Discussion
 3. Resolution Recognizing State of Emergency and Authorizing Teleconferenced Meetings Pursuant to the Provisions of AB 361 (ACTION)
10. Presentations from the Public: Not to exceed 3 minutes per person/ 30 minutes total.
Any persons present desiring to address the County Committee on any proper matter not on the agenda may do so at this time, provided that no action may be taken on any item not on the agenda.
11. Next Meeting: To Be Determined
12. Adjournment.


Individuals with disabilities in need of copies of the agenda and/or the agenda packet or in need of auxiliary aides and services may request assistance by contacting Laurie Weiss, Manager, Business Services at (714) 966-4234.


For information concerning this meeting, please contact:
Laurie Weiss, Manager, Business Services
Orange County Department of Education
Phone: (714) 966-4234
Email: ccsdo@ocde.us
or visit the County Committee website at
<http://www.ocde.us/CCSDO/Pages/default.aspx>





REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

OC Board of Education Draft Plan 5 (Adopted)










2020 Census

	1	2	3	4	5
Population	638,597	638,605	638,602	638,601	638,605
Deviation	-5	3	0	-1	3
Deviation %	-0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.0%	0.0%
Other	115,678	219,342	328,957	246,032	443,510
Other %	18.1%	34.3%	51.5%	38.5%	69.4%
Latino	419,193	192,602	111,154	236,408	130,924
Latino %	65.6%	30.2%	17.4%	37.0%	20.5%
Asian	91,777	218,669	187,651	143,383	57,787
Asian %	14.4%	34.2%	29.4%	22.5%	9.0%
Black	11,949	7,992	10,840	12,778	6,384
Black %	1.9%	1.3%	1.7%	2.0%	1.0%


Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4	5
Total CVAP	347,862	434,711	404,544	416,495	462,064
Other CVAP	102,028	189,071	253,623	206,934	352,158
Other CVAP %	29.3%	43.5%	62.7%	49.7%	76.2%
Latino CVAP	177,105	95,481	56,935	116,902	64,492
Latino CVAP %	50.9%	22.0%	14.1%	28.1%	14.0%
Asian CVAP	59,244	143,493	87,474	82,644	38,537
Asian CVAP %	17.0%	33.0%	21.6%	19.8%	8.3%
Black CVAP	9,485	6,666	6,512	10,015	6,877
Black CVAP %	2.7%	1.5%	1.6%	2.4%	1.5%

District 1




2020 Census




pulation	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,597	-5	-0.0%	115,678	18.1%	419,193	65.6%	91,777	14.4%	11,949	1.9%
Total CVAP										
347,862	102,028	29.3%	177,105	50.9%	59,244	17.0%	9,485	2.7%		

District 1




2020 Census




pulation	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,597	-5	-0.0%	115,678	18.1%	419,193	65.6%	91,777	14.4%	11,949	1.9%
Total CVAP										
347,862	102,028	29.3%	177,105	50.9%	59,244	17.0%	9,485	2.7%		

District 1




2020 Census




pulation	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,597	-5	-0.0%	115,678	18.1%	419,193	65.6%	91,777	14.4%	11,949	1.9%
Total CVAP										
347,862	102,028	29.3%	177,105	50.9%	59,244	17.0%	9,485	2.7%		

District 2




2020 Census




pulation	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,605	3	0.0%	219,342	34.3%	192,602	30.2%	218,669	34.2%	7,992	1.3%
Total CVAP										
434,711	189,071	43.5%	95,481	22.0%	143,493	33.0%	6,666	1.5%		

District 2





2020 Census



pulation	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,605	3	0.0%	219,342	34.3%	192,602	30.2%	218,669	34.2%	7,992	1.3%
Total CVAP										
434,711	189,071	43.5%	95,481	22.0%	143,493	33.0%	6,666	1.5%		


District 2

2020 Census





population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,605	3	0.0%	219,342	34.3%	192,602	30.2%	218,669	34.2%	7,992	1.3%
Total CVAP										
434,711	189,071	43.5%	95,481	22.0%	143,493	33.0%	6,666	1.5%		

District 2




2020 Census



pulation	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,605	3	0.0%	219,342	34.3%	192,602	30.2%	218,669	34.2%	7,992	1.3%
Total CVAP										
434,711	189,071	43.5%	95,481	22.0%	143,493	33.0%	6,666	1.5%		



2020 Census




pulation	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,602	0	0.0%	328,957	51.5%	111,154	17.4%	187,651	29.4%	10,840	1.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
404,544	253,623	62.7%	56,935	14.1%	87,474	21.6%	6,512	1.6%		

District 3

2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,602	0	0.0%	328,957	51.5%	111,154	17.4%	187,651	29.4%	10,840	1.7%
Total CVAP										
404,544	253,623	62.7%	56,935	14.1%	87,474	21.6%	6,512	1.6%		

District 3




2020 Census




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,602	0	0.0%	328,957	51.5%	111,154	17.4%	187,651	29.4%	10,840	1.7%
Total CVAP										
404,544	253,623	62.7%	56,935	14.1%	87,474	21.6%	6,512	1.6%		

Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
253,623	62.7%	56,935	14.1%	87,474	21.6%	6,512	1.6%


District 3



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,602	0	0.0%	328,957	51.5%	111,154	17.4%	187,651	29.4%	10,840	1.7%
Total CVAP										
404,544	253,623	62.7%	56,935	14.1%	87,474	21.6%	6,512	1.6%		


Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
404,544	253,623	56,935	14.1%	87,474	21.6%	6,512	1.6%

District 4

2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,601	-1	-0.0%	246,032	38.5%	236,408	37.0%	143,383	22.5%	12,778	2.0%
Total CVAP										
416,495	206,934	49.7%	116,902	28.1%	82,644	19.8%	10,015	2.4%		


District 4



2020 Census





Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Other %	Latino %	Asian %	Black %				
638,601	-1	246,032	38.5%	236,408	37.0%	143,383	22.5%	12,778	2.0%
Total CVAP									
416,495	206,934	49.7%	116,902	28.1%	82,644	19.8%	10,015	2.4%	


District 4

2020 Census




population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,601	-1	-0.0%	246,032	38.5%	236,408	37.0%	143,383	22.5%	12,778	2.0%
Total CVAP										
416,495	206,934	49.7%	116,902	28.1%	82,644	19.8%	10,015	2.4%		


District 4



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,601	-1	-0.0%	246,032	38.5%	236,408	37.0%	143,383	22.5%	12,778	2.0%
Total CVAP										
416,495	206,934	49.7%	116,902	28.1%	82,644	19.8%	10,015	2.4%		

District 5




2020 Census





pulation	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,605	3	0.0%	443,510	69.4%	130,924	20.5%	57,787	9.0%	6,384	1.0%
Total CVAP										
462,064	352,158	76.2%	64,492	14.0%	38,537	8.3%	6,877	1.5%		

District 5




2020 Census




pulation	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,605	3	0.0%	443,510	69.4%	130,924	20.5%	57,787	9.0%	6,384	1.0%
Total CVAP										
462,064	352,158	76.2%	64,492	14.0%	38,537	8.3%	6,877	1.5%		

District 5




2020 Census




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Latino	Asian	Black
638,605	3	0.0%	443,510	130,924	57,787	6,384
Total CVAP						
462,064	352,158	76.2%	64,492	38,537	8,377	1,578
Other CVAP						
352,158	352,158	100.0%	352,158	352,158	352,158	352,158
Latino CVAP						
130,924	130,924	100.0%	130,924	130,924	130,924	130,924
Asian CVAP						
57,787	57,787	100.0%	57,787	57,787	57,787	57,787
Black CVAP						
6,384	6,384	100.0%	6,384	6,384	6,384	6,384

District 5



2020 Census



pulation	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,605	3	0.0%	443,510	69.4%	130,924	20.5%	57,787	9.0%	6,384	1.0%
Total CVAP										
462,064	352,158	76.2%	64,492	14.0%	38,537	8.3%	6,877	1.5%		

**RESOLUTION OF THE ORANGE COUNTY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL DISTRICT
ORGANIZATION RECOGNIZING STATE OF EMERGENCY AND AUTHORIZING
TELECONFERENCED MEETINGS PURSUANT TO AB 361**

WHEREAS, the Orange County Committee on School District Organization (County Committee) is committed to ensuring public access and participation in meetings of the County Committee;

WHEREAS, on March 4, 2020, Governor Newsom declared a statewide emergency arising from novel coronavirus ("COVID-19") pursuant to Government Code section 8625; and

WHEREAS, on Sept. 16, 2021, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, Governor Newsom signed AB 361, which amended provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act ("Brown Act"), allowing legislative bodies to meet remotely via teleconferencing outside the requirements of Government Code section 54953(b), if the legislative body makes a finding that there is a proclaimed State of Emergency, and either (1) state or local officials have imposed or recommended social distancing measures, or (2) meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees due to the emergency; and

WHEREAS, the County Committee believes the spread of COVID-19 poses an imminent risk to the health and safety of in person meeting attendees; and

WHEREAS, the County Committee will conduct virtual meetings by way of telephonic and/or internet-based services as to allow members of the public to fully participate in meetings and offer public comment.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the recitals set forth above are true and correct and fully incorporated into this Resolution by reference.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County Committee recognizes that a State of Emergency in the State of California continues to exist due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County Committee finds that holding in-person meetings would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees due to the cause of the State of Emergency and that the cause of the State of Emergency directly impacts the ability of the County Committee Members to meet safely in person.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the County Committee authorizes the use of teleconferencing for all meetings in accordance with Government Code section 54953(e) and all other applicable provisions of the Brown Act, for a period of thirty (30) days from the adoption of this resolution, or such a time that the Governing Board adopts a subsequent resolution in accordance with Government Code section 54953(e)(3).

Adopted this 14th day of the month of January in 2022.

Motion made by: Virginia Wilson

Second made by: Suzie Swartz


AYES: MEMBERS Sheila Benecke, Marilyn Buchi, Meg Cutuli, Jackie Filbeck, Karin Freeman, Kathleen Heard, Kathy Moffat, Francine Scinto, Suzie Swartz, Virginia Wilson

NOES:

ABSENT: MEMBER Jo-Ann Purcell

I, Howard Marinier, Secretary to the Orange County Committee on School District Organization, hereby certify, in the County of Orange, State of California, that the above and foregoing Resolution was duly and regularly adopted by said County Committee at a special meeting thereof held on the 14th day of January, 2022, and passed by a vote of 10 to 0 in favor of said Committee Members present.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 20 day of January, 2022.



Howard Marinier
Secretary to the Orange County Committee
on School District Organization

14

User:

Plan Name: OC BOE Adopted Plan 5 NDC Copy

Plan Type:

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Friday, January 14, 2022

2:49 PM

Unified School	District	PPA_Population	%
Brea-Olinda Unified School District	4	45,731	100.0
Capistrano Unified School District	3	97,862	27.0
Capistrano Unified School District	5	265,287	73.1
Garden Grove Unified School District	1	7,663	2.8
Garden Grove Unified School District	2	268,460	97.2
Irvine Unified School District	1	3,559	1.3
Irvine Unified School District	3	266,846	97.7
Irvine Unified School District	5	2,616	1.0
Laguna Beach Unified School District	3	5,344	17.8
Laguna Beach Unified School District	5	24,699	82.2
Los Alamitos Unified School District	2	50,937	100.0
Newport-Mesa Unified School District	1	7	0.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Unified School	District	PPA_Population	%
Newport-Mesa Unified School District	3	80	0.0
Newport-Mesa Unified School District	5	196,807	100.0
Orange Unified School District	1	18,463	8.2
Orange Unified School District	2	9,210	4.1
Orange Unified School District	3	60,266	26.9
Orange Unified School District	4	136,118	60.8
Orange Unified School District	5	0	0.0
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis	1	3,786	2.3
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis	4	158,846	97.7
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	3	154,183	71.0
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	5	63,140	29.1
Santa Ana Unified School District	1	235,930	96.0
Santa Ana Unified School District	2	10	0.0
Santa Ana Unified School District	3	0	0.0
Santa Ana Unified School District	4	28	0.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Adopted Plan 5 NDC

Unified School	District	PPA_Population	%
		n	
Santa Ana Unified School District	5	9,897	4.0
Tustin Unified School District	1	88,761	62.2
Tustin Unified School District	3	54,022	37.8
Tustin Unified School District	5	20	0.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Unified School	-- Listed by District	PPA_Population	%
District 1			
Garden Grove Unified School District (part)	7,663	2.8	
Irvine Unified School District (part)	3,559	1.3	
Newport-Mesa Unified School District (part)	7	0.0	
Orange Unified School District (part)	18,463	8.2	
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis (part)	3,786	2.3	
Santa Ana Unified School District (part)	235,930	96.0	
Tustin Unified School District (part)	88,761	62.2	
District 1 Totals	358,169		

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Adopted Plan 5 NDC

PPA_Population %

District 2

Garden Grove Unified School District (part)	268,460	97.2
Los Alamitos Unified School District	50,937	100.0
Orange Unified School District (part)	9,210	4.1
Santa Ana Unified School District (part)	10	0.0

District 2 Totals 328,617

District 3

Capistrano Unified School District (part)	97,862	27.0
Irvine Unified School District (part)	266,846	97.7
Laguna Beach Unified School District (part)	5,344	17.8
Newport-Mesa Unified School District (part)	80	0.0
Orange Unified School District (part)	60,266	26.9
Saddleback Valley Unified School District (part)	154,183	71.0
Santa Ana Unified School District (part)	0	0.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

	PPA_Population	%
Tustin Unified School District (part)	54,022	37.8
District 3 Totals	638,603	
District 4		
Brea-Olinda Unified School District	45,731	100.0
Orange Unified School District (part)	136,118	60.8
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis (part)	158,846	97.7
Santa Ana Unified School District (part)	28	0.0

District 4 Totals **340,723**

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Adopted Plan 5 NDC

District 5


	PPA_Population	%
Capistrano Unified School District (part)	265,287	73.1
Irvine Unified School District (part)	2,616	1.0
Laguna Beach Unified School District (part)	24,699	82.2
Newport-Mesa Unified School District (part)	196,807	100.0
Orange Unified School District (part)	0	0.0
Saddleback Valley Unified School District (part)	63,140	29.1
Santa Ana Unified School District (part)	9,897	4.0
Tustin Unified School District (part)	20	0.0

District 5 Totals

562,466

Summary Statistics

Number of Unified School not split	2
Number of Unified School split	10
Number of Unified School split in 2	5
Number of Unified School split in 3	3
Number of Unified School split in 4	0
Number of Unified School split in 5	2
Total number of splits	29





User:

Plan Name: OC BOE Adopted Plan 5 NDC Copy

Plan Type:

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Thursday, January 20, 2022

5:47 PM

Census Place	District	PPA_Population	%
Aliso Viejo	3	52,222	100.0
Anaheim	1	275,658	79.3
Anaheim	4	72,095	20.7
Brea	4	47,397	100.0
Buena Park	4	84,187	100.0
Costa Mesa	5	112,139	100.0
Coto de Caza	5	14,723	100.0
Cypress	2	50,235	100.0
Dana Point	5	33,144	100.0
Fountain Valley	2	57,120	100.0
Fullerton	4	143,930	100.0
Garden Grove	1	411	0.2
Garden Grove	2	171,935	99.8
Huntington Beach	2	123,007	61.8
Huntington Beach	5	76,026	38.2
Irvine	1	0	0.0
Irvine	3	296,368	96.2
Irvine	5	11,590	3.8
La Habra	4	63,234	100.0
La Palma	4	15,597	100.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Census Place	District	PPA_Population	%
Ladera Ranch	5	26,188	100.0
Laguna Beach	5	23,061	100.0
Laguna Hills	3	5,249	16.7
Laguna Hills	5	26,150	83.3
Laguna Niguel	3	1,127	1.8
Laguna Niguel	5	63,290	98.3
Laguna Woods	3	17,658	100.0
Lake Forest	3	85,965	100.0
Las Flores	5	6,004	100.0
Los Alamitos	2	11,795	100.0
Midway City	2	8,845	100.0
Mission Viejo	3	93,760	100.0
Modjeska	3	632	100.0
Newport Beach	3	0	0.0
Newport Beach	5	85,338	100.0
North Tustin	3	25,749	100.0
Orange	1	6,748	4.8
Orange	2	1,258	0.9
Orange	3	44,623	31.8
Orange	4	87,562	62.5
Placentia	4	51,925	100.0
Rancho Mission Viejo	5	10,385	100.0
Rancho Santa Margarita	5	48,000	100.0
Rossmoor	2	10,634	100.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Adopted Plan 5 NDC

Census Place	District	PPA_Population	%
San Clemente	5	64,384	100.0
San Juan Capistrano	5	35,271	100.0
Santa Ana	1	265,801	85.4
Santa Ana	2	45,592	14.6
Santa Ana	4	0	0.0
Santa Ana	5	0	0.0
Seal Beach	2	25,283	100.0
Silverado	3	932	100.0
Stanton	1	78	0.2
Stanton	2	37,989	99.8
Trabuco Canyon	3	297	29.1
Trabuco Canyon	5	723	70.9
Tustin	1	80,194	99.7
Tustin	3	218	0.3
Villa Park	3	5,850	100.0
Westminster	2	91,083	100.0
Williams Canyon	3	93	100.0
Yorba Linda	4	68,415	100.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Census Place	-- Listed by District		
	PPA_Population	n	%
District 1			
Anaheim (part)	275,658		79.3
Garden Grove (part)	411		0.2
Irvine (part)	0		0.0
Orange (part)	6,748		4.8
Santa Ana (part)	265,801		85.4
Stanton (part)	78		0.2
Tustin (part)	80,194		99.7
District 1 Totals	628,890		

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Adopted Plan 5 NDC

PPA_Population %

District 2

Cypress	50,235	100.0
Fountain Valley	57,120	100.0
Garden Grove (part)	171,935	99.8
Huntington Beach (part)	123,007	61.8
Los Alamitos	11,795	100.0
Midway City	8,845	100.0
Orange (part)	1,258	0.9
Rossmore	10,634	100.0
Santa Ana (part)	45,592	14.6
Seal Beach	25,283	100.0
Stanton (part)	37,989	99.8
Westminster	91,083	100.0

District 2 Totals 634,776

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

	PPA_Population	%
--	----------------	---

District 3

Aliso Viejo	52,222	100.0
Irvine (part)	296,368	96.2
Laguna Hills (part)	5,249	16.7
Laguna Niguel (part)	1,127	1.8
Laguna Woods	17,658	100.0
Lake Forest	85,965	100.0
Mission Viejo	93,760	100.0
Modjeska	632	100.0
Newport Beach (part)	0	0.0
North Tustin	25,749	100.0
Orange (part)	44,623	31.8
Silverado	932	100.0
Trabuco Canyon (part)	297	29.1
Tustin (part)	218	0.3
Villa Park	5,850	100.0
Williams Canyon	93	100.0

District 3 Totals

630,743

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Adopted Plan 5 NDC

PPA_Population %

District 4

Anaheim (part)	72,095	20.7
Brea	47,397	100.0
Buena Park	84,187	100.0
Fullerton	143,930	100.0
La Habra	63,234	100.0
La Palma	15,597	100.0
Orange (part)	87,562	62.5
Placentia	51,925	100.0
Santa Ana (part)	0	0.0
Yorba Linda	68,415	100.0

District 4 Totals 634,342

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

	PPA_Population	%
--	----------------	---


District 5

Costa Mesa	112,139	100.0
Coto de Caza	14,723	100.0
Dana Point	33,144	100.0
Huntington Beach (part)	76,026	38.2
Irvine (part)	11,590	3.8
Ladera Ranch	26,188	100.0
Laguna Beach	23,061	100.0
Laguna Hills (part)	26,150	83.3
Laguna Niguel (part)	63,290	98.3
Las Flores	6,004	100.0
Newport Beach (part)	85,338	100.0
Rancho Mission Viejo	10,385	100.0
Rancho Santa Margarita	48,000	100.0
San Clemente	64,384	100.0
San Juan Capistrano	35,271	100.0
Santa Ana (part)	0	0.0
Trabuco Canyon (part)	723	70.9

District 5 Totals	636,416	
-------------------	---------	--

Summary Statistics

Number of Census Place not split	33
Number of Census Place split	12
Number of Census Place split in 2	9
Number of Census Place split in 3	1
Number of Census Place split in 4	2
Total number of splits	29







15





REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

OC Board of Education Option 5 Modified by RP 1












REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

OC Board of Education Option 5 Modified 1 - Cities




2020 Census

	1	2	3	4	5
Population	638,597	638,605	614,774	638,601	662,433
Deviation	-5	3	-23,828	-1	23,831
Deviation %	-0.0%	0.0%	-3.7%	-0.0%	3.7%
Other	115,678	219,342	308,094	246,032	464,373
Other %	18.1%	34.3%	50.1%	38.5%	70.1%
Latino	419,193	192,602	110,255	236,408	131,823
Latino %	65.6%	30.2%	17.9%	37.0%	19.9%
Asian	91,777	218,669	185,806	143,383	59,632
Asian %	14.4%	34.2%	30.2%	22.5%	9.0%
Black	11,949	7,992	10,619	12,778	6,605
Black %	1.9%	1.3%	1.7%	2.0%	1.0%


Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4	5
Total CVAP	347,862	434,711	384,938	416,495	481,670
Other CVAP	102,028	189,071	238,126	206,934	367,655
Other CVAP %	29.3%	43.5%	61.9%	49.7%	76.3%
Latino CVAP	177,105	95,481	55,387	116,902	66,040
Latino CVAP %	50.9%	22.0%	14.4%	28.1%	13.7%
Asian CVAP	59,244	143,493	85,124	82,644	40,887
Asian CVAP %	17.0%	33.0%	22.1%	19.8%	8.5%
Black CVAP	9,485	6,666	6,301	10,015	7,088
Black CVAP %	2.7%	1.5%	1.6%	2.4%	1.5%

District 1




2020 Census





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,597	-5	-0.0%	115,678	18.1%	419,193	65.6%	91,777	14.4%	11,949	1.9%
Total CVAP										
347,862	102,028	29.3%	177,105	50.9%	59,244	17.0%	9,485	2.7%		

District 1




2020 Census




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other CVAP %	Latino	Latino CVAP %	Asian	Asian CVAP %	Black	Black CVAP %
638,597	-5	-0.0%	115,678	18.1%	419,193	65.6%	91,777	14.4%	11,949	1.9%
Total CVAP			Other CVAP		Latino CVAP		Asian CVAP		Black CVAP	
347,862	102,028	29.3%	177,105	50.9%	59,244	17.0%	9,485	2.7%		

District 1




2020 Census




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,597	-5	-0.0%	115,678	18.1%	419,193	65.6%	91,777	14.4%	11,949	1.9%
Total CVAP										
347,862	102,028	29.3%	177,105	50.9%	59,244	17.0%	9,485	2.7%		

2020 Census




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,597	-5	-0.0%	115,678	18.1%	419,193	65.6%	91,777	14.4%	11,949	1.9%
Total CVAP										
347,862	102,028	29.3%	177,105	50.9%	59,244	17.0%	9,485	2.7%		

District 2




2020 Census





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,605	3	0.0%	219,342	34.3%	192,602	30.2%	218,669	34.2%	7,992	1.3%
Total CVAP										
434,771	189,071	43.5%	95,481	22.0%	143,493	33.0%	6,666	1.5%		

District 2




2020 Census





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,605	3	0.0%	219,342	34.3%	192,602	30.2%	218,669	34.2%	7,992	1.3%
Total CVAP										
434,771	189,071	43.5%	95,481	22.0%	143,493	33.0%	6,666	1.5%		
Other CVAP										
189,071	43.5%		95,481	22.0%	143,493	33.0%	6,666	1.5%		

District 2




2020 Census




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,605	3	0.0%	219,342	34.3%	192,602	30.2%	218,669	34.2%	7,992	1.3%
Total CVAP										
434,771	189,071	43.5%	95,481	22.0%	143,493	33.0%	6,666	1.5%		


District 2



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,605	3	0.0%	219,342	34.3%	192,602	30.2%	218,669	34.2%	7,992	1.3%
Total CVAP										
434,711	189,071	43.5%	95,481	22.0%	143,493	33.0%	6,666	1.5%		

District 3



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
614,774	-23,828	-3.7%	308,094	50.1%	110,255	17.9%	185,806	30.2%	10,619	1.7%
Total CVAP										
384,938	238,126	61.9%	55,387	14.4%	85,124	22.1%	6,301	Black CVAP	1.6%	

District 3




2020 Census




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Latino	Asian	Black
614,774	-23,828	-3.7%	308,094	110,255	185,806	10,619
Total CVAP						
384,938	238,126	61.9%	55,387	85,124	22,1%	6,301
Other CVAP						
384,938	238,126	61.9%	55,387	85,124	22.1%	1.6%

2020 Census




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
614,774	-23,828	-3.7%	308,094	50.1%	110,255	17.9%	185,806	30.2%	10,619	1.7%
Total CVAP										
384,938	238,126	61.9%	55,387	14.4%	85,124	22.1%			6,301	1.6%

District 3



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
614,774	-23,828	-3.7%	308,094	50.1%	110,255	17.9%	185,806	30.2%	10,619	1.7%
Total CVAP										
384,938	238,126	61.9%	55,387	14.4%	85,124	22.1%	6,301	1.6%		

Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
384,938	61.9%	55,387	14.4%	85,124	22.1%	6,301	1.6%


District 4



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,601	-1	-0.0%	246,032	38.5%	236,408	37.0%	143,383	22.5%	12,778	2.0%
Total CVAP										
416,495	206,934	49.7%	116,902	28.1%	82,644	19.8%	10,015	2.4%		

Other CVAP % Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP % Black CVAP % Black CVAP %


District 4



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Other %	Latino %	Asian %	Black %					
638,601	-1	-0.0%	246,032	38.5%	236,408	37.0%	143,383	22.5%	12,778	2.0%
Total CVAP										
416,495	206,934	49.7%	116,902	28.1%	82,644	19.8%	10,015	2.4%		

District 4




2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,601	-1	-0.0%	246,032	38.5%	236,408	37.0%	143,383	22.5%	12,778	2.0%
Total CVAP										
416,495	206,934	49.7%	116,902	28.1%	82,644	19.8%	10,015	2.4%		


District 4



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,601	-1	-0.0%	246,032	236,408	37.0%	143,383	22.5%	12,778	2.0%
Total CVAP									
416,495	206,934	49.7%	116,902	82,644	28.1%	19,815	19.8%	10,015	2.4%

Other CVAP	Latino CVAP	Asian CVAP	Black CVAP
206,934	82,644	19,815	10,015

District 5




2020 Census




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
662,433	23,831	3.7%	464,373	70.1%	131,823	19.9%	59,632	9.0%	6,605	1.0%
Total CVAP										
481,670	367,655	76.3%	66,040	13.7%	40,887	8.5%	7,088	1.5%		

Other CVAP % Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP % Black CVAP % Black CVAP %

District 5



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population


Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
662,433	23,831	3.7%	464,373	70.1%	131,823	19.9%	59,632	9.0%	6,605	1.0%
Total CVAP										
481,670	367,655	76.3%	66,040	13.7%	40,887	8.5%	7,088	1.5%		



District 5




2020 Census




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
662,433	23,831	3.7%	464,373	70.1%	131,823	19.9%	59,632	9.0%	6,605	1.0%
Total CVAP										
481,670	367,655	76.3%	66,040	13.7%	40,887	8.5%	7,088	1.5%		

Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %

District 5



2020 Census



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
662,433	23,831	3.7%	464,373	70.1%	131,823	19.9%	59,632	9.0%	6,605	1.0%
Total CVAP										
481,670	367,655	76.3%	66,040	13.7%	40,887	8.5%	7,088	1.5%		

User:

Plan Name: OC BOE Plan 5 Modified RP

Plan Type:

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Thursday, January 20, 2022

5:07 PM

Unified School	District	PPA_Population	%
Brea-Olinda Unified School District	4	43,078	100.0
Capistrano Unified School District	5	361,882	100.0
Garden Grove Unified School District	1	8,522	3.1
Garden Grove Unified School District	2	268,094	96.9
Irvine Unified School District	1	3,570	1.3
Irvine Unified School District	3	269,271	98.7
Laguna Beach Unified School District	5	28,256	100.0
Los Alamitos Unified School District	2	49,955	100.0
Newport-Mesa Unified School District	1	0	0.0
Newport-Mesa Unified School District	3	0	0.0
Newport-Mesa Unified School District	5	196,117	100.0
Orange Unified School District	1	18,911	8.4

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Unified School	District	PPA_Population	%
Orange Unified School District	2	9,210	4.1
Orange Unified School District	3	60,261	26.8
Orange Unified School District	4	136,242	60.7
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis	1	3,786	2.3
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis	4	161,890	97.7
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	3	221,072	100.0
Santa Ana Unified School District	1	233,974	96.0
Santa Ana Unified School District	3	9,746	4.0
Santa Ana Unified School District	4	0	0.0
Santa Ana Unified School District	5	29	0.0
Tustin Unified School District	1	89,158	62.1
Tustin Unified School District	3	54,424	37.9

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Plan 5 Modified RP

Unified School	-- Listed by District		
	PPA_Population	%	
District 1			
Garden Grove Unified School District (part)	8,522	3.1	
Irvine Unified School District (part)	3,570	1.3	
Newport-Mesa Unified School District (part)	0	0.0	
Orange Unified School District (part)	18,911	8.4	
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis (part)	3,786	2.3	
Santa Ana Unified School District (part)	233,974	96.0	
Tustin Unified School District (part)	89,158	62.1	
District 1 Totals	357,921		
District 2			
Garden Grove Unified School District (part)	268,094	96.9	
Los Alamitos Unified School District	49,955	100.0	

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

	PPA_Population	%
Orange Unified School District (part)	9,210	4.1
District 2 Totals	327,259	
District 3		
Irvine Unified School District (part)	269,271	98.7
Newport-Mesa Unified School District (part)	0	0.0
Orange Unified School District (part)	60,261	26.8
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	221,072	100.0
Santa Ana Unified School District (part)	9,746	4.0
Tustin Unified School District (part)	54,424	37.9
District 3 Totals	614,774	
District 4		
Brea-Olinda Unified School District	43,078	100.0
Orange Unified School District (part)	136,242	60.7
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District (part)	161,890	97.7

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Plan 5 Modified RP

	PPA_Population	%
Santa Ana Unified School District (part)	0	0.0

District 4 Totals

341,210

District 5


Capistrano Unified School District	361,882	100.0
Laguna Beach Unified School District	28,256	100.0
Newport-Mesa Unified School District (part)	196,117	100.0
Santa Ana Unified School District (part)	29	0.0

District 5 Totals

586,284

Summary Statistics

Number of Unified School not split	5
Number of Unified School split	7
Number of Unified School split in 2	4
Number of Unified School split in 3	1
Number of Unified School split in 4	2
Total number of splits	19



User:

Plan Name: OC BOE Plan 5 Modified RP

Plan Type:

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Thursday, January 20, 2022

5:00 PM

Census Place	District	PPA_Population	%
Aliso Viejo	3	2,055	3.9
Aliso Viejo	5	50,167	96.1
Anaheim	1	275,658	79.3
Anaheim	4	72,095	20.7
Brea	4	47,397	100.0
Buena Park	4	84,187	100.0
Costa Mesa	3	563	0.5
Costa Mesa	5	111,576	99.5
Coto de Caza	5	14,723	100.0
Cypress	2	50,235	100.0
Dana Point	5	33,144	100.0
Fountain Valley	2	57,120	100.0
Fullerton	4	143,930	100.0
Garden Grove	1	411	0.2
Garden Grove	2	171,935	99.8
Huntington Beach	2	123,007	61.8
Huntington Beach	5	76,026	38.2
Irvine	1	0	0.0
Irvine	3	307,958	100.0
Irvine	5	0	0.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Census Place	District	PPA_Population	%
La Habra	4	63,234	100.0
La Palma	4	15,597	100.0
Ladera Ranch	5	26,188	100.0
Laguna Beach	5	23,061	100.0
Laguna Hills	3	31,357	99.9
Laguna Hills	5	42	0.1
Laguna Niguel	3	0	0.0
Laguna Niguel	5	64,417	100.0
Laguna Woods	3	16,773	95.0
Laguna Woods	5	885	5.0
Lake Forest	3	85,965	100.0
Las Flores	5	6,004	100.0
Los Alamitos	2	11,795	100.0
Midway City	2	8,845	100.0
Mission Viejo	3	46,118	49.2
Mission Viejo	5	47,642	50.8
Modjeska	3	632	100.0
Newport Beach	3	197	0.2
Newport Beach	5	85,141	99.8
North Tustin	3	25,749	100.0
Orange	1	6,748	4.8
Orange	2	1,258	0.9
Orange	3	44,623	31.8
Orange	4	87,562	62.5

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Plan 5 Modified RP

Census Place	District	PPA_Population	%
Placentia	4	51,925	100.0
Rancho Mission Viejo	5	10,385	100.0
Rancho Santa Margarita	3	36,746	76.6
Rancho Santa Margarita	5	11,254	23.5
Rossmore	2	10,634	100.0
San Clemente	5	64,384	100.0
San Juan Capistrano	5	35,271	100.0
Santa Ana	1	265,801	85.4
Santa Ana	2	45,592	14.6
Santa Ana	4	0	0.0
Santa Ana	5	0	0.0
Seal Beach	2	25,283	100.0
Silverado	3	932	100.0
Stanton	1	78	0.2
Stanton	2	37,989	99.8
Trabuco Canyon	3	1,020	100.0
Tustin	1	80,194	99.7
Tustin	3	218	0.3
Villa Park	3	5,850	100.0
Westminster	2	91,083	100.0
Williams Canyon	3	93	100.0
Yorba Linda	4	68,415	100.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Census Place	-- Listed by District		
	PPA_Population	n	%
District 1			
Anaheim (part)	275,658		79.3
Garden Grove (part)	411		0.2
Irvine (part)	0		0.0
Orange (part)	6,748		4.8
Santa Ana (part)	265,801		85.4
Stanton (part)	78		0.2
Tustin (part)	80,194		99.7
District 1 Totals	628,890		

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Plan 5 Modified RP

District 2

	PPA_Population	%
Cypress	50,235	100.0
Fountain Valley	57,120	100.0
Garden Grove (part)	171,935	99.8
Huntington Beach (part)	123,007	61.8
Los Alamitos	11,795	100.0
Midway City	8,845	100.0
Orange (part)	1,258	0.9
Rossmore	10,634	100.0
Santa Ana (part)	45,592	14.6
Seal Beach	25,283	100.0
Stanton (part)	37,989	99.8
Westminster	91,083	100.0

District 2 Totals

634,776

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Plan 5 Modified RP

	PPA_Population	%
--	----------------	---

District 3

Aliso Viejo (part)	2,055	3.9
Costa Mesa (part)	563	0.5
Irvine (part)	307,958	100.0
Laguna Hills (part)	31,357	99.9
Laguna Niguel (part)	0	0.0
Laguna Woods (part)	16,773	95.0
Lake Forest	85,965	100.0
Mission Viejo (part)	46,118	49.2
Modjeska	632	100.0
Newport Beach (part)	197	0.2
North Tustin	25,749	100.0
Orange (part)	44,623	31.8
Rancho Santa Margarita (part)	36,746	76.6
Silverado	932	100.0
Trabuco Canyon	1,020	100.0
Tustin (part)	218	0.3
Villa Park	5,850	100.0
Williams Canyon	93	100.0

District 3 Totals **606,849**

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Plan 5 Modified RP

District 4

	PPA_Population	%
Anaheim (part)	72,095	20.7
Brea	47,397	100.0
Buena Park	84,187	100.0
Fullerton	143,930	100.0
La Habra	63,234	100.0
La Palma	15,597	100.0
Orange (part)	87,562	62.5
Placentia	51,925	100.0
Santa Ana (part)	0	0.0
Yorba Linda	68,415	100.0

District 4 Totals

634,342


Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Plan 5 Modified RP

	PPA_Population	%
District 5		
Aliso Viejo (part)	50,167	96.1
Costa Mesa (part)	111,576	99.5
Coto de Caza	14,723	100.0
Dana Point	33,144	100.0
Huntington Beach (part)	76,026	38.2
Irvine (part)	0	0.0
Ladera Ranch	26,188	100.0
Laguna Beach	23,061	100.0
Laguna Hills (part)	42	0.1
Laguna Niguel (part)	64,417	100.0
Laguna Woods (part)	885	5.0
Las Flores	6,004	100.0
Mission Viejo (part)	47,642	50.8
Newport Beach (part)	85,141	99.8
Rancho Mission Viejo	10,385	100.0
Rancho Santa Margarita (part)	11,254	23.5
San Clemente	64,384	100.0
San Juan Capistrano	35,271	100.0
Santa Ana (part)	0	0.0
District 5 Totals	660,310	


Summary Statistics

Number of Census Place not split	29
Number of Census Place split	16
Number of Census Place split in 2	13
Number of Census Place split in 3	1
Number of Census Place split in 4	2
Total number of splits	37





16







REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

OC Board of Education

Option 5 Modified by RP 2 with Inc









REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

OC Board of Education

Option 5 Modified 2 - HSDs






2020 Census

	1	2	3	4	5
Population	638,597	638,605	665,997	638,601	611,210
Deviation	-5	3	27,395	-1	-27,392
Deviation %	-0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	-0.0%	-4.3%
Other	115,678	219,342	359,919	246,032	412,548
Other %	18.1%	34.3%	54.0%	38.5%	67.5%
Latino	419,193	192,602	120,750	236,408	121,328
Latino %	65.6%	30.2%	18.1%	37.0%	19.9%
Asian	91,777	218,669	175,334	143,383	70,104
Asian %	14.4%	34.2%	26.3%	22.5%	11.5%
Black	11,949	7,992	9,994	12,778	7,230
Black %	1.9%	1.3%	1.5%	2.0%	1.2%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)


	1	2	3	4	5
Total CVAP	347,862	434,711	428,884	416,495	437,724
Other CVAP	102,028	189,071	281,430	206,934	324,351
Other CVAP %	29.3%	43.5%	65.6%	49.7%	74.1%
Latino CVAP	177,105	95,481	60,195	116,902	61,232
Latino CVAP %	50.9%	22.0%	14.0%	28.1%	14.0%
Asian CVAP	59,244	143,493	80,741	82,644	45,270
Asian CVAP %	17.0%	33.0%	18.8%	19.8%	10.3%
Black CVAP	9,485	6,666	6,518	10,015	6,871
Black CVAP %	2.7%	1.5%	1.5%	2.4%	1.6%

District 1




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,597	-5	-0.0%	115,678	18.1%	419,193	65.6%	91,777	14.4%	11,949	1.9%
Total CVAP										
347,862	102,028	29.3%	177,105	50.9%	59,244	17.0%	9,485	2.7%		
Other CVAP										
102,028	29.3%	177,105	50.9%	59,244	17.0%	9,485	2.7%			


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 1




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,597	-5	-0.0%	115,678	18.1%	419,193	65.6%	91,777	14.4%	11,949	1.9%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
347,862	102,028	29.3%	177,105	50.9%	59,244	17.0%	9,485	2.7%		

2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population




District 1



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,597	-5	-0.0%	115,678	18.1%	419,193	65.6%	91,777	14.4%	11,949	1.9%
Total CVAP										
347,862	102,028	29.3%	177,105	50.9%	59,244	17.0%	9,485	2.7%		
Other CVAP										
102,028	29.3%	177,105	50.9%	59,244	17.0%	9,485	2.7%			


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 1



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,597	-5	-0.0%	115,678	18.1%	419,193	65.6%	91,777	14.4%	11,949	1.9%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
347,862	102,028	29.3%	177,105	50.9%	59,244	17.0%	9,485	2.7%		


2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




District 2



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,605	3	0.0%	219,342	34.3%	192,602	30.2%	218,669	34.2%	7,992	1.3%
Total CVAP										
434,711	189,071	43.5%	95,481	22.0%	143,493	33.0%	6,666	1.5%		

District 2




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,605	3	0.0%	219,342	34.3%	192,602	30.2%	218,669	34.2%	7,992	1.3%
Total CVAP										
434,711	189,071	43.5%	95,481	22.0%	143,493	33.0%	6,666	1.5%		


2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




District 2



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,605	3	0.0%	219,342	34.3%	192,602	30.2%	218,669	34.2%	7,992	1.3%
Total CVAP										
434,711	189,071	43.5%	95,481	22.0%	143,493	33.0%	6,666	1.5%		

District 2




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,605	3	0.0%	219,342	34.3%	192,602	30.2%	218,669	34.2%	7,992	1.3%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
434,711	189,071	43.5%	95,481	22.0%	143,493	33.0%	6,666	1.5%		

2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 3




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
665,997	27,395	4.3%	359,919	54.0%	120,750	18.1%	175,334	26.3%	9,994	1.5%
Total CVAP										
428,884	281,430	65.6%	60,195	14.0%	80,741	18.8%	6,518	1.5%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 3




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
665,997	27,395	4.3%	359,919	54.0%	120,750	18.1%	175,334	26.3%	9,994	1.5%
Total CVAP Other CVAPOther CVAP %Latino CVAPLatino CVAP %Asian CVAP Asian CVAP %Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
428,884	281,430	65.6%	60,195	14.0%	80,741	18.8%	6,518	1.5%		


2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




District 3



2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
665,997	27,395	4.3%	359,919	54.0%	120,750	18.1%	175,334	26.3%	9,994	1.5%

Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
428,884	281,430	65.6%	60,195	14.0%	80,741	18.8%	6,518	1.5%




District 3




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
665,997	27,395	4.3%	359,919	54.0%	120,750	18.1%	175,334	26.3%	9,994	1.5%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
428,884	281,430	65.6%	60,195	14.0%	80,741	18.8%	6,518	1.5%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 4




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,601	-1	-0.0%	246,032	38.5%	236,408	37.0%	143,383	22.5%	12,778	2.0%
Total CVAP										
416,495	206,934	49.7%	716,902	28.1%	82,644	19.8%	10,015	2.4%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 4




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,601	-1	-0.0%	246,032	38.5%	236,408	37.0%	143,383	22.5%	12,778	2.0%
Total CVAP										
416,495	206,934	49.7%	116,902	28.1%	82,644	19.8%	10,015	2.4%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 4




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,601	-1	-0.0%	246,032	38.5%	236,408	37.0%	143,383	22.5%	12,778	2.0%
Total CVAP										
416,495	206,934	49.7%	116,902	28.1%	82,644	19.8%	10,015	2.4%		
Other CVAP										
206,934	49.7%	116,902	28.1%	82,644	19.8%	10,015	2.4%			


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 4




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,601	-1	-0.0%	246,032	38.5%	236,408	37.0%	143,363	22.5%	12,778	2.0%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
416,495	206,934	49.7%	116,902	28.1%	82,644	19.8%	10,015	2.4%		

2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 5




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
611,210	-27,392	-4.3%	412,548	67.5%	121,328	19.9%	70,104	11.5%	7,230	1.2%
Total CVAP										
437,724	324,351	74.1%	61,232	14.0%	45,270	10.3%	6,871	1.6%		
Other CVAP % Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP % Asian CVAP % Black CVAP % Black CVAP %										

2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population




District 5



2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
611,210	-27,392	-4.3%	412,548	67.5%	121,328	19.9%	70,104	11.5%	7,230	1.2%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
437,724	324,351	74.1%	61,232	14.0%	45,270	10.3%	6,871	1.6%		





REDISTRICTING
PARTNERS


OC Board of Education Option 5 Modified 2 - HSDS

District 5




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
611,210	-27,392	-4.3%	412,548	67.5%	121,328	19.9%	70,104	11.5%	7,230	1.2%
Total CVAP										
437,724	324,351	74.1%	61,232	14.0%	45,270	10.3%	6,871	1.6%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 5



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
611,210	-27,392	-4.3%	412,548	67.5%	121,328	19.9%	70,104	11.5%	7,230	1.2%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP % Black CVAP % Black CVAP %										
437,724	324,351	74.1%	61,232	14.0%	45,270	10.3%	6,871	1.6%		

2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population



User:

Plan Name: OC BOE Plan 5 RP Modified 2

Plan Type:

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Thursday, January 20, 2022

4:14 PM

Unified School Districts	District	PPA_Population	%
Brea-Olinda Unified School District	4	43,078	100.0
Capistrano Unified School District	5	361,882	100.0
Garden Grove Unified School District	1	8,522	3.1
Garden Grove Unified School District	2	268,094	96.9
Irvine Unified School District	1	3,570	1.3
Irvine Unified School District	3	269,271	98.7
Laguna Beach Unified School District	5	28,256	100.0
Los Alamitos Unified School District	2	49,955	100.0
Newport-Mesa Unified School District	1	0	0.0
Newport-Mesa Unified School District	3	196,117	100.0
Orange Unified School District	1	18,911	8.4
Orange Unified School District	2	9,210	4.1

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Unified School Districts	District	PPA_Population	%
Orange Unified School District	3	60,261	26.8
Orange Unified School District	4	136,242	60.7
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis	1	3,786	2.3
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis	4	161,890	97.7
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	5	221,072	100.0
Santa Ana Unified School District	1	233,974	96.0
Santa Ana Unified School District	3	9,775	4.0
Santa Ana Unified School District	4	0	0.0
Tustin Unified School District	1	89,158	62.1
Tustin Unified School District	3	54,424	37.9

Unified School Districts -- Listed by District

PPA_Population %

District 1

Garden Grove Unified School District (part)	8,522	3.1
Irvine Unified School District (part)	3,570	1.3
Newport-Mesa Unified School District (part)	0	0.0
Orange Unified School District (part)	18,911	8.4
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis (part)	3,786	2.3
Santa Ana Unified School District (part)	233,974	96.0
Tustin Unified School District (part)	89,158	62.1

District 1 Totals 357,921

District 2

Garden Grove Unified School District (part)	268,094	96.9
Los Alamitos Unified School District	49,955	100.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

	PPA_Population	%
Orange Unified School District (part)	9,210	4.1
District 2 Totals	327,259	
District 3		
Irvine Unified School District (part)	269,271	98.7
Newport-Mesa Unified School District (part)	196,117	100.0
Orange Unified School District (part)	60,261	26.8
Santa Ana Unified School District (part)	9,775	4.0
Tustin Unified School District (part)	54,424	37.9
District 3 Totals	589,848	
District 4		
Brea-Olinda Unified School District	43,078	100.0
Orange Unified School District (part)	136,242	60.7
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis (part)	161,890	97.7
Santa Ana Unified School District (part)	0	0.0
District 4 Totals	341,210	

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Plan 5 RP Modified 2

District 5


Capistrano Unified School District	361,882	100.0
Laguna Beach Unified School District	28,256	100.0
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	221,072	100.0


District 5 Totals

611,210

Summary Statistics

Number of Unified School Districts not split	5
Number of Unified School Districts split	7
Number of Unified School Districts split in 2	5
Number of Unified School Districts split in 3	1
Number of Unified School Districts split in 4	1
Total number of splits	17





User:

Plan Name: OC BOE Plan 5 RP Modified 2

Plan Type:

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Thursday, January 20, 2022

4:25 PM

Census Place	District	PPA_Population	%
Aliso Viejo	5	52,222	100.0
Anaheim	1	275,658	79.3
Anaheim	4	72,095	20.7
Brea	4	47,397	100.0
Buena Park	4	84,187	100.0
Costa Mesa	3	112,139	100.0
Coto de Caza	5	14,723	100.0
Cypress	2	50,235	100.0
Dana Point	5	33,144	100.0
Fountain Valley	2	57,120	100.0
Fullerton	4	143,930	100.0
Garden Grove	1	411	0.2
Garden Grove	2	171,935	99.8
Huntington Beach	2	123,007	61.8
Huntington Beach	3	76,026	38.2
Irvine	1	0	0.0
Irvine	3	307,657	99.9
Irvine	5	301	0.1
La Habra	4	63,234	100.0
La Palma	4	15,597	100.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Plan 5 RP Modified 2

Census Place	District	PPA_Population	%
Ladera Ranch	5	26,188	100.0
Laguna Beach	5	23,061	100.0
Laguna Hills	5	31,399	100.0
Laguna Niguel	5	64,417	100.0
Laguna Woods	5	17,658	100.0
Lake Forest	3	0	0.0
Lake Forest	5	85,965	100.0
Las Flores	5	6,004	100.0
Los Alamitos	2	11,795	100.0
Midway City	2	8,845	100.0
Mission Viejo	5	93,760	100.0
Modjeska	3	632	100.0
Modjeska	5	0	0.0
Newport Beach	3	83,930	98.4
Newport Beach	5	1,408	1.7
North Tustin	3	25,749	100.0
Orange	1	6,748	4.8
Orange	2	1,258	0.9
Orange	3	44,623	31.8
Orange	4	87,562	62.5
Placentia	4	51,925	100.0
Rancho Mission Viejo	5	10,385	100.0
Rancho Santa Margarita	5	48,000	100.0
Rossmoor	2	10,634	100.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Plan 5 RP Modified 2

Census Place	District	PPA_Population	%
San Clemente	5	64,384	100.0
San Juan Capistrano	5	35,271	100.0
Santa Ana	1	265,801	85.4
Santa Ana	2	45,592	14.6
Santa Ana	3	0	0.0
Santa Ana	4	0	0.0
Seal Beach	2	25,283	100.0
Silverado	3	932	100.0
Stanton	1	78	0.2
Stanton	2	37,989	99.8
Trabuco Canyon	3	3	0.3
Trabuco Canyon	5	1,017	99.7
Tustin	1	80,194	99.7
Tustin	3	218	0.3
Villa Park	3	5,850	100.0
Westminster	2	91,083	100.0
Williams Canyon	3	93	100.0
Yorba Linda	4	68,415	100.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Plan 5 RP Modified 2

Census Place	-- Listed by District		
	PPA_Population	n	%
District 1			
Anaheim (part)	275,658		79.3
Garden Grove (part)	411		0.2
Irvine (part)	0		0.0
Orange (part)	6,748		4.8
Santa Ana (part)	265,801		85.4
Stanton (part)	78		0.2
Tustin (part)	80,194		99.7
District 1 Totals	628,890		

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Plan 5 RP Modified 2

District 2

	PPA_Population	%
Cypress	50,235	100.0
Fountain Valley	57,120	100.0
Garden Grove (part)	171,935	99.8
Huntington Beach (part)	123,007	61.8
Los Alamitos	11,795	100.0
Midway City	8,845	100.0
Orange (part)	1,258	0.9
Rossmore	10,634	100.0
Santa Ana (part)	45,592	14.6
Seal Beach	25,283	100.0
Stanton (part)	37,989	99.8
Westminster	91,083	100.0

District 2 Totals

634,776

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Plan 5 RP Modified 2

	PPA_Population	%
District 3		
Costa Mesa	112,139	100.0
Huntington Beach (part)	76,026	38.2
Irvine (part)	307,657	99.9
Lake Forest (part)	0	0.0
Modjeska (part)	632	100.0
Newport Beach (part)	83,930	98.4
North Tustin	25,749	100.0
Orange (part)	44,623	31.8
Santa Ana (part)	0	0.0
Silverado	932	100.0
Trabuco Canyon (part)	3	0.3
Tustin (part)	218	0.3
Villa Park	5,850	100.0
Williams Canyon	93	100.0
District 3 Totals	657,852	

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE Plan 5 RP Modified 2

District 4

	PPA_Population	%
Anaheim (part)	72,095	20.7
Brea	47,397	100.0
Buena Park	84,187	100.0
Fullerton	143,930	100.0
La Habra	63,234	100.0
La Palma	15,597	100.0
Orange (part)	87,562	62.5
Placentia	51,925	100.0
Santa Ana (part)	0	0.0
Yorba Linda	68,415	100.0

District 4 Totals

634,342


Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)


OC BOE Plan 5 RP Modified 2

	PPA_Population	%
District 5		
Aliso Viejo	52,222	100.0
Coto de Caza	14,723	100.0
Dana Point	33,144	100.0
Irvine (part)	301	0.1
Ladera Ranch	26,188	100.0
Laguna Beach	23,061	100.0
Laguna Hills	31,399	100.0
Laguna Niguel	64,417	100.0
Laguna Woods	17,658	100.0
Lake Forest (part)	85,965	100.0
Las Flores	6,004	100.0
Mission Viejo	93,760	100.0
Modjeska (part)	0	0.0
Newport Beach (part)	1,408	1.7
Rancho Mission Viejo	10,385	100.0
Rancho Santa Margarita	48,000	100.0
San Clemente	64,384	100.0
San Juan Capistrano	35,271	100.0
Trabuco Canyon (part)	1,017	99.7
District 5 Totals	609,307	

Summary Statistics

Number of Census Place not split	33
Number of Census Place split	12
Number of Census Place split in 2	9
Number of Census Place split in 3	1
Number of Census Place split in 4	2
Total number of splits	29








17



OC Board of Education
Draft Plan 9B Submission











REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

OC Board of Education Draft Plan 9B HSD Overlay






2020 Census

	1	2	3	4	5
Population	638,795	641,452	636,779	640,604	635,380
Deviation	193	2,850	-1,823	2,002	-3,222
Deviation %	0.0%	0.4%	-0.3%	0.3%	-0.5%
Other	109,928	370,422	287,233	154,324	431,612
Other %	17.2%	57.7%	45.1%	24.1%	67.9%
Latino	431,450	132,877	155,993	246,977	122,984
Latino %	67.5%	20.7%	24.5%	38.6%	19.4%
Asian	86,841	127,879	183,519	227,623	73,405
Asian %	13.6%	19.9%	28.8%	35.5%	11.6%
Black	10,576	10,274	10,034	11,680	7,379
Black %	1.7%	1.6%	1.6%	1.8%	1.2%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)


	1	2	3	4	5
Total CVAP	348,751	453,546	400,962	406,601	455,816
Other CVAP	98,469	301,634	227,957	136,639	339,115
Other CVAP %	28.2%	66.5%	56.9%	33.6%	74.4%
Latino CVAP	185,259	70,424	78,984	113,995	62,253
Latino CVAP %	53.1%	15.5%	19.7%	28.0%	13.7%
Asian CVAP	56,969	72,815	87,482	146,581	47,545
Asian CVAP %	16.3%	16.1%	21.8%	36.1%	10.4%
Black CVAP	8,054	8,673	6,539	9,386	6,903
Black CVAP %	2.3%	1.9%	1.6%	2.3%	1.5%

District 1




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,795	193	0.0%	109,928	17.2%	431,450	67.5%	86,841	13.6%	10,576	1.7%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %	Black CVAP %	Black CVAP %
348,751	98,469	28.2%	185,259	53.1%	56,969	16.3%	8,054	2.3%	2.3%	2.3%


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 1




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,795	193	0.0%	109,928	17.2%	431,450	67.5%	86,841	13.6%	10,576	1.7%
Total CVAP										
348,751	98,469	28.2%	185,259	53.1%	56,969	16.3%	8,054	2.3%		
Other CVAP										
98,469	28.2%	185,259	53.1%	56,969	16.3%	8,054	2.3%			


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 1




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
638,795	193	0.0%	109,928	17.2%	431,450	67.5%	86,841	13.6%	10,576	1.7%
Total CVAP										
348,751	98,469	28.2%	185,259	53.1%	56,969	16.3%	8,054	2.3%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 2




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
641,452	2,850	0.4%	370,422	57.7%	132,877	20.7%	127,879	19.9%	10,274	1.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
453,546	301,634	66.5%	70,424	15.5%	72,815	16.1%	8,673	1.9%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 2




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
641,452	2,850	0.4%	370,422	57.7%	132,877	20.7%	127,879	19.9%	10,274	1.6%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
453,546	301,634	66.5%	70,424	15.5%	72,815	16.1%	8,673	1.9%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 2




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
641,452	2,850	0.4%	370,422	57.7%	132,877	20.7%	127,879	19.9%	10,274	1.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
453,546	301,634	66.5%	70,424	15.5%	72,815	16.1%	8,673	1.9%		

2020 Census


Citizen Voting Age Population



2020 Census




District 3




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
636,779	-1,823	-0.3%	287,233	45.1%	155,993	24.5%	183,519	28.8%	10,034	1.6%
Total CVAP										
400,962	227,957	56.9%	78,984	19.7%	87,482	21.8%	6,539		1.6%	


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 3




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
636,779	-1,823	-0.3%	287,233	45.1%	155,993	24.5%	183,519	28.8%	10,034	1.6%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
400,962	227,957	56.9%	78,984	19.7%	87,482	21.8%	6,539	1.6%		


2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




District 3



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
636,779	-1,823	-0.3%	287,233	45.1%	155,993	24.5%	183,519	28.8%	10,034	1.6%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
400,962	227,957	56.9%	78,984	19.7%	87,482	21.8%	6,539	1.6%		

District 3




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
636,779	-1,823	-0.3%	287,233	45.1%	155,993	24.5%	183,519	28.8%	10,034	1.6%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
400,962	227,957	56.9%	78,984	19.7%	87,482	21.8%	6,539	1.6%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 4




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
640,604	2,002	0.3%	154,324	24.1%	246,977	38.6%	227,623	35.5%	11,680	1.8%
Total CVAP										
406,601	136,639	33.6%	113,995	28.0%	146,581	36.1%	9,386	2.3%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 4




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
640,604	2,002	0.3%	154,324	24.1%	246,977	38.6%	227,623	35.5%	11,680	1.8%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
406,601	136,639	33.6%	113,995	28.0%	146,581	36.1%	9,386	2.3%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 4




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
640,604	2,002	0.3%	154,324	24.1%	246,977	38.6%	227,623	35.5%	11,680	1.8%
Total CVAP										
406,601	136,639	33.6%	113,995	28.0%	146,581	36.1%	9,386	2.3%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population

A horizontal bar chart titled 'Citizen Voting Age Population'. The chart displays the percentage of the population for five racial and ethnic groups. The bars are arranged from top to bottom: Other (grey, 33%), Latino (green, 28%), Asian (blue, 36%), Black (red, 2%), and White (light blue, 3%). The y-axis labels are on the left, and the percentage values are on the right of each bar.


Race/Ethnicity	Percentage
Other %	33%
Latino %	28%
Asian %	36%
Black %	2%
White %	3%

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
640,604	2,002	0.3%	154,324	24.1%	246,977	38.6%	227,623	35.5%	11,680	1.8%
Total CVAP										
	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
406,601	136,639	33.6%	113,995	28.0%	146,581	36.1%	9,386	2.3%		


District 5



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
635,380	-3,222	-0.5%	431,612	67.9%	122,984	19.4%	73,405	11.6%	7,379	1.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
455,816	339,115	74.4%	62,253	13.7%	47,545	10.4%	6,903	1.5%		




District 5





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
635,380	-3,222	-0.5%	431,612	67.9%	122,984	19.4%	73,405	11.6%	7,379	1.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %
455,816	339,115	74.4%	62,253	13.7%	47,545	10.4%	6,903	1.5%		

2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 5




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
635,380	-3,222	-0.5%	431,612	67.9%	122,984	19.4%	73,405	11.6%	7,379	1.2%
Total CVAP										
455,816	339,115	74.4%	62,253	13.7%	47,545	10.4%	6,903	1.5%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 5




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
635,380	-3,222	-0.5%	431,612	67.9%	122,984	19.4%	73,405	11.6%	7,379	1.2%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
455,816	339,115	74.4%	62,253	13.7%	47,545	10.4%	6,903		1.5%	


2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population



OC BOE Submission 9 Revised 12/22/21





TOTAL Population:	3,193,010
Mean Target Population:	638,602
Largest Positive Deviation:	2,850
Largest Negative Deviation:	-3,222
Overall Range in Deviation:	6,072
Overall Range in Deviation Percentage:	0.95

District	TOTAL Population	Target Population	Target Deviation	Target Deviation (%)
1	638,795	638,602	193	0.03
2	641,452	638,602	2,850	0.45
3	636,779	638,602	-1,823	-0.29
4	640,604	638,602	2,002	0.31
5	635,380	638,602	-3,222	-0.50

Total Population by Race/Ethnicity

District	Total Population	NH White	Hispanic	NH Black	NH Asian	NH Other
1	638,795	92,865 14.54%	431,450 67.54%	10,576 1.66%	86,841 13.59%	17,063 2.67%
2	641,452	330,683 51.55%	132,877 20.72%	10,274 1.60%	127,879 19.94%	39,739 6.19%
3	636,779	253,082 39.74%	155,993 24.50%	10,034 1.58%	183,519 28.82%	34,151 5.36%
4	640,604	130,839 20.42%	246,977 38.55%	11,680 1.82%	227,623 35.53%	23,485 3.68%
5	635,380	392,659 61.80%	122,984 19.36%	7,379 1.16%	73,405 11.55%	38,953 6.13%
Total	3,193,010	1,200,128	1,090,281	49,943	699,267	6,367

Citizen Voting Age Population

District	Total CVAP	NH White CVAP	Hispanic CVAP	NH Black CVAP	NH Asian CVAP	NH Other CVAP
1	345,222	90,655 26.26%	183,494 53.15%	7,882 2.28%	56,395 16.34%	6,796 1.97%
2	448,425	283,832 63.30%	69,862 15.58%	8,503 1.90%	71,048 15.84%	15,180 3.38%
3	399,360	216,568 54.23%	78,944 19.77%	6,576 1.65%	86,618 21.69%	10,654 2.66%
4	405,829	126,200 31.10%	113,156 27.88%	9,391 2.31%	146,627 36.13%	10,455 2.58%
5	461,563	328,030 71.07%	62,484 13.54%	6,991 1.51%	50,629 10.97%	13,429 2.91%
Total	2,060,399	1,045,285	507,940	39,343	411,317	56,514

User:
Plan Name: OC BOE 9B Updated Submission
Plan Type:

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Thursday, January 20, 2022

4:47 PM

Unified School	District	PPA_Population	%
Brea-Olinda Unified School District	3	45,568	99.6
Brea-Olinda Unified School District	4	163	0.4
Capistrano Unified School District	5	363,149	100.0
Garden Grove Unified School District	1	45,948	16.6
Garden Grove Unified School District	2	24,774	9.0
Garden Grove Unified School District	4	205,401	74.4
Irvine Unified School District	1	0	0.0
Irvine Unified School District	2	102,043	37.4
Irvine Unified School District	3	170,921	62.6
Irvine Unified School District	5	56	0.0
Laguna Beach Unified School District	2	71	0.2
Laguna Beach Unified School District	5	29,972	99.8

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE 9B Updated Submissi

Unified School	District	PPA_Population	%
Los Alamitos Unified School District	2	50,937	100.0
Los Alamitos Unified School District	4	0	0.0
Newport-Mesa Unified School District	1	7	0.0
Newport-Mesa Unified School District	2	171,296	87.0
Newport-Mesa Unified School District	5	25,591	13.0
Orange Unified School District	1	45,280	20.2
Orange Unified School District	3	178,776	79.8
Orange Unified School District	5	0	0.0
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis	1	65	0.0
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis	3	162,567	100.0
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	2	4	0.0
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	3	715	0.3
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	5	216,604	99.7
Santa Ana Unified School District	1	235,958	96.0
Santa Ana Unified School District	2	9,906	4.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE 9B Updated Submissi

Unified School	District	PPA_Population n	%
Tustin Unified School District	1	74,319	52.0
Tustin Unified School District	2	2,549	1.8
Tustin Unified School District	3	65,935	46.2

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Unified School	-- Listed by District	PPA_Population	%
District 1			
Garden Grove Unified School District (part)	45,948	16.6	
Irvine Unified School District (part)	0	0.0	
Newport-Mesa Unified School District (part)	7	0.0	
Orange Unified School District (part)	45,280	20.2	
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis (part)	65	0.0	
Santa Ana Unified School District (part)	235,958	96.0	
Tustin Unified School District (part)	74,319	52.0	
District 1 Totals	401,577		

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE 9B Updated Submissi

District 2

	PPA_Population	%
Garden Grove Unified School District (part)	24,774	9.0
Irvine Unified School District (part)	102,043	37.4
Laguna Beach Unified School District (part)	71	0.2
Los Alamitos Unified School District (part)	50,937	100.0
Newport-Mesa Unified School District (part)	171,296	87.0
Saddleback Valley Unified School District (part)	4	0.0
Santa Ana Unified School District (part)	9,906	4.0
Tustin Unified School District (part)	2,549	1.8

District 2 Totals

361,580

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

	PPA_Population	%
--	----------------	---

District 3

Brea-Olinda Unified School District (part)	45,568	99.6
Irvine Unified School District (part)	170,921	62.6
Orange Unified School District (part)	178,776	79.8
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis (part)	162,567	100.0
Saddleback Valley Unified School District (part)	715	0.3
Tustin Unified School District (part)	65,935	46.2

District 3 Totals

624,482

District 4

Brea-Olinda Unified School District (part)	163	0.4
Garden Grove Unified School District (part)	205,401	74.4
Los Alamitos Unified School District (part)	0	0.0

District 4 Totals

205,564

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE 9B Updated Submissi

	PPA_Population	%
	n	

District 5


Capistrano Unified School District	363,149	100.0
Irvine Unified School District (part)	56	0.0
Laguna Beach Unified School District (part)	29,972	99.8
Newport-Mesa Unified School District (part)	25,591	13.0
Orange Unified School District (part)	0	0.0
Saddleback Valley Unified School District (part)	216,604	99.7

District 5 Totals

635,372

Summary Statistics

Number of Unified School not split	1
Number of Unified School split	11
Number of Unified School split in 2	5
Number of Unified School split in 3	5
Number of Unified School split in 4	1
Total number of splits	29



User:

Plan Name: OC BOE 9B Updated Submission

Plan Type:

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Thursday, January 20, 2022

4:37 PM

Census Place	District	PPA_Population	%
Aliso Viejo	5	52,222	100.0
Anaheim	1	229,182	65.9
Anaheim	3	73,266	21.1
Anaheim	4	45,305	13.0
Brea	3	47,397	100.0
Buena Park	4	84,187	100.0
Costa Mesa	2	112,139	100.0
Coto de Caza	5	14,723	100.0
Cypress	2	50,235	100.0
Dana Point	5	33,144	100.0
Fountain Valley	2	57,120	100.0
Fullerton	3	15,988	11.1
Fullerton	4	127,942	88.9
Garden Grove	1	39,292	22.8
Garden Grove	4	133,054	77.2
Huntington Beach	2	199,033	100.0
Irvine	2	113,702	36.9
Irvine	3	194,256	63.1
La Habra	3	8,237	13.0
La Habra	4	54,997	87.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE 9B Updated Submissi

Census Place	District	PPA_Population	%
La Palma	4	15,597	100.0
Ladera Ranch	5	26,188	100.0
Laguna Beach	5	23,061	100.0
Laguna Hills	5	31,399	100.0
Laguna Niguel	5	64,417	100.0
Laguna Woods	5	17,658	100.0
Lake Forest	5	85,965	100.0
Las Flores	5	6,004	100.0
Los Alamitos	2	11,795	100.0
Midway City	4	8,845	100.0
Mission Viejo	5	93,760	100.0
Modjeska	3	632	100.0
Newport Beach	2	59,165	69.3
Newport Beach	5	26,173	30.7
North Tustin	1	10,206	39.6
North Tustin	3	15,543	60.4
Orange	1	25,112	17.9
Orange	3	115,079	82.1
Placentia	3	51,925	100.0
Rancho Mission Viejo	5	10,385	100.0
Rancho Santa Margarita	5	48,000	100.0
Rossmoor	2	10,634	100.0
San Clemente	5	64,384	100.0
San Juan Capistrano	5	35,271	100.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE 9B Updated Submissi

Census Place	District	PPA_Population	%
Santa Ana	1	273,011	87.7
Santa Ana	4	38,382	12.3
Seal Beach	2	25,283	100.0
Silverado	3	932	100.0
Stanton	4	38,067	100.0
Trabuco Canyon	3	297	29.1
Trabuco Canyon	5	723	70.9
Tustin	1	52,587	65.4
Tustin	3	27,825	34.6
Villa Park	3	5,850	100.0
Westminster	4	91,083	100.0
Williams Canyon	3	93	100.0
Yorba Linda	3	68,415	100.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE 9B Updated Submissi

Census Place	-- Listed by District		
	PPA_Populatio	n	%
District 1			
Anaheim (part)	229,182		65.9
Garden Grove (part)	39,292		22.8
North Tustin (part)	10,206		39.6
Orange (part)	25,112		17.9
Santa Ana (part)	273,011		87.7
Tustin (part)	52,587		65.4
District 1 Totals	629,390		
District 2			
Costa Mesa	112,139		100.0
Cypress	50,235		100.0
Fountain Valley	57,120		100.0
Huntington Beach	199,033		100.0
Irvine (part)	113,702		36.9
Los Alamitos	11,795		100.0
Newport Beach (part)	59,165		69.3
Rossmoor	10,634		100.0
Seal Beach	25,283		100.0
District 2 Totals	639,106		

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE 9B Updated Submissi

District 3

	PPA_Population	%
Anaheim (part)	73,266	21.1
Brea	47,397	100.0
Fullerton (part)	15,988	11.1
Irvine (part)	194,256	63.1
La Habra (part)	8,237	13.0
Modjeska	632	100.0
North Tustin (part)	15,543	60.4
Orange (part)	115,079	82.1
Placentia	51,925	100.0
Silverado	932	100.0
Trabuco Canyon (part)	297	29.1
Tustin (part)	27,825	34.6
Villa Park	5,850	100.0
Williams Canyon	93	100.0
Yorba Linda	68,415	100.0

District 3 Totals

625,735

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

	PPA_Population	%
District 4		
Anaheim (part)	45,305	13.0
Buena Park	84,187	100.0
Fullerton (part)	127,942	88.9
Garden Grove (part)	133,054	77.2
La Habra (part)	54,997	87.0
La Palma	15,597	100.0
Midway City	8,845	100.0
Santa Ana (part)	38,382	12.3
Stanton	38,067	100.0
Westminster	91,083	100.0
District 4 Totals	637,459	

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC BOE 9B Updated Submissi

District 5


	PPA_Population	%
Aliso Viejo	52,222	100.0
Coto de Caza	14,723	100.0
Dana Point	33,144	100.0
Ladera Ranch	26,188	100.0
Laguna Beach	23,061	100.0
Laguna Hills	31,399	100.0
Laguna Niguel	64,417	100.0
Laguna Woods	17,658	100.0
Lake Forest	85,965	100.0
Las Flores	6,004	100.0
Mission Viejo	93,760	100.0
Newport Beach (part)	26,173	30.7
Rancho Mission Viejo	10,385	100.0
Rancho Santa Margarita	48,000	100.0
San Clemente	64,384	100.0
San Juan Capistrano	35,271	100.0
Trabuco Canyon (part)	723	70.9

District 5 Totals

633,477


Summary Statistics


Number of Census Place not split	34
Number of Census Place split	11
Number of Census Place split in 2	10
Number of Census Place split in 3	1
Total number of splits	23





18








**REDISTRICTING
PARTNERS**

OC Board of Education Draft Plan C - USD Overlay







REDISTRICTING PARTNERS

OC Board of Education

Draft Plan C - HSD Overlay






2020 Census

	1	2	3	4	5
Population	620,484	642,821	659,873	658,622	611,210
Deviation	-18,118	4,219	21,271	20,020	-27,392
Deviation %	-2.8%	0.7%	3.3%	3.1%	-4.3%
Other	98,237	168,073	387,399	287,262	412,548
Other %	15.8%	26.1%	58.7%	43.6%	67.5%
Latino	431,651	214,820	130,323	192,159	121,328
Latino %	69.6%	33.4%	19.7%	29.2%	19.9%
Asian	80,578	248,255	131,568	168,762	70,104
Asian %	13.0%	38.6%	19.9%	25.6%	11.5%
Black	10,018	11,673	10,583	10,439	7,230
Black %	1.6%	1.8%	1.6%	1.6%	1.2%

Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)

	1	2	3	4	5
Total CVAP	329,080	419,886	463,517	415,469	437,724
Other CVAP	86,431	148,844	313,516	230,672	324,351
Other CVAP %	26.3%	35.4%	67.6%	55.5%	74.1%
Latino CVAP	182,690	101,316	69,539	96,138	61,232
Latino CVAP %	55.5%	24.1%	15.0%	23.1%	14.0%
Asian CVAP	52,726	160,573	71,772	81,051	45,270
Asian CVAP %	16.0%	38.2%	15.5%	19.5%	10.3%
Black CVAP	7,233	9,153	8,690	7,608	6,871
Black CVAP %	2.2%	2.2%	1.9%	1.8%	1.6%


District 1



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
620,484	-18,118	-2.8%	98,237	15.8%	431,651	69.6%	80,578	13.0%	10,018	1.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
329,080	86,431	26.3%	182,690	55.5%	52,726	16.0%	7,233	2.2%		

2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population






REDISTRICTING
PARTNERS

OC Board of Education
Draft Plan C - USD Overlay


District 1




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
620,484	-18,118	-2.8%	98,237	15.8%	431,651	69.6%	80,578	13.0%	10,018	1.6%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
329,080	86,431	26.3%	182,690	55.5%	52,726	16.0%	7,233	2.2%		

2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population




District 1




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
620,484	-18,118	-2.8%	98,237	15.8%	431,651	69.6%	80,578	13.0%	10,018	1.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
329,080	86,431	26.3%	182,690	55.5%	52,726	16.0%	7,233	2.2%		


2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




District 1



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
620,484	-18,118	-2.8%	98,237	15.8%	431,651	69.6%	80,578	13.0%	10,018	1.6%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
329,080	86,431	26.3%	182,690	55.5%	52,726	16.0%	7,233	2.2%		

District 2




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
642,821	4,219	0.7%	168,073	26.1%	214,820	33.4%	248,255	38.6%	11,673	1.8%
Total CVAP										
419,886	148,844	35.4%	101,316	24.1%	160,573	38.2%	9,153	2.2%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 2




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
642,821	4,219	0.7%	168,073	26.1%	214,820	33.4%	248,255	38.6%	11,673	1.8%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
419,886	148,844	35.4%	101,316	24.1%	160,573	38.2%	9,153	2.2%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 2




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
642,821	4,219	0.7%	168,073	26.1%	214,820	33.4%	248,255	38.6%	11,673	1.8%
Total CVAP										
419,886	148,844	35.4%	101,316	24.1%	160,573	38.2%	9,153	2.2%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 2




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
642,821	4,219	0.7%	168,073	26.1%	214,820	33.4%	248,255	38.6%	11,673	1.8%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
419,886	148,844	35.4%	101,316	24.1%	160,573	38.2%	9,153	2.2%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 3




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
659,873	21,271	3.3%	387,399	58.7%	130,323	19.7%	131,568	19.9%	10,583	1.6%
Total CVAP										
463,517	313,516	67.6%	67.6%	69,539	15.0%	71,772	15.5%	8,690	1.9%	


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 3




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
659,873	21,271	3.3%	387,399	58.7%	130,323	19.7%	131,568	19.9%	10,583	1.6%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
463,517	313,516	67.6%	69,539	15.0%	71,772	15.5%	8,690	1.9%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population




District 3




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
659,873	21,271	3.3%	387,399	58.7%	130,323	19.7%	131,568	19.9%	10,583	1.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
463,517	313,516	67.6%	69,539	15.0%	71,772	15.5%	8,690	1.9%		

2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population







REDISTRICTING
PARTNERS

OC Board of Education Draft Plan C - Cities Overlay


District 3



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
659,873	21,271	3.3%	387,399	58.7%	130,323	19.7%	131,568	19.9%	10,583	1.6%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
463,517	313,516	67.6%	69,539	15.0%	71,772	15.5%	8,690	1.9%		


District 4



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population





Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
658,622	20,020	3.1%	287,262	43.6%	192,159	29.2%	168,762	25.6%	10,439	1.6%
Total CVAP										
415,469	230,672	55.5%	96,138	23.1%	81,051	19.5%	7,608	1.8%		

2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
658,622	20,020	3.1%	287,262	43.6%	192,159	29.2%	168,762	25.6%	10,439	1.6%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
415,469	250,672	55.5%	96,138	23.1%	81,051	19.5%	7,608	1.8%		


District 4



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
658,622	20,020	3.1%	287,262	43.6%	192,159	29.2%	168,762	25.6%	10,439	1.6%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
415,469	230,672	55.5%	96,138	23.1%	81,051	19.5%	7,608	1.8%		

District 4




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
658,622	20,020	3.1%	287,262	43.6%	192,159	29.2%	168,762	25.6%	10,439	1.6%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
415,469	230,672	55.5%	96,138	23.1%	81,051	19.5%	7,608	1.8%		


2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




District 5



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
611,210	-27,392	-4.3%	412,548	67.5%	121,328	19.9%	70,104	11.5%	7,230	1.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
437,724	324,351	74.1%	61,232	14.0%	45,270	10.3%	6,871	1.6%		




District 5



2020 Census




Citizen Voting Age Population



Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
611,210	-27,392	-4.3%	412,548	67.5%	121,328	19.9%	70,104	11.5%	7,230	1.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
437,724	324,351	74.1%	61,232	14.0%	45,270	10.3%	6,871	1.6%		




District 5




Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
611,210	-27,392	-4.3%	412,548	67.5%	121,328	19.9%	70,104	11.5%	7,230	1.2%
Total CVAP	Other CVAP	Other CVAP %	Latino CVAP	Latino CVAP %	Asian CVAP	Asian CVAP %	Black CVAP	Black CVAP %		
437,724	324,351	74.1%	61,232	14.0%	45,270	10.3%	6,871	1.6%		


2020 Census



Citizen Voting Age Population



District 5




Camp Pendleton Main Side

Population	Deviation	Deviation %	Other	Other %	Latino	Latino %	Asian	Asian %	Black	Black %
611,210	-27,392	-4.3%	412,548	67.5%	121,328	19.9%	70,104	11.5%	7,230	1.2%
Total CVAP Other CVAP Other CVAP % Latino CVAP Latino CVAP % Asian CVAP Asian CVAP % Black CVAP Black CVAP %										
437,724	324,351	74.1%	61,232	14.0%	45,270	10.3%	6,871	1.6%		

2020 Census

Citizen Voting Age Population



74%

Other %

14%

Latino %

10%

Asian %

1%

Black %



User:

Plan Name: OC COE RP Plan C

Plan Type:

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Friday, January 14, 2022

3:30 PM

Unified School	District	PPA_Population	%
Brea-Olinda Unified School District	4	43,078	100.0
Capistrano Unified School District	5	361,882	100.0
Garden Grove Unified School District	1	54,886	19.8
Garden Grove Unified School District	2	221,730	80.2
Irvine Unified School District	3	172,527	63.2
Irvine Unified School District	4	100,314	36.8
Laguna Beach Unified School District	5	28,256	100.0
Los Alamitos Unified School District	3	49,955	100.0
Newport-Mesa Unified School District	3	196,117	100.0
Orange Unified School District	1	48,021	21.4
Orange Unified School District	4	176,603	78.6
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District	1	14,561	8.8

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC COE RP Plan C

Unified School	District	PPA_Population	%
		n	
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis	4	151,115	91.2
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	5	221,072	100.0
Santa Ana Unified School District	1	243,749	100.0
Tustin Unified School District	1	14,779	10.3
Tustin Unified School District	4	128,803	89.7

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC COE RP Plan C

Unified School	-- Listed by District		
	PPA_Population	%	
	n		
District 1			
Garden Grove Unified School District (part)	54,886	19.8	
Orange Unified School District (part)	48,021	21.4	
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis (part)	14,561	8.8	
Santa Ana Unified School District	243,749	100.0	
Tustin Unified School District (part)	14,779	10.3	
District 1 Totals	375,996		
District 2			
Garden Grove Unified School District (part)	221,730	80.2	
District 2 Totals	221,730		

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

	PPA_Population	%
--	----------------	---

District 3

Irvine Unified School District (part)	172,527	63.2
Los Alamitos Unified School District	49,955	100.0
Newport-Mesa Unified School District	196,117	100.0

District 3 Totals 418,599

District 4

Brea-Olinda Unified School District	43,078	100.0
Irvine Unified School District (part)	100,314	36.8
Orange Unified School District (part)	176,603	78.6
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Dis (part)	151,115	91.2
Tustin Unified School District (part)	128,803	89.7

District 4 Totals 599,913

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

	PPA_Population	%
	n	

District 5


Capistrano Unified School District	361,882	100.0
Laguna Beach Unified School District	28,256	100.0
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	221,072	100.0


District 5 Totals

611,210

Summary Statistics

Number of Unified School not split	7
Number of Unified School split	5
Number of Unified School split in 2	5
Total number of splits	10





User:

Plan Name: OC COE RP Plan C

Plan Type:

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Thursday, January 20, 2022

5:27 PM

Census Place	District	PPA_Population	%
Aliso Viejo	5	52,222	100.0
Anaheim	1	220,290	63.4
Anaheim	2	63,405	18.2
Anaheim	4	64,058	18.4
Brea	4	47,397	100.0
Buena Park	2	84,187	100.0
Costa Mesa	1	581	0.5
Costa Mesa	3	111,558	99.5
Coto de Caza	5	14,723	100.0
Cypress	2	5,394	10.7
Cypress	3	44,841	89.3
Dana Point	5	33,144	100.0
Fountain Valley	2	57,120	100.0
Fullerton	1	35,063	24.4
Fullerton	2	92,900	64.6
Fullerton	4	15,967	11.1
Garden Grove	1	40,129	23.3
Garden Grove	2	132,217	76.7
Garden Grove	3	0	0.0
Huntington Beach	2	480	0.2

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Census Place	District	PPA_Population	%
Huntington Beach	3	198,553	99.8
Irvine	1	8,986	2.9
Irvine	3	168,957	54.9
Irvine	4	129,714	42.1
Irvine	5	301	0.1
La Habra	2	8,462	13.4
La Habra	4	54,772	86.6
La Palma	2	15,597	100.0
Ladera Ranch	5	26,188	100.0
Laguna Beach	5	23,061	100.0
Laguna Hills	5	31,399	100.0
Laguna Niguel	5	64,417	100.0
Laguna Woods	5	17,658	100.0
Lake Forest	3	0	0.0
Lake Forest	5	85,965	100.0
Las Flores	5	6,004	100.0
Los Alamitos	2	0	0.0
Los Alamitos	3	11,795	100.0
Midway City	2	8,845	100.0
Mission Viejo	5	93,760	100.0
Modjeska	4	632	100.0
Modjeska	5	0	0.0
Newport Beach	1	208	0.2
Newport Beach	3	83,722	98.1

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Census Place	District	PPA_Population	%
Newport Beach	5	1,408	1.7
North Tustin	4	25,749	100.0
Orange	1	34,565	24.7
Orange	4	105,626	75.3
Placentia	1	4,811	9.3
Placentia	4	47,114	90.7
Rancho Mission Viejo	5	10,385	100.0
Rancho Santa Margarita	5	48,000	100.0
Rossmore	3	10,634	100.0
San Clemente	5	64,384	100.0
San Juan Capistrano	5	35,271	100.0
Santa Ana	1	265,616	85.3
Santa Ana	2	32,514	10.4
Santa Ana	4	13,263	4.3
Seal Beach	3	25,283	100.0
Silverado	4	932	100.0
Stanton	2	38,067	100.0
Trabuco Canyon	4	3	0.3
Trabuco Canyon	5	1,017	99.7
Tustin	1	8,849	11.0
Tustin	3	3,570	4.4
Tustin	4	67,993	84.6
Villa Park	4	5,850	100.0
Westminster	2	91,083	100.0

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

Census Place	District	PPA_Population	%
		n	
Westminster	3	0	0.0
Williams Canyon	4	93	100.0
Yorba Linda	4	68,415	100.0

Census Place	-- Listed by District		
	PPA_Population	%	
District 1			
Anaheim (part)	220,290	63.4	
Costa Mesa (part)	581	0.5	
Fullerton (part)	35,063	24.4	
Garden Grove (part)	40,129	23.3	
Irvine (part)	8,986	2.9	
Newport Beach (part)	208	0.2	
Orange (part)	34,565	24.7	
Placentia (part)	4,811	9.3	
Santa Ana (part)	265,616	85.3	
Tustin (part)	8,849	11.0	
District 1 Totals	619,098		

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC COE RP Plan C

	PPA_Population	%
District 2		
Anaheim (part)	63,405	18.2
Buena Park	84,187	100.0
Cypress (part)	5,394	10.7
Fountain Valley	57,120	100.0
Fullerton (part)	92,900	64.6
Garden Grove (part)	132,217	76.7
Huntington Beach (part)	480	0.2
La Habra (part)	8,462	13.4
La Palma	15,597	100.0
Los Alamitos (part)	0	0.0
Midway City	8,845	100.0
Santa Ana (part)	32,514	10.4
Stanton	38,067	100.0
Westminster (part)	91,083	100.0
District 2 Totals	630,271	

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

District 3

	PPA_Population	%
Costa Mesa (part)	111,558	99.5
Cypress (part)	44,841	89.3
Garden Grove (part)	0	0.0
Huntington Beach (part)	198,553	99.8
Irvine (part)	168,957	54.9
Lake Forest (part)	0	0.0
Los Alamitos (part)	11,795	100.0
Newport Beach (part)	83,722	98.1
Rossmore	10,634	100.0
Seal Beach	25,283	100.0
Tustin (part)	3,570	4.4
Westminster (part)	0	0.0

District 3 Totals

658,913

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

OC COE RP Plan C

	PPA_Population	%
District 4		
Anaheim (part)	64,058	18.4
Brea	47,397	100.0
Fullerton (part)	15,967	11.1
Irvine (part)	129,714	42.1
La Habra (part)	54,772	86.6
Modjeska (part)	632	100.0
North Tustin	25,749	100.0
Orange (part)	105,626	75.3
Placentia (part)	47,114	90.7
Santa Ana (part)	13,263	4.3
Silverado	932	100.0
Trabuco Canyon (part)	3	0.3
Tustin (part)	67,993	84.6
Villa Park	5,850	100.0
Williams Canyon	93	100.0
Yorba Linda	68,415	100.0

District 4 Totals 647,578

Communities of Interest (Landscape, 11x8.5)

PPA_Population %


District 5

Aliso Viejo	52,222	100.0
Coto de Caza	14,723	100.0
Dana Point	33,144	100.0
Irvine (part)	301	0.1
Ladera Ranch	26,188	100.0
Laguna Beach	23,061	100.0
Laguna Hills	31,399	100.0
Laguna Niguel	64,417	100.0
Laguna Woods	17,658	100.0
Lake Forest (part)	85,965	100.0
Las Flores	6,004	100.0
Mission Viejo	93,760	100.0
Modjeska (part)	0	0.0
Newport Beach (part)	1,408	1.7
Rancho Mission Viejo	10,385	100.0
Rancho Santa Margarita	48,000	100.0
San Clemente	64,384	100.0
San Juan Capistrano	35,271	100.0
Trabuco Canyon (part)	1,017	99.7

District 5 Totals 609,307

Summary Statistics

Number of Census Place not split	27
Number of Census Place split	18
Number of Census Place split in 2	11
Number of Census Place split in 3	6
Number of Census Place split in 4	1
Total number of splits	44



19

From: [KIM AMADORE](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: District 5
Date: Thursday, January 13, 2022 3:14:01 PM

Hello!

It has come to my attention that the Board of Education wishes to move the city of Aliso Viejo out of District 5 and into a newly formed District 3.

The vast majority of Aliso Viejo students attend schools in the Capistrano Unified School district which is in District 5; as such, by switching the city out of District 5, the Board will be splitting a community of interest which violates a redistricting principle.

Additionally, if the boundary is changed, Aliso Viejo voters would not be able to vote this year for a school board candidate because Mr. Williams is not up for re-election until 2024. This would violate the principle to minimize voters shifted to different election years as Aliso Viejo voters planned to vote for a candidate in 2022.

Please keep Aliso Viejo in District 5!

From: [Mina Carson](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Redistricting Issue
Date: Thursday, January 13, 2022 12:34:31 PM

Dear Redistricting Committee,

As a resident of the Capistrano Unified School District, I am opposed to moving the city of Aliso Viejo out of District 5 and into the new District 3.

Although my family lives in Laguna Niguel, my son attends school in Aliso Viejo. Separating Aliso out of the Capo Unified District on the OCDE districting maps would mean that my OC Board Trustee would not represent the area where my child attends school. Overall taking the city of Aliso Viejo out of District 5, would be splitting up a community of interest which violates a redistricting principle.

Also, if the boundary is changed, Aliso Viejo voters would not be able to vote this year for a school board candidate because Mr. Williams is not up for re-election until 2024. This would violate the principle to minimize voters shifted to different election years as Aliso Viejo voters planned to vote for a candidate in 2022.

I urge you to please keep Aliso Viejo in District 5.

Thank you.

Mina Carson

Laguna Niguel resident and parent

From: [Nancy Colocino](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Redistricting OC Board of Education comment
Date: Thursday, January 13, 2022 12:25:09 PM

I am concerned that the redistricting map #5 for OC Board of Education moves Laguna Woods and parts of Laguna Hills and Lake Forest to District 3.

This will prevent the moved citizens from voting for their representative until 2024 - not fair.

Also, this action splits off parts of Laguna Woods and Laguna Hills that have common needs and interests.

Nancy Colocino
19 Mariposa
Irvine, CA 92604

From: [gina kessler](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: upcoming vote to move Aliso Viejo
Date: Thursday, January 13, 2022 12:47:36 PM

Hello,

Recently I found out the Board of Education wants to move my home city of Aliso Viejo out of District 5 into District 3.

All three of our children attended schools in the Capistrano Unified District, which is in District 5. The majority of students in Capo are from Aliso Viejo. By switching our city out of District 5, the Board will be splitting a community of interest which violates a redistricting principle.

And if the boundary is changed, Aliso Viejo voters would not be able to vote this year for a school board candidate because Mr. Williams is not up for re-election until 2024. This would violate the principle to minimize voters shifted to different election years as Aliso Viejo voters planned to vote for a candidate in 2022.

As a parent and resident of Aliso Viejo, Please keep Aliso Viejo in District 5!

Thank you,

Gina Kessler

From: [Annie Krinsky](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Redistricting of OC Board of Education
Date: Thursday, January 13, 2022 4:29:19 PM

Dear Committee Members,

I am writing to voice my serious concerns about the new district lines under consideration. I urge you to reconsider the selection of Map 5 and keep Laguna Woods and all of Laguna Hills in District 5.

Map 5 splits Laguna Hills between districts and splits off Laguna Woods from part of Laguna Hills. It would move these areas from District 5 to District 3. The voters in these areas will also be deprived of an opportunity to vote this year. That is because Ken Williams, representing District 3, will not be up for re-election until 2024. This would violate the principle that we should "minimize voters shifted to different election years."

Please reconsider and keep Laguna Woods and all of Laguna Hills in District 5. I feel this is critical.

Thank you for your consideration.

Anne Krinsky

Orange County resident

From: veronicayap@cox.net
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Keep Aliso Viejo in District 5
Date: Thursday, January 13, 2022 3:15:04 PM

Hello,

My name is Veronica Yap and I am an Aliso Viejo Resident with 2 children in our Aliso Viejo schools. It has come to my attention that the Board of Education is looking to move Aliso Viejo out of District 5 where all the Capistrano Unified School District (CUSD) schools are. Please do not do this as this does not make sense that only Aliso Viejo would not be in district 5 along with all of the other schools of CUSD.

This will also affect us voting for a school board candidate this year and move our vote to 2024. Please keep Aliso Viejo in District 5 so we can keep all the CUSD schools together. Thank you very much for your time and please don't move us out of District 5.

Veronica Yap

From: [Tiffany Ackley](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Aliso Viejo - District 5
Date: Friday, January 14, 2022 12:37:39 PM

Dear Mr. Marinier:

It has come to my attention that the Board of Education wishes to move the city of Aliso Viejo out of District 5 and into a newly formed District 3. This is a mistake.

The vast majority of Aliso Viejo students attend schools in the Capistrano Unified School district which is in District 5; as such, by switching the city out of District 5, the Board will be splitting a community of interest which violates a redistricting principle. It would also remove us from other southern districts such as Laguna Beach Unified and Saddleback Valley Unified.

Additionally, if the boundary is changed, Aliso Viejo voters would not be able to vote this year for a school board candidate because Mr. Williams is not up for re-election until 2024. This would violate the principle to minimize voters shifted to different election years as Aliso Viejo voters planned to vote for a candidate in 2022.

Please keep Aliso Viejo in District 5.

Thank you.

Tiffany Ackley

Aliso Viejo Councilmember

Confidential Communications: This email and any files or attachments transmitted with it may contain privileged or otherwise confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, or believe that you may have received this communication in error, please advise the sender via reply email and immediately delete the email you received.

From: [Annie Miller](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Aliso Viejo District Change
Date: Friday, January 14, 2022 10:13:20 AM

To Whom it May Concern,

It has come to my attention that the Board of Education wishes to move the city of Aliso Viejo out of District 5 and into a newly formed District 3.

The vast majority of Aliso Viejo students attend schools in the Capistrano Unified School district which is in District 5; as such, by switching the city out of District 5, the Board will be splitting a community of interest which violates a redistricting principle.

Additionally, if the boundary is changed, Aliso Viejo voters would not be able to vote this year for a school board candidate because Mr. Williams is not up for re-election until 2024. This would violate the principle to minimize voters shifted to different election years as Aliso Viejo voters planned to vote for a candidate in 2022.

Please keep Aliso Viejo in District 5!

Annie Miller

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Louise Adler](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Date: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 11:57:30 AM

Option 9B is a great map because it keeps Laguna Hills and Laguna Woods together in the same voting district. And it keeps all of the south county school districts together.

--

Louise Adler, She/Her

From: [Andrea Alexander](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Redistricting maps
Date: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 12:44:55 PM

To: County Committee on School District Organization
Attn: Mr. Howard Mariner, Secretary to the Committee

I strongly support Map 9B because it will unite the two Latino school districts. Most importantly it will create a federally mandated voting rights population in and around Santa Ana, and also create a district of a predominately Asian population centered in North Orange County. Map 9B has the lowest level of deviation at 1% which speaks to equitable representation.

Please, I implore you to Vote for Map 9B,

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Andrea Alexander
Resident of Lake Forest for 34 years.

From: [HERB COHEN](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Redistricting_Map 9B
Date: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 3:25:08 PM

Dear Committee Members -

I would urge you to choose Map 9B for many reasons, but most importantly:

- It has one of the lowest deviations of the proposals, with just under 1% deviation, allowing for all districts to have equitable representation.
- It follows the spirit of drawing a fair map, sticking to school district boundaries, trustee area or school attendance area boundaries, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines such as the Santa Ana River.
- Ethnic groups are well represented in their respective districts.

-herb cohen

City of Lake Forest Resident

From: [Julie Colombero](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: YES on Map Option 9B-Redistricting
Date: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 4:55:20 PM

Dear Mr. Marinier:

I write in support of map option 9B and respectfully ask the committee to support it.

This map keeps the three South County school districts together and allows Aliso Viejo students to remain in the district boundary which covers the Capistrano Unified School District. Unlike the previous map, this one is a fair map as it sticks to school district boundaries and natural dividing lines.

Thank you.

Julie Colombero
Aliso Viejo resident and parent

Julie Colombero
Preferred Pronouns: She/Her

From: [Jeffrey Dimsdale](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: OC Board of Education Redistricting - URGENT
Date: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 4:37:31 PM

I urge adoption of Redistricting Map 9B, revised December 12.22.21. It is the best map for the reasons below:

1. This map keeps most of the school districts into the same trustee areas. This allows for a single representative to serve school districts in a more cohesive fashion.
2. This map has a better concentration of 'like communities' such as Latino and AAPI into single trustee areas that have previously been torn apart. AND especially the school districts with the largest Latino populations are now together in a single district (Santa Ana and Anaheim)
3. The districts are not gerrymandered – rather this map was developed to take into account a fair map, including school district boundaries, school attendance areas, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines... AND they are under 1% deviation in population differences, allowing for all districts to have equitable representation.

I urge the CCDO to support the citizens/community map: 9B revised 12.22.21.

Jeff Dimsdale (he/him)
Kiwanis Club of Costa Mesa
949-929-1201

The information contained in this electronic mail message is confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity named above, and may be privileged. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone 714-557-4031, and delete the original message. Thank you.

From: [WALT LAWSON](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: OC Board of Education - district maps
Date: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 1:03:24 PM

OC Board of Education - District Maps

I am supporting Option 9B - for the selection of District Maps for OC Board of Education.

Think it is important to keep the School Districts in South County together and keeps the Latino Schools in the same District.

Sincerely, Walter Lawson 26531 Alicante Drive Mission Viejo, CA 92691

From: [Carol B. Singer](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Adopt Map 9B revised 12.22.21
Date: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 2:59:28 PM
Importance: High

I urge you to adopt Map 9B Revised 12.22.21 for the following reasons:

- 1. This map keeps most of the school districts into the same trustee areas. This allows for a single representative to serve school districts in a more cohesive fashion.*
- 2. This map has a better concentration of 'like communities' into single trustee areas that have previously been torn apart: Latino and AAPI in particular. AND especially the school districts with the largest Latino populations are now together in a single district (Santa Ana and Anaheim)*
- 3. The districts are not gerrymandered – rather this map was developed to take into account a fair map, including school district boundaries, school attendance areas, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines... AND they are under 1% deviation in population differences, allowing for all districts to have equitable representation.*

I urge the CCDO to support the citizens/community map: 9B revised 12.22.21

Best regards,

Melanie Albert

From: [Carol B. Singer](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Adopt Map 9B revised 12.22.21
Date: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 2:57:56 PM
Importance: High

Dear Commission Members:

I urge you to adopt Map 9B Revised 12.22.21 for the following reasons:

- 1. This map keeps most of the school districts into the same trustee areas. This allows for a single representative to serve school districts in a more cohesive fashion.*
- 2. This map has a better concentration of 'like communities' into single trustee areas that have previously been torn apart: Latino and AAPI in particular. AND especially the school districts with the largest Latino populations are now together in a single district (Santa Ana and Anaheim)*
- 3. The districts are not gerrymandered -- rather this map was developed to take into account a fair map, including school district boundaries, school attendance areas, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines... AND they are under 1% deviation in population differences, allowing for all districts to have equitable representation.*

I urge the CCDO to support the citizens/community map: 9B revised 12.22.21

Best regards,

Norman Albert

From: [Carol B. Singer](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Adopt Map 9B revised 12.22.21
Date: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 2:59:46 PM
Importance: High

Dear Commission Members:

I urge you to adopt Map 9B Revised 12.22.21 for the following reasons:

- 1. This map keeps most of the school districts into the same trustee areas. This allows for a single representative to serve school districts in a more cohesive fashion.*
- 2. This map has a better concentration of 'like communities' into single trustee areas that have previously been torn apart: Latino and AAPI in particular. AND especially the school districts with the largest Latino populations are now together in a single district (Santa Ana and Anaheim)*
- 3. The districts are not gerrymandered – rather this map was developed to take into account a fair map, including school district boundaries, school attendance areas, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines... AND they are under 1% deviation in population differences, allowing for all districts to have equitable representation.*

I urge the CCDO to support the citizens/community map: 9B revised 12.22.21

Best regards,

Rose Albert

From: [Sarah Burt](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: BOE voting districts
Date: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 11:41:53 AM

Good morning Mr. Marinier,

I am writing in support of proposed BOE district 9B. This option keep the three south county districts together and is fairly cohesive with the rest of the districts. It creates districts to fairly represent Latino and Asian populations. It also create one of the lowest deviations, just under 1% which is well under the mandated 10% or less deviation.

Please keep 9B!

Thank you for your time
Sarah Burt

From: [Judy Curry](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Support for Map 9 Revised 12/22/21
Date: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 12:52:43 PM

Dear Mr Marinier:

I am contacting you to lend support for Option 9B where the three South County School Districts are kept together and all regions of the county are well represented. Please approve a just Board of Education map for Orange County and go with Option 9.

Judy Curry
20931 Avenida Amapola
Lake Forest, Ca. 92630

From: [Rona Henry](#)
To: [ocbe](#); [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: CCSDO Meet 1/21/22 Public Comment in favor of Option 9
Date: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 7:50:36 AM

I write in support of Option 9B - which I think does the best job of nesting many school districts together - including the 3 South County school districts.

Here are the other benefits:

- All regions of the county are well represented.
- The two mostly Latino school districts are put together in the same area.
- It creates a Federal Voting Rights mandated district for the growing Latino population in the central part of the county centered in Santa Ana.
- It creates a district where the growing Asian population is the plurality of the eligible voters, centered in Little Saigon and the Korean communities in North Orange County.
- It has one of the lowest deviations of the proposals, with just under 1% deviation, allowing for all districts to have equitable representation.
- It is not gerrymandered, follows the spirit of drawing a fair map, sticking to school district boundaries, trustee area or school attendance area boundaries, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines such as the Santa Ana River.

Please approve Option 9B - the most fair Board of Education map for Orange County.

Rona Henry
Laguna Woods Resident

From: [Ann Owens](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Support letter for Map 9 revised 12/22/21
Date: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 1:30:43 PM

Dear Committee,

As a retired teacher I am writing in support of the revised Map 9 which seems to be the fairest map that has been presented for approval. It does several things which show this intent. One it creates a true Latino district. Two it creates a district where Asians seem to be a growing population and are the majority of voters. Third it follows natural boundaries and does not divide up school districts. Fourth it has one of the lowest deviation rates, just under 1%. You have shown that a true, none gerrymandered map can exist which honors present school district borders. Please approve Map 9 for the Board of Education election. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Ann Owens
former SVUSD teacher

From: [Catherine Palmer](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Please Support Map 9 revised 12/22/21
Date: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 11:46:25 AM

Dear Members of the County Committee on School District Organization ,

I am writing to express my support for the Orange County Board of Education District Map 9, as revised on 12/22/21.

I support Map 9 for the following reasons:

- The three South County School districts are kept together.
- The two most Latino school districts are put together in the same area.
- All regions of the county are well represented.
- It has one of the lowest deviations of all the proposals, with just under 1% deviation, allowing for all districts to have equitable representation.
- It follows the spirit of drawing a fair map, sticking to school district boundaries, trustee area or school attendance area boundaries, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines such as the Santa Ana River.

Please approve a fair Board of Education map for Orange County and implement Map 9 as revised on 12/22/21.

Yours sincerely,

Catherine Palmer
27631 Agrado
Mission Viejo, CA 92692

From: [Carol B. Singer](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Redistricting Map - Adopt Map 9B Revised 12.22.21
Date: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 2:56:27 PM
Importance: High

Dear Commission Members:

I urge you to adopt Map 9B Revised 12.22.21 for the following reasons:

- 1. This map keeps most of the school districts into the same trustee areas. This allows for a single representative to serve school districts in a more cohesive fashion.*
- 2. This map has a better concentration of 'like communities' into single trustee areas that have previously been torn apart: Latino and AAPI in particular. AND especially the school districts with the largest Latino populations are now together in a single district (Santa Ana and Anaheim)*
- 3. The districts are not gerrymandered – rather this map was developed to take into account a fair map, including school district boundaries, school attendance areas, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines... AND they are under 1% deviation in population differences, allowing for all districts to have equitable representation.*

I urge the CCDO to support the citizens/community map: 9B revised 12.22.21

Best regards,

Carol B. Singer

From: [Lori Abbott](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: OC Board of Ed Redistricting Map
Date: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 5:10:15 PM

Hello,

I am writing because I am concerned about the current redistricting map option (map 5) and I feel Map 9 Revised 12/22/21 is a much better option.

I feel it is vitally important to keep the 3 South County school districts together, which the revised Map 9 does. This option really appears to prioritize school district boundaries, and trustee area or school attendance area boundaries, with appropriate natural dividing lines. Just as important, it has one of the lowest deviations of the proposals, with just under 1% deviation, allowing for all districts to have equitable representation.

These concerns, as well as having all regions of the county well represented, should be of high value to the Board of Education and I strongly urge the approval of a fair Board of Education map for Orange County, which is the revised map option 9.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lori Abbott

Current OCBOE District 5 Resident

From: [Rhea Dorn](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Orange County School District Map 9B
Date: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 4:10:02 PM

Members of County Committee on District Organizing (CCDO):

Map 9B, revised December 12.22.21, is the one I am supporting. It's development includes communities from across the county. It is the best map for the reasons below:

1. This map keeps most of the school districts into the same trustee areas. This allows for a single representative to serve school districts in a more cohesive fashion.

2. This map has a better concentration of 'like communities' into single trustee areas that have previously been torn apart: Latino and AAPI in particular. AND especially the school districts with the largest Latino populations are now together in a single district (Santa Ana and Anaheim)

3. The districts are not gerrymandered – rather this map was developed to take into account a fair map, including school district boundaries, school attendance areas, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines... AND they are under 1% deviation in population differences, allowing for all districts to have equitable representation.

I urge the CCDO to support the citizens/community map: 9B revised 12.22.21

*Sincerely:
Rhea Dorn
Irvine, California*

From: [Coleen Scherf-Ghara](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: OC Board of Education Redistricting
Date: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 4:36:13 PM

NOTICE: This email originated from outside of the United States. Please exercise caution when clicking on links or opening attachments unless you recognize the sender and know that the content is safe.

I urge the CCDO to support the OC Board of Education fair districting citizens/community map: 9B revised 12.22.21

Its development included communities from across the county. It is the best map for the reasons below:

1. This map keeps most of the school districts in the same trustee areas. This allows for a single representative to serve school districts in a more cohesive fashion.
2. This map has a better concentration of 'like communities' into single trustee areas that have previously been torn apart: Latino and AAPI in particular, AND especially the school districts with the largest Latino populations are now together in a single district (Santa Ana and Anaheim).
3. The districts are not gerrymandered – rather this map was developed to take into account a fair map, including school district boundaries, school attendance areas, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines... AND they are under 1% deviation in population differences, allowing for all districts to have equitable representation.

Thank you.

Coleen Scherf-Ghara
3641 Myrtle St.
Irvine, CA 92606

From: [Valerie Burchfield](#)
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: OC BOE Redistricting
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 7:52:10 AM

I am writing in support of Option 9B map as it keeps the 3 south OC districts together (I live in Laguna Niguel) and well represents the various regions of the county. This map creates a mandated voting district for Latino populations and aligns communities with high Asian populations in Little Saigon and north Orange County. Please approve Option 9B. Thank you, Valerie Burchfield Rhodes

From: cindy.ashley@cox.net
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Support of Map 9B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 8:55:41 PM

Dear Orange County Committee on School District Organization Members:

My name is Cynthia Ashley and I live in Rancho Santa Margarita.

I am writing to state my **strong support of Map 9B**. This map is by far the most fair of the proposals and most cohesive by keeping many school districts together. All regions of the County are well represented. This map is not gerrymandered, follows the spirit of drawing a fair map, sticks to school district boundaries, trustee area or school attendance area boundaries, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines such as the Santa Ana River.

Please approve a fair Board of Education Map for Orange County with Map 9B.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Cynthia Ashley

From: Vivian Candy
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Approve Map 9B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 2:58:01 PM

Please approve Map 9B, which fairly represents all regions of Orange County!
Thank you.
Vivian Candy
Sent from my iPhone

From: Michael Cassidy
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Redistricting
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 5:44:11 PM

Dear Orange County Committee on School District Organization Members ,

My name is June Cassidy and we live in Newport Beach.

I am writing to state my strong support of Map 9B. This map is by far the most fair of the proposals and most cohesive by keeping many school districts together.

It appears that all regions of the County are well represented. There has been a tendency lately for election processes to become more partisan and less fair and open, so I applaud your efforts to take this process out in the open to the public.

Please approve a fair Board of Education Map for Orange County with Map 9B.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

June Cassidy
Newport Beach, Ca. 92660

From: Veronica Conklin
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Support Map9B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 8:10:57 PM

Dear Orange County Committee on School District Organization Members –

My name is Veronica Conklin, and I live in Westminster.

I am writing to state my **strong support of Map 9B**. This map is by far the most fair of the proposals and most cohesive by nesting many school districts together. All regions of the County are well represented.

Please approve a fair Board of Education Map for Orange County with Map 9B.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter,

Veronica Garcia-Conklin

From: sdearing@comline.com
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: In favor of Map 9B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 6:55:22 PM

Dear County Committee on School District Organization,

Please approve Map 9 B, which would keep Laguna Woods in District 5 for the OC Board of Education. This map sticks to school district boundaries, trustee area or school attendance area boundaries, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines. It also keeps the three South County School districts together.

Thank you so much for considering my opinion.

Best regards,
Sue Dearing
3197 Via Buena Vista Unit C
Laguna Woods, CA 92637

From: John Deshong
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Support for Map 9, Revised 12/21/22
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 5:22:08 PM

TO: Howard Marinier, Secretary to County Committee on School District Organization

Dear Mr. Marinier,

I am writing to state my support for Map 9, Revised 12/21/22 that was presented to the County Committee on School District Organization by Mr. Billie Joe Wright.

This map hits all the important points as required under voting rights acts by creating a stronger Latino majority district in the center of the county that includes the two most Latino school districts. Additionally this map strengthens the Asian plurality in those communities a little further north.

There is equitable population distribution among districts with a deviation of just under 1% which is well below the allowable deviation of up to 10%.

I am a home owner in Mission Viejo and was active in our schools while my children were of school age.

It is important to me that the school communities of Capistrano Unified, Saddleback Valley Unified and Laguna Beach Unified be represented by one board member who is familiar with our communities and school districts.

I urge the committee to approve a fair Board of Education map for Orange County and go with the option 9 Revised Map.

—

Thank you for your time and attention to this important issue.

John Deshong

From: Kathy Esfahani
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: public comment on redistricting
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 3:31:41 PM

To the County Committee on District Organizing:

In your redistricting decision, I urge you to adopt Map 9B, revised December 12.22.21. Communities across the county participated in its development, making it the most representative choice. Here are additional reasons I support this map:

1. This map has a better concentration of 'like communities' in single trustee areas. Most critically, communities that have previously been torn apart -- Latino and AAPI -- are kept intact. This is especially critical for Santa Ana and Anaheim -- school districts with the largest Latino populations which will now be together in a single district.

2. The districts are not gerrymandered. Instead, this map was developed to take into account school district boundaries, school attendance areas, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines... AND the districts are under 1% deviation in population differences, allowing for all districts to have equitable representation.

3. This map keeps most school districts whole within a single trustee area. This allows for a single representative to serve school districts in a more cohesive fashion.

I urge the CCDO to support the citizens/community map: 9B revised 12.22.21.

Thank you,
Kathy Esfahani
Costa Mesa resident

From: libbyvince@socal.rr.com
To: [County Committee on School District Organization](#)
Subject: Support of Map 9B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 11:49:52 PM

Dear Orange County Committee on School District Organization Members –

My name is Libby Frolichman and I live in Fountain Valley, CA. I am writing in strong support of Map 9B and I urge you to adopt this map. I like this map because it does the best job of keeping school districts united, all areas of the county would have a reasonably cohesive district, and this map is the fairest to all regions.

Please approve a fair Board of Education Map for Orange County with Map 9B.

Thank you for your consideration,
Libby Frolichman

From: Susan Guilford
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Map 9 B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 2:24:01 PM

Dear Committee,

Please support Map 9 B because

- It keeps many school districts together
- The two most heavily Latino school districts are in the same district
- The three south county districts are kept together
- Follows school district boundaries, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines such as the Santa Ana River
- Has one of the lowest deviations of the proposals

Thank you for your diligent and thoughtful work on this task.

Sue Guilford
Orange CA

From: Naz Hamid
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Approve map 9B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 1:21:27 PM
Attachments: Wright Map 9 B Revised 12.22.21.pdf

Dear County Committee on School District Organization,

Please approve MAP 9B for the following reasons:

- Option 9B is by far, the most fair of the proposals and most cohesive by nesting many school districts together.
- The three South County School districts are kept together.
- The two most Latino school districts are put together in the same area.
- All regions of the county are well represented.
- Creates a Federal Voting Rights mandated district for the growing Latino population in the central part of the county centered in Santa Ana.
- Creates a district where the growing Asian population is the plurality of the eligible voters, centered in Little Saigon and the Korean communities in North Orange County.
- Has one of the lowest deviations of the proposals, with just under 1% deviation, allowing for all districts to have equitable representation.
- Not gerrymandered, follows the spirit of drawing a fair map, sticking to school district boundaries, trustee area or school attendance area boundaries, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines such as the Santa Ana River.

Thank you!
Naz Hamid

From: Patty Hanzo
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: My map preference - OCBE Cte on School District Organization
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 11:09:43 PM

Good afternoon Cte on School District Organization,

We are PYLUSD parents and have reviewed the proposed maps. Ours is a Latino and White household. We urge you to pass MAP 9B for the following reasons:

- Creates a fair CVAP (voting age population) mandated district for the growing Latino population in the central part of the county centered in Santa Ana.*
- Creates a fair CVAP (voting age population) mandated district of the growing AAPI population centered in Little Saigon and the Korean communities in North Orange County.*
- Map 9B is not gerrymandered, it uses school district boundaries the best, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines in a comprehensive manner.*
- Three school districts in the south part of OC are kept together which makes sense.*
- The two most Latino school districts are put together in the same area.*
- Map 9B will best place school districts together for the next decade.*

--

Thank you,

Patricia Hanzo, MSW

From: Janet Henry
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Support for Map 9B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 8:35:38 PM

Dear Members of the O.C. Committee on School District Organization,

As a long-time resident of Rancho Santa Margarita, I urge all of you to support Map 9B. This configuration, assures a cohesive and fair nesting of many school districts.

Thank you for your consideration.

Janet M. Henry

From: Christine Hernandez
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Support of Map 9B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 5:15:27 PM

Dear Orange County Committee on School District Organization Members –

My name is Christine Hernandez and I live in Midway City.

I am writing to state my **strong support of Map 9B**. I believe that this map is by far the most fair of the proposals and most cohesive by nesting many school districts together. All regions of the County are well represented.

Please approve a fair Board of Education Map for Orange County with Map 9B.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Christine Hernandez

From: Dorie Krepton
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Thank You
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 11:58:54 PM

Dear Committee Members:

The last two meetings your Committee presided at the Orange County Board Room on December 10, 2021 and January 14, 2022, were a breath of fresh air! You conducted the meeting with a sense of fairness, a willingness to listen, and you managed the audience in a respectful manner. Thank you.

I regularly attended the Orange County Board meeting during the 2021 school year. I also commented on on several topics such as masking and redistricting and was booed by opposing members of the audience. Sadly, the president of the board never asked the group to be quiet and respectful, but rather, seemed to be encouraging their disruptive behavior. At the December 21, 2021 Orange County Board meeting I was signed in to comment. When my name was called to speak, I withdrew in fear of my safety because members of the audience who don't agree with your point of view will loudly shout out with rude remarks. I mention this situation to you only to give you some background on what many of us have been enduring with this one-sided, biased board who refuses to listen and be respectful to all of its attending community members.

So I humbly thank you for restoring my faith in mankind. I am grateful to ALL of you for your courage, backbone, and integrity. I'm sorry you had to endure unfair comments and demeaning remarks from some members of the audience at the last meeting, January 14, 2022. But please know your presence, your work, and your unselfish efforts are most appreciated by many of us. Your work is critical to our democracy.

With respect and gratitude,

Dorie Krepton
Retired Educator

From: ghmstein@aol.com
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Trustee Areas for Board of Education
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 5:26:52 PM

Thank you for your careful and thoughtful consideration regarding the new areas for the Orange County Board of Education.

I attended the last two meetings of this committee and listened to the presentations on Map 5 and Map C. To me it is evident that Map C is the more appropriate choice for the following reasons:

- On Map C the trustee areas are fairly compact and have regular borders. On Map 5 the trustee areas are oddly-shaped and have jagged borders.
- The areas that are grouped together on Map C make sense, whereas Map 5 appears to be seeking out neighborhoods for inclusion in particular trustee areas.
- It makes more sense to me to have the borders follow school district boundaries, as is done in Map C, as opposed to city boundaries, as is done in Map 5.
- Finally, the demographer who presented Map C gave clear and reasonable explanations for the way each of the trustee areas is drawn. Questions about Map 5 at the previous meeting were met with vague responses.

Clearly Map C is the better choice. I urge the committee to approve this map.

Gisela Meier
Orange

From: Christy Moshenko
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Support Map 9B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 9:27:00 PM

My name is Christy Moshenko and I live in Trabuco Canyon, CA].

I am writing to state my **strong support of Map 9B**. This map is by far the most fair of the proposals and most cohesive by nesting many school districts together. All regions of he County are well represented.

Please approve a fair Board of Education Map for Orange County with Map 9B.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Christy Moshenko
christymo@cox.net

From: sharon_ohara
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Choose Map 9B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 5:36:53 PM

Option 9B is by far, the most fair of the proposals and most cohesive by nesting many school districts together.

The three South County School districts are kept together.

The two most Latino school districts are put together in the same area.

All regions of the county are well represented.

Creates a Federal Voting Rights mandated district for the growing Latino population in the central part of the county centered in Santa Ana.

Creates a district where the growing Asian population is the plurality of the eligible voters, centered in Little Saigon and the Korean communities in North Orange County.

Has one of the lowest deviations of the proposals, with just under 1% deviation, allowing for all districts to have equitable representation.

Not gerrymandered, follows the spirit of drawing a fair map, sticking to school district boundaries, trustee area or school attendance area boundaries, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines such as the Santa Ana River.

Please approve a fair Board of Education map for Orange County

Thank you,

SHARON OHara

700 W Walnut Ave #21

Orange 92868

From: Trevin P
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Support of Map 9B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 4:44:55 PM

Dear Orange County Committee on School District Organization Members –

My name is Trevin Peacock and I live in Buena Park.

I am writing to state my **strong support of Map 9B**. This map is by far the most fair of the proposals and most cohesive by nesting many school districts together. All regions of the County are well represented.

Please approve a fair Board of Education Map for Orange County with Map 9B.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Trevin Peacock

From: Ann Ronan
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Support for Option 9B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 12:08:58 PM

Dear Mr. Marinier and Committee members,

I am writing to request that you approve Map 9 Revised 12/22/21 in the redistricting process.

It is the most fair and makes the most sense as it keeps many school districts together.

I am in San Juan Capistrano and appreciate that it keeps the three South County School districts together.

Thanks,

Ann Ronan
San Juan Capistrano, CA

From: Andrea Schmidt
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Support of Map 9B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 4:05:42 PM

Dear Orange County Committee on School District Organization Members –

My name is Andrea Schmidt and I live in Costa Mesa.

I am writing to state my **strong support of Map 9B**. This map is by far the most fair of the proposals and most cohesive by nesting many school districts together. All regions of the County are well represented.

Please approve a fair Board of Education Map for Orange County with Map 9B.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

--

Andrea Schmidt
amschmidt21@gmail.com | (909) 782-9266

From: TERI SOREY
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: OCBE District Maps
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 1:06:23 PM

Dear Members of the County Committee,

Thank you for the work you are doing. It is hard and stressful, but important to all the students in OC!

I'm writing to encourage you to approve Map 9B because by far, it is the most fair of the proposals with all regions of the county well represented.

Map 9B is the most cohesive option because it keeps many school districts together, in particular the 3 south OC districts: Capistrano, Saddleback, and Laguna Beach.

It also keeps the two most Latino school districts together in the same area, creating a Federal Voting Rights mandated district for the growing Latino population in the central part of the county.

In addition, Map 9B creates a district where the growing Asian population is the plurality of the eligible voters in Little Saigon and the Korean communities of North Orange County.

Map 9B has one of the lowest deviations of the proposals, less than 1%, while allowing for all districts to have equitable representation.

Map 9B follows the spirit of drawing a fair map for the county by respecting school district boundaries, trustee areas, school attendance area boundaries, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines such as the Santa Ana River.

Thank you for avoiding the distractions of the loud rude voices in the room and their threats of a lawsuit. Thank you for being thorough and deliberative throughout this process.

Teri Sorey
Irvine

From: Natalie Thach
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Support of Map 9B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 9:22:58 PM

Dear Orange County Committee on School District Organization Members,

My name is Natalie Thach and I live in Anaheim.

I am writing to state my **strong support of Map 9B**. This map is by far the fairest of the proposals and most cohesive by nesting many school districts together. All regions of the County are well represented.

Please approve a fair Board of Education Map for Orange County with Map 9B.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Natalie Thach

From: Jamie Valiente
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Support of Map 9B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 4:45:16 PM

Dear Orange County Committee on School District Organization Members –

My name is Jamie Valiente and I live in Buena Park.

I am writing to state my **strong support of Map 9B**. This map is by far the most fair of the proposals and most cohesive by nesting many school districts together. All regions of the County are well represented.

Please approve a fair Board of Education Map for Orange County with Map 9B.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Jamie Valiente

From: Nisha Verma
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Please approve Map 9B for the Orange County Board of Education
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 1:28:50 PM

I am the mother of a transitional kindergarten student in Orange Unified School District. I have been following the actions of the County Committee on School District Organization and I ask that you approve Map 9B for the Orange County Board of Education, for the following reasons:

- Option 9B is by far, the most fair of the proposals and most cohesive by nesting many school districts together.
- The three South County School districts are kept together.
- The two most Latino school districts are put together in the same area.
- All regions of the county are well represented.
- Creates a Federal Voting Rights mandated district for the growing Latino population in the central part of the county centered in Santa Ana.
- Creates a district where the growing Asian population is the plurality of the eligible voters, centered in Little Saigon and the Korean communities in North Orange County.
- Has one of the lowest deviations of the proposals, with just under 1% deviation, allowing for all districts to have equitable representation.
- Not gerrymandered, follows the spirit of drawing a fair map, sticking to school district boundaries, trustee area or school attendance area boundaries, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines such as the Santa Ana River.

Thank you

Nisha Verma
298 S. Santa Maria
Orange, CA 92869
312-804-3961

From: Nancy Watkins
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Support of Map 9B!
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 5:11:13 PM

Hello Orange County Committee on School District Organization Members,

This is a critical time in public education and the work you are doing can ensure equitable representation for Orange County.

I strongly encourage you **Map 9B**. This map is fair, cohesive, and offers the best representation on the Board. Unfortunately, several OC Board of ED members do not favor this map because it would require a shift in the current power structure. The actions by members of the OCBOE are selfish and not in the best interest of constituents.

Please approve a fair Board of Education Map for Orange County with Map 9B.

Thank you for work on this important matter.

Nancy A. Watkins

Orange, CA

--

Nancy Watkins, Ed.D.
nwatkins@gmail.com

From: dana zywiciel
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Map 9B
Date: Thursday, January 20, 2022 7:30:11 PM

To the County Committee on School District Organization,

Please approve MAP 9B for the following reasons:

- Option 9B is by far, the most fair of the proposals and most cohesive by nesting many school districts together.
- The three South County School districts are kept together.
- The two most Latino school districts are put together in the same area.
- All regions of the county are well represented.
- Creates a Federal Voting Rights mandated district for the growing Latino population in the central part of the county centered in Santa Ana.
- Creates a district where the growing Asian population is the plurality of the eligible voters, centered in Little Saigon and the Korean communities in North Orange County.
- Has one of the lowest deviations of the proposals, with just under 1% deviation, allowing for all districts to have equitable representation.
- Not gerrymandered, follows the spirit of drawing a fair map, sticking to school district boundaries, trustee area or school attendance area boundaries, main streets, freeways and natural dividing lines such as the Santa Ana River.

Thank you,
Dana Zywiciel, Yorba Linda Resident

From: Griselda Aguirre
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Support of Map 9B
Date: Friday, January 21, 2022 8:51:20 AM

Dear Orange County Committee on School District Organization Members,

My name is Griselda Aguirre and I live in the city of Anaheim.

I am writing to state **my strong support of map 9B**. This map is by far the most fair of the proposals and most cohesive by nesting many school districts together. All regions of the county are well represented.

Please approve a Fair Board of Education Map for Orange County with Map 9.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Griselda Aguirre

From: Dorie Krepton
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Redistricting: Support of Map 9B
Date: Friday, January 21, 2022 12:35:08 AM

Dear Committee Members

I'm writing to you in support of Map 9B for redistricting. The map meets and follows the federal guidelines for redistricting on several guidelines:

1. It respects the boundaries of all communities.
2. It respects a broad base of voters allowing for meaningful representation and balance.
3. It cohesively holds most school districts together.
4. It favorably represents the district boundaries of actual neighborhoods rather than cutting an arbitrary line thru someone's house.
5. It follows the principle of "one person, one vote" in which each district has a substantially similar number of people sharing common social and economic interests.

Map 9B is well-reasoned in its rational and follows the tenets of fair representation and equality. Map 9B is a fair map.

Map 9B deserves your support!

Thank you for consideration

Dorie Krepton
Retired Educator

From: Debbie Salahi
To: County Committee on School District Organization
Subject: Public Comment in Favor of Map 9B at 1/21/22 CCSDO Meeting
Date: Friday, January 21, 2022 12:01:06 AM

I want my comments to go into the record. I am writing to state I am strongly in favor of Option 9B and hope that you will support it at the meeting on Friday. Option 9B keeps the three South Orange County School Districts together and all regions of the county are well represented. This is important to me because it is the right thing to do and I live in the Capistrano Unified School District.

Option 9 also provides a district for the growing Asian population and a district for the growing Latino population.

What I like best about Option 9B is it is not gerrymandered. The map that I understand was approved after the School Board meeting I attended in December looked very strangely shaped.

Please do what is right for the community and approve the fairer map, Option 9B .

Debbie Salahi
Laguna Niguel