

# REPORT

**DATE:** April 3, 2008

**TO:** Administration Committee  
Regional Council

**FROM:** District Evaluations Subcommittee

**SUBJECT:** Regional Council District Evaluations Process and Recommendations

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL:**



## RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve recommendations made by the District Evaluations Subcommittee, which includes adding two additional Regional Council Districts (Districts #66 and #67) and making adjustments to the current composition of existing Regional Council Districts.

## BACKGROUND:

The SCAG Bylaws provide that the Regional Council must review the current composition of the Regional Council Districts every five (5) years, based upon the current city population data from the State Department of Finance. The Bylaws also state that the Regional Council is to review the district boundaries in 2004, and thereafter, in every year ending in 3 and 8.

In accordance with the Bylaws, the District Evaluations Subcommittee (Subcommittee) was reactivated last fall to undertake the district evaluations process. The members of the Subcommittee, representing each of the six (6) counties within the SCAG region, are:

Hon. Larry McCallon, City of Highland (representing San Bernardino County), Chair;  
Hon. Toni Young, City of Port Hueneme (representing Ventura County), Vice-Chair;  
Hon. Margaret Clark, City of Rosemead (representing Los Angeles County);  
Hon. Richard Dixon, City of Lake Forest (representing Orange County);  
Hon. Jon Edney, City of El Centro (representing Imperial County); and  
Hon. Greg Pettis, City of Cathedral City (representing Riverside County).

Starting in December 2007, the Subcommittee met each month and concluded its evaluation process on March 10, 2008. As part of the process, the Subcommittee reviewed information such as the current population data from the State Department of Finance as well as recommendations from various subregional organizations regarding proposed changes to the current composition of the Regional Council Districts. Subregional organizations were invited to participate and provide input to the Subcommittee throughout the district evaluation process.

The SCAG Bylaws provide that "a [Regional Council] District shall be established by the Regional Council and be comprised of a group of cities that have a geographic community of interest and have approximately equal population." (Emphasis added). This is based upon the principle of proportional representation, or a "one person, one vote" system. SCAG's Bylaws also provide that a Regional Council District "may be

# REPORT

comprised of cities within different counties, but Districts established by subregions ... shall include only cities within the boundaries of such subregions." Finally, the Bylaws establish a maximum of 67 Regional Council Districts, and there are currently 65 Regional Council Districts, leaving room to establish at most two additional Districts.

## SUMMARY:

As part of its evaluation process, the District Evaluations Subcommittee determined that SCAG staff should follow the same approach used last time for reviewing district boundaries. As such, the goal is for each Regional Council District to have a population of approximately a quarter million people, with a population deviation of 50,000 people. Therefore, the objective is that that Regional Council Districts represent a population range of between 200,000 to 300,000 people.

Applying this approach in conjunction with the 2007 city population data obtained from the State Department of Finance, staff found that there are 17 Regional Council Districts which fall outside of the recommended population range. Included with this report is a table (see Attachment "A") listing the current District population data, the city population data as well as the recommendations by the Subcommittee regarding the Districts which fall outside of the recommended population range.

In some case, certain Districts which are outside of this range may not be modified due to the provisions in the Bylaws. As examples, Districts 1, 36 and 44, while all having populations under 200,000 people, include cities within the boundaries of the Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG), the Arroyo Verdugo Cities subregion and the Las Virgenes Malibu Council of Governments respectively, and therefore may not be modified pursuant to the Bylaws in order to preserve the subregional boundaries. There are other Districts whose total populations are outside of the range, but whose current configurations represent a geographic community of interest. Finally, there are certain Districts, such as Districts 16 and 19, which represent large individual cities (Santa Ana and Anaheim, respectively) whose population exceed the recommended population range, but would not make sense to fracture at this point in time.

A summary of the key recommendations made by the Subcommittee, by county, is provided as follows:

### Imperial County

- District #1: District #1 comprises the cities within the IVAG subregion and has a collective population outside of the recommended population range at 133,613 people. The Subcommittee, including Mayor Edney who served on the Subcommittee to represent the interests of the cities within Imperial County, recommends no changes be made to this District in order to preserve the subregional boundaries of IVAG.

### Los Angeles County

- District #29: District #29 currently is one of two RC districts assigned to the City of Long Beach. As part of the District Evaluation process, staff uncovered that the City of Avalon is currently not assigned to a RC District. Staff had initially recommended that Avalon be assigned to District #24, but it was Avalon's preference to be assigned to one of Long Beach's Regional Council Districts (i.e. Districts #29 and #30). The two cities discussed the matter, and according to Long Beach representatives, Long



# REPORT

Beach will accommodate Avalon's request provided Long Beach maintains the ability to appoint Long Beach City Council members to both RC District seats assigned to Long Beach. Long Beach noted that the size of the city in relation to the SCAG region justified it maintaining its two Regional Council seats. Avalon has no objection to Long Beach's proposal, concluding that it has more of a community of interest with Long Beach than with the cities in District #24, and that Long Beach would best represent Avalon's interests.

Long Beach also presented two options regarding the configurations of Districts #29 and #30, based upon this proposal. The Subcommittee reviewed these options, and the Subcommittee unanimously supported assigning the City of Avalon to one of the Districts assigned to Long Beach, which the configuration of such districts to be established as follows: (1) designate RC District #29 as comprising Long Beach and Avalon, and made up of seven (7) council members from the City of Long Beach and the five (5) council members from the City of Avalon; and (2) designate RC District #30 as comprising the City of Long Beach only, and made up of two city council members from Long Beach and its Mayor.

- District #33: District #33 currently comprises the cities of Azusa, Baldwin Park, Covina, Glendora, Irwindale and San Dimas. Nick Conway, Executive Director of the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, recommended to the Subcommittee that San Dimas be moved from District #33 to District #38, as San Dimas has more of a community of interest with the cities of Claremont, La Verne and Pomona. The Subcommittee had no objection to this recommendation. Therefore, the Subcommittee recommends that District #33 be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:

Azusa:	44,640
Baldwin Park:	81,146
Covina:	49,720
Glendora:	52,557
Irwindale:	1,655
<hr/>	
Adjusted Population	233,718 people

- District #38: District #38 currently comprises the cities of Claremont, Laverne and Pomona. Nick Conway, Executive Director of the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, recommended to the Subcommittee that San Dimas be moved from District #33 to District #38, as San Dimas has more of a community of interest with the cities of Claremont, La Verne and Pomona. The Subcommittee had no objection to this recommendation. Therefore, the Subcommittee recommends that District #38 be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:

Claremont:	37,141
La Verne:	33,449
Pomona:	162,140
San Dimas:	37,141
<hr/>	
Adjusted Population	269,741 people

# REPORT

- District #42: District #42 currently comprises the cities of Burbank, Glendale and San Fernando and has a collective population outside of the recommended population range at 340,223 people. It is the recommendation of the Subcommittee that the City of San Fernando be moved from District #42 to form a new District with the City of Santa Clarita (i.e. new RC District #67), to establish more population balance within the affected districts. The cities of San Fernando and Santa Clarita concur with the Subcommittee's recommendation. Therefore, based upon this recommendation, District #42 would be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:

Burbank:	107,921
Glendale:	207,157
<hr/>	
Adjusted Population	315,078 people

- District #43: District #43 currently comprises the cities of Lancaster, Palmdale and Santa Clarita and has a collective population outside of the recommended population range at 466,444 people. The Subcommittee recommends moving the City of Santa Clarita from District #43 to form a new District with the City of San Fernando (i.e. new RC District #67) to establish more population balance within the affected districts. The cities of San Fernando and Santa Clarita concur with the Subcommittee's recommendation. Therefore, based upon this recommendation, District #43 would be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:

Lancaster:	143,818
Palmdale:	145,468
<hr/>	
Adjusted Population	289,286 people

- New District #67: As previously noted, the Subcommittee recommends that there be a new RC District formed comprising the cities of San Fernando and Santa Clarita. Both cities concur with this recommendation, and therefore, this new District #67 would comprise the following cities with the following population:

San Fernando:	25,145
Santa Clarita:	177,158
<hr/>	
Adjusted Population	202,303 people

## Orange County

- District #12: District #12 currently comprises the cities of Dana Point, Laguna Beach, Laguna Niguel, San Clemente, and San Juan Capistrano. The Subcommittee recommends moving the City of Aliso Viejo from District #13 to District #12 to establish more population balance within the affected districts. The Orange County Council of Governments (OCCOG) Board concurs with this recommendation. Therefore, based upon this recommendation, District #12 would be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:



# REPORT

Dana Point:	36,946
Laguna Beach:	25,131
Laguna Niguel:	66,608
San Clemente:	67,373
San Juan Capistrano:	36,452
Aliso Viejo:	45,037

---

Adjusted Population	277,547 people
---------------------	----------------

- District #13: District #13 currently comprises the cities of Aliso Viejo, Laguna Hills, Laguna Woods, Lake Forrest, Mission Viejo and Rancho Santa Margarita and has a collective population outside of the recommended population range at 332,298 people. The Subcommittee recommends moving Aliso Viejo from District #13 to District #12 to establish more population balance within the affected districts. The OCCOG Board concurs with this recommendation. Therefore, based upon this recommendation, District #13 would be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:

Laguna Hills:	33,391
Laguna Woods:	18,426
Lake Forest:	78,243
Mission Viejo:	98,483
Rancho Santa Margarita:	49,718

---

Adjusted Population	278,261 people
---------------------	----------------

- District #14: District #14 currently comprises the cities of Irvine and Newport Beach. To establish more population balance as well as in recognition of the anticipated future population growth for the City of Irvine [which is consistent with prior Regional Council actions, such as the adoption the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) plan], the Subcommittee recommends moving Newport Beach from District #14 to District #15. This recommendation means that District #14 would be adjusted to comprise solely of the City of Irvine, with a population of 202,079 people.

It should be noted that as of February 28, 2008, the OCCOG Board recommended that the composition of Districts #14 and #15 remain as-is. SCAG is in receipt of a letter from Sean Joyce, City Manager for the City of Irvine dated March 5, 2008, which is in opposition to the OCCOG Board decision. The letter from Irvine cited the anticipated future population growth of the City of Irvine as well as the lack of commonality between the cities of Irvine and Newport Beach as among the reasons why it supported the proposal to move Newport Beach from District #14 to District #15.

- District #15: District #15 currently comprises the cities of Costa Mesa and Fountain Valley and has a collective population outside of the recommended population range at 171,546 people. As noted above, the Subcommittee recommends moving the City of Newport Beach from District #14 to District #15 for better balance. The Subcommittee also noted that since Costa Mesa and Fountain Valley are currently not members of SCAG, moving Newport Beach from District #14 to District #15 would in turn provide

# REPORT

Regional Council representation on both Districts #14 and #15. Therefore, based upon this recommendation, District #15 would be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:

Costa Mesa:	113,805
Fountain Valley:	57,741
Newport Beach:	84,218
<hr/>	
Adjusted Population	255,764 people

## Riverside County

- District #2: District #2 currently comprises the cities within the Coachella Valley Association of Governments (CVAG) subregion and has a collective population outside of the recommended population range at 373,504 people. The Subcommittee recommends that two Districts within the CVAG subregion be established, which is consistent with prior requests by CVAG. After obtaining input from CVAG representatives, the Subcommittee recommends that the two districts be established to comprise the western and eastern areas of the CVAG subregion. Therefore, based upon this recommendation, District #2 would represent the western area of the CVAG subregion and be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:

Cathedral City:	52,115
Desert Hot Springs:	23,544
Indian Wells:	4,942
Palm Desert:	49,752
Palm Springs:	46,858
Aliso Viejo:	16,944
<hr/>	
Adjusted Population	193,855 people

- District #63: District #63 currently comprises the cities of Canyon Lake, Corona, Lake Elsinore, Norco, and Perris. During the District Evaluations process, representatives from the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) informed the Subcommittee that the City of Wildomar was recently approved by the electorate to be a new city in California, with official incorporation to be finalized by July 1, 2008. Based upon input from WRCOG representatives, the Subcommittee recommends that Wildomar be assigned to District #63. Therefore, based upon this recommendation, District #63 would be adjusted to comprise the following cities with the following population:

Canyon Lake:	10,969
Corona:	146,164
Lake Elsinore:	47,634
Norco:	27,361
Perris:	50,663
Wildomar:	27,000
<hr/>	
Adjusted Population	309,791 people



# REPORT

- **New District #66:** As previously noted, the Subcommittee recommends that two Districts within the CVAG subregion be established. After obtaining input from CVAG representatives, the Subcommittee recommends that the two districts be established to comprise the western and eastern areas of the CVAG subregion. Therefore, based upon this recommendation, a new RC District #66 would be established to represent the eastern area of the CVAG subregion and would comprise the following cities with the following population:

Blythe:	22,625
Coachella:	38,486
Indio:	77,146
La Quinta:	41,092

---

Adjusted Population	179,349 people
---------------------	----------------

- **City of Menifee:** According to WRCOG representatives, the City of Menifee is anticipated to become an official city in California within the near future. At such time, in accordance with the SCAG Bylaws, staff will consult with WRCOG, and assign Menifee to "a District with other cities with which it has contiguous borders." Menifee has an estimated population of approximately 60,467 people.

## San Bernardino County

The Subcommittee recommends no adjustments to the Districts within San Bernardino County. For those Districts in San Bernardino County which are outside of the recommended population range (i.e. Districts #10 and #11), the Subcommittee, including Councilman McCallon who served as the Chair of the Subcommittee and represented the interests of the cities within San Bernardino County, determined it best not to make any changes at this time in order to preserve the community of interests of these districts, amongst other reasons.

## Ventura County

The Subcommittee recommends no adjustments to the Districts within Ventura County. While the current population of District #47 is outside of the recommended population range, the Subcommittee, including Mayor Young who served as the Vice-Chair of the Subcommittee and represented the interests of the cities within Ventura County, determined it best not to make any changes at this time in order to preserve the community of interests between the cities in District #47.

Assuming that the Regional Council approves the recommendations made by the District Evaluations Subcommittee, the changes to the Regional Council Districts will be official. While the changes proposed by the Subcommittee do not involve any changes to the SCAG Bylaws, it is the Subcommittee's desire that the changes be forwarded to the General Assembly for information as part of the General Assembly meeting scheduled in May 2008.

## **FISCAL IMPACT:**

Work related to the District Evaluations Subcommittee is included as part of the current Overall Work Program.

# MEMO

TO: Nancy Pfeffer, Gateway Cities COG  
FROM: Linda W. Jones, 213-236-1912 or jonesl@scag.ca.gov  
DATE: January 21, 2009  
SUBJECT: 2009 SCAG Regional Council District Representative Elections

The time is approaching for Regional Council (RC) District Representative elections for **odd-numbered districts**. The term of office for current Regional Council Members representing odd-numbered districts will expire at the conclusion of the General Assembly on May 7, 2009.

Please schedule elections for **District # 23 (Nelson)** representing Artesia, Cerritos, Hawaiian Gardens and Norwalk; **District # 25 (Gafin)** representing Downey and South Gate; **District # 27 (Gurule)** representing Bell, Bell Gardens, Commerce, Cudahy, Huntington Park, Maywood and Vernon; **District # 29 (Vacant)** representing Long Beach and Avalon; and, **District # 31 (Carroll)** representing La Habra Heights, La Mirada, Santa Fe Springs, Pico Rivera and Whittier.

## DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE ELECTION PROCEDURE

### Candidates

- All elected officials serving on city councils from SCAG member cities within the District are eligible candidates.

### Election Notice

- The subregional organization is required to communicate to each city mayor and councilmember in the SCAG District the date, time and location of the SCAG District election at least 30 days prior to the election.
- The election should be scheduled in connection with a regularly scheduled subregional governing board meeting.
- The election notice should also be sent to the City Clerk in each city within the District with a request to post the election notice.
- The election notice is a two-step process. The first notice calls for candidates within two weeks from the notice date, and establishes the election date, time and location. The second notice within two weeks of the election includes the candidate's names and repeats the election date, time and location.

### Election Procedure

- District Representatives shall be elected by a majority of a quorum. A quorum is defined as at least one (1) elected official from 2/3 of the member cities within a district.  
*Example: If District X is comprised of 6 cities, then at least 1 elected official from 4 of those member cities within the district must be present to constitute a quorum. When a quorum is present, the election may be conducted. All elected officials from all member cities can vote.*
- Please note that proxy votes are not permitted.
- Also note that elected officials from non-member cities are not eligible to vote or to be candidates.
- District elections should take place no later than one (1) month prior to the annual General Assembly, scheduled for May 7, 2009. The first meeting of the new Regional Council representative will be on June 4, 2009 at the Regional Council Retreat.
- If there is only one candidate, that individual shall be declared the SCAG District Representative without having to conduct an election.